

Ref: **SSD-61400212**
WTJ23-225



WILLOWTREE PLANNING

SUBMISSIONS REPORT:
CROWS NEST OSD SITE B
SSD-61400212

25 HUME STREET, CROWS NEST
LOT 3 DP 1296669

—
Prepared by Willowtree Planning Pty Ltd
for Third.i Crows Nest Residential Developments Pty Ltd

21 August 2025

In the spirit of reconciliation and recognition, Willowtree Planning acknowledges the Traditional Owners of this Country throughout Australia and their continuing and ongoing connections to land, waters and community. We show our respect to Elders - past and present. We acknowledge that we stand on this Country which was and always will be recognised as Aboriginal Land. We acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the Lands in this Local Government Area, belonging to the local Aboriginal People, where this proposal is located upon.

DOCUMENT CONTROL TABLE			
Document Reference:	WTJ23-225_Site B_Crows Nest_RTS Report		
Contact:	Andrew Pigott		
Version and Date	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
Version No. 1 - DRAFT (21/08/2025)	Andrew Pigott Director	Kieran Arana Senior Planner	Andrew Pigott Director
Version No. 1 - FINAL (21/08/2025)	Andrew Pigott Director	Kieran Arana Senior Planner	Andrew Pigott Director

SYDNEY

—

Suite 404, Level 4
165 Walker Street
North Sydney NSW 2060

BRISBANE

—

Level 4, 260
Queen Street
Brisbane QLD 4000

02 9929 6974

equiries@willowtp.com.au

willowtreeplanning.com.au



WILLOWTREE
PLANNING

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Willowtree Planning with input from a number of other expert consultants (if relevant). To the best of our knowledge, the information contained herein is neither false nor misleading and the contents are based on information and facts that were correct at the time of writing. Willowtree Planning accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors, omissions or resultant consequences including any loss or damage arising from reliance in information in this publication.

Copyright © Willowtree Planning (NSW) Pty Ltd

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without express written permission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES LIST	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PART 1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW	5
1.2 APPLICATION PROCESS OVERVIEW	6
1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	6
1.4 CHANGES TO THE PROPOSAL AS EXHIBITED.....	6
PART 2 ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS.....	7
2.1 SUBMISSIONS PROCESS.....	7
2.2 BREAKDOWN OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED.....	8
2.2.1 Agency Submissions.....	8
2.2.2 Public Submissions and Feedback.....	11
2.3 CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES	12
PART 3 ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE EXHIBITION.....	15
3.1 FURTHER ENGAGEMENT WITH STAKEHOLDERS	15
3.1.1 State Design Review Panel	15
3.1.2 Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure	19
3.1.3 North Sydney Council.....	20
3.2 DESIGN REFINEMENTS.....	20
3.2.1 Revised Description of Development.....	20
3.3 ADDITIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	21
3.4 UPDATED MITIGATION MEASURES	21
PART 4 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS.....	22
4.1 DPHI	23
4.2 NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL.....	29
4.3 STATE AGENCIES	47
4.4 PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS.....	60
PART 5 FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	63
PART 6 UPDATED PROJECT JUSTIFICATION	64
APPENDIX A UPDATED PROJECT DESCRIPTION	65
APPENDIX B SUBMISSIONS REGISTER	67
APPENDIX C MITIGATION MEASURES TABLE	70
APPENDIX D SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.....	72



FIGURES

Nil

TABLES

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF AGENCY SUBMISSIONS	8
TABLE 2: CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES	12
TABLE 3: SDRP MATTERS RAISED	16
TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI	23
TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL	29
TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES	47
TABLE 7: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS	60

APPENDICES LIST

Appendix A	Updated Project Description
Appendix B	Submissions Register
Appendix C	Updated Mitigation Measures
Appendix D	Supporting Documents
Appendix D1	Structural Engineering Response
Appendix D2	Architectural Response
Appendix D3	Sustainability Response
Appendix D4	Wintergarden Ventilation Assessment
Appendix D5	Wind Response
Appendix D6	Acoustic Response
Appendix D7	Legal Advice Response
Appendix D8	Traffic and Transport Response
Appendix D9	Social Impact Assessment Response
Appendix D10	Landscape Response
Appendix D11	Building Ventilation Advice



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Submissions Report has been prepared by Willowtree Planning on behalf of the Proponent, Third.i Crows Nest Residential Developments Pty Ltd, to address matters raised during the public exhibition of the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for Crows Nest OSD Site B (SSD-61400212) located at 25 Hume Street, Crows Nest (the Site).

The SSDA was publicly exhibited by the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) from 15 November 2024 to 12 December 2024, with the subsequent request for a response to submissions issued by DPHI on 17 December 2024. The SSDA seeks approval for construction and operation of an over station mixed use shop top housing development including 122 residential units and ground floor/mezzanine retail and commercial floorspace.

This Submissions Report forms an Appendix to the Amendment Report submitted to DPHI that outlines the proposed amendments to the original development application and assesses the potential environmental, economic, and social impacts of the amended project.

Overview of Submissions

DPHI, Council and Agency Submissions and Feedback

- One (1) request for response to submissions and additional information request was received from DPHI.
- One (1) submission (objection) was received from North Sydney Council.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Air Services Australia.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA).
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Sydney Airport.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Ausgrid.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Fire and Rescue NSW.
- Two (2) submissions (neutral) was received from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Heritage NSW.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Water Group.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Sydney Water.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Sydney Metro.
- One (1) submission (neutral) was received from Transport for NSW.

Public Submissions and Feedback

During Exhibition the Department received five (5) public submissions. These public submissions were noted as being primarily in favour of the proposal and recognised the need for housing in the locality and the city generally. Of the five submissions, only one was noted as an objection to the proposal being made by the Holtermann Precinct Committee. The submission primarily relates to amenity issues, excessive bulk, non-compliant building separation and non-compliant setbacks.



Key matters raised in the Submissions

Overall, the submissions related to a range of issues including, but are not limited to:

- Built form non compliances
- Calculation of GFA
- Traffic flow and accessibility
- Waste Management strategies
- Social Impact within the locality
- Traffic, access and transport
- Impacts to residential amenity

Project Refinements and Clarifications

Minor design refinements have been made, as set out in **Section 3.2** with respect to the architectural design of the proposed development. The proposed design refinements made in response to submissions and as a result of further design development are discussed in detail within the Amendment Report.

The clarifications in this report made in response to key issues raised within submissions do not change the scope of the application for which consent is sought.

Further Assessment and Mitigation Measures

The subject matter experts have reviewed the matters raised in the submissions. Revised technical studies, where relevant, have been prepared to respond to matters raised in submissions and/or provide further assessment taking into account the proposed refinements. The mitigation measures have also been updated to reflect the recommendations of the supporting documentation.

Conclusion

This Submissions Reports outlines the design refinements that have been made in response to the submissions received during the public exhibition period and as a result of further design development. The proposed amendments are minor in nature and do not give rise to any additional environmental impacts beyond the impacts assessed within the Amendment Report and the EIS.

The proposed development, as amended, remains consistent with the objectives of the exhibited development and is consistent with the project justification, including suitability of the site and the public interest.



PART 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Submissions Report has been prepared by Willowtree Planning on behalf of the Proponent, Third.i Crows Nest Residential Developments Pty Ltd, to address matters raised during the public exhibition of the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for Crows Nest OSD Site B (**SSD-61400212**) located at 25 Hume Street, Crows Nest (the Site).

This Submissions Report forms an Appendix to the Amendment Report submitted to DPHI that outlines the proposed amendments to the original development application and assesses the potential environmental, economic, and social impacts of the amended project.

The development proposed under **SSD-61400212** involves the following scope of works:

- **Ground Level - Hume Street:** Includes the OSD tower lobby, retail, and back of house spaces.
- **Level 01:** Includes a commercial mezzanine, back of house, and a loading dock which is used for OSD garbage collection.
- **Level 02:** Contains plant rooms for the metro station.
- **Level 05-07:** The OSD car parking levels are located on Level 05-07. These are naturally ventilated with 28 car spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) on Level 05, 25 car spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) on Level 06 and 25 car spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) on Level 07. There is a total of 78 spaces.

One (1) motor bike space is located on Level 06. One (1) motor bike space is located on Level 07.

50 bike parks are provided on Level 06. 106 bike spaces are provided on Level 07.

- Apartments are located from Level 08 to 18. Level 19 and 20 contain penthouse apartments.
- A roof terrace on Level 21 includes communal gardens and pools, as well as private penthouse terraces.
- **Level 08:** 10 apartments per floor
- **Level 09-16:** 11 apartments per floor
- **Level 17-18:** 11 apartments per floor
- **Level 19** - 8 apartments per floor (3 x two storey)
- **Level 20:** 5 apartments
- Total number of apartments: 122
 - 1 bedroom = 40
 - 2 bedroom = 63
 - 3 bedroom = 19
- Public domain works around Site B will be delivered as part of the CSSI approval. The proposed development will be designed to complement the station and activate the public domain.

The subject site is located within the North Sydney Local Government Area (LGA) and is zoned MUI Mixed Use pursuant to the *North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013* (NSLEP2013), the proposed



development falls within the definition of ‘shop top housing’, which is permissible with consent in the MU1 Mixed Use zone of the NSLWP2013.

The proposal satisfies the definition of SSD pursuant to:

- Schedule 1, Section 19 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021* (Planning Systems SEPP), being development within a rail corridor for commercial premises or residential accommodation with an Estimated Development Cost (EDC) of more than \$30 million.

1.2 APPLICATION PROCESS OVERVIEW

Development consent is being sought for the proposal, as SSD, under Division 4.1, Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act). In accordance with section 89F of the EP&A Act and the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021* (EP&A Regulation), the EIS for the proposal is required to be placed on exhibition for not less than 30 days. The proposal was exhibited from 15 November 2024 to 12 December 2024, during which a number of submissions were provided to DPHI, as discussed herein.

Submissions received outside the exhibition period have also been addressed in this report.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this Submissions Report is to detail and respond to matters raised in the submissions received for **SSD-61400212**.

The Submissions Report has been set out to address each submission matter, and is structured in accordance with the *SSD Guidelines – Preparing a Submissions Report*, as follows:

- PART 1** provides an overview of the project, the application process and the Submissions Report purpose and structure;
- PART 2** provides an analysis of the submissions received;
- PART 3** provides an overview of the actions taken since exhibition of the project;
- PART 4** provides responses to each of the issues raised in the submissions received;
- PART 5** provides an updated environmental assessment of the proposal;
- PART 6** provides an updated justification and evaluation of the proposal as a whole;
- APPENDIX A** provides an updated project description (as relevant);
- APPENDIX B** provides a summary of the submissions received;
- APPENDIX C** provides a revised set of project management and mitigation measures, following the review of submissions and technical responses;
- APPENDIX D** provides copies of any supporting information required by the received submissions.

1.4 CHANGES TO THE PROPOSAL AS EXHIBITED

Following the exhibition phase, and upon review of all submissions received, several amendments have been made to the proposal. It is noted that these amendments have also captured changes resulting from more detailed design. The changes are further explained in **PART 3** of this Submissions Report. Such amendments include:



- **Ground Floor** – minor internal reconfiguration including the substation, FCR, and main switch room. GFA has been increased by 1m².
- **Level 01** – minor internal reconfiguration. One (1) additional ambulant / DDA bathroom has been included.
- **Level 02** – no change.
- **Level 05** – the layout has been adjusted having regard for structural requirements associated with the transfer slab. The walls of the carpark have been moved outward and the landscape elements have been reduced. One (1) additional car parking space is provided. Bike parking has been removed from this Level.
- **Level 06** – the layout has been adjusted having regard for structural requirements associated with the transfer slab. The walls of the carpark have been moved outward. Car parking numbers have been reduced from 28 spaces to 25 spaces. One motor bike spaces has been provided. 50 double decker bike racks are provided.
- **Level 07** – Former residential Level 07 has been removed and replaced with an additional car park level for 25 car parking spaces, one (1) motor bike space and 106 double decker bike racks. This allows for a total of 78 car spaces at Site B.
- **Level 08** – Minor apartment reconfiguration to provide 10 apartments. The residential access corridors have been enclosed while the lobby area outside the lift will remain open at the eastern and western ends. This approach to corridors is repeated on all residential levels.
- **Level 09-16** – Minor apartment reconfiguration. No wintergardens are proposed for SDA apartments 0.1 and 0.12 across Level 09-13.
- **Level 15-16** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 17-18** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 19** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 20** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Roof Terrace** – Minor reconfigured to provide greater privacy for future residents having regard for the built form changes introduced via the Crows Nest TOD rezoning.
- Residential GFA is now 12,987m² (inclusive of partially enclosed corridors).
- Overall reduction from 130 apartments (one bedroom = 44, two bedroom = 63, three bedroom = 23) to 122 apartments (one bedroom = 40, two bedroom = 63, three bedroom = 19).

PART 2 ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

This section provides a summary of the submissions received, including a breakdown of respondent type, nature/ position, and number of submissions received.

2.1 SUBMISSIONS PROCESS

The proposal was exhibited from 15 November 2024 to 12 December 2024, during which a number of submissions were provided to the NSW DPHI.

Section 59(2) of the EP&A Regulation permits the Planning Secretary of the NSW DPHI to request that the Applicant to provide a written response in relation to the issues raised within any submissions made during public exhibition. This Submissions Report aims to fulfil the request from the Planning Secretary.

Submissions received outside the exhibition period have also been addressed in this Submissions Report.



2.2 BREAKDOWN OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

2.2.1 Agency Submissions

A total of 13 submissions were received from the following State departments, advisory bodies, and local authorities during the exhibition period. In addition, the Department issued a letter summarising the key issues, which is included in the Table below.

TABLE 1 below provides a summary of the agency's positions and comments:

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF AGENCY SUBMISSIONS		
Agency	Position	Summary of Comments
DPHI	Comments and recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requested a response to the submissions received from agencies and feedback from the community. ▪ The proponent was also requested to review and amend (if needed) the proposal in relation to the below matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Built form ○ Amenity ○ Wind Assessment ○ Affordable Housing ○ Design Excellence ○ Access and Parking
North Sydney Council (Council)	Objection, in part and comments for consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grounds of objection are summarised as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal envisages the maximum in-fill of the approved building envelope, which will create significant and excessive bulk and scale, with limited articulation or setbacks to enable the buildings to fit appropriately within the surrounding area and adjoining buildings and will exacerbate the appearance of significant bulk of buildings along the Pacific Highway. ○ The proposal gives insufficient regard to the placement of the envisaged residential usage on neighbouring sites, particularly with regard to setbacks, and the streetscape interfaces, thereby compromising future residential amenity. ○ The proposal has not provided sufficient bicycle spaces, end of trip facilities, or car wash bays to meet the needs of future residents and occupants of the building. ○ Traffic flow and swept path issues, particularly for the proposed car lifts. ○ Inadequate consideration has been given to construction management and how works will impact upon the surrounding area and local roads ○ The traffic and transport assessment submitted is inadequate and does not take full account of all modes of traffic and transport generation. ○ Waste management arrangements do not comply with Council DCP requirements and are not appropriate for the size and scale of the development. ○ The proposal underplays the social impact of the development upon the area and the diverse needs of the community with regards to community spaces and affordable/social housing.



TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

Agency	Position	Summary of Comments
Air Services Australia	Comment for consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not expect this development to have any impacts on instrument flight procedures (IFP) around the Sydney basin area, based on the location and noted intrusion into Sydney Airport's OLS, it is expected that details of this development and any associated crane operations would be forwarded to Sydney Airport in the first instance
Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA)	No objections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA has no objections to the Development and no issues with the Aviation Impact Assessment (AIA). CASA concurs with the Conclusions (Section 7) and the Recommendations (Section 8) of the AIA.
Sydney Airport	Comment for consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASA has determined that the proposed building will not constitute a significant hazard to aircraft operations under the regulation 139.180(1) of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998. Accordingly, CASA is not recommending obstacle lighting or marking in this. <p>If the Department decides to approve the proposed development, we recommend that the following minimum conditions be imposed on that approval, which the Department is entitled to do under r14 (3) of the Regulations. We believe that these conditions are in the interests of the safety, efficiency and regularity of air transport operations at Sydney Airport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the completion of the construction of the building, a certified surveyor is to notify (in writing) the Sydney Airport Manager, Airfield Spatial & Technical Planning of the finished height of the building. Separate approval must be sought under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 for any cranes required to construct the buildings. Construction cranes may be required to operate at a height significantly higher than that of the proposed controlled activity and consequently, may not be approved under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, therefore Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.
Ausgrid	Comment for consideration	<p>Underground Cables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid interference, contact Before You Dig Australia, follow NS156 standard, keep ground anchors 300mm+ from cables <p>Overhead Powerlines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain minimum separation distances per SafeWork NSW Code, consider crane/vehicle clearances, relocations at developer's cost <p>Driveways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain 1.5m minimum clearance from poles to allow for future replacements <p>Streetlighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider impact on development - relocation possible but at developer's cost
Fire + Rescue NSW (FRNSW)	No objections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FRNSW submit no comments or recommendations for consideration, nor any requirements beyond that specified by applicable legislation at this stage.



TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

Agency	Position	Summary of Comments
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Heritage NSW	No objections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject site is not listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR), nor is it in the immediate vicinity of any SHR items. Further, the site does not contain any known historical archaeological relics. The Department does not need to refer subsequent stages of this proposal to the Heritage Council of NSW.
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Heritage NSW	Comment for consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage NSW agrees that Aboriginal Cultural Heritage matters were assessed and addressed under the approved Crows Nest Over Station Development (SSD-9579) and the Sydney Metro – Chatswood to Sydenham (SSI-7400) approvals. Heritage NSW recommends that post approval any Aboriginal Cultural Heritage matters are managed in accordance with the approved Construction Heritage Management Plan: Sydney City & South West Metro Crows Nest Station (SSI-7400).
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water – Water Group	No objections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EIS has been reviewed by NSW DCCEEW Water Group and all requirements have been adequately addressed by the proponent, therefore NSW DCCEEW Water Group has no further comments.
Sydney Water	Comment for consideration	<p>Water and Wastewater Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary assessment indicates that water and wastewater servicing should be available for the proposed development. Amplifications, adjustments, deviations and/or minor extensions may be required. Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application stage. <p>Next Steps Should the Department decide to progress with the subject development application, Sydney Water would require the following conditions be included in the development consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Section 73 Compliance Certificate o Building Plan Approval
Sydney Metro	Comment for consideration	<p>If the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure determines to grant consent to the SSD, Sydney Metro requests that the following condition be imposed on the development consent.</p> <p>1 Prior to issue of a Construction Certificate</p> <p>1.1 The Applicant must provide Sydney Metro a summary of all Over Station Development (OSD) design loads that will be transferred to the corresponding station support elements and so demonstrate that these loads remain within the specified limits for all load cases. This confirmation must be submitted for Sydney Metro review, prior to the commencement of any works. This is required to ensure that the station structure remains capable of supporting the OSD developments on Site B, without adverse impact on the station or its operations.</p>



TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

Agency	Position	Summary of Comments
		<p>The Certifier must not issue a Construction Certificate for the development until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Metro that this condition has been satisfied.</p> <p>1.2 Copies of any certificates, drawings, approvals or documents endorsed by, given to or issued by Sydney Metro must be submitted to Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for its records prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate.</p>
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	Comment for consideration	<p>TfNSW provided suggested conditions regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Civil Works ▪ Road Occupancy Licence ▪ Green Travel Plan ▪ Construction Impact ▪ Ongoing Servicing <p>TfNSW provided advisory comments regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site information and building construction plan ▪ Access and movement ▪ Mitigation measures during construction ▪ Ongoing activities

Of the 13 submissions, excluding the Department’s letter, the following is noted:

- Eight (8) submissions provide comments and recommendations.
- One (1) submission objected to the proposed development.
- Four (4) submissions provided no objection.

2.2.2 Public Submissions and Feedback

The Department received a total of 5 submissions, of which all are ‘unique’ submissions.

Overall, the community recognises the need for housing in the vicinity of transport infrastructure and indicated general support for the proposed development.

Of the 5 public submissions received in response to the proposed development, the following is noted:

- 1 was an objection,
- 4 were in support.

The Proponent recognises the need to genuinely consider feedback received as part of the planning and design process and addressed the matters raised in this report.

The key matters raised in the single objection public submission are summarised as follows:

- Opportunity to locate jobs near dwellings in this area.
- Prioritising housing through high rise smacks of desperation.
- Lack of separation with the adjacent site to the south.
- Inadequate setbacks.



- Excessive bulk and scale will compromise solar access to the public domain.

The key matters raised in the public submissions of support are summarised as follows:

- Providing much needed dwellings, directly above the metro site, is a great opportunity.
- Crucial it is approved as soon as possible.
- Aims to transform Crows Nest into a much better place.
- Considering the housing affordability crisis, makes sense to relax setback requirements.
- Well thought-out development.

2.3 CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES

TABLE 2 below provides a categorical summary of the issues raised in the submissions and the Department's letter.

TABLE 2: CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES		
Category/Topic	Issue	Stakeholder
The Project		
Design Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit an updated Design Integrity Report to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Details on how the project addressed the SDRP's advice. This may include tabulated project responses to each issue raised on the SDRP Advice letters for the project. ○ Further advice from the SDRP prior to submitting a Response to Submissions report and project responses to the SDRP's advice and recommendations 	DPHI
The Economic, Environmental and Social Impacts of the Project		
Built Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review maximum Gross Floor Area permissible under the concept approval (SSD 9579) 	DPHI
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review maximum building heights under the concept approval, particularly in respect to specific requirements for roof top plants, structures and architectural roof features. 	DPHI
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review the objectives and requirements of the Concept Approval's Design Guidelines in respect to building articulation. 	DPHI
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review building separation distances in respect to the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). 	DPHI
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inadequate setbacks and articulation of shared property boundary and street frontages. 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-compliant building separation to the adjacent site to the south 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Non-compliant building separation to the site across Clarke Lane 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor interface with adjacent site to the south for carparking levels 	Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GFA/FSR underestimated due to exclusion of residential corridor spaces 	Council	



TABLE 2: CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES

Category/Topic	Issue	Stakeholder
Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide further details to address the ADG including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identification of apartments receiving two hours ADG compliant solar access ○ Breakdown of solar access to open spaces and living rooms ○ Show 1m² direct sunlight for 15 minutes minimum in typical floor plans ○ Provide overshadowing diagrams for surrounding properties and include consideration of their development potential. 	DPHI
Wind Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit a revised Wind Assessment Report to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assess against Lawson Pedestrian Wind Comfort Criteria ○ Define "openability" of corridor louvres for safety and comfort 	DPHI
Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit evidence of legally binding agreement for affordable housing contribution 	DPHI
Design Excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit and updated Design Integrity Report to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demonstrate SDRP response ○ Seek further advice from the SDRP 	DPHI
Access and Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit an updated Traffic Impact Assessment per <i>Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024</i> ▪ Provide required bicycle/motorbike spaces and end-of-trip facilities ▪ Address accessibility requirements for car spaces ▪ Submit revised Car Parking Strategy and Waste Management Plan with Council consultation 	DPHI
Landscape and Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations to ensure a sympathetic landscaping outcome is achieved. 	Council
Traffic and Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carparking complies with SSD-9579 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accessible parking is compliant 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bicycle parking - non-compliant. Need to provide end of trip facilities. 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car wash required 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loading and servicing facilities - no objection 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic generation to address <i>Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024</i> 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Queuing analysis - additional details required 	Council
Waste Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) update required. 	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Updated Waste Management Plan required. 	Council



TABLE 2: CATEGORISATION OF ISSUES

Category/Topic	Issue	Stakeholder
Social Impact and Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Updated details required including provision of a communal room.	Council
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Affordable housing should be provided in perpetuity of a minimum of 5%	Council



PART 3 ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE EXHIBITION

This section summarises the actions undertaken by the Proponent since the public exhibition to respond to the key issues raised in the submissions, including:

- Further engagement with the State Design Review Panel
- Further engagement with DPHI
- Further engagement with Council
- Design refinements and clarifications, and
- Further assessment of impacts.

3.1 FURTHER ENGAGEMENT WITH STAKEHOLDERS

3.1.1 State Design Review Panel

The Proponent has further consulted the State Design Review Panel (SDRP) since exhibition of the proposal. The SDRP reviewed the proposal on 12 March 2025 and indicated to the proponent that the following elements of the proposal were supported:

- The simplification of the carpark façade and proposal for a perforated screen to allow natural ventilation.
- The revised design for the southern façade of the tower which is in keeping with the other elevations.
- The refinement and rationalisation of the tower facades, including the removal of the balcony slab extensions across the vertical slots at the lower levels.
- The continuation of the green ceramic façade tile on the tower soffits, as shown in the 3D visualisations.
- The testing undertaken by Stantec to achieve passive shading of the facades.
- The louvre details being developed to mitigate unfavourable wind conditions in the common corridors.
- The principle of providing enclosure to the balconies to improve residential amenity by mitigating noise and wind.
- The information provided to describe and support the feasibility and approach of the landscape design, its relationship to Country and the plant selections that respond to orientation and sun exposure.
- The removal of the level 8 planter on the Clarke Lane elevation to create a double height space at level 7.
- The improved efficiency of the apartment planning.

The SDRP had also requested that the proponent address facets of the proposal regarding the following matters:

- Built Form
- Landscape
- Sustainability

A detailed response to the matters raised by the SDRP is provided in the Design Integrity Report prepared by Woods Bagot at **Appendix 3** of the Amendment Report.

TABLE 3 below outlines the detailed concerns raised as well as how the proponent has adequately addressed these matters.



TABLE 3: SDRP MATTERS RAISED

Category/Topic Issue	Response
Built Form	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Illustrate the impact of future development on the adjacent sites as per the revised maximum buildings heights in the LEP and the Crows Nest Transport Oriented Development precinct Design Guide to demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compliant ADG separation distances share equally between Site B and the adjacent site on Clarke Lane ○ The setbacks that would be required on the adjacent site to achieve compliant ADG building separation from the currently proposed scheme. Provide drawings that illustrate the dimensions of the available developable area for the adjacent Clarke Lane site based on this scenario 	<p>Refer to the Design Integrity Report at Appendix 3 of the Amendment Report for the response prepared by Wood Bagot in regard to the raised SDRP matters.</p> <p>Wood Bagot notes that compliant ADG separation shared equally between Site B and the adjacent site on Clarke Lane is not possible due the proposal sitting above the metro station structure. To amend the building separation, amendment to the load bearing conditions within the metro would have to be altered. This position is validated by advice from Structural Engineers (Appendix D1) wherein identifies that increased setbacks 'will introduce the transfer structures at Levels 7 and 9. Such changes would alter the loading conditions at the station on which the envelope was based. The introduction of additional transfers would also require façade modification and result in an increased solid façade visible from the street. A transfer structure at these levels would require modifications of the proposed building and the introduction of deeper structural members, leading to an increase in overall building height, which may exceed the approved height limit. A thicker transfer structure would also increase the dead load, directly impacting the station's load capacity. This added weight would also lead to higher seismic loads and lateral forces, potentially exceeding the station load limits specified in the interface drawings. Given these constraints, the current structural design of the OSD cannot be modified to accommodate these setbacks without significant alterations and outside the assumptions of the original design.'</p> <p>In addition to the above, the proponent has undertaken studies that illustrate the neighbouring development have the ability to comply with new FSR targets whilst accommodating the greater building separation requirements under the ADG (Appendix D2).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek expert analysis to guide the design of the proposed wintergardens and natural ventilation strategy of the apartments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide technical reports to support the proposed approach and to demonstrate 	<p>Technical advice (Appendix D3) and modelling from Stantec has informed the design of the wintergardens and the ability to naturally ventilate the apartments. Refer to the Wintergarden Ventilation Assessment</p>



TABLE 3: SDRP MATTERS RAISED

Category/Topic Issue	Response
<p>how the wintergarden design will facilitate natural ventilation in the apartments and attenuate noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test alternative approached such as protected balconies, which employ fixed glazing with permanent openings to provide natural ventilation, wind protection, and passive acoustic attenuation. 	<p>(Appendix D4) and Technical Building Ventilation Advice (Appendix D11).</p> <p>The design team's preference to support the wintergarden natural ventilation strategy is outlined in Section 5.2.5 of the Noise and Vibration Impact, point 2.b as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>In the event occupants choose to keep the windows closed, an alternative source of outside air will be provided to the residential dwellings. The method of providing an alternative outside air will include a design which is in accordance with AS1668 and does not reduce the acoustic performance of the building's external façade. Provision of an outside air source to the intake air side of the Fan Coil Units (FCU) located in the ceiling space of each apartment. The outside air is mixed with the return air in the return air plenum and provided to the dwelling using the fan of the FCU which can operate with or without air conditioning being functional.</i></p> <p>B. The analysis provided in the technical reports demonstrate that the winter gardens work and apartments can be naturally ventilated. Therefore, an alternative protected balcony as suggested by the SDRP is not necessary.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undertake wind testing and determine whether the upper-level balconies should also be converted to protected balconies or wintergardens to provide protection from wind. 	<p>Additional wind testing was undertaken, the updated Wind Assessment Report and Memorandum (Appendix 7) of the Amendment Report and Appendix D5) outlines that the upper balconies possess areas suitable for outdoor dining for more than 80% of the time. Blade walls can be introduced for corner balconies with greater wind affectation for mitigation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify how the natural ventilation and acoustic strategies meet the requirements of BASIX, the NCC and the ADG through coordinated technical reports to support the proposal. 	<p>A Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment has been provided at Appendix 12 of the Amendment Report wherein Section 5.2 outlines the acoustic and natural ventilation strategy of the proposal. The Report at Appendix 12 of the Amendment Report and the Acoustic Response to the SDRP Letter (Appendix D6) detail compliance with the relevant standards and policies. Ventilation areas have been measured to achieve openable areas in accordance with F6D6 and</p>



TABLE 3: SDRP MATTERS RAISED

Category/Topic Issue	Response
	<p>F6D7 of the NCC. The proposal achieves 62% cross-ventilation for the first 9 storeys, complying with ADG requirements for cross ventilation.</p> <p>Refer further to the ESD letter (Appendix 10 of the Amendment Report) for BASIX compliance discussion.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to refine the junction between the tower and carpark facades to ensure the carpark screen reads as a distinct element when viewed from the street. Illustrate the depth of the folding perforated screen and ensure that it is clearly set back from the tower facades at all pinch-points. 	<p>The detail of the junction between the tower and carpark has been refined to allow the carpark to read as a distinct and recessive element. However, as identified at Appendix 19 of the Amendment Report, structural issues mean that the walls of the carpark have had to moved marginally outward to accommodate revised structural loading.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to develop the design of the level 7 south-eastern terrace parapet/balustrade to ensure it reads as a recessive element 	<p>Due to the additional car park level, this terrace is now located on Level 8. The parapet/balustrade design has been reviewed to ensuring it presents as recessive.</p>
Landscape	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Align the proposed landscape design with the wind report findings to ensure the location of seating areas on the level 7 terrace, rooftop communal open space, and penthouse terraces are comfortable 	<p>Design of the roof terraces will continue to be detailed with a focus on user comfort. A mix of sheltered and open seating areas will be provided. These areas have been designed to ensure they are suitable for dining or seating.</p> <p>Refer to the Wind Report (Appendix 7 of the Amendment Report), Wind Memorandum (Appendix D5) and commentary from the Landscape Architect (Appendix D10) for further information.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek advice from the wind consultant on additional mitigation measures to reduce the impact of wind on Hume Street not ensure comfort and safety for pedestrians. 	<p>It is noted that wind impact upon Hume Street arises from a cumulative impact across Sites A, B and C. Mitigation should be considered with a holistic approach across all sites within the CSSI approved scope, which lies outside the OSD. It is also noted that pedestrian affectation is avoided with the vehicular carriageway bearing the impact.</p> <p>Refer to the Wind Report (Appendix 7 of the Amendment Report) and Memorandum (Appendix D5) for further information.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrate that the proposed landscape design for the level 7 communal terrace will provide a green buffer and privacy for adjacent apartments, Consider extending planting towards the eastern side of the terrace and including continuous planters to enable a green edge, aligning with what is shown on the 3D visualisations. 	<p>Due to the additional car park level, this terrace is now located on Level 8. The Level 8 communal terrace is to be treated as a green buffer to ensure privacy for adjacent developments. See the additional commentary provided by the Landscape Architect at Appendix D10.</p>



TABLE 3: SDRP MATTERS RAISED	
Category/Topic Issue	Response
Sustainability	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the design develops, continue to demonstrate and develop the sustainability strategy that encompasses the operational aspects of the building and is embedded in the architecture. 	<p>The design team remains committed to the proposed ESD principles.</p> <p>Refer to the ESD letter (Appendix 10 of the Amendment Report) for further details.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to items 2 to 4 of this advice letter and respond to the advice provided in the attached document regarding the proposed ventilation strategy. 	<p>Responses to this advice has been provided at Appendix D3.</p>

3.1.2 Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

A meeting was held with staff from DPHI and the consultant team to discuss the content of the DPHI letter and the associated issues on 21 January 2025. Key matters discussed included:

- Cross Floor Area
- Height
- Building Articulation
- Building Separation
- Wind
- Solar Access
- Overshadowing
- Access and parking
- Affordable Housing

In addition to the above, subsequent discussions have been had with DPHI staff in relation to the proposal to redistribute car parking from Site A to Site B. As identified in the original EIS, the detailed application is pursuant to the approved Concept SSD Application for the Crows Nest Station precinct (SSD-9579) in accordance with Division 4.4 of the EP&A Act. The Concept Approval established the overarching vision for the Crows Nest Station precinct and the assessment framework for which all subsequent applications are to be assessed against in accordance with Section 4.24(2) of the EP&A Act.

The proposal to redistribute some carparking from Site A to Site B led to the submission of SSD-9579 Modification 3 Redistribution of Car Parking to DPHI. The proposed modification seeks to make a minor amendment to the Consolidated Consent to remove all 46 car parking spaces from 32 Hume Street, Crows Nest (Site A) and redistribute 23 car parking spaces to 25 Hume Street, Crows Nest (Site B). Importantly, as a consequence of this change, there will be an overall net decrease in car parking spaces within the precinct from 101 car parking spaces down to 78 car parking spaces. This application is currently under assessment.

Having regard for the changes proposed to Site B, an Amending DA has been lodged with DPHI and is the subject of this assessment.

In addition to the above, in satisfaction of Condition A13 of the Concept OSD Consent (SSD-9579), a Planning Agreement has been submitted to DPHI for consideration and is currently under assessment.



3.1.3 North Sydney Council

A meeting was held with the Mayor and Council staff on 20 June 2025. Key matters discussed included the items raised in Council's submission including GFA and car parking. Council requested a response to their issues raised and a tabulated response was provided via email on 25 June 2025. Council acknowledged receipt of this response and committed to undertaking a more detailed review once a revised package is lodged with DPHI.

3.2 DESIGN REFINEMENTS

Further design refinements are proposed in direct response to submissions, and as a consequence of further design development including the additional car parking.

A summary of the proposed refinements is provided below:

- **Ground Floor** – minor internal reconfiguration including the substation, FCR, and main switch room. GFA has been increased by 1m².
- **Level 01** – minor internal reconfiguration. One (1) additional ambulant / DDA bathroom has been included.
- **Level 02** – no change.
- **Level 05** – the layout has been adjusted having regard for structural requirements associated with the transfer slab. The northern wall of the carpark has been moved outward and the landscape element has been removed at the Hume Street elevation. One (1) additional car parking space is provided. Bike parking has been removed from this Level.
- **Level 06** – the layout has been adjusted having regard for structural requirements associated with the transfer slab. The walls of the carpark have been moved outward. Car parking numbers have been reduced from 28 spaces to 25 spaces. One motor bike space has been provided. 50 double decker bike racks are provided.
- **Level 07** – Former residential Level 07 has been removed and replaced with an additional car park level for 25 car parking spaces, one (1) motor bike space and 106 double decker bike racks. This allows for a total of 78 car spaces at Site B.
- **Level 08** – Minor apartment reconfiguration to provide 10 apartments. The residential access corridors have been enclosed while the lobby area outside the lift will remain open at the eastern and western ends. This approach to corridors is repeated on all residential levels.
- **Level 09-16** – Minor apartment reconfiguration. No wintergardens are proposed for SDA apartments 0.1 and 0.12 across Level 09-13.
- **Level 15-16** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 17-18** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 19** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Level 20** – Minor apartment reconfiguration.
- **Roof Terrace** – Minor reconfigured to provide greater privacy for future residents having regard for the built form changes introduced via the Crows Nest TOD rezoning.
- Residential GFA is now 12,987m² (inclusive of partially enclosed corridors).
- Overall reduction from 130 apartments (one bedroom = 44, two bedroom = 63, three bedroom = 23) to 122 apartments (one bedroom = 40, two bedroom = 63, three bedroom = 19).

The revised project is illustrated in a suite of revised architectural and landscape plans that accompany this Amendment Report.

This has resulted in minor amendments to the architectural plans submitted with the SSDA package, refer to **Appendix D1**.

3.2.1 Revised Description of Development

As identified above, this Submissions Report forms an Appendix to the Amendment Report submitted to DPHI that outlines the proposed amendments to the original development application and assesses



the potential environmental, economic, and social impacts of the amended project. An updated Project Description is included at **Appendix A** within the Amendment Report.

3.3 ADDITIONAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This Submissions Report forms an Appendix to the Amendment Report submitted to DPHI that outlines the proposed amendments to the original development application and assesses the potential environmental, economic, and social impacts of the amended project. Additional Assessment of Impacts is provided at **PART 7** of the Amendment Report.

The Submissions Report provides consideration of the submissions received from the SDRP and during the public exhibition period. Additional assessment has been undertaken, where necessary, to respond to submissions, outline changes and provide further assessment where required by the proposed refinements. The updated/additional assessment is appended to this report (refer to Table of Contents) and comprises:

- Structural Engineering Response (**Appendix D1**)
- Architectural Response (**Appendix D2**)
- Sustainability Response (**Appendix D3**)
- Wintergarden Ventilation Assessment (**Appendix D4**)
- Wind Response (**Appendix D5**)
- Acoustic Response (**Appendix D6**)
- Legal Advice Response (**Appendix D7**)
- Traffic and Transport Response (**Appendix D8**)
- Social Impact Assessment Response (**Appendix D9**)
- Landscape Response (**Appendix D10**)
- Building Ventilation Standards (**Appendix 11**)

3.4 UPDATED MITIGATION MEASURES

The Mitigation Measures for the proposed development have been reviewed and updated as a result of the project refinements described in **Section 3.2**, the matters raised in submissions discussed at **PART 4** and the further environmental assessment outlined in **PART 7** of the Amendment Report. The updated Mitigation Measures are outlined in **Appendix C** of the Amendment Report.



PART 4 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

This section summarises the Proponent's response to the issues raised by the Department, Council, agencies, as well as the public, with reference to the documentation that is appended to this report.

The responses are provided in the following sections and have been structured as follows:

- Response to DPHI
- Response to North Sydney Council
- Response to State Agencies
- Response to Public Submissions

Refer to **TABLE 4, TABLE 5, TABLE 6** and **TABLE 7** below.



4.1 DPHI

TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
Built Form		
<p>Review the proposed built form and revise if required, to demonstrate the proposal is consistent with the following requirements:</p> <p>a) maximum Gross Floor Area permissible under the Concept Approval (SSD 9579).</p> <p><i>Note: The Department is of the opinion that areas such as corridors, lobbies, enclosed within the building's perimeter walls and some roof top "rooms" with enclosing walls are captured by the GFA definition under the North Sydney LEP.</i></p>	<p>DPHI</p>	<p>It is noted that since DPHI provided their RTS response, amendments have been made to the architectural plans in relation to the open corridors on the residential levels whereby the corridors have been enclosed and subsequently included in GFA calculations. However, the corridors directly outside the lift landing remain open at both ends and are therefore excluded from the calculation of GFA. These open corridors feature external-grade finishes and function as outdoor spaces, maintaining their role as naturally ventilated communal areas while supporting the project's sustainable design objectives.</p> <p>Provided at Appendix D7, updated legal advice prepared by Mills Oakley supports this position and provides reference to relevant case law that augments this argument. The advice notes that the corridors in question are open at both ends, with side walls being external walls; as such the corridors should rightly be excluded from the calculation of GFA.</p> <p>The Courts have considered where corridors can be excluded from the calculation of GFA. In <i>GGD Danks Street P/L and CR Danks Street P/L v Council of the City of Sydney [2015] NSWLEC 1521</i> (GGD Danks) the Court held that the floor area inside corridors should be excluded from GFA where the corridor was open at both ends and exposed to the elements. Therefore, when considering the subject space of this proposal; it is noted that the external walls of the lift foyer area are waterproofed. Both ends of the lift foyer area are also open'. It is therefore clear that the foyer should be excluded from GFA calculation.</p> <p>In regard to the rooftop spaces, the Mills Oakley advice demonstrates that the top floor spaces are clearly outdoor spaces that are exposed to the elements, and while there is a 'overhanging element' the rooftop space is not capable of being enclosed.</p>



TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Maximum building heights under the Concept Approval, particularly in respect to specific requirements for roof top plants, structures and architectural roof features.</p> <p><i>Please refer to Condition B4 of the Concept Approval with reference to North Sydney LEP.</i></p>	DPHI	<p>A Response to Submissions Report has been prepared by Woods Baggot and is provided at Appendix D2. The response details that the proposal has been presented in accordance with the Concept Approval condition B4 to ensure that the roof enclosures shall not include GFA and shall not be reasonably capable of modification to include GFA. The roof structures are designed as decorative architectural elements and will therefore satisfy Clauses 4.3A and 5.6 of the North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013.</p> <p>The roof structures are designed for shading on the roof, supporting solar panels, and integrating plant rooms. The roof features will not be able to be modified to be enclosed due to the external nature of the terrace.</p>
<p>The objectives and requirements of the Concept Approval's Design Guidelines in respect to building articulation, requiring <i>"at least one vertical break to ensure those elevations presents as multiple built forms, comprising a recess with dimensions no less than 5m x 3m for the full height of building (above the podium)"</i> for both Pacific Highway and Clarke Lane elevations of the proposed building.</p>	DPHI	<p>A detailed response is provided by Woods Bagot at Appendix D2 that confirms the project has taken an articulation approach that responds to the neighbouring context. There is a strong vertical high street rhythm which has been continued through the proposal with 4 vertical breaks along the tower on the Pacific Highway elevation. This results in a 5-tower form breaking down the massing. This elevation has a 6.4m total width of articulation with varied depths to incorporate landscaping.</p> <p>At Clarke Lane, a similar approach is applied which includes a total 3m width of articulation. Articulation is also amplified on these long elevations with the angled facades. Previous design iterations included wider articulation however following SDRP sessions these were recommended to be reduced</p>
<p>Building separation distances in respect to the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) with consideration of the development potential of adjoining sites, particularly in respect to properties opposite the site on Clarke Lane and the property adjoining the southern boundary of the site.</p>	DPHI	<p>A detailed response is provided by Woods Bagot at Appendix D2</p> <p>It is noted that further development along Clarke Lane and south of the site have a maximum 8 storey height. To the south, the proposal allows a shared setback of 12m to blank walls. A shared setback of 18m has been provided up to 8 storeys along Clarke Lane. It is also noted that when accounting for revised building heights under the TOD provisions and the corresponding</p>



TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		development potential of surrounding sites that adequate building separation under the ADG can be achieved.
Amenity		
<p>Provide further details, including supporting documentations and drawings to illustrate how the proposal will meet the objective and criteria of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). This must include:</p> <p>a) Consideration of design amendments and option to maximise solar access to the proposed apartments and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Identification of apartments receiving two hours ADG compliance solar access and those receiving no direct solar access. ii. Detailed breakdown of solar access to open spaces and living rooms iii. typical floorplans to illustrate a minimum of 1m² of direct sunlight, measured at 1m above floor level, is achieved for at least 15 minutes. 	DPHI	Refer to Appendix D2 , where Woods Bagot have outlined that achieving solar access compliance with the ADG is not possible due to the orientation of the Site. To offset this, greater residential amenity has been provided along the Pacific Highway apartments by orienting views towards Sydney Harbour. Extensive communal amenity has been provided at the rooftop for the benefit of all future residents.
<p>b) Diagrams illustrating overshadowing impacts to surrounding residential properties (and must include consideration of their development potential for residential development).</p>	DPHI	<p>The proposal is situated within the Crows Nest Metro Concept Approval Envelope for over station developments. Revised shadow diagrams illustrate that the proposal does not extend beyond the concept approval. Refer to Appendix D2 for the revised shadow diagrams.</p> <p>Crows Nest has been designated as an Accelerated Precinct. The updated planning controls will result in significantly increased development around the Crows Nest Metro Station. The new building height limits will minimise overshadowing effects from the development at Site B.</p>
Wind Assessment		
<p>Submit a revised Wind Assessment Report to:</p> <p>a) Undertake an assessment in respect to Lawson Pedestrians Wind Comfort Criteria to ensure a reasonable amenity would be provided within and around the proposed development. This must include consideration of wind comfort for the corridor spaces, noting the function and design includes seating spaces.</p>	DPHI	<p>A. A revised Wind Assessment has been provided at Appendix D5 that demonstrates appropriate amenity is provided within and around Site B.</p> <p>B. The arrangements within the corridor spaces have been revised such that the lift lobby area will remain open, but the residential corridors will now include a door to enable greater wind control.</p>



TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
b) Define and provide details of the “openability” of the proposed louvres within the corridors required to achieve safety, weather proofing and wind comfort required for the corridor and associated spaces.	DPHI	The proposed Louvre system consists of a 2-panel bi-fold vertical door which will be open through most of the year. Details of the system is provided at Appendix D2 . When closed, the open area is reduced when but still allows for fresh air to ventilate. The louvre is designed to sit within the ceiling zone when in an open position to ensure adequate head heights.
Affordable Housing		
Submit evidence to comply with Condition A13 and A14 of the Concept Approval in respect to the provision of affordable housing. This must include evidence of a legally binding agreement to pay the required contribution for the delivery of affordable housing as required by Condition A13	DPHI	A Planning Agreement was submitted to DPHI in June 2025 relation to the provision of Affordable Housing.
Design Excellence		
Submit an updated Design Integrity Report to include: a) Details on how the project addressed the SDRP’s advice. This may include tabulated project responses to each issue raised on the SDRP Advice letters for the project.	DPHI	An updated Design Integrity Report is provided at Appendix 3 of the Amendment Report that includes tabulated project responses to issues raised by the SDRP and includes detail on how the project has adopted and addressed matters by the SDRP during the design process.
b) Further advice from the SDRP prior to submitting a Response to Submissions report and project responses to the SDRP’s advice and recommendations.	DPHI	The proponent had met with the SDRP on 12 March 2025. For further review of the proposal, these comments have been addressed at Appendix 3 of the Amendment Report.
Access and Parking		
Submit an updated Traffic Impact Assessment with reference to the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024 and consideration of traffic generation from any non-residential uses at the site.	DPHI	Refer to the Traffic Engineer Response to Submission at Appendix D8 . The Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024 (Guide 2024) specifically notes that the guide applies to TIA’s commenced and development applications lodged on or after 4 November 2024, the final TAIA was issued on 5 September 2024 thus predating the release of the Guide 2024. Regardless, a revised TAIA has been provided at Appendix 21 of the Amendment Report, consideration the traffic generation from the non-residential uses at the site. Refer to Section 5.1 of the updated TAIA.



TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Provide bicycle and motorbike spaces and end-of-trip facilities as required by Condition B21 of the Concept Approval</p>	<p>DPHI</p>	<p>Refer to the Traffic Engineer Response to Submission at Appendix D8.</p> <p>Under the North Sydney DCP, residential developments must provide bicycle parking at minimum rates of one space per dwelling for residents and one space for every 10 dwellings for visitors. With 122 dwellings proposed, the development requires at least 122 resident bicycle spaces and 12 visitor bicycle spaces.</p> <p>Retail premises must provide one bicycle space per 150m² GFA for staff and one space per 400m² GFA for customers. With approximately 360m² GFA of retail space, this translates to a minimum requirement of three (3) staff bicycle spaces and one (1) customer bicycle space.</p> <p>The combined requirement totals 137 bicycle parking spaces. The modified proposal provides 156 bicycle parking spaces, surpassing the DCP requirements.</p> <p>In accordance with the Consolidated Conditions of Consent for SSD-9579, Site B is required to provide a maximum of two motorcycle spaces. The development will provide two motorcycle spaces located on the car parking levels.</p> <p>The updated architectural plans indicate two ambulant DDA bathrooms with showers, located within the commercial/ retail tenancy on Level 1. An EOTF is not considered necessary for the residential component of the development as each dwelling will have bathroom/ shower and storage facilities. Section 4.3 of the TAIA has been amended.</p>
<p>Revise the design of the proposal to adopt the recommendations of the submitted Access Report. This must include provision of required shared parking zones and convenient lift access for any accessible car spaces.</p>	<p>DPHI</p>	<p>Refer to the Traffic Engineer Response to Submission at Appendix D8.</p> <p>In accordance with the consolidated conditions of SSD-9579, Site B is required to provide a minimum of six accessible spaces. Six accessible spaces have been provided on-site satisfying the conditioned requirement.</p>



TABLE 4: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY DPHI		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		<p>In general, the accessible spaces have been designed in accordance with the requirements of AS2890.6:2022, however, there are some accessible spaces where there are columns located within areas of the shared bays not permitted by AS2890.6:2022. Specifically, these are Spaces 21 and 22 on Level 5 and Space 21 on Level 6.</p> <p>Whilst these shared bays are not strictly compliant with AS2890.6:2022, the design of these shared bays is supported through a performance solution provided by the Access Consultant (refer to MGAC Performance Solution Report).</p>
Address the recommendations of the Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment Report including any design changes and measures to mitigate the risk of conflict between existing vehicles and pedestrians.	DPHI	<p>Refer to the Traffic Engineer Response to Submission at Appendix D8.</p> <p>The TAIA report (Appendix 21 of the Amendment Report) had included recommendations pertaining to the installation of flashing lights and associated warning signage at the Clarke Lane driveway. Updated Architectural plans include additional notation requiring the installation of flashing lights and warning signage.</p>
Submit a revised Car Parking Strategy and Management Plan to include operational details, maintenance schedule, procedures for car lift mechanical break-down, and contingency for queuing of vehicles waiting to access the car lifts.	DPHI	A revised Car Parking Strategy and Management Plan has been provided at Appendix 22 of the Amendment Report and includes further operational details and procedures for car lift mechanical break-down and associated contingency in the event vehicles are queuing for the car lifts.
Submit a revised Waste Management Plan with adequate storage and waste management arrangement. This must include further consultation with Council.	DPHI	A Revised Waste Management Plan has been provided at Appendix 15 of the Amendment Report which complies with Council's requirements.



4.2 NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL

TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
Built Form		
Inadequate setbacks and articulation of shared property boundary and street frontages		
<p>The approved building envelope diagrams from December 2020 include two sets of OSD building outlines: the maximum building envelope and the indicative OSD building location above the station. For Site B, the indicative OSD features a smaller floorplate with above podium setbacks provided along all property boundaries (Figures 2 and 3). The purpose of the two building outline controls is to ensure an appropriate level of articulation to the tower to improve the internal amenity of the residences, retain a better sense of scale at pedestrian level along the Pacific Highway and better reflect the fine grain context of Crows Nest village.</p> <p>In contrast, the proposed tower fills the maximum approved building envelope, with limited above podium street and lane setbacks and minor articulation (Table 2). This results in a bulkier building that will contribute towards a 'canyon of towers' along the Pacific Highway, having regard to the increased tower heights under the Crows Nest TOD (see Section 2 of this advice).</p> <p>Filling the maximum envelope is only made possible by omitting the GFA of internal corridors in the floorspace calculation, which is not supported (see Section 5 of this advice).</p> <p>Finally, it is important to note that the North Sydney Development Control Plan 2013 (NSDCP 2013) requires a 3m above podium setback for Site B along Pacific Highway, Hume Street, and Clarke Lane to provide a better sense of scale to the street. The SSD is inconsistent with the DCP setback guidance.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>The Concept State Significant Development (SSD) Application approved building envelopes for each of the Over Station Development (OSD) sites within the Crows Nest Station precinct. These building envelopes define the parameters within which detailed building design will occur, determining the overall bulk and scale of the OSD. The proposed Site B OSD is entirely consistent with the approved building envelope for this site.</p> <p>Structural Constraints</p> <p>It is not viable to provide greater setbacks than those currently indicated within the proposed design. As the OSD sits above the Metro station, any significant amendment to the OSD envelope would impact the existing load-bearing structures within the Metro facility. Please refer to the Structural Constraints Letter provided by Robert Bird Group at Appendix 19 of the Amendment Report.</p> <p>Design Approach</p> <p>The overall design has had regard for the Crows Nest Over Station Development Design Quality Guidelines and Concept Approval design objectives. The horizontal datum between the station and OSD was identified as critical. Accordingly, additional horizontal articulation has been avoided to maintain the clarity of the proposal. Depth and relief have been incorporated by rotating façade planes to respond to context whilst incorporating dimensionality.</p> <p>Apartments along the Pacific Highway are angled to the south to maximise harbour and city views. Along Clarke Lane, apartments are similarly angled south to capture views of leafy suburbs and the eastern harbour.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		<p>Gross Floor Area Considerations</p> <p>Adjustments have been made to internal corridors to reduce their width and include them in GFA calculations. Only the areas in front of the lifts on both the eastern and western elevations remain open, allowing these areas to be appropriately excluded from GFA calculations.</p> <p>Contextual Response</p> <p>The built form design represents a considered response to existing building forms in the surrounding area. Having regard for the significantly increased height and Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of adjoining properties following the release of the Crows Nest Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Accelerated Precinct in November 2024, all new built elements sit respectfully within these structures to maintain the urban form experience envisioned by the approved Concept Design.</p> <p>The building responds to its existing and future context through several initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The colour and texture of materials have been selected to complement the existing local context whilst responding to contemporary architectural composition. ▪ The proposed form has been articulated to create contemporary building additions of visual interest, demonstrating design excellence on a prominent site. ▪ Fine detailing and textural materiality provide an additional layer of design consideration. ▪ The potential to incorporate architectural expression in the building façade will imbue the development with a unique, design-led character within the emerging precinct.



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Non-compliant building separation to the adjacent site to the south</p> <p>The southern setback of Site B has not adequately responded to the proposed increase in building height of the building adjoining the southern boundary under the Crows Nest TOD (NSW Government 2024).</p> <p>The 2036 Plan (NSW Government 2020) recommended a maximum building height of 8 storeys for the sites adjacent to Site B to the south (Figure 4). To comply with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG), a total building separation of 21m is recommended between habitable rooms, comprising a 12m setback from Site B and a 9m setback from the adjacent site.</p> <p>Previously, the proponent argued that due to the 8-storey height cap on the adjacent site, Site B only needed to provide a 6m setback to the shared property boundary for levels above 8 storeys.</p> <p>However, the recently published Crows Nest TOD increases the building height for the adjacent site from 8 storeys to 16 storeys (Figure 4). This change requires a considerably more careful response to the ADG, which recommends a total building separation of 24m between habitable rooms (12m setbacks from each side of the property boundary) for buildings above 8 storeys. Further, it is worth noting the Urban Design Report (SJB 2024) that underpins the Crows Nest TOD, recommends maximising tower separation with distances of up to 40m (Figure 5).</p> <p>The proposed Site B building provides a setback of approximately 5-6.285m from habitable rooms to the southern site boundary for level 9-18, falling considerably short of the accepted minimum 12m setback requirement under the ADG and design recommendations of the Crows Nest TOD.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of poorly separated tall buildings along the eastern side of the Pacific Highway, raises several significant concerns. The anticipated massing will be highly visible from local viewpoints, including Ernest Place, Hume Street Park, Willoughby Road, and the Pacific Highway. Lack of any meaningful gaps or articulation between buildings (Figure 5) will cause a 'wall effect' when looking up or down the highway</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>Analysis undertaken by Woods Bagot indicates that, in consideration of the development potential of adjoining sites, compliant building separation under the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) can be achieved. Please refer to Appendix D2 for detailed analysis.</p> <p>We acknowledge the Crows Nest TOD (2024) has increased heights for adjacent southern sites from 8 to 16 storeys. While Site B provides 5-6.285m setbacks to the southern boundary, the Woods Bagot analysis demonstrates ADG compliance is achievable through reciprocal setbacks from both sites.</p> <p>The ability to increase setbacks to the south is not viable having regard for the following design constraints:</p> <p>Structural Limitations</p> <p>The OSD sits above the operational Metro station with fixed load-bearing structures that cannot be modified. Any reduction in building footprint would compromise structural integrity, as detailed in the Robert Bird Group Structural Constraints Letter.</p> <p>Approved Building Envelope</p> <p>Site B operates within the Concept SSD Approval building envelope, established when adjoining sites had 8-storey height limits. This envelope is integrated with Metro infrastructure and cannot be substantially altered.</p> <p>Urban Design Response</p> <p>The design incorporates significant façade articulation through angled apartments, varied materials, and rotating planes to address 'wall effect' concerns. Ground-level activation and enhanced pedestrian connections improve the Pacific Highway interface.</p> <p>While the southern setback does not achieve 12m, the combination of existing setbacks, design measures, reciprocal development responsibilities,</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>or from the centre of Crows Nest. It will also cause significant afternoon overshadowing of Ernest Place and Willoughby Road during spring and autumn equinoxes.</p> <p>In addition, with the Crows Nest TOD also proposing further increases to building heights along the western side of the Pacific Highway, any precedent set by poor separation and articulation of towers on the metro sites, may be repeated, causing a “canyon effect” down the highway. The Site A block spans approximately 121m, while the combined length of the Site B block, including the adjacent sites with uplift, extends to 158m. If the proposed narrow building separations are maintained for these two high-density, high-rise blocks along Pacific Highway, it will result in an exceptionally long and largely continuous built form with only a visual break at Hume Street. This must not set a precedent for the western side of the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>To mitigate these impacts and provide adequate amenity to the residential units, it is recommended that a minimum 12m building setback be provided by Site B along the shared southern boundary.</p>		<p>and unique Metro infrastructure constraints ensures acceptable amenity outcomes. The Woods Bagot analysis confirms ADG compliance is achievable considering shared setback responsibilities between adjoining developments.</p>
<p><i>Non-compliant building separation to the site across Clarke Lane</i></p>		
<p>The ADG requires a total of 21m building separation between habitable rooms of Site B (18 storeys) and the site across Clarke Lane (potential 8 storeys). To comply with the ADG, a minimum 12m building setback should be provided from the centreline of Clarke Lane. However, the proposed design only provides a 6m building setback for residential levels 9-20, which falls significantly short of the required minimum setback. This non-compliance compromises privacy, amenity, and the overall design quality for future residents on both sites.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>While Site B provides 6m setbacks from the centreline of Clarke Lane for levels 9-20, this must be considered within the unique context of Clarke Lane as a narrow laneway and the site's infrastructure constraints. Further, design constraints include:</p> <p>Structural Limitations</p> <p>As detailed at Appendix D1, the OSD's eastern edge aligns with critical Metro infrastructure below. The building footprint cannot be reduced without impacting load-bearing structures supporting both the station and OSD. Any increase in eastern setbacks would compromise the structural integrity of the integrated Metro-OSD system.</p> <p>Clarke Lane Context</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		<p>Clarke Lane is a narrow service laneway, not a typical street. The 6m setback from centreline provides approximately 9-10m separation from the eastern property boundary when accounting for the lane width. Future development across Clarke Lane would need to provide reciprocal setbacks to achieve ADG compliance, recognising building separation as a shared responsibility.</p> <p>Design Response</p> <p>The eastern façade incorporates angled apartments oriented south towards harbour views, reducing direct overlooking across Clarke Lane. Material selection and window placement have been carefully considered to enhance privacy between buildings. The design includes recessed balconies and privacy screens to further mitigate overlooking concerns.</p> <p>Amenity Considerations</p> <p>Despite the reduced setback, residential amenity is maintained through apartment layouts that prioritise southern outlooks over eastern aspects. The narrowness of Clarke Lane and its service function mean that future development opposite would likely incorporate similar design responses, ensuring mutual privacy and amenity outcomes.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The 6m setback from Clarke Lane's centreline, while below ADG recommendations, responds to fixed infrastructure constraints and the laneway's unique character. Combined with design measures, reciprocal development obligations, and the Woods Bagot analysis (Appendix D2), acceptable separation and amenity outcomes are achievable for both current and future residents.</p>
<p>Poor interface with adjacent site to the south for carparking levels</p> <p><i>The proposed building includes two levels of car parking on Levels 5 and 6, with a direct open interface to the adjacent site to the south and a 0m setback to the shared boundary (Figure 7). The facade at this interface is designed as an open structure, featuring perforated metal panels.</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>Council's assessment considers a hypothetical future development scenario. The Site B OSD operates under an approved Concept SSD building envelope, and any future development on adjoining land must have regard for this existing approval and respond accordingly.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p><i>The Crows Nest TOD planning recommendations indicate that the adjacent site is intended for redevelopment with a 3-storey street wall accommodating non-residential uses, with residential uses above. As such, the proposed open facade car parking levels with a nil setback at Site B will directly face future residential units on the adjacent site</i></p> <p><i>This design raises significant concerns, as it would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent site, particularly in terms of privacy, noise, air quality and visual intrusion.</i></p>		<p>The car parking levels at the southern boundary incorporate perforated metal panels designed to provide required ventilation while offering visual screening. This treatment creates a semi-permeable façade rather than a completely open interface, balancing functional requirements with interface considerations.</p> <p>Future development on the adjoining site would need to implement appropriate design responses including setbacks from their northern boundary, suitable façade treatments, and layouts that minimise interface conflicts. The anticipated 3-storey non-residential podium on the adjoining site would provide separation between any future residential uses and the car park interface.</p> <p>The sequential nature of urban development requires each site to respond to existing conditions. Just as Site B has responded to its existing context, future developments must design appropriately for the established built form, including this approved building envelope.</p>
<p>GFA/FSR underestimated due to exclusion of residential corridor spaces</p> <p><i>The residential levels of Site B incorporate corridors with operable louvers. The proponent argues that these louvers will remain fully open 75%-90% of the year, and therefore, the corridor spaces are excluded from the total GFA calculation.</i></p> <p><i>Operable louvers can still create fully enclosed corridors. This suggests that the corridor spaces should still be considered in the GFA calculation. During the last SDRP meeting with GANSW, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure verbally advised that the Department is currently seeking legal advice on this matter that will be shared with Council in due course. Until now, Council has not received that advice. Supporting such an exclusion would set a concerning precedent.</i></p> <p><i>The table below compares the GFA calculations using the two methods. If the corridor spaces are included, the overall FSR would increase to 8.48:1, significantly exceeding the maximum 7.5:1 control (Table 3).</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>In response to feedback, a revised design has been proposed that significantly reduces the extent of GFA exempt corridors. The amended design now only excludes the area immediately outside the lift landing from GFA calculations, where open east and west windows ensure this space remains genuinely open to the elements. All other corridor areas have been included in the GFA calculations, demonstrating a responsive approach to Council's concerns.</p> <p>Legal advice prepared by Mills Oakley (Appendix D7) cites <i>GGD Danks Street P/L v Council of the City of Sydney</i> [2015] NSWLEC 1521, where the Court excluded corridors that were open at both ends and exposed to the elements from GFA. The lift landing areas in the revised design meet these criteria - they feature open windows to both east and west, are exposed to weather, and have waterproofed external apartment walls consistent with outdoor spaces.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL																	
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response															
<p>Table 2. Comparison of GFA yield of the SSD with and without including the internal corridors</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;"></th> <th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">SSD</th> <th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">SSD with corridors included in the residential GFA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Residential GFA</td> <td>12,981m²</td> <td>14,941m² <i>(does not comply with max 13,000 residential GFA control)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-residential GFA</td> <td>938m²</td> <td>938m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total GFA</td> <td>13,919m²</td> <td>15,879m²</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FSR</td> <td>7.44:1</td> <td>8.48:1 <i>(does not comply with 7.5:1 FSR control)</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		SSD	SSD with corridors included in the residential GFA	Residential GFA	12,981m ²	14,941m² <i>(does not comply with max 13,000 residential GFA control)</i>	Non-residential GFA	938m ²	938m ²	Total GFA	13,919m ²	15,879m²	FSR	7.44:1	8.48:1 <i>(does not comply with 7.5:1 FSR control)</i>		<p>The presence of operable louvers in these limited areas does not transform them into enclosed spaces. Like awnings or pergolas, the louvers provide weather protection while maintaining the fundamental character of external circulation areas.</p> <p>Similarly, the rooftop spaces are clearly outdoor areas. While incorporating overhanging elements, they are not capable of being enclosed and should not be included in GFA calculations.</p> <p>This revised approach demonstrates responsiveness to Council's concerns while maintaining appropriate exclusions supported by established case law. The proposed GFA calculation correctly applies planning principles and maintains compliance with the approved FSR of 7.5:1.</p>
	SSD	SSD with corridors included in the residential GFA															
Residential GFA	12,981m ²	14,941m² <i>(does not comply with max 13,000 residential GFA control)</i>															
Non-residential GFA	938m ²	938m ²															
Total GFA	13,919m ²	15,879m²															
FSR	7.44:1	8.48:1 <i>(does not comply with 7.5:1 FSR control)</i>															
Landscape and Trees																	
<p>The Arborist Report prepared by Urban Arbor dated 7 May 2024 states that no trees will be impacted. The period since this Arborist Report was prepared, 4 x Platanus digitoto have been planted across the Pacific Highway frontage of the subject site - this species is no longer a preferred species within North Sydney Council area due to its poor past performance. The south-easternmost tree has been planted under the overhanging awning, and next to a large steel power pole, and its imminent removal and replacement would have been required regardless of any additional works. All 4 x trees have 'Filtipave' rubber surround installed, that is not according to council specifications and require removal and reinstallation. These trees will all be impacted by proposed works to some extent (hoardings/scaffolding etc). The current OSD proposal also shows 5 x plotanus digitoto to be planted across this frontage.</p> <p>To achieve the best outcome, and to facilitate the OSD as proposed, the 4 x existing Plotonus digitoto planted across the Pacific Highway frontage of the subject site shall be removed and 5 x Plotonus X hybrida (minimum L50-litre pot size) shall be planted across this frontage. All trees shall be</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>Noted, it is expected that Council will recommend this as a condition of consent.</p>															



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>planted with sufficient awning cut-outs to allow for future unimpeded canopy growth, with the south-easternmost planting site relocated further northwest to avoid future impedance created by the adjacent steel pole. All trees shall be planted according to council specifications, with 'Filtipave' rubber surround installed around the bases no sooner than 6 months post planting with a minimum 100mm gap between it and the trunk to allow for future trunk growth.</p>		
<p>Traffic and Transport</p>		
<p>Per the conditions of consent for the concept development application (SSD-9579 Mod 2) for an over station development, it is outlined that "future development application(s) must demonstrate compliance with the following maximum parking limits: a maximum of 55 spaces within Site B, including 6 accessible spaces". The TA indicates a proposed provision of 55 car parking spaces across 2 levels. The TA notes that the car parking spaces will be allocated to the residential tenants of the building only. Hence, the provision of car parking complies with the conditions of SSD-9579 Mod 2.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>It is noted that a Modification Application to the Concept Approval development consent SSD-9579 is sought to allow for the reduction in carparking within the precinct and redistribution of car parking from Site A to Site B.</p> <p>The Modification Application is seeking to reduce the overall number of car parking spaces within the precinct from 101 to 78 by removing car parking spaces from Site A and redistributing some of these spaces to Site B such that the total number of spaces at Site B will increase from 55 to 78 spaces.</p>
<p>Similar to the above SSD-9579 Mod 2 conditions, the development application should provide 6 accessible spaces in the maximum provision of 55 car parking spaces. The TA indicates a proposed provision of 6 accessible spaces, which is included in the total of 55 car parking spaces and therefore, complies with the conditions of SSD-9579 Mod 2.</p>		<p>Site B will continue to provide 6 accessible spaces.</p>
<p>The proposal only provides 100 bicycle spaces as indicated in the TA which does not comply with the DCP requirements. The TA identifies that the Site is constrained and justifies this shortfall by noting that residents will also be able to store their bicycles in their dwellings.</p> <p>To strictly comply with the DCP (assuming the proposed non-residential component is entirely commercial), an additional 47 bicycle spaces should be provided so that the total number of bicycle spaces for the development is 147. The applicant should also clarify whether the non-residential component is classified as commercial or retail.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>In response to Council's concerns with the provision of bicycle spaces, the applicant has provided amended architectural plans that provide 156 bicycles spaces, satisfying the DCP requirements.</p>
<p>The proposal shall ensure that 1 personal locker is provided for each (non-residential) bike parking space. Assuming at least 4 bicycle spaces can be</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>The Stantec RTS adequately addresses these comments. Updated Architectural plans have been provided displaying two ambulant DDA bathrooms with showers located at Level 1 within the commercial tenancy.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>provided for the non-residential component, it would then be required that at least 1 shower and change cubicle is provided.</p> <p>The TA does not provide an assessment on the end of trip facilities. The architectural plans do not seem to have end of trip facilities annotated. The applicant shall provide an end of trip facilities assessment and clarify proposed provisions of lockers, shower and change cubicle with reference to DCP requirements.</p>		<p>Four lockers are also provided between the two ambulant DDA bathrooms, satisfying the DCP provisions. An end of trip facility is not considered necessary for the residential component of the development as each dwelling will have bathroom, shower and storage facilities. Section 4.3 of the Transport Accessibility Impact Assessment (TAIA) has been updated and can be viewed at Appendix 21 of the Amendment Report.</p>
<p>Per Provision P15 of Section 2.5.10 of the DCP, it is required that mixed use developments where there are more than 4 dwellings within the development shall incorporate car wash bays. The TA does not provide indication of the provision of car wash bays. The architectural plans does not seem to show any car wash bays. Hence, the proposal does not comply with the DCP's car wash bay requirements.</p> <p>The applicant shall incorporate car wash bays to comply with Clause P15 Section 2.5.70 of the DCP</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>As referenced within the Traffic Engineer response (Appendix D8) the consolidated conditions of SSD-9579 do not specify the need for wash bays, therefore in accordance with said conditions no wash bays have been provided.</p>
<p>Per Provision P3, Section 10.4 of the DCP, it outlines that "developments containing more than 60 dwellings must provide at least 1 service delivery space, capable of accommodating at least (a) 1 HRV or (b)2 MRVs". Application of the above requirement on the proposed yield of 130 dwellings results in a requirement of 1 HRV loading bay or 2 MRV loading bays.</p> <p>The TA outlines that the Site will be sharing the dedicated loading dock on ground level which can be accessed off Clarke Lane which will be delivered as part of the Crows Nest Metro Station works. It states that the loading dock has been designed to accommodate 2 SRVs and 1 MRV simultaneously. The TA states that the proposed loading dock is considered to be sufficient for the servicing requirement of Site B.</p> <p>The proposal does not strictly comply with the requirements of the DCP. However, noting the TA states that the proposed shared loading dock would be sufficient for waste, removalist and maintenance activities, Council's Traffic Engineers raise no objection.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>Noted, no response from applicant required.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>The TA's traffic generation assessment does not seem to address the traffic generated from the retail/commercial component of the development. This should be clarified.</p> <p>The applicant is to follow the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024 which states in Appendix E that a Transport Impact Assessment are to provide the number of trips generated to/from the development by mode. The current Transport Impact Assessment only provides for private vehicle trips. The applicant should explore other modes of transportation including active transport and public transport trip generation.</p> <p>The applicant is to provide a multimodal network impact assessment. This means not just private vehicle trips, but also public and active transport impact assessments. The applicant should refer to Chapter 6 of the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment 2024 for further details.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>The Traffic Engineer response (Appendix D8) notes that the original TAIA was prepared prior to release of the 2024 Guide. In accordance with the Guide 2024, when adopting the commercial (office) trip rates of 1.69 vehicle trips per 100m² GFA in the weekday morning peak and 1.20 vehicle trips per 100m² GFA in the weekday afternoon peak, the non-residential component of the development is estimated to generate approximately six vehicle trips in the morning peak hour and four vehicle trips in the afternoon peak hour.</p> <p>Stantec note however, that given the small GFA of the non-residential component. The intention for it to be ancillary to the development and support surrounding land-uses, location at a major public transport node and the fact that all on-site parking spaces are to be allocated to residents, minimal traffic generation during the road network's peak periods is expected. A Multimodal assessment has been provided within the updated TAIA at Appendix 21 of the Amendment Report.</p>
<p>The applicant shall confirm whether the design complies with Clause 3.5 of AS2890.1:2004 which highlights that the storage area shall be designed to accommodate the 98th percentile queue. Per this standard, the proposal must provide sufficient vehicle storage to ensure that queues of vehicles awaiting service by the car lifts do not extend beyond the property boundary under normally foreseeable conditions' E.g. The on-street area highlighted in yellow should not be used for queue storage to comply with AS2890.1:2004.</p> <p>The applicant needs to provide more details on how they would plan to manage a situation where the leftmost car lift has a car coming out at the same time a car is driving into the driveway which would result in cars blocking each other.</p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>As referenced within the Traffic Engineer response (Appendix D8) the car lift pit had been constructed as part of the Crows Nest Metro works, additionally the entrance is setback approximately 4m from the site boundary. This does not allow the storage of a B99 design vehicle wholly within the site, if a B99 design vehicle were to wait in front of the car lift the entire width between the entry and Clarke Lane will be required not allowing a car exiting from the southern car lift to pass the waiting vehicle.</p> <p>Therefore, to avoid car lift entry conflict and as to not obstruct pedestrian flow along the Clarke Lane frontage, cars must wait on Clarke Lane and give way to the vehicle exiting the site. The amended TAIA provided at Appendix 21 of the Amendment Report, indicates that 98th percentile queue length during the afternoon peak will be two vehicles, whereas the 93rd percentile will be only one vehicle. It's important to note that this queue length includes vehicles within the system, therefore the likelihood of vehicles queuing to enter the site is very low if both car lifts are operational.</p> <p>As per the Car Parking Strategy and Management Plan, if only one car lift is available, the 98th percentile queue will increase to four vehicles. In this event, where two vehicles must stop along Clarke Lane and give way to exiting vehicles, it is noted that directly adjacent to the driveway for the car lift along</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		Clarke Lane kerbside restrictions in the form of no parking are in place. This free space can be utilised by waiting vehicles as vehicles are permitted to stop in no parking zones for up to two minutes. Appendix D8 shows that a B99 design vehicle can traverse around a waiting vehicle on Clarke Lane.
<i>The applicant should confirm no on-street spaces will be lost as a result of the proposal. Alternatively, clarify any loss of on-street parking spaces.</i>	North Sydney Council	The Traffic Engineer response at Appendix D8 confirms that no loss of existing on-street parking spaces will occur as a result of the proposal.
<i>It is understood that the loading dock does not strictly comply with the requirements of Clause P3 Section 10.4 of the DCP. Instead, it is noted that the loading dock would be capable of accommodating 2 SRVs and 1 MRV simultaneously. Swept paths for these vehicles associated with the loading dock should be contained in the TA.</i>	North Sydney Council	The loading dock was designed and delivered as part of the Crows Nest Metro Station works. The over-station development does not hold any responsibility for the design of this space, refer to Appendix D8 for further commentary.
<i>Per the Vehicular Servicing Management Plan prepared by Stantec dated 9 September 2024, it states that the vertical clearance of the loading dock is 4.2m which does not comply with AS2890.2:20L8 which requires a minimum 4.5m headroom for an MRV. This shall be reviewed by the applicant.</i>	North Sydney Council	The loading dock was designed and delivered as part of the Crows Nest Metro Station works. The over-station development does not hold any responsibility for the design of this space, refer to Appendix D8 for further commentary.
<i>Cumulative construction impacts should be considered in the preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan if there are surrounding properties also being developed per SEARs requirements.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<i>Hours of construction should align with North Sydney's standard construction hours which can be found on North Sydney Council's website and shown below.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Standard construction hours</p> <p>Monday to Friday 7am - 7pm (for B3 Commercial Core and B4 Mixed Use) 7am - 5pm (for all other zones)</p> <p>Saturday 8am - 1pm</p> <p>Sunday No work permitted</p> </div>		



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<i>North Sydney Council does not support the utilisation of vehicles greater than 12.5m Heavy Rigid Vehicle due to public safety. Hence, a 19m articulated vehicle for construction is not supportable.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<i>Construction vehicles shall not utilise North Sydney LGAs' local roads located within school zones during school zone hours for safety.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<i>The applicant shall ensure swept paths and Traffic Guidance Schemes are prepared with the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan as part of a future submission.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<i>Consideration should be given to installing the works zone on roads with lower traffic volumes as opposed to Pacific Highway. A works zone on Pacific Highway should be restricted to short term works only and outside of peak hour to minimise impacts. Traffic Guidance Schemes are to be prepared accordingly as part of the detailed Construction Traffic Management plan.</i>	North Sydney Council	Noted and to be implemented as part of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
<p><i>As a result of the above issues, Council's Traffic Engineers do not support the proposal in its current form. However, should this matter be approved, the following requirements are requested:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. That a Construction Management Plan be prepared and submitted to Council for approval by the North Sydney Traffic team prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate. Any use of Council property shall require appropriate separate permits/ approvals.</i> <i>2. All parking provisions must comply with the latest versions of the Australian Standards: AS 2890.1 for off-street car parking, AS 2890.6 for off-street parking for people with disabilities, AS 2890.3 for bicycle parking, and AS 2890.2 for off-street commercial vehicle parking. The car park and loading dock design (including any modifications to the original design) must be reviewed and approved by a suitably qualified person and submitted for approval to the satisfaction of the Certifying Authority.</i> <i>3. That a condition be imposed on the determination stating that Council will not consider any future requests for 'No Parking' restriction benefitting this development.</i> 	North Sydney Council	Noted, it is expected that the Department will condition these matters accordingly.
Waste Management		



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p><i>It is noted that this site will need onsite servicing, which is not what is proposed in the submitted Waste Management Plan. As such, it is strongly recommended that the waste management plan and facilities in this proposal be amended to meet the following conditions:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The bin storage room must be large enough to fit 5 x 1100L/8 x 660L compacted waste bins + L0 x 1100L/23 x 660L recycling bins. Note: the property must purchase 1100L/660L bins.</i> <i>2. Servicing once per week. The bin room must be designed to access 1100L/660L bins'</i> <i>3. The property is to be serviced by onsite council collection using Council's 12.5m HRV with a height clearance of 4.5m. Note: Applicant is to ensure sprinkler heights and service ducts are taken into consideration. Swept path for a 12.5m HRV with a 4.5m height clearance is to be provided for the loading dock. Gradient needs to be even to ensure truck is not affecting the service ducts or the roof of the internal driveway, cross over, or entry/egress points.</i> <i>4. Properties with a lift must have a garbage chute and 240L recycling bin on each level or dual waste/recycling chutes.</i> <i>5. Space must be provided for a 120L food waste bin on each level.</i> <i>6. There needs to be bulky waste storage area to hold household clean up material. This should be separate from the garbage room.</i> <i>7. The door width for the bin room and bulky waste room must be 1.5m'</i> <i>8. Commercial bins must be separate from residential bins</i> <p><i>Objection is therefore raised to the current proposed collection method/waste management plan, and if approval is contemplated the developer should liaise with Councils Waste Operations Team to ensure an acceptable outcome as outlined above.</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>An updated Operational Waste Management Plan has been provided at Appendix 15 of the Amendment Report that addresses Council's requirements.</p>

Social Impact and Affordable Housing



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p><i>An underlying assumption in the SIA is that the social locality is generally well serviced with social infrastructure. It notes that:</i></p> <p><i>This includes health, schools, childcare and a network of open space (see later comments).</i></p> <p><i>There is a need for an additional primary school in the area - when you look at the catchment of primary and high schools being across the LGA and beyond and projected growth rates, in fact there is a need for 2 primary schools and a high school that services North Sydney.</i></p> <p><i>Disadvantaged community members, such as those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, people with mental health issues, people experiencing homelessness and the elderly will likely experience negative impacts to a higher degree due to the vulnerabilities they experience in their lives. However, none of these groups are disproportionately represented within the social locality. This assumption is not correct and is not considering the true extent of social issues occurring. The housing crisis in New South Wales and the lack of affordable housing in Crows Nest and North Sydney is not simply solved by boosting housing supply. More on this issue in the next section.</i></p> <p><i>New community infrastructure for a range of community facilities and services generated by the project, will increase demand, but it states that “for the majority of service categories, the existing facilities in proximity to the site have capacity to absorb the impacts of the project, without additional services being required”. This assumption is not correct and is not considering the true extent of social issues occurring. More on this issue in the next section.</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>A detailed response to the issues raised regarding the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is provided by Griffith Planning at Appendix D9.</p> <p>The response notes that Council’s statement concerning assumptions of the SIA are incorrect. The SIA does not assume that the Site locality is well serviced with social infrastructure. The SIA had sought to establish the impact of the proposal on existing social infrastructure in the social locality. It presents the findings of research into the social infrastructure available at time of writing the SIA. It is the research rather that demonstrates that the social locality is generally well serviced with infrastructure.</p> <p>Council’s comments pertaining to the need for two primary schools and a high school to service the needs of the LGA are also challenged. Reviewed referenced document prepared by NSW Teachers Federation does not identify the specific needs for additional educational establishments in the LGA. It is also noted that regardless, the Department’s SIA Guideline makes clear that it is not the responsibility of the SIA to predict the School needs of the North Sydney LGA, rather that focus only be applied to the needs of schools and associated impacts as a result of the proposal. This has been examined in the SIA.</p> <p>With reference to Council’s position on disadvantaged communities and peoples within the locality being subject to experiencing negative impacts to a higher degree due to their vulnerability, Griffin Planning concurs. Griffin Planning also states that this is consistent with the conclusions presented in the SIA (Page 40). Council also claims that the SIA makes an assumption that the subject groups are not disproportionately represented in the social locality, this is also challenged. Data reviewed from the ABS 2021 Census clearly indicates that these groups aren’t disproportionately present in the social locality.</p> <p>It is also noted that the SIA does not in any way state that solving the housing crisis and lack of affordable housing in Crows Nest and North Sydney is not simply solved by boosting housing supply.</p>
<p>Social Impacts in and around Crows Nest</p>		



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p><u>Childcare</u></p> <p><i>North Sydney Council's Social inclusion Study, Family and Children's Services Strategy, 2018-2024, and North Sydney Council's Family and Children's Issues Survey, 2022, discuss childcare key social impacts and conclude that the following are issues:</i></p> <p>Accessibility and Affordability: <i>There is a need for more accessible and affordable childcare services to support working families and ensure children receive early education and care.</i></p> <p>Quality of Services: <i>Emphasis on maintaining high standards in childcare services to promote child development and well-being. In 2022 Council undertook a survey of parents and carers in its child care buildings. When parents at these centres were asked: Do you have sufficient access to the childcare services you need? 20% said that they didn't. When they were asked: Do you think that childcare services are offered at a sufficiently high-quality standard? 21% said that they did not. Child care considerations such as the cost, lack of equal access, and quality early childhood education are critical factors in the wellbeing of children and families. Research by UNTCEF found Australia ranked 32nd out of 38 OECD countries on child wellbeing.</i></p> <p><i>The issue for families seeking childcare include finding affordable care for a child aged 0-to-2-years, and child care being a cost-of-living pressure on families, especially if parents have more than one child in care. In general, services that run from council buildings, have more affordable fees. Over half the child care services in and around Crows Nest/ St Leonards/ North Sydney are run privately.</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>A detailed response to the issues raised is provided by Griffith Planning at Appendix D9.</p> <p>It is agreed that there is a growing need for childcare services throughout Greater Sydney, inclusive of the North Sydney LGA. It is however important to note that the data provided by Council pertaining to childcare needs relate to the whole of the North Sydney LGA, the SIA is concerned with the needs of the social locality being Crows Nest, Greenwich, St Leonards, Wollstonecraft, Naremburn and the Royal North Shore Hospital. It is also important to note that Council's submission appears to be generally consistent with the finding of childcare availability presented in Section 4.3.1 of the SIA.</p>
<p><u>Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) Backgrounds</u></p> <p><i>There is a lack of support for the multicultural community with no specifically funded multicultural service in the vicinity. Issues for this community include:</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>A detailed response to the issues raised is provided by Griffith Planning at Appendix D9.</p> <p>The SIA notes that when compared to the Greater Sydney Region, the social locality has an average proportion of population born overseas and below</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Language Barriers: <i>Addressing language barriers through translation services and bilingual support to ensure CALD communities can access services and participate in community life.</i></p> <p>Cultural Sensitivity: <i>Promoting cultural awareness and sensitivity in service provision to respect and accommodate diverse cultural practices and needs.</i></p> <p>Limited Meeting Spaces: <i>To undertake community interactions, workshops, gathering and social occasions.</i></p>		<p>average proportion of people who speak a language other than English at home, also stating that these groups are slightly higher represented in the social locality when compared to the North Sydney LGA. While it is noted that there are no specific funded multicultural services in the vicinity of the project, the SIA does outline that there services for CALD communities at the nearby Crows Nest Community Centre which offers English conversion classes, homework help, employability workshops, Japanese and Spanish speaking mothers groups, Chinese seniors groups, Persian morning tea and a Bollywood music group. This space also has meeting spaces, as to does the recently opened St Leonards Library located in the Lane Cove LGA. It is considered that this provided adequate meeting spaces in the social locality.</p>
<p>People with Mental Health Issues: <i>13% of North Sydney residents report mental and behavioural issues, slightly higher than the NSW average of 72.6% and the highest of any LGA across northern Sydney². There have been more and more mental issues identified by workers within networks. Issues include the need for:</i></p> <p>Support Services: <i>Increasing the availability of mental health support services, including counselling and crisis intervention, to address the growing mental health needs.</i></p> <p>Stigma Reduction: <i>Initiatives to reduce stigma associated with mental health issues, encouraging more people to seek help and support.</i></p>	North Sydney Council	<p>The ability of the proponent to make meaningful contribution to the addressing of mental health issues in the LGA is questioned, other than the fact that the proposal is adequately located in relation to access to mental health services and transport.</p>
<p>People Experiencing Homelessness <i>Homelessness remains a social issue in North Sydney and Council has a role to play in ensuring that no one is overlooked. The reports of homelessness in 2024 continued to increase with people sleeping rough, sleeping in cars and sleeping in parks and in public places. To summarise services needed:</i></p> <p>Housing Solutions: <i>Developing affordable housing options and emergency shelters to provide immediate relief and long-term solutions for homelessness.</i></p>	North Sydney Council	<p>The project will contribute to affordable housing through the provision of Specialist Disability Accommodation (SDA) on Site B. A draft Planning Agreement has been prepared in this regard and is currently under consideration by DPHI.</p>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Support Programs: <i>Implementing support programs that help with employment, healthcare and social services to help individuals transition out of homelessness.</i></p>		
<p>The Elderly <i>In Crows Nest alone, the percentage increase between 2016 and 2021 of people aged over 65 years old was 29.9%. A flaw of the SIA in comparing aged population figures is not to account for the fact that outside of Crows Nest, in the North Sydney LGA, there is James Mason Village (North Sydney) exclusively housing older people and Greenway Social Housing (Kirribilli) dominated by older people. Crows Nest's older population has been increasing and needs to be able to:</i></p> <p>Age in place: <i>Supporting initiatives that allow elderly residents to buy into age-appropriate developments, with communal spaces, so that they can age in place with dignity and in-home care services.</i></p> <p>Social Inclusion: <i>Creating opportunities for social engagement and community participation to combat isolation and loneliness among the elderly.</i></p>	North Sydney Council	<p>The SIA notes, and is consistent with Council comments, that there has been a recent substantial increase in older people within the social locality and the North Sydney LGA. Council's commentary that the SIA ought to consider the impact of the proposal on elderly people within Milsons Point and Kirribilli is not supported, these are located approximately 3kms from the site and not within the social locality. Given the nature of the proposal, it is not expected that impacts will be observed within Kirribilli and Milson Point, it is also noted that these suburbs possess multiple services including social groups for the elderly run from the North Sydney Community Centre.</p> <p>It is supported that ageing in place should be a supported initiative. It is considered that the proposal provides adequate quality accommodation in a building that offers communal spaces and is close to public transport and support services.</p>
<p>Open Space <i>Crows Nest has been identified as an area lacking in sufficient open space. When comments have been garnered from the community, it has highlighted that the improvements needed include an increase of playgrounds/parks in the area.</i></p>	North Sydney Council	<p>As noted within the SIA the project is subject to a VPA between North Sydney Council, Sydney Metro and the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces made on the 16 June 2021. This agreement establishes that a monetary contribution for Site B of \$2,265,601.63, the contribution may be used by North Sydney Council to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>acquire land for the provision of public facilities or open space or</i> ▪ <i>attend to the embellishment of land for public facilities or open space or</i> ▪ <i>care for and maintain facilities or open space or</i>



TABLE 5: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY COUNCIL		
Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for another public purpose within the North Sydney Local Government Area which the Council considers suitable. (my emphasis) <p>It is considered that the above contribution will enable Council to go some way to addressing the community's concerns in relation to open space.</p>
<p><u>Council's role in Affordable Housing</u> <i>Affordable rental is housing that can be rented by very low or low- or moderate-income households for no more than 30% of household income. Council has concerned itself with the need for affordable housing through a number of measures, including on a regular basis to engage Judith Stubbs and Associates to undertake an Affordable Housing Strategy and Reviews of the Housing Market (2008, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2022) There is both a positive obligation focus of producing more low-cost housing as well as mitigating against the loss of affordable housing and strengthening the Social Impact Assessment processes to assess the loss of and protect the existing supplies of affordable housing. Stubbs's 2019 Report found that:</i></p> <p><i>"Since the affordable housing program began in 1984, at least 2,400 affordable bed spaces have been lost in the LGA".</i></p> <p><i>She further noted that:</i></p> <p><i>"Considering only the maintenance of 2016 levels of affordable housing within North Sydney LGA, the following targets will need to be met between 2016 and 2036:</i></p> <p><i>An additional 160 social housing dwellings (7.6% of projected additional dwellings)</i></p> <p><i>An additional 6,200 affordable rental and purchase dwellings (62% of projected additional dwellings) ideally, 15% of the total number of dwellings should be for affordable housing' and dedicated in perpetuity'</i></p>	<p>North Sydney Council</p>	<p>The project will contribute to affordable housing through the provision of Specialist Disability Accommodation (SDA) on Site B. A draft Planning Agreement has been prepared in this regard and is currently under consideration by DPHI.</p>



4.3 STATE AGENCIES

TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>While Airservices does not expect this development to have any impacts on instrument flight procedures (IFP) around the Sydney basin area, based on the location and noted intrusion into Sydney Airport's OLS, it is expected that details of this development and any associated crane operations would be forwarded to Sydney Airport in the first instance.</p> <p>This will enable the correct process to be followed regarding assessments/ approvals as per the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996.</p>	<p>Air Services Australia</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>CASA has no objections to the Development and no issues with the AIA. CASA concurs with the Conclusions (Section 7) and the Recommendations (Section 8) of the AIA.</p> <p>Incidentally, CASA assessed "477-495 Pacific Highway Crows Nest, NSW which is Site B of the Over Station Development" at a height of 158m above AHD under the Aviation (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 on 18 October 2024 and following is CASA's determination:</p> <p>"CASA has determined that the proposed building will not constitute a significant hazard to aircraft operations under the regulation 139.180(l) of the Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998. Accordingly, CASA is not recommending obstacle lighting or marking in this instance."</p> <p>CASA has not assessed cranes yet but has provided recommendations for much taller cranes in the St Leonards area.</p>	<p>Civil Aviation Safety Authority</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>At a maximum height of 158m AHD, the proposed development will penetrate the OLS by approx. 2 metres.</p> <p>If the Department decides to approve the proposed development, we recommend that the following minimum conditions be imposed on that approval, which the Department is entitled to do under r14 (3) of the Regulations.</p> <p>We believe that these conditions are in the interests of the safety, efficiency and regularity of air transport operations at Sydney Airport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the completion of the construction of the building, a certified surveyor is to notify (in writing) the Sydney Airport Manager, Airfield Spatial & Technical Planning of the finished height of the building. • Separate approval must be sought under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1996 for any cranes required to construct the building. Construction cranes may be required to operate at a height significantly higher than that of the proposed controlled activity and consequently, may not be approved under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations, therefore Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct. 	<p>Sydney Airport</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Ausgrid Underground Cables are in the vicinity of the development. 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. It is recommended that the developer locate and record the depth of all known underground services prior to any excavation in the area. The accurate location of cables along</p>	<p>Ausgrid</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>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. <p>The following points should also be taken into consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ausgrid cannot guarantee the depth of cables due to possible changes in ground levels from previous activities after the cables were installed. • Should ground anchors be required in the vicinity of Ausgrid underground cables, the anchors must not be installed within 300mm from the cable, and the anchors must not pass over the top of any cable. <p>Ausgrid Overhead Powerlines are in the vicinity of the development. Ausgrid has distribution overhead assets present along adjacent roadways to the site. 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.</p> <p>It is a statutory requirement that these distances be maintained throughout the construction phase. Consideration should be given to the positioning</p>		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>and operating of cranes, scaffolding, and other potential 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.</p> <p>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 at this instance.</p> <p>The Ausgrid asset relocation works will be at the developer's cost.</p> <p>New Driveways - Proximity to Existing Poles 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.</p> <p>Streetlighting The developer is to consider the impact that existing streetlighting and any future replacement streetlighting and maintenance may have on the development. Should the developer determine that any existing streetlighting may impact the development, the developer should either review the development design, particular the placement of windows, or discuss with Ausgrid the options for relocating the streetlighting. The relocating of any streetlighting will generally be at the developers cost. In many cases is not possible to relocate streetlighting due to its strategic location.</p>		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
FRNSW have reviewed the EIS with particular focus to Section 7.1.16 SEARs Item 16: Hazards and Risks. FRNSW submit no comments or recommendations for consideration, nor any requirements beyond that specified by applicable legislation at this stage.	Fire and Rescue NSW	Noted
The subject site is not listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR), nor is it in the immediate vicinity of any SHR items. Further, the site does not contain any known historical archaeological relics. The Department does not need to refer subsequent stages of this proposal to the Heritage Council of NSW.	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water - Heritage NSW	Noted
Heritage NSW agrees that Aboriginal Cultural Heritage matters were assessed and addressed under the approved Crows Nest Over Station Development (SSD-9579) and the Sydney Metro - Chatswood to Sydenham (SSI-7400) approvals. Heritage NSW recommends that post approval any Aboriginal Cultural Heritage matters are managed in accordance with the approved Construction Heritage Management Plan: Sydney City & South West Metro Crows Nest Station (SSI-7400).	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water - Heritage NSW	Noted
The EIS has been reviewed by NSW DCCEEW Water Group and all requirements have been adequately addressed by the proponent, therefore NSW DCCEEW Water Group has no further comments.	Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water - Water Group	Noted



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Water and Wastewater Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preliminary assessment indicates that water and wastewater servicing should be available for the proposed development. ▪ Amplifications, adjustments, deviations and/or minor extensions may be required. ▪ Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application stage. <p>Next Steps</p> <p>Should the Department decide to progress with the subject development application, Sydney Water would require the following conditions be included in the development consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 73 Compliance Certificate ▪ Building Plan Approval <p>Recommended Development Conditions</p> <p><u>Prior to the issue of an Occupation/Subdivision Certificate:</u></p> <p>Section 73 Compliance Certificate</p> <p>A compliance certificate must be obtained from Sydney Water, under Section 73 of the Sydney Water Act 1994. Our assessment will determine the availability of water and wastewater services, which may require extensions, adjustments, or connections to our mains. Make an early application for this certificate, as there may be assets to be built and this can take some time. A Section 73 Compliance Certificate must be obtained before an Occupation or Subdivision Certificate will be issued.</p> <p>Applications can be made either directly to Sydney Water or through a Sydney Water accredited Water Servicing Coordinator.</p>	<p>Sydney Water</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Go to the Sydney Water website or call 1300 082 746 to learn more about applying through an authorised WSC or Sydney Water.</p> <p><u>Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate/Complying Development Certificate:</u></p> <p>Building Plan Approval (including Tree Planting Guidelines)</p> <p>The plans must be approved by Sydney Water prior to demolition, excavation or construction works commencing. This allows Sydney Water to determine if sewer, water or stormwater mains or easements will be affected by any part of your development. Any amendments to plans will require re-approval. Please go to Sydney Water Tap in® to apply.</p> <p>Sydney Water recommends developers apply for a Building Plan Approval early as to reduce unnecessary delays to further referrals or development timescales.</p> <p>Tree Planting</p> <p>Certain tree species placed in proximity to Sydney Water's underground assets have the potential to inflict damage through invasive root penetration and soil destabilisation. Section 46 of the Sydney Water Act specifies what might occur when there is interference or damage to our assets caused by trees.</p> <p>For any trees proposed or planted that may cause destruction of, damage to or interference with our work and are in breach of the Sydney Water Act 1994, Sydney Water may issue an order to remove that tree or directly remove it and seek recovery for all loss and associated compensation for the removal.</p> <p>For guidance on types of trees that can cause damage or interference with our assets see Sydney Water webpage Wastewater blockages. For guidance on how to plant trees near our assets, see Diagram 5 - Planting Trees within</p>		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Sydney Water's Technical guidelines - Building over and adjacent to pipe assets.</p>		
<p>Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has delegated its rail authority functions in relation to the Sydney Metro City & Southwest rail corridor to Sydney Metro. Therefore, Sydney Metro is the relevant rail authority for the Sydney Metro City & Southwest rail corridor for the purpose of the T&ISEPP.</p> <p>Concurrence of Sydney Metro is not required. As this is an SSD development application, the provisions of section 2.99 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 apply.</p> <p>Section 4.13(2A) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 excludes concurrence or consultation requirements from applying to development applications for SSD, unless an environmental planning instrument requires concurrence or consultation to SSD. As section 2.99 of the T&ISEPP does not require concurrence to be provided in the context of a development application for SSD, concurrence is not required for the SSD.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, in order to ensure the appropriate management and mitigation of the proposed development's impacts on the Sydney Metro City & Southwest rail corridor, Sydney Metro has reviewed the SSD documents that were uploaded onto the NSW Major Projects Portal on 16 November 2024, including having regard to the matters outlined in the T&ISEPP.</p> <p>If the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure determines to grant consent to the SSD, Sydney Metro requests that the following condition be imposed on the development consent.</p> <p>1 Prior to issue of a Construction Certificate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Applicant must provide Sydney Metro a summary of all Over Station Development (OSD) design loads that will be transferred to the corresponding station support elements and so demonstrate that these loads remain within the specified limits for all load cases. 	<p>Sydney Metro</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>This confirmation must be submitted for Sydney Metro review, prior to the commencement of any works. This is required to ensure that the station structure remains capable of supporting the OSD developments on Site B, without adverse impact on the station or its operations.</p> <p>The Certifier must not issue a Construction Certificate for the development until written confirmation has been received from Sydney Metro that this condition has been satisfied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Copies of any certificates, drawings, approvals or documents endorsed by, given to or issued by Sydney Metro must be submitted to Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for its records prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate. 		
<p>TfNSW has reviewed the EIS and provides suggested conditions in TAB A and advisory comments in TAB B, for the consideration of the Department of Planning, Housing, and Infrastructure (DPH&I) in the determination of the application. Please note that this letter should be read in conjunction with the separate submission from Sydney Metro.</p> <p>Tab A - TfNSW Suggested Conditions:</p> <p>1. Civil Works Comment: Civil works on Pacific Highway require the concurrence of TfNSW under section 138 of the Roads Act, 1993.</p> <p><u>Recommended condition:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any changes to the stormwater drainage system on the Pacific Highway are required prior to be submitted to TfNSW for review. The issue of a Construction Certificate and the commencement of any works. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au. 	<p>Transport for NSW</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>b) The developer is to submit design drawings and documentation relating to all internal and external support structures to TfNSW for assessment, in accordance with Technical Direction GTD2020/001.</p> <p>The developer is to pay a permit all-inclusive fee of at least six (6) weeks prior to the commencement of construction and is to meet the full cost of the assessment by TfNSW. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au.</p> <p>If it is necessary to excavate below the level of the base of the footings of the adjoining roadways, the person acting on the consent shall ensure that the owner of the roadway is given at least seven (7) days' notice of the intention to excavate below the base of the footings. The notice is to include complete details of the work.</p> <p>c) Any proposed public utility adjustments/relocation works on the state road network will require detailed civil design plans for road opening/underborning to be submitted to TfNSW for review and acceptance prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate and the commencement of any works. The design plans must also obtain any necessary approvals from the various public utility authorities and/or their agents. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au.</p> <p>d) The developer is required to enter a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) for the abovementioned works in Parts 1 a), b) and c). A plan checking fee and lodgement of performance bond is required from the applicant in to the release of the approved plans by TfNSW.</p> <p>2. Road Occupancy Licence <u>Recommended condition:</u></p> <p>a) A Road Occupancy Licence (ROL) shall be obtained from the Transport Management Centre (TMC) for any works that may impact on traffic flows on the Pacific Highway during construction</p>		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>activities. A ROL can be obtained through https://myrta.com/oplinc2/pages/security/oplincLogin.jsf.</p> <p>3. Green Travel Plan <u>Recommended condition:</u></p> <p>a) Prior to the issue of the first Occupation Certificate, the proponent shall prepare a Green Travel Plan (GTP) in consultation with TfNSW. The NSW Government provides a range of resources to help in the development of a GTP at www.mysydney.nsw.gov.au/travelchoices/html#/support.</p> <p>The Applicant shall submit a copy of the final GTP to TfNSW at development.scc@transport.nsw.gov.au for endorsement, prior to the issue of any Occupation Certificate.</p> <p>4. Construction Impact <u>Comment:</u> Construction vehicle movements need to be managed to mitigate transport network issues and to coordinate with other nearby developments which could create significant cumulative effects.</p> <p><u>Recommended Conditions:</u></p> <p>a) A Construction Pedestrian and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) addressing the criteria in Tab B shall be submitted to TfNSW for review and endorsement prior to the issue of a construction certificate.</p> <p>The Applicant shall submit a copy of the CPTMP to TfNSW at development.ctmp.sip@transport.nsw.gov.au.</p> <p>b) Any works undertaken along the development sites Pacific Highway frontage must have regard for the existing 'Transit Lane' requirements along the development sites Pacific Highway frontage (in so far as it impacts upon the operation of the Hume Street/Pacific Highway signalised intersection).</p>		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>5. Ongoing servicing: <u>Comment:</u> All new developments should be self-sufficient and cater for all loading and servicing on-site. The applicant should not rely on the kerbside restrictions being available for site operations.</p> <p><u>Recommended Condition:</u> a) For the life of the completed development, all servicing of the site including deliveries, waste collection, etc must be undertaken within the development site and not be undertaken from the Pacific Highway frontage of the site.</p> <p>Tab B - TfNSW Advisory Comments</p> <p>1. Construction Impact (CPTMP) <u>Comments:</u> The standard CPTMP requirements include, but not limited to, the following:</p> <p>Site information and building construction plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the development • Construction program and construction methodology • Proposed construction hours • A detailed plan of any proposed hoarding and/or scaffolding • Details of crane arrangements including location of any crane(s) • Location(s) where it is proposed to park construction vehicles • Location of any proposed work zone(s) <p>Access and movement</p> <p>Identify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian and traffic management measures • Haulage routes 		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predicted number of construction vehicle movements and detail of vehicle types <p>Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any potential impacts to general traffic, cyclists, pedestrians and bus services within the vicinity of the site from construction vehicles during the construction of the proposed works; Cumulative construction impacts of projects. Existing CPTMPs for developments within or around the development site should be referenced to ensure that co-ordination of work activities is managed to minimise impacts on the surrounding road network. <p>Mitigation measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to minimise movement delays i.e., Vehicle movements are to be minimised during peak network demand periods; Details of specific measures to ensure the arrival of construction vehicles to the site do not cause additional queuing on public roads; Proposed mitigation measures. Should any impacts be identified, the duration of the impacts and measures proposed to mitigate any associated general traffic, public transport, pedestrian and cyclist impacts should be clearly identified and included in the CPTMP Measures to avoid construction worker vehicle movements. <p>Ongoing activities</p> <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of the monitoring regime for maintaining the simultaneous operation of buses, light rail and construction vehicles on roads surrounding the site. <p>Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation strategy for liaison with surrounding stakeholders, including other developments under construction; 		



TABLE 6: RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY STATE AGENCIES

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the builder's direct contact number to small businesses adjoining or impacted by the construction work and the Transport Management Centre and Customer Journey Planning Contacts for inclusion on the Live Traffic website to resolve issues relating to traffic, public transport, freight, servicing and pedestrian access during construction in real time. The applicant is responsible for ensuring the builder's direct contact number is current during any stage of construction. 		

4.4 PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

TABLE 7: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>I am pleased to provide this submission of support for the project.</p> <p>Following the opening of the world-class Chatswood-Sydenham Metro it has been important develop housing close to the stations along this line to help alleviate Sydney's housing crisis. This development is a positive step towards doing just that.</p> <p>Crows Nest, with its metro station that gets you quickly (just 10 minutes!) into the CBD, lots of commercial real estate and proximity to major arterial roads and freeways, is an ideal location for greater housing. If we can't build housing here, we can't build housing anywhere!</p> <p>This is a well thought out development - it has residential housing, retail and commercial space and car parking all involved. It will not be an aberration in the skyline, with other high-rises in the rough area in St Leonards. I urge you to approve this positive development.</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Noted</p>



TABLE 7: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>Looks great, and makes sense to provide more opportunities to live near a metro station.</p> <p>I realised the setbacks are imposed by the apartment design guide, but considering the housing affordability crisis, it might be make sense to relax that requirement to allow for more units to be built in the location considering the proximity to metro.</p>	Resident	Noted
<p>This development aims to transform Crows Nest into a much better place and therefore deserves support from the wider community.</p>	Resident	Noted
<p>Given the housing supply crisis in Sydney, it is crucial this project be approved as soon as possible. Providing 130 much needed dwellings, directly above the metro site, is a great opportunity. I only wish it was taller / larger and provided even more apartments! Nevertheless, it is crucial it is approved as soon as possible.</p>	Resident	Noted
<p>We strongly object to this proposal for these reasons;</p> <p>1 - Crows Nest / St Leonards offers exceptional connectivity with Metro, heavy rail, and excellent bus services (east west and north south).</p> <p>2 - long term planning for the area which evolved over nearly a decade has emphasised the special opportunity to locate jobs near dwellings in this area, reducing dependence on the private motor vehicle, essential in the age of climate change, and supporting in amenities through careful design, increased open space and services particularly health and education.</p> <p>3 - in our view the sudden shift to prioritise housing through accelerated high rise and increased density to meet a short term political need smacks of desperation. This gravely undermines good long term planning principles and the opportunity for well considered balanced density.</p>	Holtermann Precinct Committee	<p>It is widely recognised that the Sydney Metropolitan area is experiencing a housing crisis. The provision of housing at Site B is entirely in keeping with the planning vision adopted for Crows Nest via the <i>St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan</i>. Further, a Concept State Significant Development Application (SSD-9579) (Concept Approval) was approved in December 2020, which included provision for a mixed use development outcome at Site B, integrated with the Crows Nest Metro Station. The Concept Approval established the planning and assessment framework for all subsequent detailed applications to follow. As has been demonstrated in the EIS, the built form proposed will sit comfortably within the approved building envelope for Site B.</p> <p>It is demonstrated at Section 7.4.2 of the Amendment Report that appropriate setbacks, in keeping with the Apartment Design Guide, can be achieved for adjoining development.</p> <p>As discussed at Section 7.4.1 of the Amendment Report, the proposed development at Site B remains fully compliant with the approved building envelope and retains the setback and height parameters as per the original</p>



TABLE 7: RESPONSE TO PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Matters Raised	Stakeholder	Response
<p>4 - the lack of separation between the subject site and adjacent sites to the south will create an obtrusive canyon effect undermining and overwhelming the fine grain character of Willoughby Road, which gives the area its appeal.</p> <p>5 - inadequate setbacks will compound the canyon effect and limit plantings to offset the heat impact of the building. This will undermine residential amenity.</p> <p>6 - excessive bulk and scale will compromise solar access to the public domain limiting landscaping and open space options.</p>		<p>application. There has been a minor reconfiguration of the rooftop elements however, these changes will result in minimal changes to overshadowing and the overshadowing created by the proposed development will remain within the shadows created by the maximum building envelope.</p>



PART 5 FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Detailed consideration of further environmental assessment as a result of the changes proposed to the development has been undertaken at **PART 7** of the Amendment Report. This consideration has had regard for all changes and updates resulting from the amendments proposed and the response to submissions received. Accordingly, it is not intended that this consideration be repeated within the Submissions Report.



PART 6 UPDATED PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

An updated justification and evaluation of the proposal as a whole, incorporating any relevant issues raised in submissions and the Proponent's response to these issues has been provided at **PART 8** of the Amendment Report. Accordingly, it is not intended that this consideration be repeated within the Submissions Report.



APPENDIX A
UPDATED
PROJECT
DESCRIPTION



PROJECT DESCRIPTION - SSD-61400212

An updated Project Description is provided at **APPENDIX A** of the Amendment Report. Accordingly, it is not intended that this consideration be repeated within the Submissions Report.



APPENDIX B
SUBMISSIONS
REGISTER



SSD-61400212 - SUBMISSIONS REGISTER			
Group	Name	Matters	Addressed
Agencies / authorities	DPHI	Built form	Refer to 4.1
		Amenity	Refer to 4.1
		Wind Assessment	Refer to 4.1
		Affordable Housing	Refer to 4.1
		Design Excellence	Refer to 4.1
		Access and Parking	Refer to 4.1
	Air Services Australia	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	CASA	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	Sydney Airport	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	Ausgrid	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	Fire & Rescue NSW	No objection	No action required.
	DCCEW – Heritage NSW	No objection	No action required
	DCCEW – Heritage NSW	No objection	No action required
	DCCEW – Water Group	No objection	No action required
	Sydney Water	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	Sydney Metro	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
	Transport for NSW	No objection. Administrative recommendation.	Refer to 4.3
SDRP	Built form	Refer to 3.1	
	Landscape	Refer to 3.1	
	Sustainability	Refer to 3.1	
Council	North Sydney City Council	Built Form	Refer to 4.2
		Inadequate setbacks and articulation of shared property boundary and street frontage	Refer to 4.2
		Non-compliant building separation to the adjacent site to the south	Refer to 4.2
		Non-compliant building separation to the site across Clarke Lane	Refer to 4.2



SUBMISSIONS REGISTER

Crows Nest OSD Site B
25 Hume Street, Crows Nest

SSD-61400212

SSD-61400212 - SUBMISSIONS REGISTER			
Group	Name	Matters	Addressed
		Poor interface with adjacent site to the south for carparking levels	Refer to 4.2
		GFA/FSR underestimated due to exclusion of residential corridor spaces	Refer to 4.2
		Landscape and Trees	Refer to 4.2
		Traffic and Transport	Refer to 4.2
		Waste Management	Refer to 4.2
		Social Impact and Affordable Housing	Refer to 4.2
		Social Impacts in and around Crows Nest	Refer to 4.2
Individuals	Resident	Support. Good location.	Refer to 4.4
	Resident	Support. Looks great.	Refer to 4.4
	Resident	Support. Great opportunity.	Refer to 4.4
Community Group	Holtermann Precinct Committee	Jobs rather than housing	Refer to 4.4
		Poor long term planning	Refer to 4.4
		Lack of building separation and inadequate setbacks	Refer to 4.4
		Excessive bulk and scale	Refer to 4.4



APPENDIX C
MITIGATION
MEASURES
TABLE



MITIGATION MEASURES TABLE

Crows Nest OSD Site B
25 Hume Street, Crows Nest

SSD-61400212

An updated Mitigation Measures table is provided at **APPENDIX C** of the Amendment Report. Accordingly, it is not intended that this consideration be repeated within the Submissions Report.



APPENDIX D
SUPPORTING
DOCUMENTS

