

Appendix A – Response to Submissions Table

This Appendix provides a detailed summary of the Applicant's response to the issues raised in submissions to SSD-80211463.

Response to issues raised by the public, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI), NSW government agencies and the City of Sydney have been provided in the following sections below:

- **Table 1** – Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
- **Table 2** – City of Sydney
- **Table 3** – Transport for NSW (TfNSW)
- **Table 4** – NSW DCCEEW Water Group
- **Table 5** – SES
- **Table 6** – Ausgrid
- **Table 7** – Sydney Water
- **Table 8** – Community Submissions
- **Table 9** – Interest Groups

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Table 1 DPHI RTS Response

No.	Matter Raised	Response	Reference
Affordable Housing			
1	<p>a. Update Figures and documents to correct the following discrepancies in the application:</p> <p>i. the amount of affordable housing proposed noting that various documents identify different affordable housing gross floor areas (GFA) (between 4,942m² to 5,024m²). It is noted that based on some of these GFA figures, insufficient affordable housing GFA is provided to meet the 15% GFA requirements to qualify for the 30% uplift bonus.</p>	<p>In order to address to the DIP as well as CoS and DPHI's concerns surrounding the affordable housing units, the location of these units has been refined.</p> <p>All affordable housing units have been consolidated within the William Street West building to improve operation and management of the adorable housing, limit strata fees, and achieve greater shared amenity across all units on the site.</p> <p>4,979sqm of affordable housing GFA is proposed (58 units), equating to 15.1% of the total GFA.</p> <p>The GFA calculation for the affordable housing is included in the GFA schedule appended to the RtS Design Report and also illustrated on the plans.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the RTS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
2	<p>ii. The number of affordable apartments specified between the Urban Design Report (58 units), with the EIS, architectural plans, and community provider letter (60 units). Clarify the total number of in-fill affordable housing and market housing apartments proposed.</p>	<p>A total of 58 affordable housing units is proposed, and 177 market housing units are proposed as a part of the refined project scope.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the RTS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
3	<p>b. While it is acknowledged there has been design development following Design Integrity Panel (DIP) feedback, only 48.3% of affordable housing apartments achieve 2 hours of solar access mid-winter compared to 79.6% of the market housing. This is</p>	<p>The location and design of the affordable housing apartments has been amended to increase amenity to these apartments.</p> <p>66% of the affordable housing units now achieve more than 2 hours solar access, with 50% being naturally cross ventilated.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.2.2 of the RTS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>

inconsistent with the recommendations of the DIP, and the in-fill affordable housing practice note (December 2023) guidance in relation to affordable housing amenity. The Department recommends you explore amendments a necessary to the location and/or design of affordable housing units to ensure equitable amenity to residents.

4	<p>c. In relation to common circulation areas, provide a table which breaks down the affordable and market housing GFAs provided for each floor. It is noted that for common areas (such as waste rooms) on a floor with both affordable and market housing, GFA should be equitably apportioned based on the number of apartments on that floor and where there are non-residential uses on a floor, retail GFA should be provided for in the corridor.</p>	<p>The affordable GFA has counted only corridors and lobbies exclusively serving affordable housing. The proportion of GFA that could be included for communal areas (15%) and common corridors serving those communal areas is not required to achieve 15% of the total GFA. Refer to the Updated Urban Design Report for a table break-down of the affordable GFA.</p>	<p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>
5	<p>d. Where the number of affordable housing apartments changes, provide an updated letter from the Community Housing Provider.</p>	<p>An updated letter from the Community Housing Provider has been submitted with this RtS.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Community Housing Provider Letter at Appendix G.</p>

Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)

6	<p>a. The eastern part of the William Street West building, which is one additional storey above the approved concept envelope (upper floor of Penthouse 903W), appears to result in impacts ranging from severe (4 views), moderate-severe (1 view) and moderate (2 views) on seven dwellings towards iconic views including the Harbour Bridge) (see views 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18).</p> <p>Consider amendments to the proposal to reduce the impact of both the additional storey and rooftop elements in this location.</p>	<p>As recommended by the DPHI, the design has been amended to reduce the additional storey within the central portion of the William Street building.</p> <p>As a result, this has further improved view sharing. The results now range from minor-moderate (1), moderate (3)) and moderate-severe (2).</p> <p>Of the six re-modelled views, the amendments have significantly improved views to the Opera house and the Visita for two of the views and improved views to the harbour bridge for 2 of the views.</p>	<p>Refer to the RtS Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

7	<p>Should built form remain in this location, the VIA and RtS must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. provide updated imagery and assessment of impacts, including the impacts of any rooftop element/s ii. provide robust justification for the additional height and impact in this location noting view impacts. 	<p>The additional storey referenced above has been removed and relocated. Section 3.0 of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) includes 6 photomontages which show an amended scheme including all roof top elements. Impacts of the amended scheme are included in the relevant Tenacity tables for 5-15 Farrell Avenue North and South Towers, Tables 4 and 5.</p>	<p>Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
8	<p>b. Provide an updated VIA that addresses and incorporates the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. identify the location of all views under the assessment on both elevation and map, as views 28 - 32 are missing from the figures in the VIA. It is requested that a table be produced that includes the address the view was taken from, and the associated view number in the VIA. 	<p>Table 2 of the VIA identifies all views and corresponding addresses assessed in the previous VIA report prepared by Urbaine.</p>	<p>Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. provide an analysis of the visual/view loss impacts which considers the likely future built form context (refer to item 4 below) 	<p>Section 3.0 of the VIA includes 6 additional photomontages which show the amended RtS scheme in the context of potential permissible future massing. Section 5.3 of the RTS/Amendment Report also discusses the likely future built form context in relation to view impact.</p>	<p>Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. provide an assessment of impacts to water views and land-water interfaces at relevant views such as (but not limited to) views 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70 and if required, impact assessment ratings updated in accordance with Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council [2004] NSWLEC 140. 	<p>The extent of view impacts to water views and land water interface from the identified dwellings is addressed in the VIA Report. Indicative Tenacity Ratings have been provided based on the information provided.</p>	<p>Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. provide revised photomontages which model all shade structures, lift overruns, and the like in views. 	<p>3D architectural modelling of the amended scheme, including lift overruns and shade structures has been prepared and supplied by FJC for the use in Urbis photomontages.</p>	<p>Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>

12	v. clarify where the views 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50 and 51 are obtained from and confirm they are representative of the building	This is confirmed in Table 2 of the VIA Report.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
13	vi. provide an assessment of the issues raised in public submissions which contend that the VIA didn't address their buildings. To enable a complete assessment, it is requested that the VIA model, where appropriate and assess impacts to these properties.	Urbis have addressed this issue in Section 2.2 Objector Dwellings in 2 separate tables, Table A and Table B, within the VIA. Where possible, Urbis have provided indicative level of view impact risk for each dwelling raised in public submissions and not assessed in the Concept DA.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
14	vii. provide a comparative visual impact assessment, including modelling of view impacts, analysis and conclusions of the proposal against: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the blanket 30% bonus building height envelope the approved concept envelope. 	Section 3.0 of the VIA includes 6 photomontages which show the amended scheme relative to the approved concept envelope, previously submitted scheme and the blanket 30% bonus building height envelope. Analysis of the proposal against the bonus height and approved concept envelope is included at the relevant Tenacity tables in the VIA for 5-15 Farrell Avenue North and South Towers, Tables 4 and 5. Comparative modelling of visual effects is shown at Section 4.0.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
15	viii. where appropriate, photomontages showing the proposed envelope may also benefit from showing the blanket 30% bonus envelope dotted, so the portions attributed to Clause 4.6 variations are clearer.	The photomontages included in Section 3.0 of the VIA illustrate the blanket 30% uplift building envelope in comparison to the proposed building envelope. The portions attributed to the Clause 4.6 are clear.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
16	ix. provide a clear comparison of the visual impacts of the proposed development with built form height/massing of earlier (discounted) options.	As agreed with the DPHI, a visual representation of the proposed scheme against the 30% blanket uplift (Option 1) has been provided in the VIA. The VIA demonstrates that the proposed scheme (Option 7) has the best outcome from a view perspective.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
17	x. provide a summary table setting out the results of the visual impact assessment, addressing the above matters, which includes the address of each property.	A summary of results is included at Section 5.1 and 5.2 of the VIA.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.

18	xi. set out the Tenacity principles in full and make clear conclusions in relation to the principles.	An assessment against Tenacity is included for 5-15 Farrell Avenue North and South Towers at Tables 4 and 5 of the VIA.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
19	c. Review the assessment provided in Section 6.1.3.3 'View Impacts' of the EIS in light of the above matters raised in item 2. b. to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impacts, including quantification, assessment of reasonableness, and justification. Specific comments on Section 6.1.3.3 'View Impacts' of the EIS are made at Attachment B.	Refer to Tenacity tables 4 & 5 and Section 5.0 of the VIA.	Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
20	d. Provide updated clause 4.6 requests based on the analysis and findings of the revised VIA.	The Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request reports have been updated and submitted with the RtS.	Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J. Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.

Building Height and Massing Options

21	a. Provide an overview of options explored for building height and massing, and the reasons the options were discounted or pursued, including key environmental impacts such as visual impact/view loss and overshadowing.	Section 4.2 of the RtS Report discusses the progression of options and why previous versions of the building height and massing were discounted.	Refer to Section 4.2 of the RtS Report.
22	b. Update the clause 4.6 variations as necessary to include this analysis and demonstrate how the proposal results in improved outcomes to justify the environmental planning grounds for the variation/s.	The Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request reports have been updated and submitted with the RtS.	Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J.

Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.

Future Character of Surrounds				
23	a.	Provide an updated Urban Design Report which considers the proposal in the likely future context surrounding the site as referenced in the EIS and building height Clause 4.6.	The Urban Design Report has been updated to include a visual representation of the proposal within the likely future context surrounding the site.	Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.
24	b.	Justify how the proposed development, in particular the massing and scale of built form, fits into this future context. Provide visual/spatial analysis to demonstrate and support this discussion.	The proposed massing is consistent with the surrounding future context, including nearby developments under assessment as well as surrounding permissible uplift. The RtS Design Report justifies the proposed scale and massing of the development by mapping it within this spatial future context. The RtS VIA also considers the future context in its assessment of view impacts.	Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F. Refer to the RtS Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.
25	c.	Provide clear analysis (in visual and text form) of the comparison of overshadowing impacts between the preferred scheme, the blanket 30% uplift scheme and earlier options in terms of overshadowing impacts, to demonstrate improved outcomes.	The shadow diagrams submitted with the RtS illustrate the overshadowing impacts of the proposed development in comparison with those of the 30% blanket uplift scheme. Refer Section 8 of the Clause 4.6 Variation (Height) for further detail on this.	Refer to the Clause 4.6 Variation Report (Height) at Appendix I. Refer to the Shadow Study appended to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.
26	d.	Provide an updated response to Section 20(3)(b) of the Housing SEPP which requires the consent authority to consider the future context of the locality.	An updated response to this Section of the Housing SEPP has been provided in the Updated Statutory Compliance Table.	Refer to the Updated Statutory Compliance Table at Appendix C.

Clause 4.6 Variation to Development Standard Requests

27	<p>Provide revised Clause 4.6 variation requests for building height and FSR having regard to the following:</p> <p>a. updated numerical figures which are consistent across both variation requests (in body of text and in diagrams), including, critically, in the quantum of variation sought under each request.</p>	<p>The amended Clause 4.6 Variation Requests have been updated to reflect the amended architectural plans.</p>	<p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J.</p> <p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.</p>
28	<p>b. each request clearly set out the variation percentage sought for each development standard and provide a correct visual representation of the variation sought under each development standard.</p>	<p>The amended Clause 4.6 Variation Requests have been updated to reflect this.</p>	<p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J.</p> <p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.</p>
29	<p>c. In relation to the first test of the five-part test in <i>Wehbe v Pittwater Council</i> [2007] NSWLEC 827, update the response to these to include matters at item 1 above for affordable housing, address future context (see item 4) including consistency or compatibility of built form and update the VIA to assess the impacts of the 30% height bonus and the exceedance above the bonus envelope.</p>	<p>The Clause 4.6 Variation Requests have been amended to address these requirements.</p>	<p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J.</p> <p>Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>

30	d. in relation to the Clause 4.6 for the building height standard, provide analysis/findings regarding the future character of the locality, the impacts of the proposed built form and justification of built form options considered with consideration of their impacts. Refer to item 4 regarding this matter.	The updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) has considered the future character of the surrounds in its assessment.	Refer to updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Overshadowing

31	a. In relation to overshadowing impacts to surrounding buildings, provide half hourly elevation plans illustrating overshadowing impacts of the proposal, and a development data table identifying the hours/minutes that each impacted apartment receives solar access.	As discussed with the DPHI, FJC have prepared sun eye view diagrams in lieu of elevation plan diagrams as this provides for a more accurate and readable analysis, in the context of the site. The sun eye view diagrams are supported by a table identifying the impact to each apartment within the identified building to determine which apartments are impacted. A supporting development data detail has also been provided.	Refer to the Shadow Study appended to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

32	b. Provide overshadowing plans which model the likely future development of surrounding areas and consider the impact of this overshadowing.	The updated overshadowing plans appended to the Design RtS Report include overshadowing of the likely future development of the surrounding area.	Refer to the Shadow Study appended to the Design RtS Report at Appendix F.
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Apartment Design Guide (ADG) and Building Design

33	a. Provide an updated response to the ADG which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="268 1181 1008 1380">i. provides a comprehensive and consolidated assessment for all buildings/areas against all relevant design criteria outlined in the ADG, rather than split by building or cross-referencing to other reports such as the Landscape Report. Adequate justification must be provided where specific criteria are not met. Clarify if variations have been reviewed by the DIP. 	An updated assessment against the ADG has been provided in the Updated Urban Design Report.	Refer to the Updated Urban Design Report at Appendix F.
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

34	ii. identifies and calculates deep soil areas as required by Objective 3E-1 design criteria.	Deep soil areas have been calculated as required by the ADG.	Refer to the Updated Urban Design Report at Appendix F.
35	iii. provide updated ventilation compliance plans which identify the path of air travel for each apartment to demonstrate how apartments will be naturally cross ventilated.	Updated plans showing the apartments that achieve cross ventilation with the path of air travel for each has been provided.	Refer to the Natural Cross Ventilation Study appended to the Design RtS Report at Appendix F.
36	iv. in relation to apartment size and private open space, provide a development data table/schedule which collates internal area (GFA) and private open space (POS) (GFA) for each apartment	A Private Open Space Schedule has been appended to the RtS Design Report.	Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.
37	v. provide a storage area calculation plan that clearly identifies the required storage volume, demonstrating that at least 50% of the required storage is located within each apartment	A Storage Schedule Summary has been provided with the Design RtS Report and demonstrates that at least 50% of the required storage is located within the proposed apartments.	Refer to the Design RtS Report at Appendix F.
38	b. Provide an Architectural Plan which identifies building materials and finishes details, including on elevations.	This has been provided in the Updated Architectural Plans.	Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.
Design Integrity Panel			
39	a. Provide a more comprehensive response to the DIP issues.	Following additional engagement, the DPHI confirmed that this is addressed within the broader package. A comprehensive response to the post-lodgement DIP meeting has been provided in the RtS Report.	Section 4.1 of the RtS Report.
40	b. Reconvene the DIP and present a response to all design issues raised during exhibition, including Council's comments. Provide a detailed response to the DIP's comments as part of the Submissions Report.	The DIP was reconvened and a summary of the design issues raised during the exhibition was provided to the DIP. A detailed response to the DIP's comments has been included.	Section 4.1 of the RtS Report.

Refer to the Design Integrity Panel Letter 3 at Appendix W.

Traffic and parking

41	<p>a. Noting the site is located within a highly accessible area and the proposal provides an excess of 25 car spaces for non-affordable units above the minimum requirements specified in the Housing SEPP, explore opportunities to reduce the number of residential (non-affordable) car parking spaces to align with the minimum number specified in the Housing SEPP.</p>	<p>The rationale behind the excess parking stems from the desire to future proof the development when the affordable dwellings transition to market dwellings after 15 years.</p> <p>It is also noted that the requirements in the Housing SEPP are minimum rates and therefore do not prevent the provision of parking above these rates.</p> <p>Residential visitor and retail car parking is provided below the maximum Sydney LEP requirements. The proposed parking represents a balanced approach.</p>	<p>Refer to the Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
42	<p>b. Reconsider the proposed two driveways on Forbes Street noting the proposal does not meet the City of Sydney's maximum 6m driveway width requirement. It is noted that reducing the number of non-affordable residential parking spaces may help in providing a consolidated driveway entry to comply with Council requirements and improve streetscape outcomes.</p>	<p>The Updated Architectural Drawings demonstrate that both driveways have been amended with 6m wide driveways plus splay in accordance with the CoS requirement.</p> <p>Options for consolidated car park and loading driveways as well as access from Dowling Street were considered during the design development. However, given the gentler gradients required for commercial vehicles, the length of the vehicle ramp would have been excessive; impacting proposed public domain area, pedestrian through links within the site, and street activation opportunities along William Street given the high variance of natural RLs across the site.</p> <p>Given the size of the site and frontage available along Forbes Street, the two driveways are appropriately separated to reduce pedestrian / vehicle conflicts.</p>	<p>Refer to the Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>

43	c. Confirm that all visitor bike parking is contained within the development site.	The Updated Architectural Plans show that all visitor bike parking will be contained within the development site, in accordance with City of Sydney DCP 2012 Section 3.11.1 (4) & (7).	Refer to the Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V. Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.
44	d. Show the car parking count on basement architectural plans, including a schedule showing breakdown by allocation type and total.	The Updated Architectural Plans show the parking schedule for the basement, including a breakdown of residential, visitor and retail parking.	Refer to the Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V. Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.
45	e. The loading dock height clearance is proposed at 4.2m, with 4.5m height clearance required by AS2890.2:2018 for 8.8m Medium Rigid Vehicle access. The TIA justifies the non-compliance on the basis of "the site's CBD fringe location and type of land uses being offered on site being primarily residential and retail." The height clearance should be increased to comply, unless specific site constraints preventing compliance are demonstrated. In addition, confirmation would be required from the BCA consultant that this is acceptable in relation to the NCC.	There are site specific constraints preventing compliance with this Australian Standard. These constraints relate to existing footpath levels and flood planning levels on William Street. Any increase in height of the loading dock would either increase the ramp length required or have impact on retail opportunities / street activation along William Street and the proposed pedestrian through site link and/or require deeper basement levels below, increasing car park ramp lengths and excavation. Appropriate height clearance signage will be used to ensure drivers are aware of the limitations. A qualified BCA consultant has confirmed that the proposed loading dock height clearance is acceptable.	Refer to the Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V.
Wind			
46	a. Prepare an updated wind assessment that addresses the rooftop communal open space areas and private open spaces. Demonstrate the proposal will achieve acceptable safety and	An updated Wind Assessment has been prepared with rooftop testing conducted on a flat roof with the blanket 30% uplift scheme to determine	Refer to the Updated Pedestrian Wind

<p>comfort levels of these areas. Provide further plans/details and mitigation measures, as needed, to demonstrate that the wind conditions in these areas will provide comfortable conditions for the intended use of the spaces.</p>	<p>the baseline results for use in predicting the conditions in the final configuration.</p> <p>The proposed roof layout includes a perimeter balustrade, landscaped zones and semi-enclosed areas. In addition, roof articulation to the south and the plant/lift overrun would provide shielding from certain wind directions, increasing the proportion of time that the rooftop open spaces are suitable for resident use.</p> <p>The proposed balustrade height has been increased in areas to a minimum of 1.8m to provide meaningful benefit to the wind conditions on the rooftop.</p> <p>The expected wind comfort on the rooftop areas of the proposed design is anticipated to range from Pedestrian Sitting in the semi enclosed spaces and more sheltered southern areas, to Pedestrian Walking near the northern edges. These conditions are typical for rooftop environments and is considered appropriate for the proposed development. Calm areas, suitable for sitting, are expected to be available for most wind directions.</p>	<p>Assessment at Appendix K.</p>
<p>47 b. The Central Plaza achieves a comfort rating of "Pedestrian standing" which is a reduction in comfort compared with the "Pedestrian sitting" rating of the earlier comparative scheme. The proposal must consider further mitigation measures to maintain comfort for sitting.</p>	<p>The measured wind conditions in the park without landscaping are similar to those experienced in Belmont Park and Wynyard Park. Additional mitigation measures have been incorporated including vertical screens between outdoor seating areas, and tree planting to the north of the plaza. These are expected to improve wind conditions in the Central Plaza space and are considered appropriate for achieving the desired outcome for this area. The combined wind conditions in the Central Plaza are demonstrated to be suitable for pedestrian sitting in the concept DA and blanket uplift schemes. With the addition of the proposed mitigation measures, Pedestrian Sitting is capable of being achieved in the central plaza area for the proposed SSSA design.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Pedestrian Wind Assessment at Appendix K.</p>

48	<p>c. Confirm "Configuration B' in the wind report is the approved concept envelope/development. Wind analysis should also compare against the blanket 30% uplift scheme to be consistent with the approach to analysis of other impact issues.</p>	<p>Confirming that 'Configuration B' is the approved concept envelope. The Wind Report has been updated to make this clearer.</p> <p>In general, the proposed SSDA development has a neutral impact on the measured wind conditions in and around the site when compared to the 30% blanket uplift scheme.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the development since wind tunnel testing of the SSDA scheme in May 2025. From a wind perspective, the SSDA envelope as currently proposed is very similar to the tested configuration as lodged, with the building on the corner of William Street and Forbes Street being 1 storey taller, and the William Street East building being one storey lower.</p> <p>Wind conditions for the current SSDA envelope would be expected to be similar to those tested in the lodged scheme and retesting of this updated configuration is considered unnecessary.</p> <p>Additionally, wind mitigation measures have been incorporated within the central plaza to create localised calmer areas suitable for pedestrian sitting. With these measures in place, the SSDA scheme is expected to achieve wind conditions broadly equivalent to the lodged configuration.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Pedestrian Wind Assessment at Appendix K.</p>
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Site Survey

49	<p>a. Provide a revised site survey showing total site area and area by lot.</p>	<p>This has been provided as part of the RtS Response.</p>	<p>Refer to Revised Site Survey Appendix L.</p>
50	<p>b. Further to recommendations in the Arborist Report, update the site survey to show the location of Tree 4 - Syzygium and Tree 13 - Liriodendron, as these trees are recommended to be retained.</p>	<p>This has been provided as part of the RtS Response.</p>	<p>Refer to Revised Site Survey Appendix L.</p>

Subdivision

51	Noting the proposal does not include subdivision, clarify whether the proposal will be amended to include subdivision works to:	A draft plan of subdivision has been submitted with the RtS to identify the area relating to the VPA, including the location of easements relating to publicly accessible open space and public access.	Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.
	a. create the lots required for public domain works and other VPA works to be dedicated to Council	The application is amended to include the proposed amalgamation of lots and subdivision to create the lot for the VPA land.	
52	b. consolidate the existing lots into one lot and then subdivide the site for the four buildings proposed.	The four buildings will be located on one Torrens title. The strata subdivision of the site will occur prior to occupation of the site.	Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.
53	Alternatively, discuss whether this will be undertaken via separate application and its relationship with this application (e.g. timing)	It is proposed to amalgamate the existing lots on the site and subdivide the land into two lots (one for the development site and one for the VPA land), as per the plan of subdivision. Subdivision will occur prior to occupation of the buildings on the site.	Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.
Staging of the Development			
55	Clarify whether the proposal will be constructed and delivered in stages and if so, provide a Staging Plan and Staging Management Plan.	Staging is not proposed.	Refer to Section 3.1 of the RTS Report.
	The Staging Management Plan must clearly outline the proposed construction and occupation staging. This should consider how the site will be managed which includes, but is not limited to:	Table 8 of this Appendix includes further detail on correspondence with the Cancer Council regarding construction impacts and access arrangements.	
	a. amenity impacts to occupants and users including construction traffic, noise, vibration, odour and dust impacts.		
56	b. vehicle and pedestrian site access during construction stages	See above.	N/A
57	c. traffic and parking impacts including how basement parking will be accessed and how traffic will be managed onsite	See above.	N/A
58	d. safety impacts and mitigation measures to ensure users are not harmed by construction activities or vehicles	See above.	N/A

59	e. the timing of occupation of the affordable housing component of the development, noting that affordable housing must be delivered concurrently with the first stage of the development.	See above.	N/A
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	-----

Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)

60	<p>The VPA made in 2024 for 164 – 194 William Street Woolloomooloo is between four parties, with the developer being William Street Nominee Pty Ltd (ABN 21 642 735 360).</p> <p>However, the applicant/proponent for the SSD application is noted in the EIS as William Street Residential Pty Ltd (ACN 684 567182). The ABN for William Street Nominee Pty Ltd is not a valid ABN. Please advise if the VPA should be updated to replace William Street Nominee Pty Ltd with William Street Residential Pty Ltd.</p> <p>If so, these changes should be undertaken with other changes to the VPA identified in the EIS by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The Applicant has been engaging with the City of Sydney on the VPA. A deed of Novation and Variation was prepared by the City and issued to the applicant on the 4th of March. This includes updates to the land ownership, DA reference and development description. The Deed of Novation was signed and returned to the City on 14 April 2026.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.1 of the RTS Report.</p>
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

Easements and Covenants

61	a. Clarify the future status of existing easements on the site including which easements will be extinguished and which will be retained.	<p>Appendix M submitted with the Rts identifies the existing easements on the site that are intended to be released. These relate to Ausgrid assets and are to be re-instated prior to the issue of the Occupation Certificate and will reflect the approved location of the proposed substation which is identified as “F” on the Draft Plan of Subdivision.</p>	<p>Refer to the Easement Plan at Appendix M.</p> <p>Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.</p>
62	b. Clarify whether publicly accessible open space areas will contain an easement for public access benefitting the City of Sydney.	<p>The draft plan of subdivision submitted with the Rts identifies the location of the easements for publicly accessible open space and public access benefitting the CoS.</p>	<p>Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.</p>

Noise and Vibration

63	<p>Provide an updated NVIA which:</p> <p>a. identifies predicted noise levels from loading dock operations to residential receivers internally and external to the development and if required, provides mitigation measures to ensure acceptable noise levels.</p>	<p>The NVIA has been updated to include a section on Loading Dock Noise Emissions to internal and external receivers (Section 6.2.5).</p> <p>The proposed loading dock on Forbes Street is predicted to generate up to 60 dB(A) Leq at nearby external receivers during truck manoeuvring, equating to an LAeq,15min of about 48 dB(A), which complies with NPfI criteria during the day and evening if deliveries are appropriately scheduled. Daytime use allows multiple movements, while evening use should be limited to one delivery per 15 minutes, and night-time use should be restricted to Council waste collection only. For internal receivers, suitable floor and ceiling construction above the dock is capable of achieving internal noise levels below 30 dB(A) Leq, demonstrating that residential amenity can be adequately protected.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated NVIA at Appendix O.</p>
64	<p>b. considers noise generation impacts to internal and external receivers from the outdoor communal open spaces and the Central Plaza.</p>	<p>The NVIA has been updated to include a section on Noise from Communal Open Space to internal and external receivers (Section 6.2.4).</p> <p>No specific noise controls are proposed for the communal open space, with use recommended during the day and evening only, and not overnight between 10pm and 7am (other than quiet reflection). For external receivers, the setback balustrades and landscaped buffers mean use of the space is unlikely to result in adverse noise impacts. For internal receivers on site, the design and intended hours of use mean the communal open space is not expected to affect residential acoustic amenity.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated NVIA at Appendix O.</p>
<p>Trees and Landscaping</p>			
65	<p>a. Provide updated the Landscape Plans which show trees to be retained.</p>	<p>The landscape plans have been updated to show the trees to be retained.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>

66	b. Identify trees to be removed in an updated Demolition Plan.	The trees to be removed have been included in the Demolition Plan.	Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.
Detailed Comments on Section 6.1.3.3 View Impact of the EIS			
67	<p>a. <i>“The proposed scheme has been subject to several iterations of massing to ensure that the 30% infill affordable housing uplift is utilised in a balanced and contextually appropriate manner.”</i></p> <p>The built form options and their contextual fit need to be demonstrated in the RTS. Refer item 3 above.</p>	A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
68	<p>b. <i>“The VIA assessment evaluates the proposed scheme against the previously approved building envelope, with particular regard to the additional impact on identified views. Importantly, it provides a direct comparison between the approved and uplift scenarios, demonstrating that whilst there is some additional view impact, the proposed envelope outcome significantly mitigates the view affectation, compared to a standard 30% uplift scheme.”</i></p> <p>The VIA does not make a visual assessment against the standard 30% uplift scheme. The VIA should assess the impacts of all envelopes and their reasonableness to support the statement in the EIS.</p>	A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
69	<p>c. <i>“The assessment reviews 70 viewpoints, many of which do not experience an increased view loss as a result of the development.”</i></p> <p>Refer further below on numerical analysis. The view impact analysis needs to be quantified, analysed and justified. It is noted that, 43% of the views analysed experience visual impact of Moderate impact or greater. Furthermore, it is difficult to glean a proper summary of the impacts from the VIA document. There needs to be a summary</p>	A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RTS VIA at Appendix H.</p>

	<p>table including details of each view assessed, the address of the property and from which room the photo was taken/it was modelled, with visual impact assessments per envelope and the reasonableness of the impact.</p>		
70	<p>d. “The visual assessment reviews the approved concept envelope, the compliant infill affordable housing envelope, and the proposed SSDA envelope.”</p> <p>The VIA shows a visual representation of envelopes but does not assess the visual impacts of the standard 30% height bonus or proposed height exceedance above the bonus.</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
71	<p>e. “Notably, of the 70 viewpoints assessed, 16 were categorised as Moderate, 6 as Moderate-to-Severe. These assessments relate to the increased visual impact from the proposed alternative massing, when compared to the approved concept envelope.”</p> <p>It is noted that the EIS advises that much has been done to reduce impacts, however the EIS should also explicitly state whether view impacts are reasonable or not.</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
72	<p>f. “As demonstrated in the above extracts, a number of views are improved as a result of the strategic massing, as opposed to a blanket 30% uplift scenario.”</p> <p>The extract images in Section 6.1.3.3 do not demonstrate this as Table 20 is a comparison of the proposed envelope and approved concept plan envelope.</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
73	<p>g. “Applying the tenacity principles, the proposed scheme achieves an appropriate balance between facilitating growth and maintaining equitable view sharing outcomes.”</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>

<p>It is suggested that the RTS (including updated VIA) explain the Tenacity principles in full and make clear assessments against them.</p>			
74	<p>h. “Compared to the previously considered envelope, the scheme introduces only modest changes in massing, with impacts that remain consistent with the Tenacity principles and within the parameters of reasonable view sharing.”</p> <p>The RTS needs to demonstrate how the impacts remain consistent with the Tenacity principles, together with parameters of reasonable view sharing.</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>
	<p>i. Update the section to ensure that the text and images correctly correlate and are accurate, for example (but not limited to)</p> <p>i. “For reference, each view is depicted in Figure 34 below.”</p> <p>This figure does not represent all views. Refer point further above on this.</p> <p>ii. “Established tenancy principles”.</p> <p>It is assumed this should refer to “Tenacity” instead of “tenancy”.</p>	<p>A peer reviewed VIA has been prepared for the RtS and a relevant Impact Assessment has been provided in the RtS Report based on this updated assessment. This assessment addresses the DPHI’s concerns on the previously submitted VIA and the EIS’s impact assessment.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.3 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS VIA at Appendix H.</p>

City of Sydney

Table 2 City of Sydney RTS Response

No.	Comment	Response	Reference
Building Mass & Clause 4.6 Variations			
1	<p>The proposed development relies on 2 clause 4.6 variations, varying both the maximum building height and FSR. While it is acknowledged that the Design Integrity Panel supports the massing of Option 6, which the proposed development adopts, the Department must be satisfied that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the 2 variation requests.</p> <p>The City is concerned because the proposed variations directly cause view-sharing and outlook impacts to neighbouring properties and adversely affect the wind comfort around the site and in the proposed publicly accessible park.</p> <p>The City also questions the extent of additional floor space and building height that should be allocated to the proposed development, and the City considers that the quantum of affordable housing floor space provided is less than 15% of GFA.</p>	<p>The proposed variations in height and FSR are a direct result of the relocation of floorspace onto the William Street East building, which was an intentional design choice to reduce view and amenity impacts to the surrounding developments compared to the 30% uniformed uplift. This is explained further in the two updated clause 4.6 variation requests which have been updated to reflect the feedback received during public exhibition, including the additional Visual Impact Assessment and refinements to residential amenity.</p> <p>The proposed affordable housing component is 4,979 sqm which equates to 25 % of the proposed units and 15.1 % of the proposed GFA.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (Height) at Appendix I.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Request (FSR) at Appendix J.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H.</p>
Affordable Housing			
2	<p>At a minimum, the Affordable Housing component should at least meet the minimum requirements set out in the City of Sydney Affordable Housing Program, referenced in the Sydney LEP, which specifies a DA contribution and a Rezoning (uplift) contribution.</p> <p>We are concerned that the proposed apartments allocated as 15-year time-limited affordable housing are burdened with the poorest amenities of the proposed development, with the majority of those</p>	<p>The proposed affordable housing has been relocated entirely within the William Street West building. The affordable housing achieves the below residential amenity outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 66% of AH units receive 2 or more hours of solar access in mid-winter (as per the ADG requirement) 50% of AH units achieve cross ventilation. 	<p>Please refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p> <p>Please refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>

apartments being noise-affected, without natural cross ventilation, and have no access to direct sunlight. The City reinforces the Design Integrity Panel's recommendation that at least 70% of the affordable housing units are to achieve the level of solar access expected by Objective 4A-1, and requests that amenities be equitably distributed across market and time-limited affordable housing units.

The City also objects to the applicant's method of calculating affordable housing floor space. 'Affordable housing component,' as defined by section 15B of the Housing SEPP, refers to the percentage of the GFA used for affordable housing.

The component should only include GFA that is used exclusively for affordable housing. The applicant currently attributes 50% of the circulation space in the William Street West building on the mezzanine level - level 04 as affordable housing floor space. These corridors are not used exclusively for affordable housing but shared with other market housing units. As such, those shared corridors must be excluded.

We are also concerned that the Affordable Housing will be rented out at a discount to the market rate, rather than as a percentage of household income. In an inner-city suburb like Woolloomooloo, a discount to market rent, is unlikely to equal affordable rental housing.

The affordable housing GFA provided is 4,979 sqm equates to 15.1% of the overall GFA. It is noted that this includes floor space only accessible to affordable housing residents.

Affordable Housing will be rented out in accordance with the requirements under the Housing SEPP and will be managed by a Community Housing Provider.

Natural Cross Ventilation

3	<p>Several apartments have been incorrectly identified as naturally cross-ventilated. These include the William Street East apartments 105E-705E; William Street West apartments 101W-301W; and Dowling Street apartments 201, 202, 301, and 302. This prevents the proposed development from achieving at least 60% of the apartments being naturally cross-ventilated, excluding any that are noise-affected.</p> <p>Natural cross ventilation is clearly defined in the glossary of the ADG. At a minimum, openings must be provided on both the windward and</p>	<p>The proposed design has been refined and further assessment using thermal modelling, as advised by the DIP, has been undertaken. 63% of the total units proposed now achieve natural cross ventilation.</p> <p>This has been calculated in line with the ADG.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.9 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>
---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

leeward sides of the building to achieve the air pressure differential necessary for natural cross ventilation.

The proposed development must be amended to be consistent with Objective 4B-3 of the ADG.

Solar Access

4	<p>The analysis provided in the Urban Design report does not correlate with the submitted sun eye views. The number of apartments receiving 2 hours of sun is overstated, while the number of apartments receiving no sun is understated. The City considers that the proposed development would not achieve 70% of apartments receiving at least 2 hours of sun, and the number of apartments receiving no sun would be greater than that identified by the Urban Design report and therefore be inconsistent with Objective 4A-1 of the ADG.</p> <p>It is noted that the sun eye views demonstrate that 19 apartments do not achieve any direct sunlight. These apartments include the William Street West apartments M09W, 111W-311W, 410W, 106W-306W, 405W-705W and William Street East apartments 105E-705E. Furthermore, 7 apartments, being the William Street East apartments M03E-603E, do not achieve 2 hours of direct sunlight, despite some sun access between 9am and approximately 10.30am.</p> <p>The proposed development must be amended to be consistent with Objective 4A-1 of the ADG.</p>	<p>75% of all apartments proposed receive 2 or more hours of solar access on 21 June, which complies with the ADG requirement.</p> <p>10% receive between 15 minutes and 2 hours, and 26% receive less than 15 minutes on 21 June.</p> <p>Refer to the solar access diagrams provided with the Design RtS Report which identify the relevant units.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 4.9 of the RtS Report.</p> <p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Design Excellence

5	<p>The Competitive Design Alternatives Report in Appendix A of the Bridging Design Excellence Strategy is missing. A copy of the Competitive Design Alternatives Report must be submitted to allow the</p>	<p>A copy of the Competitive Design Alternatives Report has been submitted with the RtS.</p>	<p>Refer to the Competitive Design Alternatives Report at Appendix R.</p>
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Department to be satisfied that the key principles identified in Section 5.1 of the report are retained and the areas for refinement in Section 5.2 have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>The City advises that the following areas still require further refinements:</p> <p>Internal Layout</p> <p>The internal layout of Dowling Street apartments 102, 203 and 303 should be reconsidered to maximise their spatial efficiency.</p> <p>The internal layout of Dowling Street apartments G02 and 102 should also be reconsidered to improve the internal acoustic amenity given the interface with the proposed lift at the NE corner of the building.</p> <p>Several apartments include study nooks that do not have direct access to natural light and air. Further optimisation is required.</p>	<p>The DRP raised similar concerns around the arrangement of apartments in the Dowling Street Building in relation to the balcony shapes and solar access to study nooks. Apartments have been subsequently revised to achieve better residential amenity outcomes.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
<p>6 Floor to floor heights</p> <p>The submitted sections do not accurately identify the proposed finished floor levels. Updated sections are required to clearly and accurately identify the proposed FFLs, and to demonstrate that all residential levels are provided with a minimum floor-to-floor height of 3.2m to ensure compliance with the relevant standards of the NCC. It is noted that the Urban Design Report includes several sections that demonstrate floor-to-floor heights of 3.2m.</p>	<p>The Updated Architectural Plans accurately identify the proposed finished floor levels. These all comply with the minimum 3.2m residential requirement.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
<p>Other Design Considerations</p>		
<p>7 Liveable Apartment</p> <p>In accordance with the Housekeeping Amendments to Section 4.2.3.12 of the Sydney DCP 2012, which have been exhibited and are currently awaiting gazettal, all (100%) apartments are to meet the silver level of the Liveable Housing Design (LHD) Guidelines, and at least 15% of the apartments are to meet the platinum level with circulation at all internal</p>	<p>20% of all apartments proposed meet the silver level of the LHD Guidelines, in line with the requirements of the ADG. An ADG Compliance Schedule Summary identifying which apartments are adaptable is included with the Design RtS Report.</p> <p>It is noted that the DCP does not technically apply to SSDA's.</p>	<p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>

doorways in accordance with Australian Standard 1428.1:2021 Section 10.3.

8	<p>Private Open Space</p> <p>William Street West apartments 108W, 208W, 308W, and 408W do not have any private open space. A compliant quantum of private open space must be provided while preserving the currently proposed facade articulation.</p>	<p>All apartments now include private open space in the form of a balcony or winter garden. A Private Open Space Schedule has been provided with the Design RtS Report.</p>	<p>Refer to the RtS Design Report at Appendix F.</p>
9	<p>Alternative source of natural ventilation</p> <p>Many of the Forbes Street apartments have bi-fold doors as their only source of ventilation. The use of bi-fold doors should be reconsidered as they do not provide secure ventilation at nighttime.</p>	<p>Bifold doors are no longer proposed.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
10	<p>Documentation</p> <p>The materials and finishes details, which are currently in the urban design report, should be included on the architectural drawings and keyed to the elevations.</p>	<p>The proposed materials and finishes have been included in the elevations in the Updated Architectural Plans.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>

Sustainability

11	<p>The Design Excellence Strategy endorsed under the Concept Consent (D/2022/139) requires the following key ESD targets to be carried through the competitive process, design development and construction stages to completion of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improving upon the minimum legislated BASIX benchmarks as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BASIX Energy minimum score + 5 – BASIX Water minimum score +10; and 	<p>The ESD Report has been updated to reflect these sustainability commitments.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated ESD Report at Appendix P.</p>
----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------

- electrification of all building components, including in all dwellings, centralised services and commercial/retail premises.

The submitted BASIX certificate confirms the proposed development can achieve BASIX Energy +5 and BASIX Water +10. The ESD Report, however, does not include a clear commitment for the proposed development to achieve full electrification.

These commitments should be clearly demonstrated in the ESD report and secured by conditions of consent.

Communal Open Space and Communal Facilities

<p>12 Publicly accessible open spaces</p> <p>The proposed provision of publicly accessible open spaces is supported. The applicant needs to confirm how public access will be secured. Easement for public access benefiting the City, and with terms agreed by the City, is preferred. It must be noted, however, that the proposed provision of publicly accessible open spaces must not be relied upon to offset/reduce the required amount of section 7.11 development contribution.</p> <p>It is noted that the design of the public park is strongly founded upon the Design with Country framework. The sandstone 'escarpment,' the 7 'Peace Keeper' trees and the form of the seating areas are important elements to be retained. However, the extent of the 'escarpment' must not encroach into the land to be dedicated to the City.</p> <p>There is also concern that the tree planting within the 'escarpment' may have access to very limited soil volume. The design of tree pits in the 'escarpment' and other raised planters should be provided to demonstrate that the soil volume is consistent with the City's Landscape Code, and that root access to the surrounding soils have been maximised.</p>	<p>Prior to occupation of the building, a Plan of Management will be prepared for the precinct which will deal with security, maintenance and other operational matters for the retail premises, through site links and public open space.</p> <p>A draft plan of subdivision has been submitted with the Rts to identify the area relating to the VPA, including the location of easements relating to publicly accessible open space and public access. Suitable conditions of consent can be imposed required the preparation of terms prior to the occupation of the building.</p> <p>The "escarpment" sandstone element does not encroach into the land to be dedicated to the City.</p> <p>Sections have been provided in the Updated Landscape Plans that show the soil volume provided for the proposed planters in this area.</p>	<p>Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>13</p>	<p>Communal Open Space</p> <p>The requirement for communal open space should be 25% of the post-dedication site area, inclusive of the proposed publicly accessible central park. The applicant must confirm that the proposed development complies with that requirement and demonstrate how residents will be informed and provided with clear and secure access to the communal open spaces and facilities across the 4 buildings. This may include a signage strategy.</p> <p>The design of the level 8 roof terrace requires further development. The northern edge is currently unprogrammed, while the 5 defined areas appear to cater to very similar purposes. The extent of the curvilinear canopy is also unclear, given the inconsistencies between the architectural and landscape drawings.</p>	<p>The proposed communal open space accounts for 49% of the site area, post dedication</p> <p>Residents will be provided with information on the communal open space available to them upon moving into the development.</p> <p>The rooftop design has also been refined, however it is noted that the intention is that these are passive areas for residents.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B.</p>
<hr/>			
<p>14</p>	<p>Communal Facilities</p> <p>The communal facilities in the William Street East and Dowling Street buildings are located in the basement, poorly connected to other communal areas, and not easily identifiable resulting in with poor passive surveillance. The location of, and access to, the indoor communal facilities needs to be reconsidered to ensure that they are perceived as safe spaces to be used by residents.</p> <p>The programming of the communal space in the William Street East building, on the Dowling Street level, should also be considered. The indicative communal Wine Cellar Store is considered to have limited utility.</p>	<p>The communal facilities have been amended and refined.</p>	
<p>Landscape Design</p>			
<p>15</p>	<p>Deep Soil</p> <p>The proposed deep soil zone is significantly encumbered by pavement and structures such as stairs, walls, ramps, private terraces, and the</p>	<p>781sqm of deep soil is proposed.</p> <p>Updated deep soil calculations are provided in the RtS Design Report.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>

sandstone 'escarpment' of the central park. Thus, the actual deep soil area provided by the development is significantly less than that currently stated by the applicant.

Clause 19(2)(c) of the Housing SEPP imposes a non-discretionary development standard requiring a deep soil zone of at least 15% of the site area. The proposed development must be amended to comply with this requirement while ensuring that the proposed deep soil areas are at least 3m wide and unimpeded both above and below ground.

Any shortfall must not be justified against the previous concept consent (D/2022/139). This is because the proposed development is subject to a different set of planning controls and relies on the building height and FSR uplifts of the Housing SEPP.

16	<p>Landscape Strategy</p> <p><i>The landscape and planning strategy also require further development to address the following comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The extent of green roofs should be maximised, including perimeter planting around penthouse terraces. The landscape report only lists 4 species for green roofs. Further opportunities to maximise biodiversity on green roofs should be explored; ▪ The species selection for building facade planting should reflect analysis of the different microclimates, especially aspect, of the different areas of planting; ▪ Confirm if the facade planting is proposed to be irrigated, and if the stormwater design allows for the capture and reuse of stormwater for irrigation; ▪ The architectural drawings show a landscaped area on level 7 of the William Street West building, facing William Street. This area, 	<p>Landscape Plans for the roofs of all buildings has been provided, including the identification of raised planter beds, and planted species which have been selected to maximise biodiversity with consideration of the climate and aspect. Canopy trees are included in habitable rooftop areas.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

however, is not captured by any of the submitted landscape documentation. A landscape strategy is needed for this area; and

- Canopy trees should be accommodated on the roof terraces, with soil volume consistent with the Sydney Landscape Code.

17	Tree Canopy	<p><i>The analysis of the landscape report currently relies on canopy proposed on the land to be dedicated to the City to comply with the 15% requirement. An updated analysis is required to demonstrate that the proposed development will achieve 15% of the post-dedication site area as canopy cover, without relying on any trees located within the land to be dedicated to the City.</i></p>	<p>The Landscape Plans have been updated to reflect a canopy cover plan that does not rely on canopy proposed on the dedicated land. The proposed development still achieves 15.85 % canopy cover.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>
----	--------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

VPA and Public Domain Works

18	VPA Works	<p><i>The proposed development must be amended to clearly include subdivision, at a minimum to allow the subdivision of the land to be dedicated to the City. This is critical to allow the City to be the Principal Certifier for the works to be carried out on the land to be dedicated.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed landscape design must provide a clear delineation between private property and the boundary of the land to be dedicated. This includes paving, ramps, garden beds, stairs etc. Any planter connected with the 'escarpment' must include a clear edge indicating the extent of land to be dedicated.</i></p> <p><i>While the indicative design for the VPA laneway is supported in-principle, detailed levels, cross sections and long sections are to be provided to clarify proposal and the landscape details must be further development in accordance with the City's Parks Code. A lighting proposal for the laneway is also required and the applicant should</i></p>	<p>A draft plan of subdivision has been provided with the Rts.</p> <p>The Updated Landscape Plans also provide further detail in relation to the delineation between the private property and the VPA land.</p> <p>Suitable conditions of consent can be imposed ensuring that the VPA land is designed to Council's satisfaction, along with lighting requirements.</p>	<p>Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision at Appendix N.</p> <p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>
----	------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>obtain detailed lighting requirements from the City's Public Domain team.</p>			
19	<p>Judge Lane</p> <p><i>The City has requested, prior to the subject SSD being lodged, that the entirety of Judge Lane be converted into a shared zone, this includes both the north-south and east-west street sections. Landscape works are to be extended to include the transformation of Judge Lane into a shared zone, with detailed design of interfaces between Walumay Neighbourhood Park and Judge Lane, particularly regarding level changes and accessibility.</i></p>	<p>The City had previously requested as part of the Design Competition Process that competitors "explore the conversion of Judge Lane into a shared zone."</p> <p>The conversion of Judge Lane into a shared zone has been explored. Judge Lane is a service lane with a dead end that, as noted in the Cancer Council submission, primarily services the Cancer Council building, being the primary commercial operator accessing the lane</p> <p>The proposed development provides a 24/7 accessible, off-road, east-west pedestrian connection through the site. There is no rationale as to why a no-through service lane needs to be converted to a shared zone when the primary pedestrian access is provided through the site.</p>	N/A
20	<p>Public Domain Works Diagram</p> <p><i>A diagram must be submitted indicating the expected extent of works to be undertaken within the public domain. This is to correlate with the area of expected levels and gradient and interfaces to the surrounding public domain.</i></p>	<p>A Public Domain Plan has been provided in the Updated Landscape Plans.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated Landscape Plans at Appendix E.</p>
21	<p>Public Domain on William Street, Forbes Street and Dowling Street</p> <p><i>The proposed public domain upgrade, including additional street trees, furniture, and new paving along William Street, Forbes Street and Dowling Street, is supported in-principle. While further refinements are required to address the following matters, they can be resolved when detailed public domain plans are required prior to the issue of any construction certificate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree locations must be fully coordinated with existing and proposed services, as well as existing and proposed trees. 	<p>Noted. Separate public domain approvals will be required in accordance with relevant conditions of consent.</p>	N/A

- Tree planting adjacent to the proposed driveway on Forbes Street must be reviewed against vehicle sightlines for safe ingress and egress; and confirmed by a traffic study.
- Other street tree planting opportunities should be explored if the nominated tree locations are not viable.
- Proposed street furniture arrangement must comply with City of Sydney standards, and be avoided within the structural root zones of any trees.

Wind Comfort

22 *The submitted wind analysis demonstrates that the proposed development will result in poorer wind comfort within and around the site compared to the 'Initial scheme,' which is assumed to be the concept envelope approved under D/2022/139 with a uniform 30% height increase. The wind analysis also fails to provide any assessment on the wind conditions of the proposed rooftop communal and private open spaces.*

An updated wind assessment must be provided to demonstrate the following and recommends appropriate mitigation measures where necessary:

- the central park and its edges being locations 19, 20, 22 and 23, must achieve the sitting comfort criteria to provide the publicly accessible open spaces an acceptable level of amenity and to support the retail activities at its edges;
- the rooftop communal and private open spaces must achieve the sitting comfort criteria to support their recreational uses;
- locations 13 and 16 must achieve the standing criteria to ensure an acceptable level of amenity to the primary access point of the North-South through-site link and to support the retail tenancies.

An Updated Wind Report has been provided which addresses pedestrian wind comfort on both ground level and rooftop communal areas, as well as comparison across the concept envelope, 30% blanket uplift, and the proposed scheme.

Refer to Section 3.2.7 of the RtS Report.
Refer to the Updated Wind Report at Appendix K.

Water Management

23	<p><i>The MUSIC-link report contained within the submitted Integrated Water Management Plan is incomplete and contains failing parameters. A complete MUSIC-link report must be provided and include justification for any failing parameters to enable further review.</i></p> <p><i>The Integrated Water Management Plan also suggests that the storage volume of the required onsite detention can be reduced. The onsite detention requirement should be clarified with Sydney Water, and an updated Integrated Water Management Plan must be provided to confirm compliance with Sydney Water's requirements.</i></p>	<p>The MUSIC-link report provided at Appendix C of the Integrated Water Management Plan (IWMPP) lodged with the EIS was complete. The "failing parameters" noted are the default settings for the approved filtration devices and are set by Oceanprotect. As such, no updated MUSIC-link report has been provided.</p> <p>As stated in the lodged IWMP, TTW has contacted Sydney Water and have confirmed that they require that the OSD has a minimum volume of 100 Cu.m and PSD of 237 L/s.</p> <p>The DRAINS model shows that in reducing the total maximum discharge rate to 233 L/s, the tank would actually only need to store <80 Cu.m of water. The current proposal is therefore to provide this volume.</p> <p>It is noted that approval for the tank size is subject to a S73 approval with Sydney Water and will be dealt with under this process.</p>	<p>Refer to the IWMP lodged with the EIS.</p>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

Flooding

24	<p><i>The submitted Flood Impact and Risk Assessment must be updated to confirm compliance with the City's Interim Floodplain Management Policy. In particular, the report identifies that several of the proposed entries to the basement, including the vehicular entry on Forbes Street and those through the residential lobbies on William Street, are affected by PMF depths greater than 150mm. As such, the proposed finishes floor levels of those entry points must comply with either 1% AEP + 500mm freeboard or the PMF, whichever is greater.</i></p> <p><i>The finished floor levels for the retail tenancies on William Street and Bridge Street must also comply with 1% AEP CC2030 levels.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At all basement entry locations, 1% AEP flood depths are less than 150mm and as such, the PMF level has been adopted as the appropriate Flood Planning Level. <p>Section 3.0 of the lodged Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (FIRA) notes that both the Interim Floodplain Management Policy (2014) and the Draft DCP (2023) require basement openings to be protected to either the 1% AEP level + 500mm freeboard or the PMF level, whichever is higher.</p> <p>However, the FIRA also explains how the assessment of basement and entry levels has been undertaken with council's definition of flooding as surface water depths exceeding 150mm.</p>	<p>TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.</p>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

Applying 500mm freeboard to the 1% AEP flood level at locations affected by shallow nuisance flows is not consistent with the intent of the policy and would result in an unreasonable design outcome. The approach adopted by TTW ensures flood risk is appropriately managed while avoiding unnecessary elevation of access points where credible flood risk is not present.

- Flood depths at all retail tenancy ingress points are less than 150mm in this event. These entry points are not considered flood affected under the 1% AEP CC2030 scenario in accordance with the adopted assessment approach and Council’s definition of flooding. The proposed finished floor levels for the retail tenancies are considered compliant from a flood risk perspective.

Contamination

25 *The submitted Remediation Action Plan has not been peer reviewed by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor.*

To satisfy clause 4.6(1) of the Resilience and Hazards SEPP, a statement by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor certifying that the RAP is practical and the site will be suitable after being remediated in accordance with the requirements of the RAP is required. Alternatively, a letter of Interim Advice from an NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor may be provided to advise that the site is capable of being made suitable for the proposed use following remediation.

The City also requests that the Remediation Action Plan explicitly confirm that any land to be dedicated to the City will not be subjected to a long-term management plan in accordance with the VPA.

The RAP lodged with this SSDA was previously lodged and approved under the Concept DA. It has been peer reviewed by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor, as requested in an RFI for the Concept DA. This has been resubmitted as part of the RtS for reference.

It must be noted that the VPA includes specific obligations that the applicant is required to adhere to. The VPA states that the land must:

- Be remediate prior to its transfer or dedication to the City
- Not be subject to any long-term Environmental Management Plan; and
- Be transferred or dedication free of any encumbrances or encroachments.

Therefore, the VPA which has been executed and registered on title, includes the relevant obligations which the application must adhere to.

Contamination Site Auditor Statement at Appendix U.

Parking and Traffic

26 *The proposed car parking provision is excessive given the location and accessibility of the site. The City recommends that the number of car parking spaces be minimised by adopting the parking rates of Sydney LEP 2012, which would include the provision of residential visitor parking spaces into the overall number of parking spaces. The provision of accessible, car share, and motorcycle parking spaces would also reduce proportionally. This is to achieve the aim of Sydney LEP 2012 to encourage active and alternative transport modes and to encourage sustainable development.*

While the number of bicycle parking spaces is consistent with Sydney DCP 2012, their locations do not satisfy the criteria of Section 3.11.3(4) and (7). In particular, visitor bicycle parking spaces must be provided within the development site, not on any public footpaths.

The width of the 2 proposed driveways on Forbes Street must be minimised to be no greater than 6m as per City of Sydney Technical Specifications Part C, see Standard Drawing 2.6.8. This is to support the designation of Forbes Street as a liveable green network with pedestrian priority by maximising pedestrian safety and amenity.

The rationale behind the excess parking stems from the desire to future proof the development when the affordable dwellings transition to market dwellings after 15 years.

It is also noted that the requirements in the Housing SEPP are minimum rates, and therefore do not prevent the provision of parking above these rates.

Residential visitor and retail car parking is provided below the maximum Sydney LEP requirements.

- The Updated Architectural Plans show that all visitor bike parking will be contained within the development site, in accordance with City of Sydney DCP 2012 Section 3.11.1 (4) & (7).
- The Updated Architectural Drawings demonstrate that both driveways have been redesigned with 6m wide driveways plus splay in accordance with the CoS requirement.

Options for consolidated car park and loading driveways as well as access from Dowling Street were considered during the design development. However, given the gentler gradients required for commercial vehicles, the length of the vehicle ramp would have been excessive; impacting proposed public domain area, pedestrian through links within the site, and street activation opportunities along William Street given the high variance of natural RLs across the site.

Given the size of the site and frontage available along Forbes Street, the two driveways are appropriately separated to reduce pedestrian / vehicle conflicts.

TTPP Traffic RFI Response at Appendix V

Updated Architectural Plans at Appendix B

Waste Management

27	<p><i>An updated waste management plan must be provided to demonstrate compliance with the provisions of Section 3.11.13, 3.14, and 4.2.6 of Sydney DCP 2012 and the City's Guidelines for Waste Management in New Developments.</i></p> <p><i>The residential and commercial waste storage areas must be designed to manage the required number of bins as per the predicted waste generation of the site and without relying on waste compaction. The size of the residential waste storage area, in particular, must reflect the twice-weekly collection frequency. The architectural drawings must clearly show the number of bins required, with bins drawn to scale to demonstrate that the proposed layout is functional with acceptable manoeuvrability and access.</i></p> <p><i>The residential bin holding room adjacent to the loading dock must be adequately sized to allow all residential bins to be presented in a single location for collection. The maximum manual handling distance for residential bins and bulky waste is 10m. This would require the entrance door to the bulky waste storage room to be adjusted.</i></p> <p><i>The waste management plan must demonstrate that the movement of bins to the loading dock is via the goods lift, not the vehicle ramp or the public domain. It must also identify an enclosed and designated space with three phase power to store the ride on bin tug and trailer designed for the transfer of 4 x 1,100L bins. Adequate clearance for the use of this trailer must also be demonstrated.</i></p>	<p>The OWMP has been updated to respond to this comment.</p> <p>The new revision complies with the relevant sections of the DCP and guidelines, and ensures that waste storage aligns with waste collection frequency.</p> <p>It is noted that a bin tug has been identified as the appropriate method for manoeuvring all bins, rather than a trailer, reflecting both site logistics and practices observed in similar nearby developments. This approach is standard for developments of this scale.</p>	<p>Refer to the Updated OWMP at Appendix Q.</p>
----	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Transport for NSW

Table 3 TfNSW RTS Response

No.	Comment	Response	Reference
TfNSW Comments on the Environmental Impact Statement Exhibition			
2	<p>TfNSW offers the following comments in respect of the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development site is near to the Cross City Tunnel, Mainline Tunnel (East Bound) Ch. 2140m to 2240m. and between X-passages CP-40 and ED-40. 2. Tunnel crown depths at the location are approximately 20m. 3. Proposed maximum excavation depths are about 12m (RL +3M). 4. Since the proposed development is located directly above the easement zone and the excavation depth has only minimal offset from the tunnel structure's easement, there is a potential for intersection, based on detailed clash analysis. Therefore, a comprehensive assessment will be required for this development proposal, including the horizontal offset clash analysis from William Street, as per the attached easement plans in TAB D. 	Noted.	-
Additional Information Required			
3	Project Drawings (including site survey drawings, and site dimensions).	Noted.	-
4	Interface Drawings (Architectural and Structural Drawings that depict the development, including excavation and structures, in relation to the tunnel protection and easement zones. Please refer to the attached easement zone drawings. For the eastern mainline tunnel, the easement		-

zone extends beyond the William Street Road boundary, and the protection zone for rock anchors has been defined specifically.

5	Easement zones near X-passages needs to be considered according to the attached drawings.	-
6	<p>Based on the aforementioned information, a comprehensive assessment regarding the construction impact of the proposed development over the tunnel structure, shall be provided by the developer, including the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Geotechnical Analysis b. Structural Impact Assessment, which should incorporate a pre-construction dilapidation survey of the tunnel asset within the construction impact influence zone. c. Instrumentation and Monitoring (including surface monitoring and in-tunnel monitoring), to ascertain any adverse impacts on the Tunnel asset. d. TAB D includes is a checklist with further details. This gives details of the overall Construction Impact Assessment requirements. e. It is likely the developer will be required to enter into an interface agreement with Transurban Cross City Tunnel, to agree the process and requirements for design reviews, monitoring, insurance etc. 	<p>As noted in the RtS report, the applicant is actively engaging with TfNSW to resolve these matters.</p> <p>Ongoing, close collaboration is occurring between the project team and TfNSW and these matters will be dealt with in parallel to the assessment of the application.</p>

NSW DCCEEW Water Group

Table 4 NSW DCCEEW Water Group RTS Response

No.	Comment	Response	Reference
Recommendation – pre-determination			
1	Confirm the basement drainage design and pump out system used to predict the post construction groundwater inflows.	<p>Douglas have reported in Section 2.2 of their Groundwater Impact Assessment (GIA) report (208700.01.R.002.Rev1, dated 23 July 2025) [Douglas2025] the following;</p> <p><i>“we expect that dewatering of the site will be achievable via conventional sumps and pumps and is expected to be redirected and discharged into council stormwater drains.”</i></p> <p>The design is currently for a sump and pump system. Seepage will be collected from strip drains behind shotcrete perimeter walls and gravel drainage below the slab which is directed to a series of sumps connected to a pumping system connected to the council stormwater system at street level.</p>	Douglas Partners DCCEEW RFI Response Letter at Appendix T.
2	<p>Commit to revise the groundwater seepage analysis and impact assessment if there is a change to the drainage design.</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>The Groundwater Impact Assessment (Appendix Z) as provided modelled groundwater inflows for the operation phase however the drainage works and pump out system is not detailed. Clarification of the works, at least in concept form, is required to understand what the modelled inflows and impacts have been based on. This is also required to enable an exclusion from a water supply works approval under section 4.41 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</p>	No other use of the collected groundwater is planned. If this changes, there will be a revised impact assessment undertaken.	Douglas Partners DCCEEW RFI Response Letter at Appendix T.

Should there be a change in the design of the basement drainage system prior to construction, the groundwater seepage analysis will need to be updated to confirm the inflow and impact predictions and the need to revisit monitoring and licensing requirements.

Recommendation – post-determination

3 That DPHI requests 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 Water Management (General) Regulation 2025.

Explanation

The Groundwater Impact Assessment (Appendix X) predicted groundwater inflows during construction of 1.8ML/yr for a base case and 6.7ML/yr in the highest permeability sensitivity case. Under the Water Management Act 2000, if groundwater is intercepted a WAL must be obtained prior to any water take occurring unless an exemption under the Water Management (General) Regulation 2025 applies. An exemption may be available for water take during construction activities in coastal water sources under Clause 6 of Schedule 4 of the WM Reg, or where the groundwater take during construction or operation is less than or equal to 3ML per water year (cl 19, sch 4 of WM Reg). To claim either of these exemptions certain requirements must be met, such as:

- The person claiming the exemption keeps a record of the water taken under the exemption and provides this to the Minister within 28 days of the end of the water year; and
- The records are kept for 5 years.

As discussed in the GIA submitted with the EIS (Appendix Z):

Dewatering of groundwater for construction purposes constitutes an aquifer interference activity under the Water Management Act 2000 and may require a Water Access Licence (WAL) and appropriate water entitlement units (share and extraction components), depending on the water source and proposed take.

In accordance with the Water Management (General) Regulation 2025, extraction of water from the greater metropolitan region groundwater source for the purpose of construction dewatering are currently exempt from requiring a Water Access License (WAL) under the coastal construction of infrastructure exemption clause.

For long-term, continuous dewatering of the basement, the predicted groundwater inflows into the proposed basement in the base case are 0.4 ML per year (less than 3 ML per year), therefore the development does not to require a WAL as it meets exemption under Clause 19(b) of the Water Management (General) Regulation 2025.

Regarding the sensitivity case 2 from the GIA report submitted with the EIS (Douglas2025), a WAL should not be required as inflows for long-term dewatering for the drained basement are predicted to be no more than 3ML per year.

Should the monitoring of the actual inflow volume during the construction suggest it is likely to exceed 3 ML, a Water Access Licence would be required with appropriate groundwater share allocation from NRAR (1 water share per 1 ML). It is our understanding that small numbers of water shares are

Douglas Partners
DCCEEW RFI Response
Letter at Appendix T.

readily available on the market and this should not be an issue in the unlikely event that it is required.

Water take records are to be kept and provided to the Minister within 28 days of the end of water year and records kept for 5 years to claim the exemptions.

SES

Table 5 SES RTS Response

No.	Comment	Response	Reference
1	Ensures that all openings to the basement (ramp, vents, etc) are situated above the PMF or 1% AEP plus freeboard, whichever is higher as a condition of consent. If this is not feasible reconsider basement carparking as any openings to the basement are below the PMF will pose risk to life and property.	<p>Basement openings have been assessed in accordance with Council’s definition of flooding and the applicable Flood Planning Level criteria. The FIRA lodged with the EIS demonstrates that all basement openings are located at or above the PMF level.</p> <p>It is not considered reasonable to impose a condition requiring basement openings to be set to the higher of the PMF or 1% AEP level plus freeboard where 1% AEP conditions do not constitute flooding.</p>	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.
2	Requests the proponent demonstrates consistency with the Shelter in Place Guideline (NSW Government, 2024) prior to granting consent to ensure the risk to life is adequately managed and/or mitigated. The current proposal has not demonstrated consistency and the streets surrounding the site are inundated by high hazard flooding during the PMF event.	<p>The FIRA lodged with the EIS demonstrates that inundation of adjacent road frontages occurs within approximately 10 minutes of the onset of the critical 15-minute PMF storm. Flows across Forbes street rapidly reach H5-H6 hazard levels, preventing safe access to the basement car parking. Attempting evacuation in these conditions would increase risk to life.</p> <p>As such, the proposal provides onsite refuge above the PMF level, enabling occupants to safely shelter in place without reliance on evacuation. High hazard flooding of surrounding streets during the PMF reflects broader catchment behaviour. Mitigation of surrounding offsite high-hazard flows is not considered reasonable to demonstrate overall consistency with the guideline.</p>	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.
3	<p>Principle 1 Any proposed Emergency Management strategy should be compatible with any existing community Emergency Management strategy.</p> <p>Any proposed Emergency Management strategy for an area should be compatible with the strategies identified in the NSW State Flood Plan3</p>	The primary response strategy is pre-emptive closure of the retail stores in response to flood warnings or severe thunderstorm warnings which is consistent with Section 5.8.3 of the CoS Flood Emergency Sub Plan. Refer to Section 9.2.1 of the FIRA.	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.

and the City of Sydney Council Flood Emergency Sub Plan, where evacuation is the preferred emergency management strategy for people impacted by flooding.

4	<p>Principle 2 Decisions should be informed by understanding the full range of risks to the community.</p> <p>Decisions relating to future development should be risk-based and ensure Emergency Management risks to the community of the full range of floods are effectively understood and managed.</p> <p>Further, risk assessment should consider the full range of flooding, including events up to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and not focus only on the 1% AEP flood. Climate change should also be considered.</p> <p>The site is a high flood island, which becomes isolated by shallow depth, high velocity flooding as frequently as the 10% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event, with low level flooding up to 50mm depth inundating all surrounding streets.⁵ During the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) flooding on William Street, adjacent to the development, reaches depths of up to 500mm.⁶ All surrounding streets reach Hazard Level 5 (H5) and isolated areas within the roadway reach Hazard Levels 6 (H6).⁷ This level of hazard is unsafe for all people and vehicles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noted. The FIRA submitted with the EIS considers events ranging from the 10% AEP up to the PMF event. Climate change has also been considered in the FIRA. ▪ Shallow sheet flows with depths of less than 50mm are regarded as nuisance flows, not flooding, in accordance with the CoS definition. Thus, this is not considered isolation of the site. <p>Flows across the immediate adjacent roadways are classified as low hazard (H1 – generally safe for people and vehicles) in all modelled events up to the 0.2% AEP. In the PMF event, flows become hazardous, particularly over Forbes Street. However, hazard flows are limited to extremely rare events and will be sufficiently managed through on-site refuge. The site is located within a high-density urban area. Importantly the high hazard flooding of surrounding streets during the PMF reflects broader catchment behaviour as opposed to on site behaviour</p>	<p>TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.</p>
5	<p>Principle 3 Development of the floodplain does not impact on the ability of the existing community to safely and effectively respond to a flood.</p> <p>Evacuation must not require people to drive or walk through flood water. Development strategies relying on an assumption that mass rescue may be possible where evacuation either fails or is not implemented are not acceptable to the NSW SES.</p>	<p>As noted above, the primary response strategy for the site is pre-emptive closure of retail premises, and shelter in place for residential floors. This will ensure the ability of the existing community to evacuate will not be compromised. Where pre-emptive closure of retail premises is not possible, the secondary response is to shelter in place also. Refer to Section 9.2 of the FIRA lodged with the EIS.</p>	<p>TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.</p>

6	<p>Principle 4 Decisions on development within the floodplain does not increase risk to life from flooding.</p> <p>Managing flood risks associated High Flood Islands requires careful consideration of development type, likely users, and their ability respond to minimise their risks. This includes consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Isolation – There is no known safe period of isolation in a flood, the longer the period of isolation the greater the risk to occupants who are isolated. Secondary risks – This includes fire and medical emergencies that can impact on the safety of people isolated by floodwater. The potential risk to occupants needs to be considered and managed in decision-making. Consideration of human behaviour – The behaviour of individuals such as choosing not to remain isolated from their family or social network in a building on a floor above the PMF for an extended flood duration or attempting to return to a building during a flood, needs to be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is noted. However, shelter in place guidance published by the DPHI in January 2025 states that shelter in place is an appropriate emergency management response when the flood warning time is less than 6 hours and the flood duration is less than 12 hours, which is the case of the site. Secondary risks have been considered in Section 9.2.3 of the FIRA lodged with the EIS. As noted above, high hazard flows are limited to extremely rare events (greater than the 0.2% AEP). The duration of flooding at the site is also short, with an isolation period of 1-hour in the 2-hour PMF event. 	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.
7	<p>Principle 5 Risks faced by the itinerant population need to be managed. Any Emergency Management strategy needs to consider people visiting the area or using a development.</p>	This is noted and considered in Section 9 of the FIRA lodged with the EIS.	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.
8	<p>Principle 6 Recognise the need for effective flood warning and associated limitations.</p> <p>An effective flood warning strategy with clear and concise messaging understood by the community is key to providing the community an opportunity to respond to a flood threat in an appropriate and timely manner. As the site is affected by flash flooding little to no warning time is likely to be available, with Severe Weather Warnings and Severe</p>	This is noted.	TTW Flooding RFI Response Letter at Appendix U.

Thunderstorm Warnings from the Bureau of Meteorology the only warnings currently available for the site.

- 9 Principle 7 Ongoing community awareness of flooding is critical to assist effective emergency response. This is noted.

Development in a floodplain will increase the need for NSW SES to undertake continuous community awareness, preparedness, and response operations. The flood risk at the site and actions taken to reduce risk to life should be communicated to all site users (includes increasing risk awareness, community connections, preparedness actions, appropriate signage and emergency drills) during and after the construction phase. However, it is important to note that the NSW SES is opposed to the imposition of development consent conditions requiring private flood evacuation plans rather than the application of sound land use planning and flood risk management.

TTW Flooding RFI
Response Letter at
Appendix U.

Ausgrid

Table 6 Ausgrid RTS Response

No.	Comment	Response	Reference
Ausgrid Underground Cables are in the vicinity of the development.			
1	<p>Special care should be taken to ensure that driveways and any other construction activities do not interfere with existing underground cables located in the footpath or adjacent roadways.</p> <p>It is recommended that the developer locate and record the depth of all known underground services prior to any excavation in the area. Information regarding the position of cables along footpaths and roadways can be obtained by contacting Before You Dig Australia (BYDA).</p> <p>In addition to BYDA the proponent should refer to the following documents to support safety in design and construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SafeWork Australia – Excavation Code of Practice. ▪ Ausgrid’s Network Standard NS156 which outlines the minimum requirements for working around Ausgrid’s underground cables. 	Noted.	N/A
2	Ausgrid cannot guarantee the depth of cables due to possible changes in ground levels from previous activities after the cables were installed.	Noted.	N/A
3	Should ground levels change above Ausgrid’s underground cables in areas such as footpaths and driveways, Ausgrid must be notified, and written approval provided prior to the works commencing.	Noted.	N/A
4	Should ground anchors be required in the vicinity of Ausgrid underground cables, the anchors must not be installed within 300mm	Noted.	N/A

of any cable, and the anchors must not pass over the top of any cable.

Ausgrid Overhead Powerlines are in the vicinity of the development.

5	<p>The developer should refer to SafeWork NSW Document – Work Near Overhead Powerlines: Code of Practice. This document outlines the minimum separation requirements between electrical mains (overhead wires) and structures within the development site throughout the construction process. It is a statutory requirement that these distances be maintained throughout the construction phase. Consideration should be given to the positioning and operating of cranes, scaffolding, and sufficient clearances from all types of vehicles that are expected be entering and leaving the site. The “as constructed” minimum clearances to the mains must also be maintained. These distances are outlined in the Ausgrid Network Standard, NS220 Overhead Design Manual. This document can be sourced from Ausgrid’s website at www.ausgrid.com.au. It is the responsibility of the developer to verify and maintain minimum clearances onsite. In the event where minimum safe clearances are not able to be met due to the design of the development, the Ausgrid mains may need to be relocated in this instance. Any Ausgrid asset relocation works will be at the developer’s cost.</p>	Noted.	N/A
---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----

Ausgrid Kiosk Substation in the vicinity of the development

6	<p>There is an existing kiosk style electricity substation that may be impacted by the proposed construction. Subsidence and vibration must be minimised at the substation site. The use of ground anchors under a substation is generally not permitted due to the presence of underground cabling and earthing conductors which may be more</p>	Noted.	N/A
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------	-----

than 10m deep. A further area of exclusion may be required in some circumstances.

7	The substation ventilation openings, including substation duct openings and louvered panels, must be separated from building air intake and exhaust openings, natural ventilation openings and boundaries of adjacent allotments, by separation distances which meet the requirements of all relevant authorities, building regulations, BCA and Australian Standards including AS 1668.2: The use of ventilation and air conditioning in buildings - Mechanical ventilation in buildings.	Noted.	N/A
8	In addition to above, Ausgrid requires the substation ventilation openings, including duct openings and louvered panels, to be separated from building ventilation system air intake and exhaust openings, including those on buildings on adjacent allotments, by not less than 6 metres.	Noted.	N/A
9	Any portion of a building other than a BCA class 10a structure constructed from non- combustible materials, which is not sheltered by a non-ignitable blast-resisting barrier and is within 3 metres in any direction from the housing of a kiosk substation, is required to have a Fire Resistance Level (FRL) of not less than 120/120/120. Openable or fixed windows or glass blockwork or similar, irrespective of their fire rating, are not permitted within 3 metres in any direction from the housing of a kiosk substation, unless they are sheltered by a non-ignitable blast resisting barrier.	Noted.	N/A
10	The development must comply with both the Reference Levels and the precautionary requirements of the ICNIRP Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to Time-varying Electric and Magnetic Fields (1 HZ – 100 kHz) (ICNIRP 2010).	Noted.	N/A

11	Existing Ausgrid easements, leases and/or right of ways must be maintained at all times to ensure 24-hour access. No temporary or permanent alterations to this property tenure can occur without written approval from Ausgrid.	Noted.	N/A
New Driveways – Proximity to Existing Poles			
12	Proposed driveways shall be located to maintain a minimum clearance of 1.5m from the nearest face of the pole to any part of the driveway, including the layback, this is to allow room for future pole replacements. Ausgrid should be further consulted for any deviation to this distance.	Noted.	N/A
New or modified connection			
13	To apply to connect or modify a connection for residential or commercial premises. Ausgrid recommends the proponent to engage an Accredited Service Provider and submit a connection application to Ausgrid as soon as practicable. Visit the Ausgrid website for further details; https://www.ausgrid.com.au/Connections/Get-connected	Noted.	N/A



Sydney Water

Sydney Water provided recommended standard conditions of consent, the Applicant is willing to accept reasonable and relevant conditions of consent.

Community Submissions

Table 7 Community RTS Response

Matter Raised	# of Submissions	Response	Reference
<p>Design / Bulk and Scale</p> <p>Design, bulk and scale concerns were raised extensively in public submissions, with many residents arguing that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site that is out of proportion with its surroundings. Concerns are also raised that the distribution of bulk is uneven, with height concentrated in tower forms rather than being more evenly modulated across the site, exacerbating visual impact, overshadowing and amenity loss. Several submissions question whether the proposal demonstrates design excellence, noting changes from the previously approved concept, limited articulation, insufficient setbacks, and façade treatments that are seen as amplifying bulk rather than breaking it down.</p> <p>Many submissions noted that the approved scheme on the site was suitable, but the current proposal's height and bulk was inconsistent with local provisions and the character of the area. These submissions argued that the design is lacking a sympathetic transition in height or form to its surrounds, with insufficient modulation, setbacks or articulation to integrate with the streetscape.</p>	129	<p>The proposed built form is the outcome of a lengthy and iterative design process informed by multiple rounds of engagement with the DPHI, the Government Architect NSW (GANSW) and three Design Integrity Panel (DIP) reviews. Since exhibition, the scheme has been further refined in direct response to concerns regarding bulk distribution, view sharing and contextual fit.</p> <p>During the most recent engagement with the DIP, which presented the proposed scheme, <i>'The Panel reiterated that the built form and massing demonstrate a clever and considered response to the site context. The surrounding context includes a varied topography from which tall tower forms emerge. The panel expressed that the redistribution of height into the William Street East tower was contextually appropriate and consistent with tall tower forms in the surrounding context, and that the proposal continues to present a skilful design response in addressing and minimising external amenity impacts.'</i> Please refer to Appendix X for complete details.</p> <p>Importantly, the proposal does not apply a uniform 30% uplift across the site. As demonstrated in the Options Analysis (Section 4.2), a blanket uplift was tested and discounted due to its poor urban design outcomes, including increased overshadowing and view impacts. Instead, height and floor space have been strategically redistributed to less sensitive parts of the site, with height removed from the central massing and William Street West building and relocated to the William Street East building. This redistribution improves transitions in scale,</p>	<p>Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Rts Report</p> <p>Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Report (Height) at Appendix I</p> <p>Design Integrity Panel Letter 3 at Appendix W</p> <p>Response to Submissions Design Report at Appendix F</p>

enhances view sharing and reduces impacts on surrounding residential buildings.

The redistributed massing, including associated impacts have been assessed in the Clause 4.6 for Building Height (Appendix I). This document provides extensive detail around the skilful redistribution of massing, and how the design provides the most appropriate outcome in the context of the surrounding and future environment.

The refined massing (Option 7) has been reviewed by the DIP, which reaffirmed support for the overall massing strategy and confirmed that the proposal remains capable of achieving design excellence. The revised scheme demonstrates greater modulation, articulation and setbacks than the uniform uplift scenario and more effectively addresses the concerns raised in submissions.

<p>Traffic and Parking</p> <p>68% of submissions raised traffic and parking as a concern during the exhibition of the proposal.</p> <p>Submissions emphasised the cumulative impacts arising from new residents in addition to new nearby developments and the existing congested nature of surrounding narrow streets.</p> <p>They raised concerns around pedestrian safety, emergency service access, parking availability and overall decreased residential amenity.</p> <p>The need to assess cumulative traffic impacts that consider surrounding proposed developments (such as 134 William Street) was emphasised in submissions.</p>	<p>106</p>	<p>A detailed Traffic Impact Assessment and subsequent RFI response have been prepared by TTPP to address concerns raised in submissions and by public agencies. The assessment confirms that the proposed development will not result in unacceptable traffic impacts on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>The site is currently occupied by a car rental use, which generates higher weekday traffic volumes than the proposed residential development. As such, the proposal is expected to result in a net reduction in weekday vehicle movements compared to existing operations. In addition, the site's proximity to Kings Cross Station and multiple bus routes supports lower car dependency.</p> <p>Vehicle access has been refined to minimise streetscape and safety impacts, with basement access consolidated to two driveways on Forbes Street, each reduced to a maximum width of 6 metres in accordance with City of Sydney requirements. Parking provision complies with the Housing SEPP and remains below the maximum rates permitted under the Sydney LEP, with parking levels</p>	<p>Section 3.2 of the RtS Report Section 4.4 of the RtS Report Traffic RtS Response Letter at Appendix V</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>future-proofed to account for the potential transition of affordable housing to market housing after the 15-year period.</p> <p>Cumulative traffic impacts, including nearby developments, have been considered and are addressed in the supporting traffic documentation.</p>	
<p>View Impacts</p> <p>96 of 156 (62%) community submissions raised view impacts as an issue.</p> <p>These submissions included community members living in surrounding units who expressed that the proposed height of the building would impose on their iconic views.</p> <p>A number of these units requested a view assessment or additional view assessment be undertaken for their unit.</p>	<p>97</p>	<p>Additional view assessment has been undertaken in relation to the submitters who requested view assessment for their unit. The VIA submitted with the RtS includes a table breakdown of the dwellings assessed and allocates a risk rating to each.</p> <p>Of the public submissions raised in relation to view loss, some north-facing high-level dwellings at 6 residential flat buildings are at risk of some extent of view loss. Based on the information available this may include a medium of greater risk of view loss of merit and higher-order view impacts in Tenacity terms.</p> <p>Of the 70 previously assess view places, 12 relate to public submissions in relation to view loss.</p> <p>The previous view assessment is based on unit levels and indicative heights. The height and unit level of objectors at 184 Forbes Street and 227 Victoria Street are unknown. As such, the representative photomontages and exact objector dwellings cannot be confirmed.</p> <p>Further detail is available in the VIA.</p>	<p>Section 4.3 of the RtS</p> <p>RtS Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix H</p>
<p>Overshadowing / Solar Access</p> <p>Submissions raised concerns over the overshadowing impact of the proposed development on surrounding residences and public domain, reducing the overall amenity of the surrounds as a result. Several submitters contend that the scale of overshadowing is inconsistent with planning objectives in the LEP, DCP and Apartment Design Guide, and that meaningful</p>	<p>73</p>	<p>A revised overshadowing and solar access assessment has been undertaken in response to submissions and DPHI requests. The updated analysis tests the refined built form and confirms that the proposal maintains acceptable and compliant solar access outcomes for surrounding residential properties and public spaces.</p> <p>Detailed sun-eye diagrams were prepared for properties specifically identified in submissions. The assessment demonstrates that all</p>	<p>Section 4.5 of the RtS Report</p> <p>Response to Submissions Design Report at Appendix F</p>

mitigation would require reduced height, increased setbacks or a re-distribution of building mass to better protect sunlight access to surrounding properties and public areas.

surrounding buildings that currently achieve a minimum of two hours of sunlight at mid-winter continue to do so, with no widespread or unreasonable reduction in solar access. One apartment within Rosebank Hall experiences a minor reduction, which remains well within the tolerances permitted by the ADG.

Importantly, the refined scheme improves on-site solar access outcomes, with 75% of apartments now receiving at least two hours of sunlight at mid-winter, an increase from the lodged scheme. The proposal therefore achieves the intent of the ADG while appropriately managing impacts on neighbouring properties.

Social Impacts

73

Across the submissions, residents raise a range of concerns about the social impacts of the proposed development, particularly in relation to community safety, social cohesion and cumulative change to the precinct. Many submitters express concern that the scale and density of the proposal, when combined with other major developments nearby, would intensify overcrowding and place pressure on already vulnerable social conditions in the Woolloomooloo–Darlinghurst–Kings Cross area. Specific concerns are raised about the proposed publicly accessible park, with some residents fearing it may become a focal point for antisocial behaviour without clear management, safety or support measures in place. There are also concerns about increased transient populations, short-term accommodation, and a perceived erosion of neighbourhood stability and long-term community ties.

One submission requested conditions be imposed for a social impact management plan and detailed plan of management prior to CC fixing lighting to Australian

Social impacts have been considered at both the site and precinct scale. The proposal delivers 58 affordable housing dwellings in a highly accessible inner-city location, directly responding to identified housing need and broader strategic objectives for increased housing diversity and affordability.

Concerns regarding the operation, safety and management of the publicly accessible park and through-site links have been addressed through both design refinements and operational measures. The public spaces have been designed in accordance with CPTED principles, incorporating clear sightlines, active frontages, improved lighting, CCTV coverage and strong passive surveillance from surrounding uses.

During post-exhibition engagement with the DIP, concerns were raised regarding the location and visibility of the DDA lift as lodged, particularly in the context of public access arrangements. Through these discussions, the DIP expressed a preference for 24-hour public accessibility to the open spaces, subject to appropriate safety and management measures. The Applicant is also agreeable to this approach.

Section 4.8 of the RtS Report
Response to Submissions
Design Report at Appendix F

Standards, CCTV coverage, transparent lift walls to public areas, security staffing levels and incident reporting in consultation with NSW police for at least three years post occupation.

In response, the DDA lift has been relocated to provide a more direct, legible and visible connection to the publicly accessible spaces. This will also be supported by 24-hour security and CCTV coverage.

Collectively, these measures respond directly to concerns regarding antisocial behaviour and community safety and ensure the publicly accessible open space functions as a safe, well-managed and genuine community asset.

<p>Justification of the project</p> <p>Justification of the project was a central theme in many submissions, with objectors questioning whether the proposal is adequately justified against applicable planning controls, policies and objectives. Submissions raise concern that the development significantly exceeds LEP height and floor space controls, even after applying the Housing SEPP bonuses, and relies heavily on Clause 4.6 variation. Many submitters contend that the proposal departs substantially from the previously approved concept envelope and design competition outcomes, undermining established planning expectations and view-sharing principles. Submissions also question whether the affordable housing component genuinely justifies the scale of uplift sought, noting the time-limited nature of affordability, the concentration of affordable units in lower-amenity locations, and the perception that the primary outcome is additional market-rate floor space rather than a balanced public benefit.</p>	63	<p>The proposal has been comprehensively reassessed against the relevant statutory and strategic framework, including the Housing SEPP, Sydney LEP and broader State housing objectives. Updated Clause 4.6 variation reports for height and floor space have been prepared to respond to concerns raised in submissions by the community and the DPHI.</p> <p>The scale of development is directly linked to the delivery of 15% affordable housing GFA, which is secured for a minimum period of 15 years and managed by a registered Community Housing Provider. The refined design consolidates affordable housing into a single building to improve amenity, solar access and operational outcomes, addressing concerns raised regarding equity and quality.</p> <p>Where any exceedance in development control has occurred, it has been demonstrated that compliance with the development standards is reasonable, relevant, and provides public benefit. The refined built form remains consistent with the fundamental design principles of the approved concept and has been endorsed through the DIP process as capable of achieving design excellence.</p>	Section 6 of the RtS Report
<p>Impact on Infrastructure</p>	48	<p>Infrastructure impacts have been assessed through specialist technical studies and consultation with relevant agencies. The site is</p>	N/A

Submissions raised concerns around the development's proposed increase in density and the impacts that would have on local infrastructure.

Submitters argue that the scale and density of the proposal, particularly when considered alongside other major developments in the vicinity, would overwhelm the capacity of the local road network, public transport, parking, and emergency services. William Street is repeatedly described as operating at or beyond capacity, with fears that additional vehicle movements would worsen congestion, impede emergency access, and spill traffic into narrow surrounding streets.

Further concerns around access to community services and amenities for children and families such as schools and sporting facilities were also raised.

located within an established inner-city area with access to existing transport, utilities and services.

Traffic, servicing and access have been assessed and refined to ensure safe and efficient operation. Utilities providers, including Sydney Water and Ausgrid, have confirmed that services can be provided subject to standard conditions and detailed design at the appropriate stage.

The proposal does not introduce infrastructure demands beyond what can be reasonably accommodated in this location, particularly given the reduction in weekday traffic generation compared to the existing car rental use and the site's high level of public transport accessibility.

<p>Wind</p> <p>Across the submissions, wind impacts are consistently raised as a serious concern, particularly given the proposed increase in height and bulk. Submitters note that William Street already experiences strong wind tunnel conditions and argue that the increase in height on the site would significantly worsen downwash and wind acceleration at street level, especially along William Street, Dowling Street, Forbes Street and nearby laneways. There is concern that increased wind speeds would reduce pedestrian comfort, undermine street-level activity and public spaces, and create safety risks for pedestrians, including older people and those with limited mobility. Many submissions also question the adequacy of the pedestrian wind assessment, suggesting it understates impacts, relies too heavily on</p>	<p>42</p>	<p>An updated Pedestrian Wind Assessment has been prepared to test the refined scheme and respond to concerns raised in submissions. The assessment confirms that wind conditions across the site, including street level, the central plaza and rooftop areas, are appropriate for their intended use.</p> <p>Targeted mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design, including increased balustrade heights, roof articulation, landscaping and vertical screens in the central plaza. These measures are expected to materially improve pedestrian comfort and achieve relevant comfort criteria.</p> <p>The refined envelope performs comparably, and in some locations more favourably, than both the approved concept envelope and the blanket 30% uplift scenario. The proposal is not expected to result in unsafe or uncomfortable wind conditions.</p>	<p>Section 3.2.7 and 4.6 of the RTS Report</p> <p>Updated Pedestrian Wind Assessment at Appendix K</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

landscaping, and does not adequately test key locations such as street corners, building entries and through-site links. Submissions called for stronger mitigation measures and more rigorous, precinct-wide wind testing.

<p>Residential Amenity</p> <p>Across the submissions, residents raise significant concerns about impacts on residential amenity, particularly noise, privacy, disturbance and overall liveability. A common issue is the anticipated increase in noise from traffic, servicing vehicles, delivery bikes and general activity associated with a much larger resident population, in an area already described as busy and noisy. Many submissions also express concern about noise transmission from rooftop communal areas and balconies, particularly at night, with elevated spaces seen as likely to carry sound across the neighbourhood. Privacy loss from increased overlooking and proximity of taller buildings is also raised, alongside concerns that intensified activity, lighting and foot traffic would erode the sense of residential comfort and quiet enjoyment. Collectively, submitters argue that these impacts would materially diminish day-to-day amenity and wellbeing for existing and future residents.</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>Residential amenity has been a key focus of post-exhibition refinements. Apartment layouts and façades have been revised to improve daylight access, natural ventilation, usability and privacy, in response to DIP feedback and community concerns.</p> <p>Noise impacts, including from rooftop communal areas, have been assessed through an updated Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Rooftop areas are designed and managed to minimise noise transmission, with conditions to be imposed appropriately.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal achieves strong compliance with the ADG and delivers improved internal amenity outcomes compared to the lodged scheme.</p>	<p>Response to Submissions Design Report at Appendix F</p> <p>Updated Architectural Drawings at Appendix B</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Heritage</p> <p>Submissions objected to the proposal on the basis that it would dominate the skyline and the streetscape, detracting from the historic character of the area.</p> <p>They argued that the proposed design is not sympathetic to the nearby heritage conservation area and requested that a Heritage Impact Assessment appropriately address this.</p>	<p>39</p>	<p>The Heritage Impact Assessment submitted in the original lodgement package has been prepared to assess the relationship between the proposal and nearby heritage items and conservation areas. The assessment concludes that the development does not adversely impact the significance of surrounding heritage assets.</p> <p>The refined built form continues to respond to the existing and emerging character of William Street, with height concentrated in locations consistent with nearby taller forms and reduced scale</p>	<p>Response to Submissions Design Report at Appendix F</p> <p>Heritage material submitted with original lodgement package.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		toward more sensitive interfaces. Public domain improvements and façade articulation further support a positive streetscape outcome.	
<p>Procedural Matters</p> <p>Across the submissions, a number of procedural concerns are raised around the assessment and exhibition process. Many submitters argue that the exhibition period was too short for a project of this scale and complexity, particularly given the volume of technical material provided, limiting the community’s ability to review the proposal and prepare informed submissions. Concerns are also expressed about the adequacy of community engagement, with some residents stating that they were not properly consulted or that their enquiries were not responded to. Submissions also question inter-agency consultation, noting that while the EIS states that consultation with Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services would occur, no clear evidence of that consultation is provided within the exhibited material. Collectively, submitters argue that these procedural issues undermine confidence in the assessment process and call for greater transparency and rigour for a State Significant Development.</p>	31	<p>The SSDA was publicly exhibited in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation and DPPI guidelines. All submissions received during and immediately following the exhibition period have been considered.</p> <p>Since exhibition, the Applicant has undertaken further engagement with DPPI, Council, TfNSW, GANSW and key stakeholders. Additional technical information and clarifications have been prepared in response to agency and community feedback and are included with this Response to Submissions package to support transparency and informed assessment.</p> <p>Moreover, where the development exceeds compliance with key planning controls, Clause 4.6 Variation Requests have been provided in alignment with the standard statutory process.</p>	<p>Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Report (Height) at Appendix I</p> <p>Updated Clause 4.6 Variation Report (FSR) at Appendix J</p>
<p>Loss of Privacy</p> <p>Loss of privacy was raised consistently in public exhibition submissions, with residents expressing concern that the proposed height, bulk and proximity of the development would introduce direct overlooking into existing apartments and terrace houses. Submissions describe elevated sightlines from the proposed towers into neighbouring balconies, living rooms and bedrooms, particularly along Dowling Street, Forbes Street, Kirketon Road, Farrell Avenue and Rosebank</p>	19	<p>Loss of privacy has been carefully considered through the design development process, particularly in response to concerns raised.</p> <p>The refined proposal incorporates appropriate building separation distances, increased setbacks at upper levels, and targeted façade and balcony design measures to minimise direct overlooking into neighbouring dwellings. Since exhibition, apartment layouts and façade articulation have been further refined to simplify balcony</p>	<p>Response to Submissions Design Report at Appendix F</p> <p>Updated Architectural Drawings at Appendix B</p>

Street. Many residents note that existing separation distances and setbacks are inadequate given the scale of the proposal, resulting in a loss of usable private open space and the need to close blinds to maintain privacy. Concerns were also raised that older residential buildings, including terraces within heritage conservation areas, are particularly vulnerable to privacy intrusion due to narrow street widths and traditional layouts. Several submissions state that privacy impacts are not adequately assessed in the EIS and Visual Impact Assessment, with limited consideration of affected receivers and insufficient detail on effective mitigation measures, leading to calls for reduced height, increased setbacks or re-distribution of built form to address these impacts.

forms, reduce oblique sightlines and improve privacy outcomes, particularly along north-facing and side boundary interfaces.

Where close proximity is unavoidable due to the constrained inner-city context, privacy impacts are mitigated through a combination of balcony balustrade design, screening, window placement and orientation. These measures are consistent with the ADG and reflect established expectations for residential development in high-density urban locations.

<p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>Across the submissions, construction impacts are raised as a major concern, particularly given the scale of the proposal and its location within a dense precinct. Submitters note that the Transport Impact Assessment anticipates sustained heavy vehicle activity across demolition, excavation and superstructure stages, with off-site worker parking likely to result in queuing, increased diesel emissions and vibration impacts on narrow surrounding streets. Many residents fear prolonged disruption over several years, with the precinct described as likely to function as a near-continuous construction zone for an indeterminate period. Concerns are consistently raised about extended exposure to construction noise, vibration and dust, particularly from deep excavation and basement works, and the heightened risk this poses to older residential buildings not designed to withstand such activity. Submissions also argue that the application relies</p>	<p>13</p>	<p>Construction impacts will be managed through a Construction Management Plan to be approved prior to works commencing. This will address noise, vibration, dust, traffic management, hours of work and protection of surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The Applicant will accept a reasonable and relevant condition stipulating the requirement to submit a Construction Management Plan ahead of onsite works commencing.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

too heavily on future construction management plans, and that a significantly more detailed and upfront assessment of construction mitigation measures, environmental management and cumulative impacts is required before approval can be considered.

Interest Groups

Table 8 Response to Interest Groups

Summary of Issues Raised	Response	Reference
<p>Alex Greenwich – Member for Sydney</p> <p>The Member for Sydney supports increasing housing supply on William Street but argues the proposal’s height and scale are excessive and would harm streetscape quality, pedestrian comfort and local amenity. It raises concerns about the rear-located public plaza being inactive and unsafe, recommending it be relocated to the William Street frontage to improve activation and reduce anti-social behaviour. The submission also calls for a major reduction in car parking given the site’s accessibility and low car ownership, and questions the value of time-limited affordable housing, arguing it does not justify the increased bulk and scale and should be provided in perpetuity.</p>	<p>The proposal has been developed through a rigorous design excellence process and has undergone multiple iterations informed by engagement with the DPPI, the Government Architect NSW and three DIP reviews. As outlined in Sections 3.2 and 4.2, the built form does not apply a uniform uplift across the site. Instead, height and floor space have been strategically redistributed to less sensitive parts of the site to improve streetscape transitions, manage wind and pedestrian amenity, and enhance view sharing when compared to a blanket 30% uplift scenario.</p> <p>The location and design of the publicly accessible park have been selected with consideration to safety and activation concerns, as well as alignment with the approved concept envelope. While the park is not relocated to the William Street frontage, the design prioritises strong physical and visual connections to William Street and surrounding public domain through a new laneway, active edges, clear sightlines and passive surveillance. CPTED principles, lighting, CCTV. Together, these elements will ensure the space is safe, legible and well managed.</p> <p>Car parking has been assessed having regard to the site’s accessibility and applicable statutory controls. The proposed parking provision complies with the Housing SEPP and remains below the maximum rates permitted under the Sydney LEP. Parking levels have also been future-proofed to accommodate the potential transition of affordable housing to market housing following the 15-year affordability period.</p>	<p>Section 3.2 of RtS Report</p> <p>Section 4.2 of RtS Report</p> <p>Section 4.7 and 4.8 of RtS Report</p> <p>Section 3.2.6 of RtS Report</p> <p>Section 4.4 of RtS Report</p> <p>Sections 3.2.2 and 6.7 of RtS Report</p>

The provision of affordable housing is secured in accordance with the Housing SEPP and delivers 15.1% of total GFA as affordable housing for a minimum period of 15 years, managed by a registered Community Housing Provider. The planning framework does not require affordable housing to be provided in perpetuity in order to access the SEPP incentives. The proposal delivers a substantial and tangible public benefit that has been carefully balanced against the scale of development sought.

Cancer Council NSW

The Cancer Council raises strong concerns about its proximity to their offices and the lack of consultation to date. Key issues relate to the absence of a Construction Management Plan, with no clear assurances that pedestrian and vehicle access to Cancer Council NSW's offices, particularly via Judge Street and Judge Lane, will be maintained during the three-year construction period. The submission also highlights potential impacts from construction activity, including noise, dust, traffic congestion and pressure on local infrastructure, as well as health risks associated with demolition and construction, particularly exposure to asbestos, hazardous materials and reduced air quality. Finally, it objects to the development on the basis of inadequate and ineffective consultation, requesting meaningful engagement and enforceable conditions before any approval is granted.

The Applicant acknowledges Cancer Council NSW's concerns regarding construction impacts and consultation and has undertaken direct engagement with Cancer Council NSW following public exhibition. A meeting was held on 5 December 2025 to discuss access arrangements, construction staging and potential impacts. Through this engagement, it was confirmed that 24-hour pedestrian and vehicle access to Cancer Council NSW's offices via Judge Lane and Judge Street will be maintained throughout construction, and that construction activities will be confined to a defined works zone within existing parking areas.

Construction impacts, including noise, vibration, dust, traffic and air quality, will be addressed via a Construction Management Plan and will be required as a condition of consent.

The Applicant has committed to ongoing consultation with Cancer Council NSW during the construction phase to minimise disruption and address operational concerns as they arise.

The matters raised in the submission are therefore considered capable of being appropriately managed through detailed construction planning and conditions of consent.

Section 3.1 of RtS Report