

Attachment E

Submissions

From: Sophia Scarpellino <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Sophia Scarpellino
<[REDACTED]> <Sophia Scarpellino <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Saturday, November 15, 2025 10:33:47 AM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the current development application. Considering the housing pressures facing both this area and Greater Sydney, it is vital that new developments prioritise genuinely affordable housing options for both buyers and renters.

For this reason, I strongly believe the proposal should include a minimum of 50% affordable housing, without any time-limited conditions such as a 15-year sunset clause. Affordable housing should be permanent, or alternatively replaced with true social housing that remains publicly owned.

The development should also include a broader mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartments rather than predominantly large or high-end dwellings. This would ensure the project caters to different types of households and helps rebuild the “missing middle” in Glebe, where many young families and middle-income workers can no longer afford to live.

I would also like to raise concerns regarding the proposal’s approach to car parking. Every apartment should include at least one car space, with the option for two. While I understand the City of Sydney’s preference for minimising parking in favour of public transport, this is not realistic for many families. Daily school and childcare drop-offs, weekend travel, family holidays, and the need for properly installed car seats make reliance on hire cars or public transport impractical. Car parking in Glebe is extremely limited during evenings and weekends, and new developments should not add further strain to the existing streets.

As a young family, we are leaving Glebe after ten years because we cannot afford to buy a home here. Increasingly, the area consists of only very wealthy residents, older long-term homeowners, and those in public housing. The middle is disappearing, and this development is a critical opportunity to help restore diversity and affordability.

I urge Council to ensure this project delivers permanently affordable, family-friendly homes, provides a realistic amount of parking, and supports a more balanced and inclusive local community.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Kind regards,

Sophia Scarpellino

From: Apryl Repole <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Apryl Repole <[REDACTED]> <Apryl Repole <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Saturday, November 15, 2025 7:24:07 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: [REDACTED]
Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi Shannon,

I am writing to provide my comments on the referenced proposal (D/2025/1006).

I have concerns regarding the capacity of the surrounding roads, particularly in relation to Leichhardt St and Mary St, Glebe. These streets are already quite narrow and experience a high volume of traffic. I'm worried as additional vehicles associated with the proposed flats would further strain the area and create significant congestion and safety issues.

Lower-density housing options—such as villas or houses—would be far more suitable for this location and would help maintain the livability and residential amenity for the community.

Kind regards,
Apryl

From: Belle Stewart <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Belle Stewart <[REDACTED]> <Belle Stewart <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 11:51:33 AM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Shannon Rickersey,

My name is Belle Stewart, and as a local resident to Stewart Street, Glebe, I would like to comment on this proposal. I have lived on Stewart for over 8 years, and grew up in Glebe and the surrounding areas. I have a young family, with my partner and I both working full time with a 2 year old.

- This project should provide **permanent** affordable housing options to young families and low-middle income earners. There has been an exodus of young families in this suburb due to being priced out by luxury developments. Being a young, working family ourselves, we have seen the cost of living in this suburb rise dramatically and the economic status of the area change from working class to wealthier, upper class residents. As we have lived in this area for a long time, and I have lived here most of my life, there is no other area for us to move our lives to if we get priced out. The community needs to embrace and foster diversity in the types of families and individuals that can afford to live in the area.
- These housing options should not have a 15 year sunset clause, that would make the affordable housing option non-permanent.
- There should be a minimum of one car space per apartment. The parking options in Glebe are already limited, and the council has done very little to combat this or improve parking options. If there is a new large housing development, there should be enough parking to accommodate each new dwelling at a minimum.
- There should be a variation of apartments, such as 1, 2 & 3 bedroom apartments, to attract different types of families to the area.
- Environmentally friendly and sustainable infrastructure should be used during the construction and within the building, to maintain and support the natural flora and fauna of the area.

Thank you for considering my comment. My contact number is [REDACTED].

Regards,
Belle Stewart

From: [REDACTED]

Sent on: Monday, November 24, 2025 6:41:37 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Submissions Team,
Ref D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037

I am a resident in [REDACTED] Leichhardt Street, Glebe with 2 other family members. I request my name and address be kept private.

We have 4 areas we request the council addresses.

1. That there is enough permanent and visitor carpark space on site to accommodate the residents. This is due to the fact that the area is already very tight for street parking, and the streets are already narrow.
2. The second vehicle entrance/exit on site as you travel from Glebe Point Rd is in Leichhardt Street after it becomes one way, away from Glebe Point Rd. When the site was an office location, employees would regularly turn towards Glebe Point Rd from that driveway and we had regular near misses as their cars went the wrong way, despite the signage. How are the council and the developers going to ensure that vehicles from 431 Glebe Point Rd do not exit that second driveway in the wrong direction?
3. Further to this point, the council has made a complete mess of the signs on the road in Leichhardt St with arrows painted in both directions. While this is meant for bicycles only, every single day there are multiple cars and trucks that head in the wrong direction. Can the council please return the street to one way for all traffic, including bicycles, and return the markings on the road to that one direction. I fear a serious accident on this road and it will be the fault of the confusing markings and bi-direction for one mode of transport and single direction for another.
4. There must be a clear traffic management plan that does not impact residents and their vehicular access to properties in the Leichhardt St, Oxley St, Stewart St circle. The road is narrow, and the traffic already struggles to manage 2 ways on Leichhardt St between Glebe Point Rd and Stewart St (west end). The council must be involved in approving and monitoring the traffic management plan so there is minimal impact to the local residents. We cannot afford to be locked away from access to Glebe Point Rd for extended periods. Using Mary Street has not been a good option when it was used in the past when the road was dug up for Sydney Water works. Mary St is two-way, narrow and cars parked on it, and a tight, blind corner. If Mary Street is used as an option, traffic must also be managed properly on Mary St between Glebe Point Rd and Leichhardt/Stewart St.

Thank you
[REDACTED]

From: patricia warren <[REDACTED]> on behalf of patricia warren
<[REDACTED]> <patricia warren <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Thursday, November 27, 2025 1:56:09 PM
To: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>; Patricia warren <[REDACTED]>
Subject: D/2025/1006 431 Glebe Point Rd. Glebe - attention Bill MacKay Planning Assessment
Attachments: DA 431 Glebe Point Rod..docx (45.68 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Please see attached response to

D/2025/1006 431 Glebe Point Rd Glebe

Patricia Warren
27.11.25

RE: D/2025/1006

431 Glebe Point Road Glebe

Lot 2 DP 181698

Proposed Development is in a R1 General Residential (Category C) zoned area.

The proposal is for alternations and additions to existing commercial building for use as a residential flat building.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is an aggressive development proposal relying on exemptions following the site's rezoning plus requests for a further exemption on height and an increase in the bulk of the building. The cumulative effect of this development proposal is not consistent with the building's local heritage listing and it is pushing the boundaries by its reliance on exemptions and requests for same.

There are numerous inconsistencies in supporting documents on figures that are critically related to the proposed configuration of the building.

The Traffic Report is poor.

Solar access to a number of units is poor.

Waste management is poor

As it stands, the illusions, discrepancies and conflicts embedded in the supporting documents would make it difficult if not impossible for City of Sydney's planning staff to produce a credible report in support of this proposal.

Additional supporting documents are needed on view lines, and a pedestrian impact statement.

There are serious issues relating to traffic and vibration that must be addressed during construction with follow up post construction investigation and remediation where required.

INTRODUCTION

Originally a pharmaceutical factory, commercial offices and then a sleeping research unit until Abacus Funds Management Ltd received development consent for the residential conversion on 30th November 2004 (D/2004/94) for 59 units. The DA lapsed. The site is zoned R1 General Residential under City of Sydney (Category C).

The site was purchased by the developer for \$39,000,000 with settlement on the 21/12/2021

The estimated cost of the project is \$25,575,059.00

TOTAL excluding capital gain on the purchase price is \$64,575.059

The proposal is for

1 x 2br

25 x 3br

4 x 4br

This equates to an overall average of \$2,152,505.97 PLUS a minimum 25% margin as per industry standards of \$16,143,765.00 bringing the total to \$80,718.824 or a minimum overall average cost/unit of \$2,690.627.00. Costs can expect to escalate prior to marketing.

This proposal is targeting the high quality end of the housing market. The relevance of this is how that targeted market is related to the planning instrument and the exemptions/concessions sought by the developer to realise that market.

SITE, AREA , HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING AND EXISTING USE RIGHTS

The Gross Area of the **Site** is approx. 2,254m² as stated in the Detailed Site Investigation. The Statement of Environmental Effects states the site is 2,413.38. The difference in the reports is 159.38m².

Depending on what document one reads, the Gross Floor **Area** is 6,060m² or 8,000m².

Again, depending on the document read, the existing Floor Space Ratio is 2.48 up to 2.51.1

The site benefits from Existing Use Rights for this FSR. However, it can only proceed if the FSR in the proposed development is less than the existing commercial FSR. Thus the developer is stating there is a reduction of 119m² from the existing FSR to 5,941sqm. To get this figure, the developer is relying on a gross floor area of 2,395.56 and floor space ratio of 2.48 or 2,365 with a floor space ratio of 2.51.1. The developer must reduce the floor area to make the project exempt from the LEPs strict FSR controls. It is imperative that staff determine on what gross floor area is the developer working and the evidence needed to determine the credibility of the that figure!

Typically, in this locality, under R1 planning instruments the FSR is 1:1 or 1.5:1 which would yield between 2,254m² and 3,381m². The developer, by using exemptions under Existing Use Rights is increasing the FSR by a maximum of 75.72% above the standard FSR in the standard residential instrument. This gives insight into the benefit of the exemptions in the buildings rezoning.

The existing height, as stated in the Statement of Environmental Effects is approx. 23.4m. However, based on property data collected from satellite/aerial imagery, the measured roof height of the existing structure is approx. 22m. Elsewhere in documents on this proposal is a stated height of 24.9m. There is a lack of consistency in the height of the building with a maximum different in height of 2.9m. **There needs to be a credible survey of the height of the building.**

Existing Use Rights make the existing height legally compliant. In contrast, the standard planning instrument would allow a maximum height of 12m. However, the proposed alterations increase the height by 1.8m. Elsewhere in the documents the proposed increase is 0.8m and 1.5m.

There needs to be clarification on what height the developer is seeking exemption on and what would be its effects on the final height of the building.. Based on the forementioned data in supporting documents and aerial imagery, this could increase the height of the building to a maximum of $24.9\text{m} + 1.8\text{m} = 26.7\text{m}$. The developer is stating the height will be 25m!

No City of Sydney planning staff can be held responsible/accountable for an assessment of the development proposal unless there is a commonality in the datum point for surveys of the existing site area, gross floor area, floor space ratio and height figures.

LOCAL HERITAGE LISTING AND CONTEMPORARY ADDITIONS ON ROOF TOP TERRACE.

“Introduction of a limited extent of contemporary additions at the existing roof terrace level to complement existing building form and provide additional space to an extent that does not significantly affect neighbouring properties or primary views from the public domain

As it is worded this is a meaningless statement. Any re-configuration of the externals of the building must abide by its LOCAL Heritage Listing, including the existing roof top terrace. As presented the roof terrace post construction diagram is close to 100% more than the existing built form. The proposed structures are clearly visible.

EXEMPTION, UNDER EXISTING USE RIGHTS PROVIDES FOR A SUBSTANTIALLY HIGHER FLOOR SPACE RATIO AND HEIGHT THAN WOULD BE PERMISSIBLE UNDER THE STANDARD RESIDENTIAL PLANNING INSTRUMENT.

THE LACK OF CONSISTENCY IN THE CRITICAL FIGURES ON WHICH THIS DEVELOPMENT RELIES MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR A CREDIBLE REPORT ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. DEFINITIVE LEGAL CONFIRMATION IS NEEDED WITH REFERENCE TO THE DEPOSITED PLAN (DP 181698) AND ASSOCIATED TITLE DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE NSW LAND REGISTRY SERVICES FOR THE AREA OF THE SITE. DEFINITIVE LEGAL CONFIRMATION IS NEEDED FOR THE GROSS FLOOR AREA AND THE EXISTING HEIGHT OF THE BUILDING.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT VIOLATES THE LOCAL HERITAGE LISTING OF THE BUILDING.

CONSTRUCTION INTEGRITY

“Two additional floors were added to the 1947 western portion following its sale in 1985, ostensibly using the same construction, although no construction documentation of this has been sourced to date”

This statement glosses over the fundamental question of the construction integrity of the additional two floors. An independent structural engineer’s certification on the load bearing is warranted, particularly given the declining standards in building that predates the addition of these floors. At a minimum it is an insurance for future buyers of the proposed residential units.

IMPACT ON LIGHT RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

I am unsure about this point but recommend it be clarified as part of the assessment. How, if at all, is the route of the existing light rail related to the building? Will the load of the proposed development affect the tunnel that swings around to its exit point. If so, what engineering is required on the tunnel?

WATER, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE

Stewart Street had major problems with water flowing down. It cost a substantial sum of public monies to rectify the drainage problem. Stewart Street is now ‘dry’

Mary Street has never had a problem with drainage flowing down it. It is imperative that continues during and post construction.

Council needs to monitor the effectiveness of proposed water, sewerage and drainage works for six months, at the developer's expense to make sure there is no repeat of the Stewart Street experience.

SOLAR ACCESS

The developer has acknowledged that the *“site/building orientation limits solar access for some areas which may necessitate alternative strategies to ensure solar access to the required minimum number of units”*. It is difficult to accept this statement given the number of units involved, particularly since I cannot find explicit reference to what ‘alternative strategies’ are proposed. Worse, there are 11 non-compliant units re solar access. This represents 36.67% of the development. Council has identified 15% of apartments receive no direct sunlight 9.00AM-3.00PM in mid winter on 21 June. The developer has challenged the 15% stating it is 7%. 70% of the units receive only a minimum of 2hrs sunlight between 9AM-3.00PM mid winter 21st June.

Building Height Plane and Solar Access

Built as a factory in 1927, there is no overall building height plane that is consistent with a residential development to allow solar access. That requirement is the only safeguard for natural light in a residential zoned area. Solar access to a dwelling is related to an occupant's physical and mental health.

(Whilst on the subject of energy, the developer is asked to **install thermal glazing throughout the entire complex**. The energy saving on this alone will be a strong marketing point.)

THE DESIGN NEEDS TO BE REFIGURED TO PROVIDE DIRECT SOLAR ACCESS TO UNITS FOR THE MAXIMUM MID WINTER INSOLATION.

OVERVIEWING AND BALCONIES

Overviewing

‘The buildings height and position allows opportunity for overlooking to nearby properties as well as the possibility of increases to overshadowing without careful considerations’

I have experienced too much of this, “careful consideration”! It is incumbent upon the developer to prohibit overlooking onto nearby properties, particularly units in 2 Mary

Street. The developer must make explicit what ‘careful consideration’ is. As it stands the statement is meaningless.

THE DEVELOPER MUST PRESENT A VIEW LINE DIAGRAM TO DEMONSTRATE THE EXTENT OF OVERVIEWING FROM ALL ASPECTS IN THE PROPOSAL .

Balconies

“The proposal also includes the extension of balconies beyond the existing envelope on three levels to the northeastern corner of the building. The proposed cantilevered 1.8m wide extensions are located in a discrete location away from the most prominent public (Glebe Point Road) face of the building, facing onto Stewart reserve away from neighbouring residences in order to limit any overlooking/privacy impacts”

The notion of external balconies detracts from the local Heritage Listing and thus opposed. They are highly conducive to overlooking and overshadowing. They increase the bulk and scale of the existing building. Removal of the proposed balconies would inhibit, to an extent the problem of overlooking. To argue that the balconies are only viewing the Stewart Street reserve has no credibility

THE DEVELOPER MUST PRODUCE A VIEW LINE FROM THE PROPOSED BALCONIES AND A VIEW LINE WITHOUT THE BALCONIES TO DETERMINE THE IMPACT OF OVERVIEWING. BALCONES ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE LOCAL HERITAGE LISTING OF THE BUILDING, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE CHANGE IN SYMMETRY THEY IMPOSE. BALCONIES INCREASE THE BULK OF THE BUILDING.

ROOF TOP POOL, SPA.

“Robust structure suggests opportunity for substantial landscape and pool for common outdoor & garden spaces at L3 roof level ‘

The pool and spar are outrightly opposed. Noise rises in a mushroom pattern then falls. Noise carries, particularly with wind the moisture in the air. This development is surrounded by numerous flat/units and terrace dwellings left to be impacted by the noise of those using these facilities.

People are egocentric when it comes to the recreational use of pools. The noise of drunken revellers is appalling at any time/place. Putting time limits on the use of the pool is a madness because (i) people now work 24/7 and (ii) lack of enforcement of time restrictions. Time restrictions are now inequitable with people working as they do now e.g. working across time zones, professional ‘shift workers’.

“Existing Height and FSR non-compliances suggest limited opportunity to expand beyond existing envelope/footprint, but expansion of L4/5 footprints into roof terrace area may be feasible if no impact to neighbouring properties, visual impact from public domain, heritage impact

Any expansion of L4/5 into the roof terrace is not in accordance with any Heritage Listing. The visual impact is blatant as shown in the draft diagram.

THE PROPOSED ROOF TOP TERRACE DEVELOPMENT IS OPPOSED BECAUSE OF THE NOISE SPILL OVER, IMPACT ON THE LOCAL HERITAGE LISTING OF THE BUILDING, AND THE VISUAL IMPACT SOUGHT WITH AN INCREASE IN HEIGHT.

TRAFFIC REPORT

The development is for

2br x 1

3br x 25

4br x 4

Total 30 + 7 tandem spaces adaptable for storage

Council’s planning instruments state the number of parking spaces required as

(c) on land in category C—

(i) for each studio dwelling—0.4 spaces, and

(ii) for each 1 bedroom dwelling—0.5 spaces, and

(iii) for each 2 bedroom dwelling—1 space, and

(iv) for each 3 or more bedroom dwelling—1.2 spaces, and

(v) for each dwelling up to 30 dwellings—0.2 spaces, and

If I am interpreting this correctly then the minimum number of required parking spaces is 42.

The developer is proposing 30 car spaces plus 7 tandem spaces that are adaptable for storage.

Clarification is required as to the maximum number of car spaces required AND can tandem spaces, adaptable for storage be considered car parking spaces under the planning instrument? If 42 spaces are required for Category C land then the development must comply.

Targeted Market and Implication for On-site Car Parking Spaces OR Generated Off-Street Parking

The developer is targeting the high end of the market. Most probably, downsizers from surrounding suburbs, dual-income professionals, wealthy 'parent purchasers' buying for adult children and high income international buyers.

High income households do not rely on an 'integrated transport system' as the Traffic Report is advocating. They do not rely on a single vehicle. At best, the Traffic Report is delusional.

Known behaviour for similar high end units indicates that a household count for

3br is 2 cars

4br is 3 cars

International buyers often 2 cars PLUS A DRIVER PICKUP ROUTINE

To accommodate this would require 63 car spaces for residents i.e. including 1 for the 2br and no space for a pick up routine. This means the proposal is 26 car parking spaces short ($63-37=26$)

These figures signal the significant increase in overflow parking should Council accept the TRAFFIC REPORT per se. That overflow parking will put pressure on Mary Street, Leichardt, and Oxley Streets. Common areas on strata complexes can be expected to be abused, cross overs abused, illegal stopping and friction with existing residents.

Given this development post-dates the neighbouring construction where vehicles/unit were at a different time, can Council charge parking contributions for on street parking?

COUNCIL MUST PREPARE A PARKING REPORT FOR ON STREET PARKING WITHIN CONTEXT OF THE EXISTING ON STREET PARKING PERMITS IN THE ADJOINING AREA. THIS SHOULD RAISE THE VEXATIOUS QUESTION AS TO HOW PARKING PERMITS ARE DISTRIBUTED AND THE DISCRIMINATION AMONGST RESIDENTS IN SO DOING.

Visitor Parking

There is no provision for visitor off street parking nor is there a car wash bay. The assumptions made to circumvent visitor car parking are bizarre and poor and deserving of dismissal.

It is reasonable to expect a high demand for on site visitor car parking spaces. Consider the need for routine pick up drivers, daily cleaning staff, aged care and medical carers,

relatives, tradies, daily deliveries, think the digital economy and Uber Eats¹ for example, and occasional sundry professional visits.

Visitors to high end market dwellings do not travel on an integrated transport system nor do they park away from the dwelling, particularly if the targeted market includes the ageing wealthy downsizers as is the case at 501 and 451 Glebe Point Road. It begs the question why at these sites and not at 431 Glebe Point Road?

THE DEVELOPER MUST PROVIDE VISITOR CAR PARKING SPACES.

Accessibility Car Parking

The developer is stating the proposal is for 'adaptable reuse' and is definitely targeting a wealthy clientele. It is reasonable to assume part of that clientele are aged/ageing. There will be anticipated mobility issues. It is a bad reflection on the developer to ignore this issue because the DA's parking plan contradicts the most likely buyer cohort.

The developer presents as being astutely aware of 'adaptable housing' conflicting with 'accessible housing' and thus has deliberately avoided the need to provide for accessibility parking.

Whilst the building is Class 2 and therefore no accessibility parking is required, this proposal for adaptable use from commercial to residential is at a scale that it would be considered a new residential development given the proposed internal reconfiguration. Accessibility parking would be required.

ACCESSIBILITY CAR PARKING SPACES ARE NEEDED

Car Washing Bay

37 cars need a washing bay! That is non-negotiable.

Traffic Generation.

I cannot accept the traffic generation argument that vehicle movement is reduced by - 88vph AM and -62.6vph PM during peak periods. Good research is based on granular data. This is not good research but has relied on a desk top calculation based in guidelines averages. As a former full time resident and now intermittent resident of Mary Street, I can attest to scant vehicular movement into and out of 431 Glebe Point

¹ Mary Street is alive with meal deliveries with scooters parked and racing into 2 Mary Street complex.

Road at any time 1976 to date. Similarly, to accept a mere 6 vehicle trip/hr AM and 5 vehicle trip PM in peak hour from 30 units of the size and 30 + 7 adaptable car spaces warrants staff's forensic review of the Traffic Report.

Perhaps it is the Abacus' lapsed DA that gives insight into how the impact of car parking spaces is better addressed given the presumption that units of 3 and 4 bedroom will have more than 1 car i.e. reconfiguring the DA to provide for 2 levels of basement car parking? This would overcome the problems of multiple cars/unit, visitor car parking, accessibility car spaces and a car wash bay?

Pedestrian Traffic

There is no pedestrian impact statement in the documents. This must be done given the density of neighbouring development and thus the pedestrian traffic generated, particularly in Leichardt Street where Mary and Stewart Street merge pedestrian traffic in Leichardt Street to flow to and from Glebe Point Road.

THE DEVELOPER MUST PRODUCE A PEDESTRIAN IMPACT STATEMENT

CONFLICT BETWEEN ADAPTABLE RE-USE AND ACCESSIBILITY

There appears to be numerous non-compliant door widths, circulation spaces needed for accessibility issues requiring substantial redesign of the proposal.

ENTRY AND EXIT TO THE COMPLEX

The proposal provides for an entry/exit for the waste vehicle as per the map provided. What restrictions is the developer providing if he will only let the mini waste vehicle to use that exit and thus prevent other vehicles from using it?

My question is why can't the exit be used by all vehicles to disperse traffic movement?

Consideration needs to be given for the proposed exit for the mini waste vehicle to be used for all vehicles.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Waste Management raises additional concern. Is the City of Sydney Council setting a precedent by potentially approving for a mini waste contractor to collect waste from private residential property by driving onto the property for said pick up?

The mini contractor's van is exactly 6.4m long but I am uncertain how high it has to raise the collection arrangement on the vehicle to pick up the garbage bins? Perhaps the clearance would be 4m? A 2.6m clearance is proposed.

Would it not be easier for garbage bins to be wheeled in/out for a normal Council pick up? However, the disadvantage of this would be blocking the two way Leichhardt Street whilst in progress? It already occurs in Mary Street, Stewart Street and Leichhardt Streets!

Waste is to be removed from units via a chute system. This requires a daily swapping of full bins. Will this require a daily pick up of waste? This might be the justification for a daily wheel out, wheel in bin collection? The impact on vehicular movement in Leichhardt Street needs to be considered if there is to be a daily Council collection of waste.

WASTE MANAGEMENT NEEDS TO BE RE-CONSIDERED

TRAFFIC PROBLEMS DURING CONSTRUCTION

There are genuine concerns re traffic/parking during construction which Council is asked to address and notify surrounding residents of those conditions

1. Adequate parking must be made available for tradespersons during construction to avoid the use of cross overs in adjoining residential unit complexes. Tradies are deserving of parking spaces but not at the expense of blocking residents access to their own garages, parking spaces in the surrounding area e.g. Mary Street.
2. There must be a full time traffic controller during the entire construction period. The surrounding development generates a considerable amount of traffic. Mary Street, Stewart Street, Leichhardt Street intersection will be a nightmare for unfettered traffic flow if there is no traffic control. Mary Street in particular will be reduced to a rat run if there is no full time traffic controller.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN/MONITORING POST CONSTRUCTION

It is more than reasonable to assume that the traffic generated from this development will be far greater than in the Traffic Report. This will include both overflow on street parking and volume and density of traffic flows. Council needs to monitor this for say 6 months post construction at the developer's expense. The results need to be the base for parking restrictions and indeed traffic control measures that in all probability will be needed.

CONSTRUCTION NOISE AND OTHER ACOUSTICS

As I have recently had to endure a 2.5year apartment built on the adjoining property, I can assure you there are substantial noise issues that must be addressed as part of the conditions of consent.

1. Screening of the noise from all power tools and machinery.
2. Dust suppression
3. Daily cleaning of surrounding pavements
4. Strict adherence to standard working hours. These hours must include any warming up of machinery and no after hours deliveries.
5. Continuous vibration monitoring must be done during demolition and construction periods. It is imperative that a vibration meter is installed on/in/at 2 Mary Street so that variations in vibration are documented and directly attributable to any damage in/to the complex. This is a precautionary position to prevent any pending disputes about the impact of works.
6. Most important is to have a DILAPIDATION REPORT pre construction and post construction for 2 Mary Street at the developer's expense. Vibration meters must be installed in Mary Street given what is involved in this development.

Loud radios are prohibited on site.....it is irritating to watch tradies having those radios turned up high blast while they have head gear on working on power tools. Worse is to watch tradies leave these radios at high blast whilst they are out of sound of them...so best to prohibit at the beginning.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is an aggressive development. It is heavily reliant on exemptions and requests for exemptions. The supporting documents lack consistency on figures directly related to the reconfiguration of the internals of the existing building. The increase in the height and bulk of the building is not in sympathy with its local heritage listing. The Traffic Report is poor. There are documents that still need to be produced. There are far too many illusions embedded in the supporting documents for the proposal to have credibility.

As it stands the development is opposed.

The developer is asked to reconfigure/redesign the proposal to meet the criticisms in this submission.

Patricia Warren

27.11.25

From: Jordan D <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Jordan D <[REDACTED]> <Jordan D
<[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Friday, November 28, 2025 10:35:24 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Shannon Rickersey,

I am a resident nearby the proposed project 431 Glebe Point Rd, living on adjacent Mary Street.

I support affordable residential redevelopment of this site. A thoughtful project focusing on low-income and social housing, with sufficient parking space for residents and guests would be highly beneficial for our area.

Please consider a large number of social and affordable housing in your development process. A residential development without sufficient affordable/social housing will be strongly opposed and protested by the community here.

Thankyou for your understanding.
Jordan Damir

Sent from my iPhone

Phone [REDACTED]

10/3

28 November 2025

City of Sydney Council
GPO Box 1591
Sydney NSW 2001

Document Services

- 4 DEC 2025

City of Sydney

Attention MR Bill Mackay
MANAGER Planning Assessments

OBJECTION TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION - D/2025/1006
431 GLEBE POINT ROAD, GLEBE ; Lot 2 DP181698
BY OWNER LOT 7 - 2 MARY ST GLEBE - [REDACTED]

It is my firm opinion that the specification data provided by the developer in this DA, is inaccurate, incomplete and misleading. Some data is confusing and contradictory. The DA needs to be resubmitted with accurate and precise information so that the public can properly evaluate it. ERRORS and misinformation in the DA benefit the developers exploitation of the site.

My concerns arise because of my doubts about the following matters.

Whilst special exemptions apply to this DA due to the building's previous history this cannot be taken as an exemption to other council building regulations such as Height, overlooking, traffic congestion etc.

There is something seriously amiss about the developer's planned car space numbers. The DA proposes 30 car spaces plus 7 tandem spaces, suggested as being suitable storage spaces. Using Council's own planning requirements a minimum of 41.8 (i.e. 42) car spaces are required; namely 1 x 2 bedroom unit = 1 car space; 25 x 3 bed. units at 1.2 spaces each = 30 car spaces; 4 x 4 bed units at 1.2 spaces = 4.8 spaces; and for each dwelling for 30 units $30 \times 0.2 \text{ spaces} = 6 \text{ car spaces}$. Total minimum car spaces is 41.8 (42).

The developer's DA understates the minimum car spaces required by 5, being 12% less than required. This shortfall is a result of overdevelopment by too many and/or too large proposed units.

The DA states the site area as being "approximately 2,254 m²". My quick and easy phone call to the Valuer-General's Department verified 431 Blake Point Road is 2,415 m². It is hard to understand how the DA's 'Detailed Site Investigation' could be so wrong on such a simple matter.

Current data indicates the existing roof height on the heritage building is 22 metres high. The developer seeks council approval to increase this to 25 metres high. But there is confusion in the DA as to exactly what height increases the developer is seeking. Part of the DA suggests a 1.8m increase in height, elsewhere it is 1.5m and 0.8m. Furthermore, the actual existing height of the building is in dispute. The DA claims it is 24.9m, the Statement of Environment Effect states it is 23.4m. Satellite/aerial measurement puts it at 22m.

If council accepts the developer's claim of 24.9m height and approves a proposed alterations increase in height of 1.8m the new height becomes 26.7m and not the 25m as claimed in the DA. Furthermore, if the real height of the existing building is 22m and the DA is actually requesting a height increase of 0.8m, then the 'smoke and mirrors' discrepancy between two heights is significant, $26.7m - 22.8m = 3.9m$. By slight of hand the developer could potentially sneak in almost 4 metres of extra height.

Nothing stated above suggests deliberate intent by any individual. But there are too many holes in this DA for it to be taken seriously. It must be resubmitted with accurate and verifiable data so that council and the public can assess exactly what is being requested in the DA.

To further heighten my concerns is the nonsense in the DA that the proposed cantilevered balconies on three levels of the North/East corner of the Heritage building are positioned in "a discrete location".... "in order to limit any overlooking/privacy impacts. This claim demands a site inspection by a council inspector to test the veracity of this claim. Sydney is a flood with apartment balconies overlooking main streets, such as Glebe Point Road. So why would any developer claim to position the balconies "away from the most prominent public face" (ie. Glebe Point Rd.). And contrary to the developers claim this also increases the overlooking and privacy impacts on neighbours. Any external balconies, visible from any street view violates the Heritage status of this building and are opposed by this submission. The Traffic Report supporting the DA is also questionable. This is an up market/high end unit development with 25 3 bedroom and 4 4 bedroom units. Standard regulatory calculations for minimum car space requirements fall short of real requirements for elite dwellings. Wealthier residents can be expected to have 2 cars per 3 bedroom units and 3 cars per 4 bedroom unit. On average, investors can be expected to buy 25% of the units for rental purposes, again at the top end of the market. A likely scenario is for 3 high income earners sharing a 3 bedroom apartment with 2 of the 3 owning their own vehicle. The obvious short fall in off-street parking is significant. Nor is there any mention in the DA of providing visitor car space parking - which ought to be at the minimum 2 to 3 spaces above the existing 42 minimum required for this DA.

The proposed 30 units to be built on this site is too many and this submission states this is an over development. The developer should resubmit a DA with less units or smaller units so as to make available more space for cars and less traffic congestion.

Yours Sincerely,

From: Shannon Rickersey <SRickersey@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> on behalf of Shannon Rickersey <SRickersey@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> <Shannon Rickersey <SRickersey@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>>
Sent on: Monday, December 8, 2025 8:16:13 AM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: FW: D/2025/1006 431 GPR Glebe
Attachments: 431GPR DA 2025 1006.docx (14.5 KB), 431 DA 2025 1006.pdf (732.99 KB)

From: Bill MacKay <BMACKAY@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Monday, 8 December 2025 7:57 AM
To: Shannon Rickersey <SRickersey@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Natasha Ridler <NRidler@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: FW: D/2025/1006 431 GPR Glebe

Shannon

FYI

Bill Mackay
Manager
Planning Assessments



Telephone: +612 9265 9494
Mobile: +61 418 611 616
cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au



The City of Sydney acknowledges the Gadigal of the Eora nation as the Traditional Custodians of our local area.

From: Susan Cleary <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, 7 December 2025 11:16 AM
To: Bill MacKay <BMACKAY@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: D/2025/1006 431 GPR Glebe

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Mr Mackay

Please find my comments attached in relation to the DA for 431 Glebe Point Road Glebe.

I have sent my submission to your personal email address as my computer does not recognize the email address given by Planning .

Thank you for your consideration of my submission.

Susan Cleary OAM PSM

Bill MacKay
Manager Planning Assessments
City of Sydney

2 Leichhardt Street
Glebe 2037 NSW
7 December 2025

Dear Mr Mackay

Re: D/2025/1006 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE

I refer to the above DA for 431 GPR and wish to make the following comments.

Proposed Terraced Rooftop Recreation Area

There is a proposed rooftop recreation area which will have a noise impact on my property. Whilst I understand the need for such recreation areas given the proposed adaptive reuse of the building, from previous experience with uses made of the lower Terraced area I know only too well the noise impact from the use of the area for recreational activities.

You might recall that a DA D/2011/1624 was lodged with the City of Sydney to create a recreation area on the rear roof top. As a result of submissions made in response to this DA approval was given to the DA with conditions which included a set back from the south eastern boundary and hours of operation. I attach a copy of the approval dated 19 January 2012.

I would therefore ask that the DA be reviewed to ensure sufficient noise abatement procedures are in place to protect the amenity of adjoining properties.

Parking: Ingress to and Egress from the Building

The DA proposes that parking will be provided in the existing basement area which has been used for parking previously. However with previous uses of the building both the ingress to the building and egress from the building have been via the main parking entrance to the building in Leichhardt Street adjacent to 2 Leichhardt Street. As Leichhardt Street at this point is one way cars have been required to drive along Leichhardt Street and up Oxley and Stewart Streets to exit the area. This has acknowledged the fact that for cars to use the much smaller entrance/exit point in that part of Leichhardt Street which is two way is quite dangerous. At this point there is incoming traffic from Glebe Point Road, traffic exiting from Stewart Street and traffic exiting from Mary Street. This situation alone is quite challenging at times without having cars exiting from 431 GPR onto Leichhardt Street.

I understand why this solution has been proposed as it causes much less inconvenience to residents of 431 GPR. However it is dangerous. I don't know what the solution is but if the developer persists with this solution for exiting traffic from 431GPR then their needs to be a solution to further increasing the traffic chaos which currently exists at this point.

Thank you for consideration of my submission.

Susan Cleary OAM PSM

VI

Susan Cleary

From: "Maryann Bonett" <mbonett@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Date: Thursday, 19 January 2012 2:54 PM
To: <[REDACTED]>
Subject: S Cleary & R Armstrong - NOD Decision - D/2011/1624
 19 January 2012
 Ms S Cleary and Dr R S Armstrong
 [REDACTED] u

Site: 431 Glebe Point Road , GLEBE NSW 2037
Proposal: Works to rear roof top terrace of Level 5 to create recreation area. including landscaping works and a new canvas shade structure extending from the rear eastern wall of the existing meeting rooms on Level 5.
DA No: D/2011/1624

Dear Sir/Madam

I refer to your submission about the above application. The matters you raised were considered in assessing the application. The application was **approved** under Council delegation subject to conditions of consent. Amongst others, the following conditions have been included in the Notice of Determination regarding the use of the terrace area following completion of works:

- A setback of at least 1 metre be provided to the south-eastern boundary of the terrace to restrict persons being able to access this area. This is to be in the form of a balustrade or landscaping works.
- The hours of operation for use of the terrace is restricted to between 8.00am and 8.00pm, Monday to Friday
- The terrace area is only to be used for activities associated with the approved use of the building. It is not to be rented out for events and functions not associated with the building
- Should any complaint be received by Council from a place of different occupancy (including commercial premises) and the complaint is substantiated by a Council Officer, the use of area concerned must cease operation until "attenuation works" are carried out so as that the premises complies with the relevant noise conditions.

The final decision, including any conditions, is available online at the City's website www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/DASearch. A copy of the planning report by the Council officers, which assessed the proposal and the issues raised in the submissions is also available on the website.

However if you would like to purchase a copy please visit Council at one of the following locations:

CBD/One Stop Shop Town Hall House Level 2, 456 Kent Street Sydney; Kings Cross Neighbourhood Service Centre 50-52 Darlinghurst Road Kings Cross; Glebe Customer Service Centre, 186 Glebe Point Rd, Glebe; Redfern Neighbourhood Service Centre 158 Redfern St Redfern.

If you would like to speak directly to a Council planning officer about this decision, you can contact **Kris Walsh** on ph. 9246 7892, or by email at krwalsh@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours faithfully

BILL MACKAY
 Manager – Planning Assessment

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the

From: Matt Sheumack <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Matt Sheumack <[REDACTED]> <Matt Sheumack <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Monday, December 8, 2025 12:50:24 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey
Attachments: DA 431 Glebe Point Rd_D2025_1006_Response_MS.pdf (341.29 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi Shannon,

Please find attached my submission in response to the DA lodged for the redevelopment of 431 Glebe Point Road (D/2025/1006)

If you need additional clarification, or require this in a different file format, please reach out via email.

Thanks and Regards,
Matt

Matt Sheumack
Owner: Unit 13 2 Mary Street Glebe, 2037

Ref: D/2025/1006

431 Glebe Point Road Glebe

Lot 2 DP 181698

dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Shannon Rickersey

Overview

This document raises concerns (“objections”) to the proposed conversion of the former Woolcock Medical institute at 431 Glebe Point into Premium 3 and 4 bedroom apartments. These concerns and observations arise from 17 years owning and living at 2 Mary St: in the immediate vicinity of this proposed redevelopment, and having experienced some of the negative impacts from previous nearby construction and renovation projects.

It also raises issues with the proposed design and the disconnect between council requirements and some of the inputs and assumptions used in modelling, and the reality of the living in the area.

More general questions and concerns are also raised, where the documentation appears incomplete, self-contradictory, or unclear.

Traffic Management during Construction:

A redevelopment of this scale, in this location, with this level of street constraint, has substantial potential to replicate past failures unless strict controls, monitoring, communication, and enforcement mechanisms are imposed from the outset. Past incidents on Mary Street include:

- cars blocked in or blocked out of garages
- trades vehicles obstructing emergency access
- illegal street closures from heavy vehicles
- inappropriate behaviour from traffic management workers (including verbal abuse from traffic controllers who were not physically in the location where they expected vehicles to stop).
- elderly residents and medical workers unable to leave for appointments or shifts
- both accidental and malicious property damage during previous works
- multiple verbal disputes escalating to physical altercation
- issues with having post-development dilapidation acknowledged, accepted, and rectified.

Note that these are real historical events, not theoretical risks.

The intent is not blanket opposition to this development. It to impose a requirement on the project that is that all known historic risks be acknowledged and addressed:

- Those disruptions that are unavoidable must be managed transparently, and that the burden of coordination, communication, and impact-reduction sits with the developer, not the existing residents.
- A clear and transparent escalation path be established by which owners can report problems, violations, and unanticipated issues be handled efficiently, professionally and courteously. Contact details need to be publicly signposted and provided to nearby buildings. These must be active at any time that work is happening at the site, including before and after office hours and on weekends.

Construction traffic will cause significant disruption unless managed at an unusually high standard. Mary Street cannot safely accommodate construction vehicles stopping or staging. Past experience with much smaller scale redevelopments and renovations have demonstrated that trades and deliveries routinely block garages, double-park, or idle in the road, creating major delays for people trying to enter or exit their properties.

A project of this scale requires continuous traffic control, strict prohibition of worker parking on Mary Street, and enforced routing plans for every heavy vehicle movement. Any deviation immediately gridlocks the street. Therefore:

- Notification protocols for closures, crane lifts, and partial blockages must be mandatory with a published escalation path and fixed response times.
- A minimum of one full-time traffic controller must be stationed sufficiently nearby to Mary Street to actively manage residents, trades, deliveries and all other vehicular traffic, for the entire duration of the project.

Eliminating the risk of confrontation and violence:

I will preface this by categorically stating that employees and subcontractors on building sites are generally fantastic people who are there to do a job and get back to their families – just like everybody else. But it only takes one who isn't. It has happened before. This is wording to ensure that it does not happen again. This is not specifically targeted at this developer or any subcontractor in particular. Good site management, as noted elsewhere in this document, should mean this clause should never be required. Nevertheless:

- Any threat of wilful damage, conflict and violence must be removed completely from the equation. The developer must undertake and enforce a zero-tolerance policy to any harassment, threats or violent behaviour toward nearby residents by any employee, contractor or sub-contractor involved in their project, and will fully cooperate with the police if and when required.

Parking

The proposal's assumptions around car ownership and public transport use do not appear to engage with the real behavioural patterns of residents who will purchase apartments in this price bracket. The traffic modelling rests on the assumption that a building of thirty high-end dwellings will generate minimal car ownership and that most movements will be "active transport" or public transport usage. This is an unreasonable assumption.

Baselining the target demographic: Considering recent sales in the area, only one is anywhere near the scale of the new apartments in 431 Glebe Point road: 5/18 Oxley St –

3 bed, 2 bath, 2 car – \$2.9M. Recent sales in other parts of the Sydney City Council areas (Pyrmont, Ultimo, Green Square, Alexandria) are in the same ballpark. Looking at the published purchase price for the building (\$39M + the submitted cost estimate of construction \$25M), we are looking at an average cost-to-the-developer of \$2.2M each. With profit and cost of sale, interest, \$3M per apartment is the absolute bare minimum sale price to make this development financially viable.

Based on this sale price estimate, the large, well appointed, multi-bedroom apartments in the proposed development will sell to professionals, downsizers, and dual-income households; households who routinely own two or more vehicles. I.e: These are not starter apartments aimed at low income or first home buyers without substantial capital behind them.

Thus the model ignores modal reality: people in this demographic do not rely on buses or bicycles as a primary means of transport. This is especially true in the Glebe Point area where (as much publicised in the local media) privatised routes are unreliable, buses are cancelled without warning, or bypass stops when running late. The L1 Metro has suffered repeated shutdowns, and ferry reliability has deteriorated ahead of the new Fish Market opening. None of this appears in the transport assessment, which instead assumes a theoretical idea transport network. Bicycle riding is practical as a weekend exercise or possible commute to the city, but not a replacement for any task involving carrying of goods.

The DA proposes 30 units with a total of 93 bedrooms sized for adult occupancy (1 x 2 bed, 25 x 3 bed, 4 x 4 bed). Even if we use conservative occupancy rates (taking ABS 2021 rates across Greater Sydney), we get an estimate of 80 people (1 x 2.1 + 25 x 2.6 + 4 x 3.2). ABS and transport surveys support the assertion that high wealth households tend to own 2 or more vehicles. If we allocate 2 vehicles to each 3+ bed unit, and 1 to the 2 bed, we get 59. If each adult occupant requires a vehicle, the number increases significantly. This suggests demand for 59 - 80 residents' vehicles.

Visitor parking is non-existent in the DA. It is also unreasonable to assume visitors arrive at this block to arrive by bus, metro or bicycle.

Another reference point: Parking allocated to Pre-LEP 2012 apartments:

- 5/18 Oxley St – 3 bed, 2 bath, 2 car (Mentioned above)
- 501 Glebe Point road – Almost all 3 and 4 bedroom apartments have 2 allocated car parking spaces
- Expanding the search further in other areas of City of Sydney, including Pyrmont, Ultimo, Green Square, Alexandria, and even the CBD itself: Single car spaces for 3 bedroom apartments are the exception, with most developments allocating 2.

Based on these observations, the LEP 2012 prevents an adequate number of on-site vehicle spaces from being allocated for a development of this apartment mix. However, it does permit more parking spaces than are included in the submitted design.

Post-construction, the unaddressed shortfall in parking spaces will push resident and visitor vehicles into the immediate surrounding – onto Glebe Point Road, Mary Street, Leichhardt Street and Oxley Street. Mary Street is already overburdened – it is narrow, has a blind corner at the exit, and often blocked by vehicles stopping illegally for deliveries or services. The DA provides no mechanism on how to absorb this overflow. It appears tool Council has is to mandate that no on-street resident or visitor parking permits will be permitted for owners of this block.

To address these issues, Council should

- Require a revised independent Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment that reflects realistic data-backed occupancy rates, car-ownership, vehicle usage and visitor numbers for large, high-value, multi-bedroom dwellings based on cited current demographic usage data.
- Require that a commensurate number of resident and visitor parking spaces be included in the design based on this outcome of assessment.
If there is no way to reconcile the permitted number of parking spots and the requirements of the anticipated residents, then Council should require design modification (e.g., revised dwelling mix or reduced dwelling count) so the development aligns with households with lower car-ownership profiles.
- Impose and publish a strict condition that residents of the development are ineligible for on-street resident and visitor parking permits in perpetuity so that the final number of constructed parking spaces becomes the enforced physical maximum, preventing the silent shift of parking demand to nearby streets.
- Require that the DA explicitly and permanently pair the five adaptable residences with five (or more) compliant adaptable/accessible parking spaces; and explicitly prohibit the use of stacked parking for any adaptable or accessible allocation.

Building Monitoring & Damage Prevention

Previous work around 2 Mary Street demonstrated that “before and after” dilapidation reports are not enough to ensure that problems are not immediately and graciously rectified after the concluding report. A development of this magnitude, involving excavation, piling, and heavy machinery, so close to the existing building (<50m) requires continuous vibration monitoring placed on the boundaries of 2 Mary Street.

- Real-time logging and exceedance alerts must be mandatory to prevent contractors arguing after the fact that cracks or movement pre-dated construction. Without continuous monitoring, the risk of structural damage becomes unquantifiable and unrecoverable.
- Dilapidation reporting must be undertaken by an independent assessor, paid for by the developer, and must include photographic, dimensional, and geospatial references. As Mary St is downhill from the development, the topography of the area increases the risk any excavation misstep can redirect ground movement or water flow. The developer must present a clear plan for protecting adjoining retaining walls, garages, and the exposed roadside edges of properties. Machinery must not be staged or stored near the drop to Leichhardt Street, where there are risks of impact, a barrier system is required to prevent accidental impact with private structures.

Drainage & Water Management

Mary Street has had minor issues in the past with drainage during heavy Sydney rains. This was particularly an issue before the installation of the NBN when the water collecting along the eastern edge of the road would overflow, fill the Telstra copper pit, and cut phone services. The grates can be overwhelmed in heavy rain. The stormwater outlet at the back of 2 Mary Street has backed up and flooded before, and residents have previously had to clear blockages manually to prevent more severe damage. Construction activities that alter ground levels, divert temporary drains, or reduce gutter capacity could dramatically worsen this behaviour. The DA does not address the hydrological implications for the immediate downhill properties, particularly during excavation or in the period before permanent drainage is installed.

- The developer must demonstrate how temporary drainage will be maintained during all phases of construction, especially when pits are open or surfaces stripped.
- Post-construction, the new building must not increase runoff velocity or redirect flows toward Mary Street. Council should require a 6–12 month post-occupation

drainage assessment to catch failures not evident during construction (particularly given the intensifying and less predictable annual rainfall patterns in Sydney). If flooding or ponding increases, corrective works must be imposed at the developer's cost, not shifted to residents.

- It should also be noted that all these street drains go directly into Blackwattle Bay and therefore into Sydney Harbour, so no demolition residue or wash-out, chemicals or other contaminants should be allowed to make its way into the system.

Noise Impacts (Construction and Ongoing)

Construction noise in Mary Street amplifies due to the narrow canyon effect between buildings. 12 of the 16 units on in 2 Mary Street have Windows that directly open to this area, as do the common entry way and stairwell. Without strict controls, daily operations will be intolerable for residents. Many works will involve concrete cutting, hammering, excavation and metalwork with high acoustic intensity.

- The developer must enclose or shield high-noise activities and prohibit warm-ups of generators or excavators before allowed hours. Dust suppression and daily street cleaning are mandatory because dust accumulates rapidly on steep streets and drifts directly into neighbouring windows.

After completion, noise from rooftop terraces, balconies and plant rooms will significantly affect nearby dwellings. Sound is channelled and travels easily into open windows along Mary Street. The DA does not address how rooftop gatherings, barbecues, or night-time use will be controlled.

- Acoustic barriers, operational restrictions, and enforceable by-laws must be mandated, otherwise the building becomes a permanent noise source for the surrounding homes.

Privacy & Amenity Impacts

The proposed balcony configurations introduce direct sightlines into neighbouring properties, including bedrooms and living spaces that have previously enjoyed visual separation. The height of the building and the downhill position of Mary Street amplifies this effect: a balcony in the proposed development only a few metres above street level can look directly into apartments further down the slope. This gets worse at higher floors. The proposal does not provide privacy modelling, shadow diagrams from balcony level, or any assessment of cumulative loss of amenity for adjacent residents.

The bulk of the building and the rooftop structures increase visual intrusion into a neighbourhood of much smaller-scale dwellings. The transition in height at this location is abrupt and unrelieved. The rooftop area, in particular, risks becoming a social zone overlooking Mary Street unless strict operational controls and screening are imposed.

Accordingly, the following requirements apply:

- Sight-line analysis: A formal, independently prepared sightline and overlooking report must be submitted prior to approval of final façade materials. The report must identify every point from which a resident of the new building can overlook private living areas of adjacent properties (including balconies, living rooms, and bedrooms on the south and west sides of 2 Mary Street). Mitigation measures must be tied directly to those findings.
- Balcony treatment – no transparent glass where overlooking occurs:
Any balcony, terrace, or elevated platform from which a resident could directly overlook neighbouring private living spaces must *not* use clear or high-transmissivity glazing. Acceptable materials include:
 - Solid, opaque construction (e.g., rendered panels, metal, composite)
 - Opaque or heavily frosted glass that effectively prevents observation of individuals.
 - Dark, low-transmittance glazing with demonstrated privacy performanceUnder no circumstances should standard transparent sheet glass be used in these locations.
- Window treatment for problematic elevations:
Similarly, should any window placement result in direct views into neighbouring properties, the development must apply one or more of:
 - High-sill windows
 - Frosted/opaque glazing
 - Fixed external screening
 - Reorientation of the glazing planeThe burden is on the applicant to demonstrate that overlooking has been eliminated, not merely reduced on paper.
- Minimum privacy height:
Balustrades and balcony treatments in affected locations must achieve an opaque or non-transparent height at least equal to a typical windowsill line (approximately 1.1–1.3 metres), ensuring a standing adult cannot view downward into neighbouring windows or balconies.

- **Privacy screens:**
Where the sight-line report identifies direct lines of view into habitable rooms or balconies, fixed privacy screens must be installed. Screens must be permanent, robust, and non-perforated to the extent necessary to eliminate direct overlooking. Operable louvres may be used only if engineered to prevent opening angles that reintroduce the original sightline.
- **Light spill and night-time amenity:**
External lighting and internal orientation must be designed to avoid intrusive illumination into neighbouring bedrooms and living spaces. Shielded luminaires and downward-facing fixtures must be mandated.

Conclusion

While I do not oppose the redevelopment of 431 Glebe Point Road, I will oppose any aspect of it that externalises risk, inconvenience, cost, or ongoing loss of amenity onto neighbouring properties. If the developer wishes to proceed, they must design and manage the project in a manner that prevents those impacts, rather than transferring them to the community.

Sydney requires ongoing renewal of ageing building stock, but execution of this project requires a high level of design, planning and management as it is located within a tight, already stressed urban environment with narrow streets, minimal parking, constrained access, and existing medium-density housing on all sides. Past experience demonstrates that poorly planned and managed construction activity in this area leads directly to blocked access, damage to vehicles, obstruction of residents and medical workers, unsafe traffic conditions, drainage congestion, and (in rare but unfortunate cases) physical altercations. These are predictable and preventable outcomes, not unforeseeable anomalies.

For this development to proceed responsibly, all external impacts - construction, operational, privacy, amenity, noise, vibration, dust, traffic, and drainage - must be actively mitigated through enforceable conditions, continuous monitoring, transparent communication channels, and clear escalation paths. None of these should fall onto residents to absorb or rectify. Economic viability of the project cannot depend on shifting risk, disruption, and long-term amenity impacts onto neighbouring residents.

About the Submitter

- Owner-occupier at 2 Mary Street since 2008, with more than 17 years of firsthand experience living in the building and observing not-insignificant disruptions and impacts from multiple neighbouring developments.
- Have firsthand experience with the capacity and reliability limits of local transport, including the 431 bus route, the L1 Dulwich Hill light rail (Jubilee Park and Glebe stations), and the Blackwattle Bay Ferry Service.
- Active member of the Strata Committee for many years. This response is not representing or speaking on behalf of the committee but is bringing a clear duty of care to protect the building, common property, and residents.
- Enterprise IT Professional with 30+ years of experience in large-scale high-budget enterprise projects, familiar with assumption identification and validation, project risk management, inter-team coordination, and the consequences of poor planning. As such, carry the professional view that any project where successful completion depends on externalising impact, cost, inconvenience onto third parties carries increased risk for internal and external stakeholders that needs to be correctly and comprehensively identified, documented, costed and managed.

Matt Sheumack

Owner: Unit 13, 2 Mary Street, Glebe NSW 2037

07/12/2025

From: John Sleeman <[REDACTED]> on behalf of John Sleeman
<[REDACTED]> <John Sleeman <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 10:57:16 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: John Sleeman <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey
Attachments: 251207A_Sleeman_Submission_Development_431_GPR.pdf (1015.6 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Shannon,

Please find attached our submission for D/2025/1006.

We would be pleased to provide any further supporting information if required.

--

Kind regards,
John and Elena Sleeman

mailto:[REDACTED]

3/433 Glebe Point Road,
Glebe. NSW 2037
Ph home : [REDACTED]

email : [REDACTED]

8th December 2025

Mr Stuart Greville

City of Sydney
Town Hall House
456 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2001

**Development Application: D/2025/1006
431 Glebe Point Road, Glebe NSW 2037**

We refer to your letter dated 10 November 2025, advising of the above development application. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the development. We object to the proposed development at 431 Glebe Point Road, Glebe. The reasons for the objection follow:

Privacy

Currently the building at 431 Glebe Point Road is vacant, however has been used for commercial uses, since we have lived at 3/433 Glebe Point Road for the last 30 years. The building has generally been vacant on weekends. Additionally the current glazing is fixed and tinted. Our private courtyard is in easy view by the existing glazing facing north and north east. In addition the existing building is clearly viewed from within our upstairs bedrooms. However we do not feel our privacy is invaded, as the building use is commercial with fixed tinted windows, and when we wish to use our courtyard on weekends the building use is vacant. Additionally a large area of the existing north western façade is without windows.

There is a significant error in Section 3.1 of the Statement of Environmental Effects by BBC Consulting Planners, as it states :’ *To the north of the site, on the opposite side of Leichhardt Street, is No. 433 Glebe Point Road (a two-storey former dwelling now comprising two apartments with a detached garage) and is identified as a local heritage item (reference: 1774)*’. The ‘detached garage’ is our 2 bedroom 2 storey freestanding dwelling, being Unit 3 of 433 Glebe Point Road. 433 Glebe Point Road is Strata 17375 with 2 apartments in the main building and a freestanding dwelling on the corner of Leichhardt and Mary Streets. This significant oversight may explain why privacy to our free standing dwelling and courtyard has been completely overlooked.

The proposed changes to the building will provide a large number of bedroom windows and balconies with a clear view into our house, and of our private courtyard from levels 1 to 4 of the building. Additionally there is a private courtyard on Level 3.

However in Section 6.2.2.5 '*Privacy Impacts*' of the Statement of Environmental Effects by BBC Consulting Planners it is recognized that :

'Windows on Level 1 and 2 of the southern façade have the potential to overlook adjoining properties to the south'.

For these windows, *'Window openings will be (as required) obscure glazing to a height of 1500mm above finished floor level. Other materials including obscure glazing, louvres and screens will reduce the impacts of overlooking to/ from the site'.*

However in relation to our residential building at 3/433 Glebe Point Road, and units 1&2/433 Glebe Point Road, others at 435 Glebe Point Road and further to the north-west it is stated :

"The northern and western facades address public roads which provide separation between the development and adjacent residential properties."

The assertion from the Statement of Environmental Effects that there are no Privacy Impacts from the northern and western facades is clearly in error.

Photos showing the north/north western facades clearly visible from 441 to 433 Glebe Point Road are shown in **Attachment B**.

We strongly assert that the provision of a significant number of bedroom windows and balconies with a clear view into our bedroom windows and our private courtyard is not acceptable. Furthermore no mitigation is suggested in the Statement of Environmental Effects, nor on the Architectural Drawings. The Architectural Drawings do however provide screens such that apartments within the development are provided with screening where required (for example such there is '*Vertical Privacy Screening*' from a Terrace and Living Room of one apartment to the Bedroom of another).

Accordingly the proposal must be designed to incorporate shielding from the northern and western facades similarly to that proposed for the southern facades. i.e. *'Window openings will be (as required) obscure glazing to a height of 1500mm above finished floor level. Other materials including obscure glazing, louvres and screens will reduce the impacts of overlooking to/ from the site'.*

We strongly object to the proposal in its current form, with no mitigation to address the overlooking to our property. We particularly object to the fact that the Statement of Environmental Effects appears to have deliberately overlooked the '*Privacy Impacts*' to our property.

Building Bulk

The current building dominates Glebe Point Road, and is inconsistent with the Glebe Point Road street scape from Parramatta Road to Leichhardt Street. Never the less the proposal plans to increase the existing building height with the addition of a new rooftop level.

There is inconsistency in the documentation, the Statement of Environmental Effects states: *'The building currently has a maximum building height of 23.4 metres. The proposed maximum height of building will be 24.9 metres (increase of 1.5 metres)'*. However the Variation Request states : *'The building currently has a maximum building height of 22.57 metres. The proposed maximum height of building will be 25 metres (increase of 2.47 metres over existing) which exceeds the height control in SLEP 2012 by up to 13 metres.'*

We have viewed the building from Pyrmont, and clearly the addition of an additional floor will create a change to the massing of the building. Photographs taken from Pyrmont of the building illustrate the existing building mass, and its relationship to the surrounding lower rise buildings.

Accordingly, given the existing height already significantly exceeds the maximum of 12 m, as allowed under the SLEP 2012, any further increases should not be allowed.

Attachment B shows views of the Building from Pyrmont.

The Proposed Carpark Exit on Leichhardt Street, Between Glebe Point Road, and the Intersection of Leichhardt Street and Stuart Street.

We refer to the *TRAFFIC AND PARKING ASSESSMENT REPORT* dated 22 September 2025, by Varga Traffic Planning. The report contains erroneous information, in that it claims there is an existing carpark exit on Leichhardt Street, on the building north eastern façade. From the Report unnumbered Figure *'Site view along Leichhardt Street site frontage, facing south-east'* the insert states *'Existing exit driveway to be retained'*. Also the Report unnumbered Figure *'Site view along Leichhardt Street site frontage, facing west'* insert states *'Existing entry only driveway is to be retained.'*. Again an error in the report, as this is the existing entry AND exit location for the carpark

This existing carpark 'exit' (as erroneous stated) is located adjacent to the building lift, and has been used only for goods deliveries, with the delivery vehicle typically parked next to the building access mesh door. We live at 3/433 Glebe Point Road, and have lived here for 30 years, and during this time this building access door and associated ramp to Leichhardt Street has **never been used as an exit** from the building for vehicles of any type. It has on occasion been used to deliver goods, as next to the building access mesh door the goods lift is located. It would dangerous to use this as a vehicular exit, as the lift door is located immediately adjacent to where vehicles would pass to exit the building.

Never the less the Traffic and Parking Assessment Report proposes to use the existing goods delivery access door and associated ramp as a car park exit. This proposal would create traffic chaos on Leichhardt Street, as we explain.

Vehicular entry and exit to and from the building has always been from the carpark entry and exit location, on the north eastern façade of the building, located on the one-way section of Leichhardt Street, about 35 meters from the Leichhardt and Stuart Street intersection. We will elaborate on why this configuration has been used, and why it minimizes traffic problems.

- The section of Leichhardt Street between Glebe Point Road, and the Intersection of Leichhardt Street and Stuart Street is two-way, however with carparking on the north-western side it is not possible for vehicles to pass each other. There is a give way sign at Stuart Street, and vehicles at this location can see to Glebe Point Road, and if a vehicle has entered Leichardt Street from Glebe Point Road they will wait until the vehicle progresses to the one-way section of Leichhardt Street before proceeding. If they proceed before the above vehicle has passed, then one of the two vehicles will have to reverse. It is worth noting that most of the cars that use these streets understand the restriction at the two-way section of Leichhardt Street, and drive accordingly.
- A proposed exit from the building in this two way section of Leichhardt Street, where vehicles cannot pass, will create chaotic traffic. The proposed exit does not have clear view to Glebe Point Road, as the road is curved, and the building not straight. After exiting the carpark, if there is a car from Glebe Point Road, they will have to reverse back in to the carpark from Leichhardt Street. If there are two simultaneous vehicles leaving at this time they will both have to reverse back into the carpark.
- Pedestrians from Glebe Point Road usually walk along the north-eastern side of Leichhardt Street, and given the road curvature and non-straight building façade would potentially not see the cars existing the proposed carpark exit.
- The existing carpark entry and exit location is in a one way section of Leichhardt Street, and accordingly vehicles can easily enter and exit. Vehicles entering can easily see and give way to vehicles existing. Vehicles existing can easily see and give way to vehicles on Leichhardt Street.

Also we note:

- From the Basement Plan when cars are exiting the building from the proposed Leichardt Street exit they would pass very close to doors to the basement waste room.
- Appendix C of the Traffic Report shows vehicles hitting the building (the vehicle path is superimposed on where the building is).

Traffic Generation.

The traffic report compares potential maximum traffic generation from a commercial property to that calculated from the proposed development.

We do not concur with this approach, the existing traffic generation when the building has been used as a commercial premises, i.e. the Woolcock Research should have been determined/measured and compared with that calculated from the proposed development.

Construction Noise

The existing building is surrounded by residences, and our house's facade is located typically only 15 metres from the building. The proposed development will require substantial changes to the existing building facade and internal and external works.

The associated Statement of Environmental Effects States: *'Construction/demolition work will occur during the hours of 7:30am and 5:30pm (Monday to Friday) and 7:30am and 3:30pm (Saturday) with no work on Sundays. All work including limited demolition, excavation and building work will comply with the City of Sydney Code of Practice for Construction Hours/ Noise and relevant Australian Standards'*.

We recommend the construction hours proposed be adopted by Council in any conditions of consent

The control of potentially offensive noise is an essential part of modern life. This is particularly important in the construction of buildings within residential areas.

We strongly assert it is necessary for full compliance with the Sydney City Council's construction noise criteria, and that a monitoring program is essential.

Construction Vibration

Immediately adjoining 431 Glebe Point Road to the north are significant heritage buildings, and in addition similar buildings are located on the opposite side of Leichhardt Street. The use of rockbreaking or similar equipment has the potential to cause damage to these buildings. The most appropriate standard DIN 4150 – 'Structural vibration in buildings' recommends maximum vibration levels for buildings. For buildings particularly sensitive to vibration, that are of great intrinsic value (eg buildings that are under a preservation order) maximum vibration levels of 3 mm/s for a frequency of less than 10 Hz are recommended. Typical measurements of rockbreaking equipment operating on sandstone produce vibration levels of 5 mm/s at 18, 6 and 1.7 meters from the rockbreaker tip for large, medium and small rockbreaking equipment respectively. Clearly there is a potential for damage of these heritage buildings if excavation of the carpark by rockbreakers or similar equipment is used.

Careful monitoring and control of excavation works will be required to eliminate the potential for damage to the adjoining heritage buildings.

Operation Noise

The Acoustic Report conducted long term ambient noise monitoring and determined Project Trigger Noise Levels of 51 dBA for the 43 dBA for the evening, and 38 dBA for the night. We concur with these levels, and they should be adopted for the setting of operational noise criteria.

We consider it is essential that the long term operation of this type of development comply with EPAs Noise Policy for Industry and Sydney City Council criteria for noise generated by the various systems and operations. These should include but not be limited to air conditioning, kitchen and toilet exhaust systems, carpark supply and exhaust air systems, automatic doors associated with the carpark, traffic noise in the car park and external traffic noise.

The control of potentially offensive noise is an essential part of modern life. We therefore strongly assert it is necessary for full compliance with both the EPAs Noise Policy for Industry and Sydney City Council long term operational noise criteria.

Summary

In summary we have been please to be given the opportunity to examine and comment on the proposal to provide apartments in the building presently located at 431 Glebe Point Road. However as neighbours we are not satisfied that the planned development represents a good outcome for the local residents, and the potential new residents. In key areas stated above, the proposal fails to satisfy criteria associated with good planning for a new residential development within an existing residential area of historical significance. Given the numerous shortcomings we conclude the proposal should be refused.

Yours sincerely,



John Sleeman



Elena Sleeman

ATTACHMENT A Before and After Views 433 to 431 Glebe Point Road



ATTACHMENT A Before and After Views 441 to 431 Glebe Point Road



ATTACHMENT B Views of 431 Glebe Point Road from Pyrmont



From: John Sleeman <[REDACTED]> on behalf of John Sleeman
<[REDACTED]> <John Sleeman <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 11:26:00 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: [REDACTED] John Sleeman <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Submission - D/2025/1006 - 431 Glebe Point Road GLEBE NSW 2037 - Attention Shannon Rickersey
Attachments: 251207A_SP17375_Submission_Development_431_GPR.pdf (820.07 KB)

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Dear Shannon,

Please find attached our submission for D/2025/1006.

We would be pleased to provide any further supporting information if required.

--

Kind regards,
Oh behalf of Strata Plan 17375
John Sleeman [mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])

Strata Plan 17375
433 Glebe Point Road,
Glebe. NSW 2037
Ph home : [REDACTED]

email : [REDACTED]

8th December 2025

Mr Stuart Greville

City of Sydney
Town Hall House
456 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2001

**Development Application: D/2025/1006
431 Glebe Point Road, Glebe NSW 2037**

We refer to your letter dated 10 November 2025, advising of the above development application. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the development. The management committee of Strata Plan 17375 encompasses the 3 units of 433 Glebe point Road. The management committee objects to the proposed development at 431 Glebe Point Road, Glebe. The reasons for the objection follow:

Privacy

Currently the building at 431 Glebe Point Road is vacant, however has been used for commercial uses. The building has generally been vacant on weekends. Additionally the current glazing is fixed and tinted. Unit 3's private courtyard as well as bedroom windows for Units 1 and Unit 2 are in easy view by the existing glazing facing north and north east. Additionally a large area of the existing north western façade is without windows.

There is a significant error in Section 3.1 of the Statement of Environmental Effects by BBC Consulting Planners, as it states :'*To the north of the site, on the opposite side of Leichhardt Street, is No. 433 Glebe Point Road (a two-storey former dwelling now comprising two apartments with a detached garage) and is identified as a local heritage item (reference: 1774)*'. The '*detached garage*' is a 2 bedroom 2 storey freestanding dwelling, being Unit 3 of 433 Glebe Point Road. 433 Glebe Point Road is Strata 17375 with 2 apartments in the main building and a freestanding dwelling on the corner of Leichhardt and Mary Streets. This significant oversight may explain why privacy to the free standing dwelling and courtyard has been completely overlooked.

The proposed changes to the building will provide a large number of bedroom windows and balconies with a clear view into bedrooms of the three units of 433 Glebe Point Road from levels 1 to 4 of the building. Additionally there is a private courtyard on Level 3.

However in Section 6.2.2.5 '*Privacy Impacts*' of the Statement of Environmental Effects by BBC Consulting Planners it is recognized that :

'Windows on Level 1 and 2 of the southern façade have the potential to overlook adjoining properties to the south'.

For these windows, *'Window openings will be (as required) obscure glazing to a height of 1500mm above finished floor level. Other materials including obscure glazing, louvres and screens will reduce the impacts of overlooking to/ from the site'.*

However in relation to our residential building at 3/433 Glebe Point Road, and units 1&2/433 Glebe Point Road, others at 435 Glebe Point Road and further to the north-west it is stated :

"The northern and western facades address public roads which provide separation between the development and adjacent residential properties."

The assertion from the Statement of Environmental Effects that there are no Privacy Impacts from the northern and western facades is clearly in error.

Photos showing the north/north western facades clearly visible from 441 to 433 Glebe Point Road are shown in **Attachment B**.

We strongly assert that the provision of a significant number of bedroom windows and balconies with a clear view into the Strata bedroom windows and Strata common areas and private areas is not acceptable. Furthermore no mitigation is suggested in the Statement of Environmental Effects, nor on the Architectural Drawings. The Architectural Drawings do however provide screens such that apartments within the development are provided with screening where required (for example such there is '*Vertical Privacy Screening*' from a Terrace and Living Room of one apartment to the Bedroom of another).

Accordingly the proposal must be designed to incorporate shielding from the northern and western facades similarly to that proposed for the southern facades. i.e. *'Window openings will be (as required) obscure glazing to a height of 1500mm above finished floor level. Other materials including obscure glazing, louvres and screens will reduce the impacts of overlooking to/ from the site'.*

We strongly object to the proposal in its current form, with no mitigation to address the overlooking to our property. We particularly object to the fact that the Statement of Environmental Effects appears to have deliberately overlooked the '*Privacy Impacts*' to our property.

The Proposed Carpark Exit on Leichhardt Street, Between Glebe Point Road, and the Intersection of Leichhardt Street and Stuart Street.

We refer to the *TRAFFIC AND PARKING ASSESSMENT REPORT* dated 22 September 2025, by Varga Traffic Planning. The report contains erroneous information, in that it claims there is an existing carpark exit on Leichhardt Street, on the building north eastern façade. From the Report unnumbered Figure 'Site view along Leichhardt Street site frontage, facing south-east' the insert states 'Existing exit driveway to be retained'. Also the Report unnumbered Figure 'Site view along Leichhardt Street site frontage, facing west' insert states 'Existing entry only driveway is to be retained.'. Again an error in the report, as this is the existing entry AND exit location for the carpark

This existing carpark 'exit' (as erroneous stated) is located adjacent to the building lift, and has been used only for goods deliveries, with the delivery vehicle typically parked next to the building access mesh door. Members of the Strata Plan management committee have lived at 433 Glebe Point Road, for 30 years, and during this time this building access door and associated ramp to Leichhardt Street has never been used as an exit from the building for vehicles of any type. It has on occasion been used to deliver goods, as next to the building access mesh door the goods lift is located. It would dangerous to use this as a vehicular exit, as the lift door is located immediately adjacent to where vehicles would pass to exit the building.

Never the less the Traffic and Parking Assessment Report proposes to use the existing goods delivery access door and associated ramp as a car park exit. This proposal would create traffic chaos on Leichhardt Street, as we explain.

Vehicular entry and exit to and from the building has always been from the carpark entry and exit location, on the north eastern façade of the building, located on the one-way section of Leichhardt Street, about 35 meters from the Leichhardt and Stuart Street intersection. We will elaborate on why this configuration has been used, and why it minimizes traffic problems.

- The section of Leichhardt Street between Glebe Point Road, and the Intersection of Leichhardt Street and Stuart Street is two-way, however with carparking on the north-western side it is not possible for vehicles to pass each other. There is a give way sign at Stuart Street, and vehicles at this location can see to Glebe Point Road, and if a vehicle has entered Leichardt Street from Glebe Point Road they will wait until the vehicle progresses to the one-way section of Leichhardt Street before proceeding. If they proceed before the above vehicle has passed, then one of the two vehicles will have to reverse. It is worth noting that most of the cars that use these streets understand the restriction at the two-way section of Leichhardt Street, and drive accordingly.
- A proposed exit from the building in this two way section of Leichhardt Street, where vehicles cannot pass, will create chaotic traffic. The proposed exit does not have clear view to Glebe Point Road, as the road is curved, and the building not straight. After existing the carpark, if there is a car from Glebe

Point Road, they will have to reverse back in to the carpark from Leichhardt Street. If there are two simultaneous vehicles leaving at this time they will both have to reverse back into the carpark.

- The carpark entry to the garage serving Units 1 and 2 of 433 Glebe Point Road is located on Leichhardt Street, immediately opposite the proposed exit. As such there is potential for accidents to occur with the exit located where proposed.
- Pedestrians from Glebe Point Road usually walk along the north-eastern side of Leichhardt Street, and given the road curvature and non-straight building façade would potentially not see the cars existing the proposed carpark exit.
- The existing carpark entry and exit location is in a one way section of Leichhardt Street, and accordingly vehicles can easily enter and exit. Vehicles entering can easily see and give way to vehicles existing. Vehicles existing can easily see and give way to vehicles on Leichhardt Street.

Also we note:

- From the Basement Plan when cars are exiting the building from the proposed Leichardt Street exit they would pass very close to doors to the basement waste room.
- Appendix C of the Traffic Report shows vehicles hitting the building (the vehicle path is superimposed on where the building is).

Traffic Generation.

The traffic report compares potential maximum traffic generation from a commercial property to that calculated from the proposed development.

We do not concur with this approach, the existing traffic generation when the building has been used as a commercial premises, i.e. the Woolcock Research should have been determined/measured and compared with that calculated from the proposed development.

Construction Noise

The existing building is surrounding by residences, and our house's facade is located typically only 15 metres from the building. The proposed development will require substantial changes to the existing building façade and internal and external works.

The associated Statement of Environmental Effects States: *'Construction/demolition work will occur during the hours of 7:30am and 5:30pm (Monday to Friday) and 7:30am and 3:30pm (Saturday) with no work on Sundays. All work including limited demolition, excavation and building work will comply with the City of Sydney Code of Practice for Construction Hours/ Noise and relevant Australian Standards'*.

We recommend the construction hours proposed be adopted by Council in any conditions of consent

The control of potentially offensive noise is an essential part of modern life. This is particularly important in the construction of buildings within residential areas.

We strongly assert it is necessary for full compliance with the Sydney City Council's construction noise criteria, and that a monitoring program is essential.

Construction Vibration

Immediately adjoining 431 Glebe Point Road to the north are significant heritage buildings, and in addition similar building are located on the opposite side of Leichhardt Street. The use of rockbreaking or similar equipment has the potential to cause damage to these buildings. The most appropriate standard DIN 4150 – 'Structural vibration in buildings' recommends maximum vibration levels for buildings. For buildings particularly sensitive to vibration, that are of great intrinsic value (eg buildings that are under a preservation order) maximum vibration levels of 3 mm/s for a frequency of less than 10 Hz are recommended. Typical measurements of rockbreaking equipment operating on sandstone produce vibration levels of 5 mm/s at 18, 6 and 1.7 meters from the rockbreaker tip for large, medium and small rockbreaking equipment respectively. Clearly there is a potential for damage of these heritage buildings if excavation of the carpark by rockbreakers or similar equipment is used.

Careful monitoring and control of excavation works will be required to eliminate the potential for damage to the adjoining heritage buildings.

Operation Noise

The Acoustic Report conducted long term ambient noise monitoring and determined Project Trigger Noise Levels of 51 dBA for the day, 43 dBA for the evening, and 38 dBA for the night. We concur with these levels, and they should be adopted for the setting of operational noise criteria.

We consider it is essential that the long term operation of this type of development comply with EPAs Noise Policy for Industry and Sydney City Council criteria for noise generated by the various systems and operations. These should include but not be limited to air conditioning, kitchen and toilet exhaust systems, carpark supply and exhaust air systems, automatic doors associated with the carpark, traffic noise in the car park and external traffic noise.

The control of potentially offensive noise is an essential part of modern life. We therefore strongly assert it is necessary for full compliance with both the EPAs Noise Policy for Industry and Sydney City Council long term operational noise criteria.

Summary

In summary we have been please to be given the opportunity to examine and comment on the proposal to provide apartments in the building presently located at 431 Glebe Point Road. However as neighbours we are not satisfied that the planned

development represents a good outcome for the local residents, and the potential new residents. In key areas stated above, the proposal fails to satisfy criteria associated with good planning for a new residential development within an existing residential area of historical significance. Given the numerous shortcomings we conclude the proposal should be refused.

Yours sincerely,



John Sleeman

On behalf of the Management Committee of Strata Plan 17375

ATTACHMENT A Before and After Views 433 to 431 Glebe Point Road



ATTACHMENT A Before and After Views 441 to 431 Glebe Point Road

