

Attachment D

Submissions

From: Paul Gallant [REDACTED]

Sent on: Thursday, October 16, 2025 9:20:15 AM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/942 - 4-6 Wentworth Avenue SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 - Attention Daniel Stanley

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.

Whilst the overall design appears from the renditions to be accomodating to the heritage facades, the rooftop additions that extend forwards with little to no setback severely compromise the facade. These addition should be set back replacing the exposed rooftop spaces with for instance gardens, setback balconies, solar panels etc.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent on: Monday, October 20, 2025 9:39:40 AM

To: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to Proposed Development at 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills D/2025/942

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 Sir or Madam,

I am the owner and resident of [REDACTED], Surry Hills, located immediately adjacent to and within visual proximity of the proposed development site at **4–22 Wentworth Avenue**. I wish to formally object to this Development Application D/2025/942 by **Willow Development Group** on the following planning and amenity grounds.

1. Overshadowing and Loss of Solar Access

The proposed **13-storey commercial tower (approx. 65m high)** significantly exceeds the established mid-rise scale of the Wentworth Avenue - Goulburn Street precinct (typically 5–8 storeys).

According to the applicant's **shadow analysis (SEE, September 2025)**, the building will cast **substantial additional shadow towards the south-west after 2:00 pm during winter solstice**, reaching properties along **Goulburn Street**, including mine.

This directly contradicts **Clause 3.2.1 of the Sydney DCP 2012**, which seeks to maintain adequate sunlight to habitable rooms and private open spaces of neighbouring dwellings between 9 am and 3 pm in midwinter. The resulting overshadowing would materially diminish internal natural light and overall residential amenity.

2. Excessive Height and Visual Bulk

The proposal's overall **height, scale, and massing** are inconsistent with the surrounding heritage warehouse context.

While the retention of heritage façades is commendable, the **15-storey glass tower addition** dominates both the Wentworth Avenue streetscape and **the skyline visible from Goulburn Street**, resulting in a disproportionate and visually intrusive outcome.

This conflicts with **Clause 3.10.1 of the Sydney DCP 2012**, which requires new developments to achieve compatible bulk and scale relative to their context, particularly in heritage precincts.

3. Construction Impacts (Noise, Dust, Vibration, and Duration)

The submitted **Construction Management Plan (Rev 05, 25 September 2025)** outlines a **24–30 month** construction program, including **excavation for new basement levels**, heavy truck movements via **Wemyss Lane**, and continuous works from 7 am to 7 pm on weekdays.

Given the narrow street network and acoustic character of this area, these works will likely cause prolonged **noise, dust, and vibration impacts** on nearby residential buildings such as mine.

I request Council to impose **strict construction hours, noise monitoring, and dust suppression requirements**, as well as an on-site community contact officer during active works.

4. Traffic, Access, and Safety

The **Traffic Impact Assessment (TTW, 29 September 2025)** confirms vehicle access will be via **Wemyss Lane**, but truck staging and turning movements will still affect the **Wentworth Avenue / Goulburn Street intersection**.

This intersection already experiences significant congestion, pedestrian traffic, and bus activity. The additional vehicle and delivery movements during construction and ongoing servicing will exacerbate local congestion and

pose pedestrian safety risks.

This contravenes **Clause 3.11.1 of the DCP**, which seeks to ensure safe and efficient access and movement around development sites.

5. Cumulative Impact on Residential Amenity

While this site is zoned for mixed-use redevelopment, the cumulative scale of excavation, height, and construction activity will have a **substantial adverse impact on the amenity, quiet enjoyment, and visual outlook** of existing residents on Goulburn Street.

Given the limited setback and significant change in skyline, the proposal does not achieve a balanced transition between commercial intensity and residential liveability envisaged by the **Central Sydney Planning Strategy**.

Requested Actions

I respectfully request Council to:

1. **Refuse the current DA** on grounds of excessive height, overshadowing, and amenity impact; or
 2. Require **substantial modifications**, including:
 - Reduced overall building height and increased upper-level setbacks;
 - Detailed shadow analysis demonstrating no additional loss of sunlight to residential buildings on Goulburn Street.
 - Strict construction management conditions (noise, dust, vibration, traffic control);
 - Appointment of a community liaison officer during demolition and excavation.
-

Conclusion

While I support considered urban renewal and heritage conservation, this proposal in its current form represents **an overdevelopment of the site** with unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, sunlight access, and construction-related disruption.

I request that the City of Sydney carefully assess this DA against the relevant LEP and DCP provisions and require amendments to ensure an equitable balance between commercial intensification and residential liveability.

Yours faithfully,

██████████
Resident Owner

██████████ Surry Hills NSW 2010

From: Paul Sherriff [REDACTED]
Sent on: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 9:01:17 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2025/942 - 4-6 Wentworth Avenue SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 - Attention Daniel Stanley

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.

To whom it may concern

As a resident of 27-29 Commonwealth Street, I live a couple of hundred metres from this development.

I would like to support this application as I believe that it would enhance the look and amenity of the local area. I believe that my property value benefits from tasteful developments in my neighbourhood and this one, from the artist's impressions, would be a tasteful addition.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.

Yours etc
Paul Sherriff

302/29 Commonwealth Street
Sydney 2000



Paul Sherriff | Applications Specialist | ISU | CPSU

m: [REDACTED]

Member Service Centre: 1300 137 636 | cpsu.org.au

The Community and Public Sector Union (CPSU) acknowledges the traditional owners and custodians of country throughout Australia and acknowledges their continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay our respects to the people, the cultures and the elders past and present.

This e-mail message and any accompanying attachment is intended for the use of the recipient only and may contain confidential, commercially valuable or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, review, copying or dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this message. Before opening any attachments, please check them for viruses and defects.

From: J Loughnane [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent on: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:10:07 PM

To: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Objection to Development Application D/2025/942 – 4-8 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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.

Objection to Development Application D/2025/942 – 4-8 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

Tuesday, 28 October 2025

To: City of Sydney Council

Address: 456 Kent Street (Town Hall House), Sydney NSW 2000

Re: Development Application D/2025/942 – Proposed 13-storey Commercial Tower over 4–8 Wentworth Ave, Surry Hills

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a long-term Surry Hills resident, to object to Development Application D/2025/942. The application proposes a 13-storey commercial tower above the existing heritage buildings at 4-8 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills. While I strongly support thoughtful, sustainable, and community responsive development in our area, this proposal is fundamentally inconsistent with the local character, planning intent, and community needs. My objections, detailed below, are based on serious concerns regarding heritage impacts, excessive height, lack of residential benefit, and environmental nuisances. I urge the Council to refuse the proposal in the public interest.

1. Excessive Height and Visual Dominance

The proposed tower addition to 4 Wentworth Avenue (Hotel Stellar) is grossly out of scale with the surrounding streetscape and heritage context. Surry Hills' urban fabric in this precinct is predominantly low-to-mid-rise, defined by early 20th-century warehouse buildings of a few storeys that create a human-scaled environment. In contrast, a looming glass-and-steel tower would dominate views and erode the area's intimate character. The City's planning controls and heritage guidelines explicitly seek to limit visual bulk of additions on this site. For example, site-specific DCP controls demand any rooftop addition "present as a discrete, light-weight addition" and "*minimise the visual bulk of the addition*". A steel and glass tower atop century-old warehouses cannot, by its very nature, be considered "discrete" or minimal in bulk.

Even the applicant's own Heritage Impact Statement acknowledges that "*the tower is the prominent vertical element... uniquely juxtaposed against the heritage podium*". In plain terms, the new tower will stick out like a sore thumb above the heritage buildings. While the architects claim this juxtaposition is handled "*in a sympathetic manner*", residents strongly disagree. The sheer height and mass of the addition will dwarf the historic facades, diminish their streetscape presence, and detract from the group's distinctive heritage character. From many public vantage points (especially up and down Wentworth Ave and adjacent streets), the tower will be glaringly visible and disruptive to the heritage skyline that currently prevails. No amount of setback or facade articulation can fully mitigate the fact that the proposal rises far above the established parapet line of the block.

It is also noted that the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and site-specific Clause 6.55 controls set a maximum building envelope for this site, which was crafted to respect heritage and solar access constraints. Any claims that the

proposed height “fits” within an approved envelope do not change the qualitative visual impact on the neighborhood. In fact, the Statement of Environmental Effects indicates the envelope was determined primarily by the need to protect neighbors’ sunlight – a reminder that pushing the height to these limits was an absolute maximum scenario, not an invitation to build to that extreme irrespective of context. The planning intent for Wentworth Avenue has always been a transition zone, not an extension of the high-rise CBD.

In summary, the height and bulk of the proposed addition above the existing 4 Wentworth Avenue building is inconsistent with the scale and character of its surroundings and violate the spirit (if not the letter) of Council’s heritage controls. I urge Council to uphold the principle of “height in context” and require any redevelopment on this site to remain truly subservient to the heritage buildings, not to overwhelm them.

2. Lack of Residential Contribution (and Questionable Need for More Offices)

This development conspicuously lacks any residential component, at a time when inner Sydney desperately needs housing, not more empty offices. The subject site (postcode 2010) and the neighboring CBD (2000) are experiencing an acute housing affordability and availability crisis. Rental vacancy rates in Sydney are hovering around record lows (roughly 1.5% city-wide, and ~2.0% in the inner-city [metrorealty.com.au](https://www.metrorealty.com.au)), reflecting a severe undersupply of homes. It is perplexing and disappointing that this large proposal offers zero new apartments or dwellings.

Office vacancy rates in central Sydney are at high levels and climbing. As of mid-2025, the Sydney CBD office vacancy was approximately 13.7% – the highest since the 1990s [tenantcs.com](https://www.tenantcs.com). There is abundant evidence of surplus commercial floor space in and around the city. Notably, the immediate vicinity already has significant vacant or unleased offices:

- The large office tower at 1 Oxford Street (at Whitlam Square, a stone’s throw from this site) has multiple floors available for lease, indicating difficulty in securing tenants for existing stock (confirmed by current real estate listings).
- The newly completed Oxford & Foley redevelopment on Oxford Street just a few hundred meters away is bringing 9,200 m² of additional commercial offices to the market [cityhub.com.au](https://www.cityhub.com.au), much of which remains unleased to date as the project struggles with delays and tenant commitment. In fact, that project has been in the news for its challenges, with portions still vacant and a legal dispute highlighting the precarious demand.
- A City of Sydney study of the Oxford Street precinct (2021) found roughly 29,924 m² of commercial floor area sitting vacant along the strip meetings.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au. This underscores that adding more offices in this area is counter-productive, when existing buildings cannot find occupants.

In this context, approving yet another purely commercial tower is poor planning and a lost opportunity. The rationale of “edge of CBD commercial floor space” is weak given the structural shift to remote/hybrid work and numerous reports of increasing office vacancies. I question whether adding more office stock with a tower of this nature on top of the existing structure serves any public good, especially at the cost of heritage impacts and local amenity.

3. Noise and Mechanical Plant Impacts

I have serious concerns about the acoustic impacts of the extensive mechanical plant proposed (particularly on the rooftop) and the ability of the development to contain noise without harming neighbors. The plans include significant new building services and rooftop plant areas, for example, the Services Management Plan describes a central cooling plant with five large air-cooled chiller/heat pump modules on the roof. This kind of equipment, if not exceptionally well attenuated, can generate considerable noise (including low-frequency hum) and vibration that travel to nearby residential buildings. The Noise Impact Assessment provided by the applicant makes a number of assumptions and comes to the conclusion that the proposal can “*comply with the relevant noise criteria... subject to the mitigation measures outlined*”. In other words, the design as-is does not have margin to spare, it will only meet noise limits if all recommended mitigation is implemented perfectly.

Those recommended measures are extensive. The Noise Report itself lists mitigation such as “*positioning mechanical plant away from nearby noise sensitive receivers, fitting acoustic attenuators to ductwork, installing screening around plant, acoustic insulation of ducts and bends, and even possible re-selection of mechanical equipment*”. These are

strong indicators that the baseline design would be too noisy without special acoustic treatment. As a nearby resident, I find little comfort in a theoretical compliance on paper that relies on such measures and on a future “Plan of Management” to keep things in check. Experience shows that rooftop machinery (chillers, cooling towers, fans, etc.) often creates ongoing noise nuisances: tonal humming, night-time start/stop cycles, vibrations through structures, all of which can profoundly disturb the peace of residents in proximity.

The submitted Noise Plan has limitations as well. It notes that the commercial tenancies are yet to be defined and assumes typical office use noise (with mechanical plant being the main concern). However, if any tenancy were to introduce unexpected noise sources (e.g. a gym, function space, or amplified music), additional issues could arise. Moreover, the assessment’s conclusion that the development is “*supportable from an acoustic perspective*” is contingent on all mitigation working perfectly and no changes in operating conditions. In reality, mechanical plant can deteriorate over time, screens can be left open, or equipment can run outside expected hours, any such deviations could lead to exceedances of noise criteria.

I also highlight potential vibration impact: large rooftop units can transmit vibration through the structure, affecting nearby buildings (rattling windows, etc.). The documents do not elaborate on vibration mitigation in detail. For a development of this scale in a mixed residential area, stringent conditions would need to be in place (e.g. requiring spring-mounted isolation for all rooftop plant, regular acoustic compliance testing, restricted hours for certain noisy operations, etc.). Even then, enforcement is difficult once the building operates.

In summary, the acoustic amenity of surrounding residents is at serious risk. The proponent’s own reports underscore that risk by spelling out how much acoustic treatment is required to barely meet standards. I urge Council to give paramount consideration to noise impacts. If the project cannot guarantee no increase in noise levels at nearby dwellings (especially during night-time when background levels are low), it should not proceed as proposed.

4. Light Pollution and After-Hours Illumination

The introduction of a tall commercial tower in what is largely a residential and low-rise area raises concerns about light pollution. Office buildings, by nature, tend to have extensive internal and external lighting from illuminated interiors (lights often left on for cleaners or security) to façade lighting or signage. In a neighborhood that currently becomes reasonably quiet and darker at night (apart from street lighting), a brightly lit tower could be a jarring intrusion into the nocturnal environment. Nearby apartment residents may face new light spill into their windows, and the general Surry Hills community could lose some of the darkness of the night sky.

There are established standards and controls aimed at preventing light pollution. For example, Australian Standard AS 4282-1997 “*Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting*” sets guidelines to protect the amenity of surrounding areas lindsaytaylorlawyers.com.au. The City of Sydney’s own DCP also requires that “*external lighting must minimise the light spill into the night sky*” meetings.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au. It is unclear from the DA documents how the new tower will comply with these principles. Will the large expanses of glazing be automatically dimmed after hours? Will any external facade uplighting or LED signage be proposed (now or in the future)? These factors matter greatly to residents’ quality of life.

We already experience light glow from the CBD towers in some parts of Surry Hills, but those are at a greater distance. Placing a 13-storey lit volume in the middle of our community (essentially on the residential side of the city’s edge) could have a direct impact. Even reflections from glass can cause uncomfortable glare to drivers and pedestrians. The applicant’s Reflectivity Statement promises to limit façade reflectivity to 20%, which is welcome (to reduce daytime glare). However, even with a 20% reflectivity glass, a tall building can act like a beacon when internal lights are on at night, shining outward.

I urge Council to assess the lighting impact carefully. If this project were to proceed (despite other issues), conditions should require an after-hours lighting management plan e.g. all non-essential lighting to be off by a certain hour, automated blinds to prevent light spill, no up-lighting of the exterior, etc. As a community, we value our night-time amenity, and we do not want Surry Hills to become an extension of the bright CBD skyline. The goal should be to prevent any intrusive light beyond the site boundaries. At present, the DA lacks clear assurance on this front, making it another point of objection.

5. Lack of Meaningful Community Benefit & Relevant Precedents 260

Considering the significant impacts and planning contraventions noted above, one must ask: *what is the tangible benefit of this proposal for the community?* From a resident's perspective, there is none. The scheme appears driven solely by private commercial interest (maximizing office yield) with no substantial public benefits or contributions to offset its impacts. There is no new public space, no community facility, no affordable housing, nor even a through-site link of note (the only minor "public" element mentioned is an activated laneway route through one building, which is minimal). In past developments, especially where heritage or height conflicts arose, proponents have sometimes offered public benefits (e.g. plazas, community uses, design excellence enhancements) – but here we see little beyond basic compliance gestures.

Crucially, planning precedents in Sydney show that developments which are at odds with heritage character or which offer insufficient merit can and should be refused or significantly modified. I draw attention to a recent example in the City of Sydney jurisdiction: a Planning Proposal for an over-height office building at 47–51 Riley Street, Woolloomooloo (another fringe CBD location) sought to double the permitted height and was met with strong community opposition. Objections highlighted that it "*disrespects adjacent heritage buildings and... detracts from the historical and cultural character*" [change.org](https://www.change.org), among other issues. In that case, community voices prevailed – the proposal was withdrawn/alterd, and the excessive height scheme did not go ahead. This shows that Council and residents can insist on better outcomes. We do not have to accept a development that does not align with the local character or needs.

Additionally, numerous proposals in Sydney have been rejected by either Council or the Land and Environment Court where the public benefits did not outweigh the impacts. For instance, developments that breached height limits or affected heritage significance have been overturned on the basis that they failed to respect the "desired future character" or did not provide sufficient justification for the breach. Here, the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate why the community should accept a tall commercial tower in a heritage streetscape with no clear public benefit. In my view, they have not made any convincing case. Simply refurbishing and reusing the heritage buildings (which is expected, since they are protected) is not a "benefit" bestowed by the developer, it is a minimum requirement. The minor conservation works and retail activation are welcome but standard; they do not compensate for the long-term skyline change, increased traffic, noise, and other externalities the project will impose on locals.

In summary, this DA lacks a public interest rationale. It conflicts with multiple planning objectives (heritage conservation, human-scaled streetscape, housing supply priorities) and *offers little to nothing in return*. Approving it would set a poor precedent that developments can sidestep local character controls as long as they meet bare-minimum technical criteria. I urge Council to consider the broader message and precedent, a refusal here will signal that community and character matter more than short-term commercial gains.

6. Reflectivity, Overshadowing and Other Environmental Effects

Finally, I wish to highlight potential unintended impacts on neighboring properties and public amenity relating to overshadowing and glare. The DA's Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) acknowledges that maintaining sunlight to nearby residences was a key factor in formulating the planning controls for this site. Indeed, the site-specific DCP envelope was designed "primarily to protect solar access to two residential apartment buildings to the south-east" (the Meta and Belvedere apartments). The applicant asserts that their scheme stays within the envelope's shadow limits, claiming it "*will not result in additional overshadowing, beyond that anticipated... to the neighbouring apartments*". This claim needs to be rigorously verified by Council. Even if technically within the envelope, the new tower will inevitably cast new shadows at certain times, possibly on Wentworth Avenue itself, or on other nearby lower buildings. Any *incremental* loss of sun, particularly in winter mornings or afternoons, can impact residents' comfort and the usability of public footpaths or outdoor spaces. I ask Council to carefully scrutinize the shadow studies and ensure there is no unacceptable overshadowing of public spaces or habitable rooms of adjacent buildings, especially during critical sun access hours (midwinter).

The facade reflectivity issue was touched on earlier but bears emphasis here as well. A highly glazed commercial tower, if not properly treated, can act like a mirror for the sun. Glare can affect drivers on surrounding streets, pedestrians, and occupants of other buildings. The provided Reflectivity Statement commits to a maximum 20% reflectance glass, which is in line with Council's guidelines to reduce reflective glare. However, I note that 20% reflectivity is still moderately reflective. Large panels of such glass can create bright reflections under strong sunlight. The impact on drivers along Wentworth Ave or commuters on nearby Albion Street should be considered sudden solar reflections from a new tower

could be a safety hazard. Similarly, existing residents who have sightlines toward the proposed tower might suddenly get reflected sunlight bouncing into their windows at certain times of day/year.

To manage these issues, the design of the facade (angle of glass, use of fins, etc.) is important. The SEE does not detail *how* the 20% reflectivity will be achieved or if the architects have done glare modeling for worst-case scenarios. I recommend that, if the project proceeds, Council requires a detailed reflectivity and glare analysis to ensure no adverse glare to public roadways and buildings. Mitigations (such as non-reflective coatings or sunshade devices) might be needed beyond just picking a glass type.

In summary, overshadowing and reflectivity are not trivial concerns, they directly affect urban liveability. The controls set for this site were born out of these concerns, and any deviation or oversight could result in unintended harm to neighbors' sunlight access or comfort. I trust Council will hold the proposal strictly accountable to meeting all shadow parameters and glare standards, with a conservative approach that errs on protecting existing residents' amenity.

In conclusion, in light of the above points, I respectfully submit that Development Application D/2025/942 should be refused in its current form. The proposal's excessive height at 4 Wentworth Avenue, heritage incompatibility, noise and light impacts, and absence of community benefit make it fundamentally unsuitable for approval. As a local resident who values the unique character and liveability of Surry Hills, I urge the City of Sydney to defend our planning controls and encourage a more appropriate, human-scaled, and community-friendly redevelopment of this site. Surry Hills welcomes progress, but not at the expense of its heritage and people-oriented scale. We look to Council to ensure that any development at 4–8 Wentworth Avenue truly responds to its surroundings. Perhaps a smaller commercial use project that incorporates mixed use and respects the old warehouses rather than imposing a discordant commercial glass tower.

Importantly, I do not oppose the portion of this proposal involving the commercial redevelopment of the existing buildings along Wentworth Avenue. On the contrary, I support the ground-level activation and adaptive reuse of the heritage fabric for retail and commercial uses, which I consider both appropriate and positive for the precinct. This component of the development will enliven the streetscape and is sufficient to deliver a meaningful commercial uplift to the site and broader streetscape. However, precisely because this base redevelopment already achieves those benefits, the proposed 13-storey commercial tower above those heritage buildings represents an unnecessary and excessive vertical addition. I therefore wish to clearly distinguish my support for the base commercial component from my strong objection to the over-scaled vertical addition.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. Please keep me informed of the progress of this DA and do not hesitate to contact me for further clarification of the concerns raised.

Yours faithfully,

Jason Loughnane
Resident of Surry Hills (2010)

From: pauline manley <[REDACTED]>

Sent on: Thursday, October 30, 2025 9:53:18 AM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Submission - D/2025/942 - 4-6 Wentworth Avenue SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 - Attention Daniel Stanley

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.

I oppose this development. The tower & podium developments will block morning sunlight for 3 existing high-rise buildings & one low-rise on the other side of Wentworth Avenue. These are mainly residential homes. For some of these east facing homes, this is the only sun they get all day. This will significantly impact the quality of life for residents & visitors. While the environmental impact statement mentions wind, there is NO mention of this sun blockage, which has to be a consideration for residents & owners who invested in this area assuming they would be protected from such a large development based on the heritage classification.

There are existing building sites on Wentworth Avenue & an application has been approved for a major construction project on Commonwealth St, just behind the affected buildings. With the amount of noise residents already endure, regular night time road works, the refurbishment of Hyde Park, traffic, prime nighttime revelry, residents shouldn't have to endure two building sites. on either side of their dwelling that will go on for years.

Third, the proposed developments are not aligned with the heritage aesthetics & does not uphold the heritage value of this site.

There is a growing dissent among my neighbours.

Warm Regards

DR Pauline Manley

Long time resident of the area

From: [REDACTED]

Sent on: Sunday, November 9, 2025 1:28:27 PM

To: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to D/2025/942

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.

Objection to D/2025/942
4-22 Wentworth Ave
Surry Hills

Dear General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier at SP73236 (148 Goulburn St)**, behind the proposed development site. I object to **DA D/2025/942**.

I have grave concerns regarding two matters:

Firstly this site is historically significant as comprehensively described on the State Heritage Inventory for NSW. The State Heritage Inventory endorses that any additions to the buildings on this site should not detrimentally impact on the groups overall scale, architectural features and proportions, and the group's distinctive streetscape presentation.

I am concerned that the proposed additions contravene these stipulations and will adversely affect the historical significance of this row of warehouses.

Secondly, I am concerned that works, additions and changes of use such as a large hotel will increase significantly the traffic in the area, notably the narrow lane way, Wemyss Lane, between the proposed site and my building. This narrow lane is already a busy thoroughfare for the residents, who access our buildings in this lane, and the already multiple business traffic.

Unfortunately this DA is going to have significant impact on the surrounding environment as outlined above and unless it can be proven that a more sympathetic enhancement to the buildings can be sought, I object to the current proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

[REDACTED]
Resident
Meta 148 Goulburn St
Surry Hills

Sent from my iPhone

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

Sent on: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:05:12 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au; council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** [REDACTED] **Goulburn St** [REDACTED] **Brisbane St**, [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted] Goulburn St)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

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

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 6:26:12 PM

To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942: 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills”

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.

I am an owner/occupier at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons:

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character and public art impact in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing. The apartment we live in gets direct sunlight and there is the possibility that this new structure will inhibit our

only direct sun.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. There are no privacy impact assessments, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Owner/Occupier— [REDACTED] Goulburn St [REDACTED] Brisbane St)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 5:53:27 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided. The noise that echoes in Wemyss Lane is substantial and this would exacerbate the issue.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow

diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

██████████

Owner / Occupier

██████████ (██████████ Goulburn St / ██████████ Brisbane St)

██████████████████████ / ██████████

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

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 6:23:12 PM

To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building [REDACTED]

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

My apartment looks directly on the Lane and the noise over the period of construction will be intolerable.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission. **Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.**

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – (Goulburn St / Brisbane St)

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 5:59:58 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au; [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] (**Goulburn St / Brisbane St**), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow

diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St)
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

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

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 7:28:21 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.

I am an owner/occupier at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building [REDACTED]

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 6:27:44 PM

To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards

[Redacted signature]

--
[Redacted name]

[Redacted contact information]

I acknowledge the Gadigal people of the Eora nation, who are the traditional owners of the land I work on. Always was, always will be Aboriginal Land.

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 6:06:02 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] (**Goulburn St / Brisbane St**), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to 279 apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow

diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – (Goulburn St / Brisbane St)

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

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 6:03:17 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 - 4-22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.

I am an owner at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St), [REDACTED] I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons:

Construction access

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicle access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours — this has not been demonstrated.

Ongoing traffic and servicing

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis — it has not been provided.

Heritage impacts

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

Waste Management

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning — it has not been provided.

Overshadowing

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams — they are missing.

Privacy

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis — it is missing.

Conclusion

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of

the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Best regards,

Owner – (Goulburn St)

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
Sent on: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:17:37 AM
To: DA Submissions <DA Submissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 4 22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.

I am an occupier at [REDACTED] Goulburn St [REDACTED] Brisbane St, [REDACTED] I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building [REDACTED]

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours. This has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis. It has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building [REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning. It has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams. They are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis. It is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Occupier [REDACTED] Goulburn St [REDACTED] Brisbane St

Kind regards

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

Sent on: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:32:35 AM

To: DAsubmissions <DAsubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am sole director of an owner at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

1. 2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

2. 3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

3. 4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise especially after hours. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

4. 5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to our apartments. DCP Section [3.2.1.1](#) requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

5. 6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

6. CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development

without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Owner of [Redacted] Brisbane st
Owner/Occupier – [Redacted] ([Redacted] Goulburn St / [Redacted] Brisbane St)

From: Dieu Huynh <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Dieu Huynh <[REDACTED]> <Dieu Huynh <[REDACTED]>>

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 7:45:51 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: "Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills"

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 Sir/Madam,

I have been a resident of Meta building at 148 Goulburn and 21 Brisbane street since 2007.

The proposal building of DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills" will cause 1) loss of sunlight to our building especially my located on lower floor 2) further loss of privacy 3) will cause further traffic congestion since entrance to parking is on Wemyss lane.

Your careful consideration of this matter is greatly appreciated,

Yours sincerely,

Dr Dieu Huynh

owner of Unit 110/21 Brisbane Street Surry Hills NSW 2010 at SP73236

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent on: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 8:06:46 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please redact my personal information when publishing my submission.

I am an owner and occupier at [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] Brisbane St, [REDACTED]. The main windows of my apartment, my source of light and outside noise look directly out to Wemyss Lane.

I object to DA D/2025/952 for the following reasons

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane.

DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items.

This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts.

Daily commercial waste trucks will block residential access and create unacceptable noise.

DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments.

DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments.

No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided.

The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory.

Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner and Occupier – [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] Brisbane St

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
Sent on: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 11:07:34 AM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED]** I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Owner – [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St)

[REDACTED]

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

Sent on: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 12:56:38 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 redact our personal details.

We write as an owner/occupier of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] Goulburn Street [REDACTED] Brisbane Street - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We object to the development application D/2025/952.

We appreciate that the date of responses has passed. We declare that we did not appear to receive any notification despite the City of Sydney excellent track record of providing information on developments in our area. We will, of course, review our correspondence, but be assured we pay close attention to these matters.

Our objections relate to:

* Overshadowing: Direct sunlight is limited at present and object to any further deterioration

* Waste management: There is already a steady stream of disruptions from different services to different units along Weymess lane and the prospect of constant night time disruption is disturbing. Are local residents expected to accept that every one of a dozen buildings can send waste and other support vehicles non-stop through the early hours of the morning?

* Heritage impacts: Our building is an important area building. While not adjacent to Wentworth Avenue, historically it was strongly linked and integrated with a notable streetscape: the old physical connections - the corridors and boardwalks that traverse Weymess Lane - are gone but the links remain.

Again, we are surprised about apparently not receiving notification and the short notice on a significant development.

Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Goulburn Street
Surry Hills NSW 2010
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]

Sent on: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 1:41:37 PM

To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4-22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow

diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

kind regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]

Sent on: Thursday, November 20, 2025 3:29:12 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

██████████

Owner/Occupier – ██████████ (██████ Goulburn St / ██████ Brisbane St)

From: Mai On <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Mai On <[REDACTED]> <Mai On <[REDACTED]>>

Sent on: Thursday, November 20, 2025 10:59:07 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cbc.city.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942-4-22 Wentworth Avenue , Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment officer,

I am owner SP 73236 Lot41 206/21 Brisbane Street Surry Hills. My building is located directly across the site .

I object to DA D/2025/952 due to the following reasons .

Inconvenient access by blocking lane way.

Pedestrian safety and blocking emergency access ..

Vibration could cause damage to our heritage building .

On going traffic with laundry truck , taxi and waste .

Waste trucks will create too much noise .

Over shading will make our heritage build unseen and unattractive.

I respectfully request that council refuse this application.

Regards

Mai and Simon On

Owner SP 73236

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
Sent on: Saturday, November 22, 2025 10:21:37 AM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – (Goulburn St Brisbane St)

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]
Sent on: Saturday, November 22, 2025 2:51:12 PM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED]** I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Owner – [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St)
[REDACTED] / [REDACTED]

From: <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Sunday, November 23, 2025 5:54:36 PM
To: DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
CC: City of Sydney <council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 – 4–22 Wentworth Avenue, Surry Hills

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact our personal information** when publishing my submission.

We are **owner/occupiers** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St), [REDACTED]. We object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely maneuver in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 meters tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. Our bed and living rooms directly face Wemyss lane and as such will be impacted by the proposed. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

We respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – (Goulburn St / Brisbane St)

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

Sent on: Monday, November 24, 2025 11:38:33 AM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Objection to DA D/2025/942 - 4 - 22 Wentworth Ave Surry Hills

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.

Sent from my iPhone Dear General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] **Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St**), [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

• 1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] **Goulburn Street**) is Heritage [REDACTED] The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (**21 June**) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to **300** apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow

diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

7. We purchased this apartment for [REDACTED]. Our apartment faces onto Wemyss Lane and the increase in noise and traffic will be incredibly distressing and not tolerable. No consideration has been given to people who actually live in these heritage apartments and the impact not only the building will have but the ongoing laneway use in the future.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]
Owner/Occupier – [REDACTED] ([REDACTED] Goulburn St / [REDACTED] Brisbane St)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED] on behalf of [REDACTED]

Sent on: Monday, November 24, 2025 4:14:02 PM

To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

CC: council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

Subject:

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 General Manager and Assessment Officer,

Please **redact my personal information** when publishing my submission.

I am an **owner/occupier** [REDACTED] **Goulburn St** [REDACTED] **Brisbane St**, [REDACTED] I object to **DA D/2025/952** for the following reasons

1. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS

Wemyss Lane is our only vehicular access. The Construction Traffic Management Plan does not include:

- Swept-path diagrams proving trucks can enter, turn and exit
- Number of truck movements per day/week or construction hours
- Pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access analysis
- Vibration impact assessment on our heritage building ([REDACTED])

During construction, residents may be unable to access homes, emergency vehicles may be blocked, and our heritage building may be damaged. DCP Section 3.11.10 requires safe access that doesn't impact neighbours—this has not been demonstrated.

2. ONGOING TRAFFIC AND SERVICING

A 7,500m² hotel requires daily linen trucks, food deliveries, waste collection and taxi/rideshare activity. The Traffic Impact Assessment does not show where these vehicles will go, how often they'll come, or whether they can safely manoeuvre in Wemyss Lane. DCP Section 3.11 requires proper traffic analysis—it has not been provided.

3. HERITAGE IMPACTS

Our building ([REDACTED] Goulburn Street) is Heritage [REDACTED]. The Heritage Impact Statement does not assess:

- Impact on our building's setting and visual character
- Construction vibration impacts on historic fabric
- Loss of heritage character in Wemyss Lane

LEP Clause 5.10(4) requires assessment of impacts on nearby heritage items. This has not been done for our building.

4. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Waste Management Plan does not explain collection frequency, truck sizes, turning capacity in the lane, or noise/odour impacts. Daily commercial waste trucks will block resident access and create unacceptable noise. DCP Section 3.14 requires proper waste planning—it has not been provided.

5. OVERSHADOWING

The building will be up to 62 metres tall. No compliant shadow diagrams for mid-winter (21 June) are provided, and there is no assessment of sunlight loss to apartments. DCP Section 3.2.1.1 requires shadow diagrams—they are missing.

6. PRIVACY

Upper-level additions will overlook our apartments. No privacy impact assessment, sightline diagrams, or mitigation measures are provided. The NSW Apartment Design Guide requires privacy analysis—it is missing.

CONCLUSION

Essential information required by Council's planning controls is missing, incomplete or contradictory. Under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Council cannot approve a development without properly understanding its impacts.

I respectfully request that Council refuse this application unless it is withdrawn and resubmitted with complete and compliant information.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Kind regards,

Owner/Occupier – (Goulburn St (Brisbane St)