



Submissions report

Crows Nest TOD State Significant Development (SSD-83076206)

402-420 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest

Prepared on behalf of X Quantum Pty Ltd

July 8, 2026

Document control

Authors

Reviewed by	Michael File, Director	michael@fpdplanning.com
Prepared by	Anna Johnston, Associate	anna.johnston@fpdplanning.com

Project summary

Prepared on behalf of	X Quantum Pty Ltd
Land to be developed	402-420 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest
Legal description	SP54033
Project description	38 storey mixed use development comprising a four-storey retail / commercial podium and 273 residential apartments, including affordable housing

Contents

Document control	ii
1 Introduction	5
2 Analysis of submissions.....	6
2.1 Breakdown of submissions	6
2.1.1 Government Agency Advice	6
2.1.2 Submission from local councils	6
2.1.3 Submissions from the Public	6
2.2 Categorisation of Issues	7
3 Actions taken since exhibition.....	9
3.1 Review and analysis of submissions.....	9
3.2 Refinements to the Proposal	9
3.3 Further assessment.....	9
3.4 Further consultation	10
4 Response to submissions	11
4.1 DPHI key issues letter	11
4.2 Advice from Government agencies and organisations	13
4.3 Local government submissions	16
4.4 Public submissions	21
5 Conclusion.....	31
 Table 1 Categorisation of issues	 7
Table 2: Response to DPHI key issues letter	11
Table 3: Response to Government agency advice	13
Table 4: Response to North Sydney Council submission	16
Table 5: Response to Lane Cove Council submission	20
Table 6: Response to public submissions.....	21
 Appendix A: Submissions register.....	 32

This page is left intentionally blank

1 Introduction

This Submissions Report has been prepared by FPD Planning on behalf of X Quantum Pty Ltd to support the assessment of a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for the development of 402-420 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest (the site).

The SSDA was lodged in December 2025, and the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was exhibited from 21 April 2026 to 5 May 2026. The exhibited EIS sought approval for:

- Demolition of all existing structures on the site, tree removal, excavation and site preparation works
- Construction of a 39 storey mixed use building comprising:
 - Four levels of basement car parking accessed from Oxley Street.
 - A five storey podium with ground floor retail / servicing and four levels of above ground car parking.
 - Above podium resident communal open space and communal floor space along with two levels of commercial floor space.
 - 32 levels of residential floor space accommodating 254 dwellings including affordable housing.
 - Rooftop servicing and private roof terraces.
- Retention of existing access from Oxley Street to access basement car parking and construction of a new driveway from Oxley Street to access ground floor servicing and upper level car parking.
- Associated landscaping and public domain works.
- Infrastructure servicing.

In response to the exhibition 23 public submissions were received along with submissions from North Sydney Council and Lane Cove Council. Advice was also received from six Government agencies and authorities.

The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) has requested the Applicant prepare a response to submissions report to address issues raised in the submissions, as required under section 59(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021*. DPHI also has also outlined key issues to be addressed in the submissions report.

This Submissions Report has been prepared to address all matters raised in submissions from local councils and members of the public as well as advice from state government agencies and authorities and key issues raised by DPHI.

A response to all submissions and advice is provided in Section 4 and a Submissions Register is provided at Appendix A of this report. This Report has been prepared in accordance with the *State Significant Development Guidelines Appendix C - Preparing a Submissions Report*.

A separate Amendment Report including supporting technical studies has been prepared which outlines and assesses the proposed changes to the development which have been made to address issues raised in submissions.

2 Analysis of submissions

An analysis of the submissions and advice received is detailed below.

Section 4 sets out the response to all issues raised and a Submissions Register is provided at Appendix A.

2.1 Breakdown of submissions

2.1.1 Government Agency Advice

Advice was received from the following Government agencies and authorities:

- Transport for NSW (TfNSW)
- Sydney Metro
- Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) – Water Assessments, Planning and Knowledge Division
- Commonwealth Civil Aviation Safety Authority
- Air Services Australia
- Sydney Airport.

The matters raised in the advice are addressed in Section 4.2.

2.1.2 Submission from local councils

One submission was received from North Sydney Council making comments on the proposal and one from Lane Cove Council objecting to the proposal. The matters raised in the council submissions are addressed in Section 4.3.

2.1.3 Submissions from the Public

A total of 23 public submissions were received including:

- Objections: 12
- Submissions in support: 9
- Submissions making comments: 2

The key concerns raised in submissions related to:

- Height and density
- Building design and landscaping
- Residential uses including dwelling mix and affordable housing and loss of existing housing
- Commercial uses including lack of demand
- Amenity impacts including solar access, privacy, loss of views, wind impacts and noise
- Impact on future development at 35-51 Nicholson Street
- Traffic and transport matters including traffic congestion, access arrangements, car parking, pedestrian safety and public transport
- Waste management
- Lack of open space
- Construction impacts
- Extent of public consultation
- Impact on property values
- Procedural matters.

Submissions made in support of the project highlighted the following benefits:

- Strategic location adjacent to Crows Nest metro and near St Leonards Station
- Delivery of a transit-oriented development outcome
- Provision of more housing supply located close to transport, jobs and facilities including the hospital
- Improved housing affordability
- Proposed commercial uses will be beneficial for the area
- General support for the architectural design and alignment with local character
- Design excellence in the architectural presentation and environmental sustainability.

The matters raised in public submissions are addressed in Section 4.4

2.2 Categorisation of Issues

The matters raised in submissions have been categorised as follows as per the categories outlined in *State Significant Development Guidelines Appendix C - Preparing a Submissions Report*:

Table 1 Categorisation of issues

Category	Matters raised
The Project (e.g. the site, the project area, the physical layout and design, key uses and activities, timing)	• Preference for below ground car parking and use of the podium for retail / commercial • Preference for wintergarden balconies to be removed • The height and scale of development • Impacts on existing character • Suggestions to maximise housing density and provide social and affordable housing • Building design and landscaping • Building setbacks, built form interfaces and relationship to surrounding development • Access and servicing issues • Lack of infrastructure and access to open space • Lack of onsite car parking provided and impacts on street parking • Car parking should be reduced • Lack of solar compliance • Suitability of dwelling mix • Oversupply of housing • Inadequate waste storage
Procedural matters (e.g. level or quality of engagement, compliance with the SEARs, identification of relevant statutory requirements)	• Inadequate length of consultation period and lack of consultation with residents in the area.
Economic, environmental and social impacts (e.g. amenity, air, biodiversity, heritage)	• Traffic impacts including traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, car parking impacts and lack of public transport to support development • Traffic impact of GFA exceedance • Structural design concerns adjacent to the Sydney Metro tunnel • Potential groundwater impacts • Amenity impacts including overshadowing, privacy and overlooking, noise and wind impact • Loss of views and visual impacts

Category	Matters raised
	• Social impacts • Displacement of exiting residents on the site • Construction impacts • Lack of open space • Lack of demand for non-residential floor space • Impact on property values • Cumulative amenity impacts
Justification and evaluation of the project as a whole (e.g. consistency of project with Government plans, policies or guidelines)	• Exceedance of FSR controls • Crows Nest TOD affordable housing requirement for the site is excessive
Issues that are beyond the scope of the project or not relevant to the project. (e.g. broader policy issues or not relevant to the project)	• Upgrades required to bus infrastructure • Crows Nest Metro is operating beyond its capacity

A response to each of the issues raised in the submissions is provided in Section 4 this report.

The Submissions Register at Appendix A highlights where each submission has been addressed in the report.

3 Actions taken since exhibition

In response to the issues raised during the public exhibition of the proposal, the applicant has undertaken a series of actions to address concerns and refine the project. These actions are outlined below.

3.1 Review and analysis of submissions

FPD Planning has worked with the applicant (X Quantum Pty Ltd) and design team (FJC Studio and Arcadia) to review all submissions and amend the proposal to respond to submissions as summarised in Section 3.2 and as detailed and assessed in the Amendment Report.

Relevant consultants have also reviewed submissions and provided advice and amended technical studies to assess the revised proposal as detailed in Section 4.

3.2 Refinements to the Proposal

Amendments have been made to the proposed development to respond to issues raised in submissions as detailed in the Amendment Report and summarised below:

- All above ground car parking has been relocated from the podium to the basement
- The podium has been reconfigured to provide four levels of predominantly non-residential floor space
- The revised four storey podium aligns with the scale and design of existing and approved development along Pacific Highway
- The interface to 35-51 Nicholson Street has been reviewed to setback the building to an agreed weighted average boundary line to accommodate an appropriate level of building separation to future proposed development
- The vehicular access has been reconfigured to prioritise pedestrian amenity and movement along Oxley Street by consolidating the basement access point, removing the two way access to the above ground car parking, limiting the second driveway a single lane loading dock access, reducing the width of driveway crossovers and providing a pedestrian refuge between the two driveways
- The loading dock has been reconfigured and expanded to maximise servicing efficiency
- All wintergarden balconies have been removed to minimise unnecessary building bulk and scale and enhance the façade design
- An end-of-trip facility has been incorporated within the podium for retail / commercial premises workers
- Podium level communal open space has been expanded and the primary communal open space relocated to the northern side of the building to maximise sunlight
- Car parking and bicycle parking has been refined to reflect the amended land uses mix with the overall car parking rates reduced compared to the maximum rates in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide
- A separate commercial lobby from Pacific Highway has been introduced and the residential lobby expanded to maximise amenity and visibility from Pacific Highway

3.3 Further assessment

An Amendment Report has been prepared to provide an assessment of the proposed changes to the development. This is supported by amended technical studies and additional technical advice including:

- Architectural Design Report, prepared by FJC Studio
- Architectural Plans, prepared by FJC Studio
- 3D Visualisations, prepared by FJC Architects
- Landscape Report, prepared by Arcadia
- Landscape Plans, prepared by Arcadia
- Civil Plans, prepared by TTW
- Pedestrian Wind Study and memo, prepared by RWDI
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- Transport Impact Assessment and Preliminary Traffic Construction Management Plan, prepared by JMT Consulting
- Integrated Water Management Plan
- Geotechnical Assessment, prepared by Douglas Partners
- Groundwater Impact Assessment, prepared by Douglas Partners
- BASIX Report/BASIX Certificate, prepared by E-Lab Consulting
- Section J Compliance Report, prepared by E-Lab Consulting
- Operational Waste Management Plan, prepared by Elephants Foot Consulting
- Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan, prepared by Elephants Foot Consulting
- Embodied Emissions Form prepared by Newton Fisher Group.
- Estimated Development Cost Report by Newton Fisher Group.

The Amendment Report has concluded that the amended development will not result in any unacceptable environmental, social, or economic impacts, and is in the public interest.

3.4 Further consultation

Since the exhibition of the EIS, the applicant has been in ongoing discussions with Wee Hur, the developer of the adjoining site at 35-51 Nicholson Street, to coordinate the design and delivery of both projects. Wee Hur are currently progressing a separate SSD for student housing with the EIS currently being prepared.

The parties are working towards an agreement on building separation, a future realignment of the irregular shared boundary, and extinguishment of easements to facilitate an integrated and orderly redevelopment outcome across both sites.

Any changes to the development resulting from the realignment of the shared boundary are proposed to be addressed through a minor future modification to the approval.

Further consultation is also being carried out with Sydney Metro on relevant geotechnical and structural documentation which is currently being prepared.

The consultation outcomes are outlined in further detail in the Amendment Report.

4 Response to submissions

4.1 DPHI key issues letter

Responses to the matters raised by the DPHI in the letter dated 29 January 2026 are included in Table 2.

Table 2: Response to DPHI key issues letter

No.	Comment	Response
1. Podium uses and car parking		
1.1	Relocate above-ground car parking from the podium to the basement, including: • Maximising the use of podium levels for non-residential purposes (e.g. retail and/or commercial uses) to enhance street activation and support employment opportunities • Providing an architectural response that is consistent with the scale and design of existing and approved development along Pacific Highway • Ensuring a sensitive interface to the western boundary in response to existing and future residential uses • Investigate alternative structural support methods for basement excavation, such as temporary in-ground shoring systems within the site.	The amended development includes the following changes to address this comment: • All above ground car parking has been relocated from the podium to the basement • The podium has been reconfigured to provide four levels of predominantly non-residential floor space enhancing street activation and significantly increasing retail and commercial floor space from 2,128sqm to 4,107sqm • The revised four storey podium aligns with the scale and design of existing and approved development along Pacific Highway. The interface with development to the west is discussed in Item 2.2 of this table below. Structural support methods are considered in the updated Geotechnical Investigation, and further Geotechnical advice is being prepared to inform the structural design having regard the Sydney Metro tunnel.
2. Driveway access		
2.1	Prioritise pedestrian amenity and movement along Oxley Street by consolidating access points and reducing both the number and width of driveway crossovers.	The driveway access has been reconfigured to accommodate access to all car parking within basement levels via the existing driveway from Oxley Street with a second dedicated loading dock access provided from Oxley Street. Amenity for pedestrians along Oxley Street has been enhance as follows: • Reduction in overall width of the crossovers in comparison to the originally submitted proposal, with the widths minimised to reflect the swept paths of the design vehicles • For the loading dock access reduction to a single lane driveway which will reduce the extent of public domain impacted • The provision of a break between the driveways of approximately 5m in width providing a pedestrian refuge between the two driveways.

No.	Comment	Response
		In contrast, the original proposal included a continuous crossover totalling over 15m in width.
2.2	Continue engagement with adjoining landowners to resolve basement and boundary constraints, with the aim of rationalising access arrangements and facilitating a more efficient and cohesive development footprint.	Since the exhibition of the EIS, the applicant has been in ongoing discussions with Wee Hur, the developer of the adjoining site at 35-51 Nicholson Street, to coordinate the design and delivery of both projects. The applicant has been working with Wee Hur to come to an agreement on shared building separation, a future realignment of the irregular shared boundary, and extinguishment of easements to facilitate an integrated and orderly redevelopment outcome across both sites. This is discussed in further detail in the Amendment Report.
3. Traffic, parking and pedestrian impacts		
3.1	Consider a reduction in car parking spaces given the highly accessible location of the site opposite the Metro station and proximity to other public and active transport modes.	Car parking has been reduced and relocated to be entirely within basement levels. Residential car parking is below the maximum rates under the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
3.2	Assess and justify traffic impacts associated with any exceedance of floor space ratio.	This is addressed in the amendment Traffic Impact Assessment which sets out that: • The increased density equates to a very minor increase in traffic movements. • The increased density is equivalent to approximately 55 additional residential apartments which may generate between 4 to 8 traffic movements in the busiest hour of the day which is negligible in the context of existing and future traffic movements through the area. • Further, the proposal seeks to mitigate traffic impacts by providing car parking below the already constrained maximum parking rates noted in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
4. Gross floor area		
4.1	Review and reconsider the extent of the proposed fully enclosable balconies to minimise unnecessary building floorspace and the associated increase in bulk and scale.	All wintergarden balconies have been removed to minimise unnecessary building bulk and scale and enhance the façade design and articulation.
4.2	Review apartment layouts to address any remaining enclosed balconies that may compromise natural ventilation and daylight access to habitable rooms.	Not applicable. All wintergarden balconies have been removed.

No.	Comment	Response
4.3	Having regard to the submitted Noise Impact Assessment and Wind Impact Assessment, consider alternative balcony configurations in locations not significantly affected by wind or noise.	An updated Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment and Wind Impact Assessment have been prepared to demonstrate that the alternative balcony design maintains an appropriate level of amenity.
5. Bicycle parking and end of trip facilities		
5.1	Incorporate end-of-trip facilities for commercial premises workers, as recommended in the Transport Impact Assessment.	An end of trip facility has been included in the podium as outlined in the Amendment Report.
5.2	Clarify the bicycle parking provision as the EIS and Traffic Impact Assessment state there are 149 non-caged spaces provided, however, less spaces can be identified in plans.	The bicycle parking provision has been refined and clarified to align with the amended land use mix and meet relevant requirements of the North Sydney DCP. This is outlined in the Amendment Report.

4.2 Advice from Government agencies and organisations

Responses to advice received from Government agencies and organisations is included in Table 3.

Table 3: Response to Government agency advice

No.	Comment	Response
1. Transport for NSW		
1.1	The provisions of Section 2.120 (Impact of road noise or vibration on non-road development) of State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 apply to the submitted application, as the annual average daily traffic volume along this section of the Pacific Highway is more than 20,000 vehicles. As such, the applicant will need to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the determining authority that the application can comply with provisions contained in Section 2.120 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021, specifically in relation to measures to ensure the required noise levels as detailed in Subclause 3 are not exceeded when the building is ready to be occupied.	This is addressed in the amended Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.
1.2	TfNSW has issued its draft conditions of approval for consideration.	Noted. Conditions are supported. As noted in the advice from Transport for NSW, the proposed development proposes works within the Pacific Highway road reserve as detailed in the Civil Plans at Appendix L. As a classified road, approval from Transport for NSW will be required in accordance with Section 138 of the Roads Act.

No.	Comment	Response
2. Sydney Metro		
2.1	Detailed survey plans and sections are required, that: - Are verified by an NSW registered surveyor, clearly showing the proposed development in relation to the M1 North West & Bankstown Line rail corridor, including First and Second Reserves - Show dimensions, the position and separation distances from the rail corridor (including First and Second Reserves). - Include details of any proposed excavation retention system, including details regarding temporary works, including piled walls for basements or ground anchors and the geometric relationship to First and Second Reserves and Sydney Metro Infrastructure.	Detailed survey plans and sections are currently being prepared.
2.2	An updated Structural Impact Statement, is required including: - Structural drawings that show shoring design and foundation layouts (types and depths) in accordance with the Sydney Metro Underground Corridor Protection Guidelines. - Details of measures/actions/assessment to minimise the potential crashes of shoring anchors, if required for the proposed basement construction, with the temporary anchors installed during metro station box construction which are not distressed. It is noted that the 'Appendix A - Structural Statement for SSDA' indicates that a Risk Assessment and Engineering Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the detailed design process. The following should be provided as part of the SSD: - A preliminary Risk Assessment, with all known design information, prepared in accordance with Section 7.3 'Risk Assessment' of the Sydney Metro Underground Corridor Protection Guidelines. A preliminary Engineering Impact Assessment, with all known design information, prepared in accordance with Section 7.2.2 'Engineering Impact Assessment Report' of the Sydney Metro Underground Corridor Protection Guidelines.	Structural Drawings, Structural Impact Statement, Preliminary Risk Assessment, and Preliminary Engineering Impact Assessment are currently being prepared by Xavier Knight.
2.3	A Geotechnical Impact Assessment is required for anchors installed within the Second Reserve. The Assessment should be prepared in accordance with the Sydney Metro Underground Corridor Protection Guidelines.	A Geotechnical Impact Assessment is currently being prepared by Douglas Partners.

No.	Comment	Response
2.4	It is recommended that the Applicant consult with Sydney Metro before submitting the additional information to DPHI.	This documentation is also being provided to Sydney Metro for further consultation alongside the assessment of the Response to Submissions.
3. DCCEE – Water Assessments, Planning and Knowledge Division		
3.1	Prior to determination the proponent should quantify the maximum annual volume of water take due to aquifer interference activities and demonstrate the ability to acquire sufficient water entitlement unless an exemption applies. If the take of groundwater is found to be greater than 3 ML per year, DPHI should request the proponent to assess impacts due to aquifer interference activities in accordance with the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy and framework (2012).	This is addressed in the Groundwater Impact Assessment which states that the results of the analysis indicate that the predicted annual inflows for long-term dewatering into the drained basement is 1.2ML. As the predicted inflow rate is less than 3ML per year, a Water Access Licence will not be required.
3.2	DPHI should request the proponent to obtain a water access licence (WAL) to account for the maximum predicted water take for construction and operation activities unless an exemption applies under the <i>Water Management (General) Regulation 2025</i> .	This can be addressed as a condition of consent, noting that a licence is not expected to be required as detailed above.
4. Commonwealth Civil Aviation Safety Authority		
4.1	The EIS advises a building height of 133.8m (RL 221.48m). The building and cranes will need to be approved under the <i>Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 2026</i> and CASA will be invited to comment. CASA has assessed taller buildings proposed for St Leonards and North Sydney under these regulations. Notwithstanding that CASA is not an Approval Authority, CASA has no objections to the proposal at a maximum building height of RL 222 metres (rounded up).	Noted, approval will be sought prior to construction. This can be addressed as a condition of consent.
5. Air Services Australia		
5.1	Air Services Australia – Airport Developments has no comments on the proposed Environmental Impact Statement.	Noted.
6. Sydney Airports		
6.1	Sydney Airports advise the following: This site lies within Sydney Airport's Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) – Outer Horizontal Surface, at this location the OLS height starts from 156mAHD.	Noted. Air Services Australia has been consulted and has raised no concerns regarding the development.

No.	Comment	Response
	- As the primary designer of Instrument Flight Procedures, Airservices Australia determines the height of TIFPOP (and RTCC) and should be consulted prior DA approval. - It is unlikely that that Sydney Airport will support construction equipment or cranes that penetrate the TIFPOP surface. - 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 <i>Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 2026</i>. - Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.	Relevant approvals will be sought prior to construction. This can be addressed as a condition of consent.

4.3 Local government submissions

The submission from North Sydney Council is addressed in Table 4 and the submission from Lane Cove Council is addressed in Table 5.

Table 4: Response to North Sydney Council submission

No.	Comment	Response
1. Building density, envelope and design		
1.1	Proposed podium setbacks comply to the Pacific Highway and Oxley Street. Zero setbacks to side and rear boundaries are reasonably proposed.	Noted.
1.2	Serious consideration should be given to eliminating the above ground parking and most of the other building services from the podium and replacing them with habitable space, preferably non-residential, to support long term employment in the precinct. This should include a more diverse range of retail and/or business premises was included.	The amended development has relocated all above ground car parking from the podium to the basement and reconfigured the podium to provide four levels of predominantly non-residential floor space enhancing street activation and significantly increasing retail and commercial floor space from 2,128sqm to 4,107sqm resulting in the increase in potential jobs from around 85 to over 160.
1.3	Collaboration with the developers of 35-51 Nicholson Street should be encouraged to manage rights of way and other easements which impact on basement access and have resulted in the need for above ground car parking.	The amended development has relocated all above ground car parking from the podium to the basement with access to the basement using the existing driveway via the easement over the adjacent land. Extinguishment of the existing basement substratum will be required to facilitate the construction of the basement. It is considered this can be addressed as a condition of consent. Since the exhibition of the EIS, the applicant has been in ongoing discussions with Wee

No.	Comment	Response
		Hur, the developer of the adjoining site at 35-51 Nicholson Street, to coordinate the design and delivery of both projects including to extinguish relevant easements.
1.4	The setback to 35-51 Nicholson Street requires reconsideration to ensure equitable sharing of building separation.	As discussed above the applicant has been working with Wee Hur to agree building setbacks which ensure equitable sharing of the building separation to provide a suitable level of amenity for both projects. This is discussed in further detail in the Amendment Report and Architectural Design Report.
1.5	Given only units on upper levels are proposed to have wintergardens, which are less visible from the street compared to lower levels, and due to the environmental and amenity benefits they can provide, wintergardens as proposed are supported.	Noted. Wintergardens have been removed at the request of DPHI.
2. Solar compliance		
2.1	Solar access to a greater number of units should be provided as to enhance environmental sustainability of the building.	The amended development maximises solar access, whilst continuing to apply the principle of maximising Harbour and CBD views and orienting apartments away from busy roads and future development. The number of apartments which achieve greater than 2 hours of solar access has increased from 53.5% to 60.1%. This is discussed in further detail in the Amendment Report.
3. Landscaping / connection with country		
3.1	Awnings and the like should be carefully designed to coordinate with the street-planting proposed. Such matters can be addressed by conditions.	Noted. This can be addressed as a condition of consent.
3.2	Landscaping purported to be a fundamental element of "Connection to Country", however this does not reflect any collaboration with or involvement of local First Nations people. Council recommends that DPHI consider developing guidelines to ensure a consistent approach to addressing Connecting with Country principles and consultation with local First Nations communities.	Connection with Country principles have been considered in the architectural and landscape design. A full Designing with Country report and consultation is not required as part of the SEARs.
4. Social impacts		
4.1	Social impacts including safety have not been adequately addressed.	Social impacts have been considered through the EIS.

No.	Comment	Response
		Public safety has also been considered and addressed through the Architectural Design Report.
5. Dwelling mix		
5.1	The dwelling mix does not align with the requirements of the North Sydney DCP and is not supported by an economic assessment.	The North Sydney DCP includes the following dwelling mix requirement: • Studio: 10-20% • 1 bedroom: 25-35% • 2 bedroom: 35-45% • 3 bedroom +: 10-20%. The dwelling mix has been refined to better align with this requirement as follows whilst responding to market demand. The changes to the dwelling mix are shown below: • Studio: 2% • 1 bedroom: 19% • 2 bedroom: 40% • 3 bedroom +: 39%.
6. Communal spaces		
6.1	The EIS does not demonstrate that the communal spaces on level 5 and the rooftop are suited to the types of households that may occupy the building.	The podium level communal open space has been reconfigured and expanded to maximise amenity and useability. The communal areas are arranged across two complementary zones: • The southern portions include an internal gym, multi-purpose room, private dining room, and kitchen, with direct access to landscaped terraces, BBQ facilities, and informal seating areas. These spaces foster everyday use and casual social interaction, strengthening community within the building. • The north western portion provides additional communal open space oriented to maximise solar access, with the primary communal open space of 532sqm achieving the ADG solar access requirement. This layered approach ensures the podium roof supports a diverse mix of activities, including recreation, fitness and social gatherings to support the future resident population.
7. Affordable housing		

No.	Comment	Response
7.1	Council is of the opinion that a rate of 15% affordable housing should apply to the highly accessible site.	A suitable quantify of affordable housing is subject to further consideration and will be nominated by DPHI.
8. Wind impacts		
8.1	The recommendations of the 'pedestrian wind study' are expected to be addressed in a condition, should consent be granted.	Noted. This can be addressed as a condition of consent and is included in the proposed mitigation measures.
9. Traffic and transport		
9.1	A substantial reduction of parking should be considered given reduced demand resulting from the accessible location.	Car parking has been reduced and relocated to be entirely within basement levels. The car parking is below the maximum rates under the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
9.2	While the submitted TIA proposes a total of five loading/service spaces (including one space suitable for a 10.5m waste vehicle), reliance on the TfNSW Urban Freight Forecasting Model should not override the minimum requirements of the DCP. Accordingly, compliance with the DCP minimum for the residential component should be clearly demonstrated, with additional provision made for non-residential servicing demands.	Noted. TfNSW have not raised any concern about the proposed loading arrangements and application of the TfNSW Urban Freight Forecasting Model. The TfNSW Urban Freight Forecasting Model is now the industry standard model to determine the provision of on-site loading bays – this is recognised in the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment. The DCP sets out requirements for loading / servicing based on standalone uses and does not recognise the ability for a mixed use development to share loading dock bays.
9.3	A detailed Loading Dock Management Plan should be submitted, outlining the operational arrangements for the loading dock, including vehicle scheduling, allocation of loading spaces, waste collection, and measures to minimise conflicts between residential, commercial, and service vehicle movements.	The Traffic Impact Assessment sets out practices to be implemented with respect to loading dock management. A more detailed loading dock plan can be prepared prior to the initial occupancy of the development, and this can be addressed through a condition of consent.
9.4	A left in left out arrangement should be adopted from the driveway to Oxley Street.	The Traffic Impact Assessment sets out that given the relatively minor traffic movements the proposed driveway from Oxley Street can accommodate both left and right turn movements. No objections were raised by TfNSW to the project nor did TfNSW request a left in / left out restriction be enforced.
9.5	The basement layout must comply with all relevant requirements of the Australian Standards, including, AS 2890.1 – Off-street car parking, AS 2890.2 – Off-street commercial vehicle facilities, AS 2890.6 – Off-street parking for people with disabilities, AS 2890.3 – Bicycle parking.	Noted and agreed. It would be expected this requirement would be reinforced through a suitably worded consent condition.

No.	Comment	Response
	Certification from a suitably qualified professional engineer that the site access and basement design complies with these requirements must be provided at Construction Certificate stage.	
9.6	The cumulative impact of approved and potential developments should be considered in the modelling of the subject site to ensure a more accurate representation of future traffic conditions.	This is addressed in the Transport Impact Assessment. In particular, the Crows Nest TOD rezoning was supported by detailed future year traffic modelling assessment to assess the traffic implications of the envisaged uplift in the precinct. The St Leonards and Crows Nest Station Precinct Traffic and Transport Study – Future Year Modelling Report did not identify any future upgrades at the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection to support the development of the broader St Leonards and Crows Nest precinct.
9.7	The following comments were provided on the preliminary construction management plan: • The working hours for the project will be in accordance with the development consent conditions applicable to the site. • All vehicles should be front in and front out only from site and Works Zone. • Reference should be made to North Sydney Council's Standard Requirement for a CTMP. Please note that the Standard Requirements should be addressed in the CTMP report and included as an attachment. • The need for, and location of, a Works Zone will be determined during the assessment of the detailed CTMP followed by Works Zone application. This will ensure forward manoeuvres only, minimise impacts on other road users, maintain safety, and be supported by swept path analysis.	Noted, these comments can be incorporated in an updated and detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan to be prepared prior to the commencement of construction and addressed through a condition of consent.

Table 5: Response to Lane Cove Council submission

No.	Comment	Response
1. Gross floor area		
1.1	The floor space exceedance has been selectively attributed to wintergardens and should not be supported.	All wintergardens have been removed. An amended Clause 4.6 request has been prepared to fully justify the GFA exceedances.
2. Traffic impacts		
2.1	The proposal would result in increased adverse impacts on local traffic congestion which is exacerbated by the non-compliant density proposed.	This is addressed in the amendment Traffic Impact Assessment which sets out that: • The increased density equates to a very minor increase in traffic movements.

No.	Comment	Response
		The increased density is equivalent to approximately 55 additional residential apartments which may generate between 4 to 8 traffic movements in the busiest hour of the day which is negligible in the context of existing and future traffic movements through the area. Further, the proposal seeks to mitigate traffic impacts by providing car parking below the already constrained maximum parking rates noted in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
2.2	The non-compliant FSR would result in a significant increase to car parking requirements and surplus strain on street parking. It is considered unacceptable that the proposal also fails to provide any visitor parking.	The proposed development provides car parking below the already constrained maximum parking rates noted in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
3. Consultation period		
3.1	The recently reduced public exhibition period for all Major Projects to only 14 days is not considered to be reasonable time to allow for adequate community consultation and should be increased to 28 days.	Noted. The proposal was exhibited in accordance with relevant legislative and policy requirements. This is a matter for DPHI.
4. Conditions		
4.2	Council has recommended conditions including relating to: - Hours of work - Dust monitoring - Noise monitoring - Trades personnel parking and logistics plan.	Noted. Conditions will be prepared by DPHI as part of its assessment and these matters can be addressed as appropriate.

4.4 Public submissions

Issues raised in public submissions are addressed in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Response to public submissions

No.	Comment	Response
1. Height and density		
1.1	The scale of the building is inconsistent with the surrounding area and will negatively impact neighbourhood character.	The exceedance of permissible Height and GFA has been justified through a clause 4.6 report which concludes the exceedances would not result in any significant impacts. The proposed height of 38 storeys plus rooftop servicing is within the height of 40 storeys identified in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.

No.	Comment	Response
		The building also aligns with the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide controls relating the building setbacks and forms a building envelope which achieves the objectives of the Apartment Design Guide for building separation.
1.2	Height and density could be further increased given the strategic location and to provide more social and affordable housing.	Noted. The proposed development aligns with the vision for Crows Nest as detailed in the Crows Nest TOD controls.
1.3	The floor space exceedance is not adequately justified and should not be supported including for the following reasons: • The wind report indicates that private balconies can achieve suitable wind conditions without the need for wintergardens. • The Clause 4.6 does not address impacts on bulk and scale. • The clause 4.6 does not demonstrate why compliance cannot be achieved. • Approval would result in an undesirable precedent.	All wintergardens have been removed. An amended Clause 4.6 request has been prepared to fully justify floor space exceedances.
1.4	The proposed 4m above podium setback to 298 Pacific Highway to the south to is a significant departure from the TOD control which requires compliance with the North Sydney DCP setback of 12m. The reduced and non-compliant side setback directly contributes to increased building bulk and proximity, resulting in greater overshadowing, reduced solar access and amenity when compared to a development that complies with the 12-metre setback control. The non-compliance enables additional floor space at the expense of neighbouring amenity, relies inappropriately on air rights not held by the proponent, and fails to adequately assess cumulative impacts.	The 4m above podium side setback provides for an ADG compliant separation distance with the adjoining approved building providing a suitable level of tower separation and maintaining an appropriate level of privacy and amenity. An amended Clause 4.6 request has been prepared to fully justify floor space exceedances.
2. Building design and landscaping		
2.1	The building should present a well-resolved podium, strong street activation, high quality materials, and a façade treatment that provides depth, articulation and visual interest.	The podium design has been reconfigured to accommodate a four storey retail / commercial podium which is reflected in the façade treatment. Full-height glazing within the arched bays presents an open, engaged frontage to the Highway, with the masonry frame providing depth, shade, and a strong material identity. Ground and first level arches are wider, maximising transparency and activation, while upper levels adopt narrower, more organic arches referencing native plant forms, providing greater solidity and a larger

No.	Comment	Response
		surface for patterned brickwork that subtly evokes the textures of the redgum bark. A rooftop planting terrace crowns the podium, softening the transition to the tower.
2.2	The podium should read at a comfortable pedestrian scale, provide active frontages where possible, and include generous weather protection along the footpath.	The amended development proposes a four storey podium comprising predominantly retail and commercial uses. The lower two levels comprise retail floor space maximising activation of the surrounding streets with commercial floor space in the upper two levels. Awnings are located along Pacific Highway and Oxley street to provide a high level of pedestrian amenity.
2.3	Landscaping, lighting and wayfinding should also be integrated into the design so the development contributes positively to the day-to-day experience of the street.	Wayfinding has been maximised through a high level of visibility to pedestrian access points with the location of separate commercial and residential lobbies fronting Pacific Highway, along with direct accesses to ground floor retail spaces. Wayfinding and lighting can be further addressed as a condition of consent to be satisfied prior to construction.
3. Residential uses		
3.1	The apartment mix should be reviewed with more one and two bedroom apartments to meet the needs of singles, couples, downsizers, key workers and renters seeking well-located housing, whilst retaining a portion of larger dwellings.	The dwelling mix has been reconfigured including increasing the percentage of 1-2 bedroom apartments from 57% to 61%.
3.2	There is currently an oversupply of residential apartments in the area.	The Crows Nest TOD has been designed to respond to the housing crises and address housing affordability.
3.3	The nominated Affordable Housing contribution under the North Sydney LEP is excessive at 16% and was apparently an incorrect amount arising from a flawed feasibility analysis. An amount of 8-10% for a fixed period or 5-8% in perpetuity would be reasonable and would still exceed the requirement in other areas across the Sydney Metro Area.	A suitable affordable housing rate is under consideration by DPHI.
3.4	The development should be required to contain a significant proportion (>33%) of permanent build to rent / affordable housing units.	A suitable affordable housing rate is under consideration by DPHI.

No.	Comment	Response
3.5	The loss of existing housing will displace existing residents, and existing housing stock should be maintained.	The loss of existing housing is acknowledged however the proposed development aligns with Government vision for Crows Nest which aims to maximise total housing supply within close proximity to Crows Nest Metro.
4. Commercial uses		
4.1	Additional commercial uses are not necessary given supply in the immediate area with a variety of shops. Adding more retail will undermine viability for existing businesses.	The proposed non-residential uses exceed the minimum requirement of the Crows Nest TOD controls and responds to DPHI's preference for a predominantly retail / commercial podium. Further, the substantial housing growth proposed for this site along with housing delivered on other sites within the Crows Nest TOD area will generate significant additional demand for retail and commercial floor space.
5. Amenity impacts		
5.1	The building will cast shadows and block sunlight.	The overshadowing resulting from the proposed development is a function of the approved height of 135m under the Crows Nest TOD controls. The proposed development aligns with requirements for solar access outlined in the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide.
5.2	The development will result in loss of views and this has not been adequately assessed to meet the SEARs and address relevant planning principles. In particular concerns were raised regarding view loss by residents at 545 Pacific Highway and St Leonards Square.	View impacts are considered acceptable on the basis that: - The proposed development is largely consistent with the planned built form context for Crows Nest TOD precinct which anticipates buildings up to 40 storeys along the Pacific Highway. - The scale of the proposed development is consistent with the intended outcomes for the site as established by the Crows Nest TOD controls and does not result in significant additional visual impacts beyond those considered as part of the TOD rezoning.
5.3	The development will result loss of privacy for surrounding residents.	The proposed development maximises privacy for existing and future surrounding residents by providing for building separation and screening which achieves the objectives of the ADG. This is addressed in further detail in the Amendment Report.
5.4	Increased noise both during construction and operation.	Construction Noise Impacts are addressed in the amended Noise Impact Assessment and will be further addressed through a

No.	Comment	Response
		Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan prior to construction. Operational noise impacts are also addressed in the amended Noise Impact Assessment which sets out that operational impacts can be appropriately managed including through the design of mechanical plant which will be addressed as part of the construction design development.
5.5	The building will result in wind tunnel impacts at street level reducing pedestrian comfort and safety.	This is addressed in the Pedestrian Wind Assessment which demonstrates the pedestrian comfort can be maintained subject to recommended mitigation measures.
5.6	Cumulative amenity impacts of multiple developments in the area.	Cumulative impacts were assessed through the Crows Nest TOD rezoning, and the proposed development generally aligns with the Crows Nest TOD controls.
5.7	Non-compliance with ADG solar access is not justified as it does not consider that views will be blocked by future development under the Crows Nest TOD.	Notwithstanding future development under the Crows Nest TOD, much of the development will retain significant views to the south and south west. The proposed development seeks to balance solar access to apartments whilst taking advantage of these significant views towards the harbour and city.
6. Impact on future development at 35-51 Nicholson Street		
6.1	Setbacks should be reviewed and increased to provide for an improved interface and sharing of building separation distances with the adjacent future development at 35-51 Nicholson Street. Consideration should also be given to how the setbacks provide for suitable daylight and solar access.	The applicant has been working with the developer of the adjacent land at 35-51 Nicholson Street to come to an agreement about sharing of building separation which has resulted in an increased setback of at the podium levels and results in 12m habitable to habitable separation at the podium levels and 18m separation distance at the lower tower levels. Screening has also been introduced into the façade within the podium and lower tower levels to maximise privacy to adjacent future development. The proposed response addresses the objectives of the ADG.
6.2	Concerns were raised in relation to visual privacy for future residents of the proposed student housing at 35-51 Nicholson Street particularly as a result of the location of communal open space. This should be addressed through suitable buildings separation	The communal open space has been reconfigured to locate the primary communal space on the northern frontage of the buildings to maximise solar access and minimise overlooking of future development to the west.

No.	Comment	Response
	along with measures such as privacy screening, façade treatments and/or landscaping.	Smaller communal spaces wrap around the western side of the building however screening has been introduced in this location to maintain privacy and minimise overlooking.
6.3	Noise impacts of communal open space should be considered.	The relocation of the primary communal open space will reduce noise impacts to future development at 35-51 Nicholson Street. Further, noise impacts associated with the communal space will be managed through strata management arrangements limiting hours of operation of the communal spaces.
6.4	Further detailed consideration be given to a consolidated access driveway arrangement along Oxley Street. Pedestrian safety measures will be critical and could be achieved through controlled egress to slow down vehicles exiting from the site, as well as pedestrian refuges or other measures to minimise potential conflicts.	The driveway access has been reconfigured to accommodate access to all car parking within basement levels via the existing driveway from Oxley Street with a second dedicated loading dock access provided from Oxley Street. Amenity for pedestrians along Oxley Street has been enhance as follows: • Reduction in overall width of the crossovers in comparison to the originally submitted proposal, with the widths minimised to reflect the swept paths of the design vehicles • For the loading dock access reduction to a single lane driveway which will reduce the extent of public domain impacted • The provision of a break between the driveways of approximately 5m in width providing a pedestrian refuge between the two driveways. In contrast the original proposal included a continuous crossover totalling over 15m in width.
6.5	It is requested that further detailed consideration be given to the potential intensification of the use of the existing vehicle access (right of carriageway), as well as the proposed fire egress from the proposed development to the adjacent land.	The applicant has been working with the developer of the adjacent land at 35-51 Nicholson Street (Wee Hur) to come to an agreement on extinguishment of easements to facilitate an integrated and orderly redevelopment outcome across both sites. The amended development does not utilise the existing easement for fire egress for the new mixed building.
7. Traffic impacts and road infrastructure		
7.1	Oxley Street already operates at or beyond capacity during peak hours and the addition of several hundred new apartments will significantly worsen this situation.	The Crows Nest TOD rezoning was supported by a detailed future year traffic modelling assessment to assess the traffic implications of the envisaged uplift in the precinct. The St Leonards and Crows Nest

No.	Comment	Response
		Station Precinct Traffic and Transport Study – Future Year Modelling Report did not identify any future upgrades at the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection to support the development of the broader St Leonards and Crows Nest precinct.
7.2	Existing traffic conditions will be worsened particularly given driveway access near the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection.	The updated Traffic Impact Assessment includes traffic modelling which confirms that the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection would continue to operate with spare capacity (level of service B) when taking into consideration the increased traffic as a result of the proposal.
7.2	An additional right hand turning lane is required from Oxley Street to Pacific Highway.	The Crows Nest TOD rezoning was supported by detailed future year traffic modelling assessment to assess the traffic implications of the envisaged uplift in the precinct which did not identify any future upgrades at the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection to support the development of the broader St Leonards and Crows Nest precinct. The updated Traffic Impact Assessment includes traffic modelling which confirms that the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection would continue to operate with spare capacity (level of service B) when taking into consideration the increased traffic as a result of the proposal.
7.4	The location of non-residential uses will create additional traffic.	The updated Traffic Impact Assessment highlights that traffic impacts as a result of the proposed development are acceptable, including with the proposed non-residential uses.
7.5	Changes to the traffic network should be made to improve traffic including: - Northern end of Christie Street from Nicholson Street to Pacific Highway to be two way and allow vehicles to access Pacific Highway. - Connect the two sections of Nicholson Street across Oxley Street.	The Crows Nest TOD rezoning was supported by detailed future year traffic modelling assessment to assess the traffic implications of the envisaged uplift in the precinct which did not identify the need for these upgrades. Further, these upgrades are outside the scope of the proposed development.
7.6	The developer should be required to build a pedestrian underpass to Crows Nest Metro reducing the numbers of pedestrians crossing Pacific Highway and improving traffic flows.	This is outside the scope of the proposed development. However the proposed development will pay Housing and Productivity Contribution which can support the funding of regional infrastructure.

8. Access arrangements

No.	Comment	Response
8.1	A continuous 15m driveway along Oxley Street results in poor urban design outcome. The existing driveway should not be expanded and ramps should be located internally.	The driveway access has been reconfigured to accommodate access to all car parking within basement levels via the existing driveway from Oxley Street with a second dedicated loading dock access provided from Oxley Street. Amenity for pedestrians along Oxley Street has been enhance as follows: • Reduction in overall width of the crossovers in comparison to the originally submitted proposal, with the widths minimised to reflect the swept paths of the design vehicles • For the loading dock access reduction to a single lane driveway which will reduce the extent of public domain impacted • The provision of a break between the driveways of approximately 5m in width providing a pedestrian refuge between the two driveways.
8.2	Vehicle access should be from Hume Street rather than Oxley Street.	The site does not have frontage to Hume Street. The site access has been located to maximise distance to the Pacific Highway / Oxley Street intersection.
9. Car parking		
9.1	Concerns were raised about impact of car parking demand on surrounding streets.	The proposed car parking meets the maximum requirements of the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide for residential uses and the North Sydney DCP for non-residential uses which apply to the site and is appropriate given the proximity of the site to Crows Nest Metro.
9.2	No additional car parking, other than car share, should be included until traffic issues can be resolved.	The proposed car parking meets the maximum requirements of the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide for residential uses and the North Sydney DCP for non-residential uses which apply to the site and is appropriate given the proximity of the site to Crows Nest Metro.
9.3	Car parking should be limited to 100 spaces.	The proposed car parking meets the maximum requirements of the Crows Nest TOD Design Guide for residential uses and the North Sydney DCP for non-residential uses which apply to the site and is appropriate given the proximity of the site to Crows Nest Metro.
9.4	The car parking proposed for the non-residential uses is inadequate.	Car parking proposed for non-residential uses aligns with maximum rates in the North Sydney DCP which apply to the development and is appropriate given the proximity of the site to Crows Nest Metro.

No.	Comment	Response
10. Public transport infrastructure		
10.1	The applicant should work with the relevant authorities to upgrade the stop and shelter to include a larger and better designed shelter, improved weather protection, more seating, better lighting, and clear passenger information. The bus shelter should be designed as part of a broader streetscape improvement rather than as a standalone item. The interface between the bus stop and the building should retain pedestrian movement paths including for prams, wheelchairs and mobility aid users.	TfNSW has not requested an upgrade of the bus stop adjacent to the site. Planning for bus infrastructure is undertaken by TfNSW to respond to growth.
10.2	The Crows Nest Metro station and the metro rail is operating at or over capacity and this will be exacerbated by the proposed development.	This is outside the scope of the project and is a matter for TfNSW.
11. Waste management		
11.1	Inadequate waste storage area has been provided for residential FOGO waste. 23sqm is required for the storage, handling and manoeuvrability of waste bins, however only 22sqm is provided.	The proposed development has been modified to provide 27sqm of storage for FOGO waste bins.
12. Open space		
12.1	There is inadequate green space and parks in the area to support the development and wider growth.	Open space provision has been considered through the Crows Nest TOD.
13. Construction impacts		
13.1	The cumulative impacts of two large developments progressing simultaneously would impact on the streetscape and amenity resulting in noise, dust and poor pedestrian access. Concerns were raised regarding the resulting adverse impact on local businesses.	This will be addressed through preparation of a construction management plan prior to commencement of construction which will consider construction programs for other nearby projects.
14. Public consultation		
14.1	The proposed does not meet the SEARs requirements for community engagement as consultation was not carried out with impacted residents in the surrounding area including at St Leonards Square.	The extent of public consultation was determined by DPHI in accordance with relevant policies.
14.2	The EIS erroneously states that a meeting was held with adjacent developer Freecity to discuss the application. Freecity received a phone call from the landowner, however was never briefed on the application.	The applicant confirms that it met with Freecity on 29 July 2025 to discuss the proposal. Further, Freecity's comments in response to the exhibition have been considered and addressed in this submissions report.

No.	Comment	Response
15. Other matters		
15.1	The development will result in negative impacts on property values.	There is no indication the proposal will impact on property values.
15.2	Landowners consent from North Sydney Council would be required, as the development proposes removal of street trees and a new awning over public land.	Separate approval will be required for works within the road reserve under Section 138 of the <i>Road Act 1993</i> .

5 Conclusion

This Submissions Report has been prepared to address to matters raised in submissions and advice in response to the exhibition of the SSDA for the mixed use development of 402-420 Pacific Highway, Crows Nest.

The proposed development has been substantially amended to respond to issues raised in response to the consultation. In particular, this has included the relocation of all above ground car parking to basement levels repurposing the podium for predominantly retail and commercial uses. This has resulted in significant design improvements including enhanced streetscape activation and increased retail / commercial floor space, alignment of the podium with future development, and enhanced pedestrian safety and amenity through reconfiguration of the basement access. The amended design also delivers an increase in housing supply with the total number of dwellings increasing from 254 to 273 dwellings.

As part of the preparation of the design changes the applicant has worked with the developer of 35-51 Nicholson Street, Wollstonecraft (Wee Hur) located to the west of the site to facilitate an integrated and orderly redevelopment outcome across both sites and a high level of amenity.

This Report, in conjunction with the Amended Report and supporting technical advice, responds to and addresses all issues raised in submissions, agency advice and the key matters identified by DPHI.

The Amendment Report demonstrates that proposal is consistent with the strategic planning framework subject to requested variations, will not result in any unacceptable environmental, social, or economic impacts, and is in the public interest.

Appendix A: Submissions register

Submitter	Section issues addressed
State government agency and authority advice	
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	Section 4.2
Sydney Metro	Section 4.2
DCCEEW – Water Assessments, Planning and Knowledge Division	Section 4.2
Commonwealth Civil Aviation Safety Authority	Section 4.2
Air Services Australia	Section 4.2
Sydney Airport.	
Local government submissions	
North Sydney Council	Section 4.3
Lane Cove Council	Section 4.3
Public submissions	
SE-116535239 – Daniel Mendes	Section 4.4
SE-116705239 – Jiangu Xue	Section 4.4
SE-116714741 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-116809739 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-117169739 – Greg Woodhams	Section 4.4
SE-117271239 – Alex Soncini	Section 4.4
SE-117797239 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-118019739 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-118129239 – Joshua Whiley	Section 4.4
SE-118412239 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-118809239 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-119116489 – Carene Kiss	Section 4.4
SE-119949739 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120133992 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120152739 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120349989 – Name withheld	Section 4.4

Submitter	Section issues addressed
SE-120351239 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120487239 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120577742 – Steve Gray	Section 4.4
SE-120595739 – Michael Stewart	Section 4.4
SE-120648989 – Andrew Bland	Section 4.4
SE-120762489 – Name withheld	Section 4.4
SE-120770739 – Name withheld	Section 4.4