

Attachment D

Submissions

From: Brian & Sue Hartmann <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Brian & Sue Hartmann
<[REDACTED]> <Brian & Sue Hartmann <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Monday, February 9, 2026 3:45:03 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2026/64 - 51 Buckingham Street SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 - Attention Costa Dantos

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 refer to the above development application I am the owner of Lot 13, 47-49 Buckingham Street, Surry Hills which is adjacent to the subject building. I wish to support the application and have no objections to the proposed work. I am very pleased to see some substantial remedial work and restoration of this historically significant building is finally taking place.

Regards

Brian Hartmann

From: Ian Sefton <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Ian Sefton <[REDACTED]> <Ian Sefton <[REDACTED]>
Sent on: Saturday, March 7, 2026 5:34:21 PM
To: dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Submission - D/2026/64 - 51 Buckingham Street SURRY HILLS NSW 2010 - Attention Costa Dantos
Attachments: Ian Sefton Submission DP Cleveland House D-2026-64.pdf (544.99 KB)

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

Hi Costa Dantos,

Please find attached my comments for Submission - D/2026/64 - 51 Buckingham Street SURRY HILLS NSW 2010.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Sefton
[REDACTED]

Ian Sefton
72/156 Chalmers St
Surry Hills NSW 2010

7 March 2026

RE: Integrated Development Proposal D/2026/64

Dear Mr MacKay,

I object to the Cleveland House Integrated Development Proposal (ref: D/2026/64) which is for a Heritage property of State significance at the address 51 Buckingham St, Surry Hills NSW 2010.

I live in and own a unit at Princes Gardens which is an apartment complex comprising 103 units neighbouring Cleveland House on the western and southern boundaries. Princes Gardens is the owner of the right of footway land to the west and the right of carriageway land to the south of Cleveland House.

I have lived in close proximity to Cleveland House now for 24 years and have resided at Princes Gardens for the past 10 years. In this time I have watched Cleveland House fall into a sad state of disrepair. Any renovation work appears to be largely by Brian Vincent, owner and occupant of Cleveland House. Over the last few months I have watched and listened to Brian as he hammers away at the south facing wall of the house removing the cement render in preparation for the new extension.

My objections to the integrated development proposal are as follows:

1. The Heritage Council has stated that the western and northern vistas of Cleveland House are the most important. It is the western vista that most Sydneysiders see when they see Cleveland House which is visible from Chalmers St, Prince Alfred Park, from trains as they approach Central Station and the many tall buildings beyond.

The to-be-demolished 1940's bathroom extension is not visible from the northern or western vista and has approximately 2 square metres of wall visible from the less significant eastern vista. Consideration is displayed in the development of this bathroom with respect to public views of the house.

The proposed two storey toilet block extension will be highly visible from the public domain and will have a detrimental impact on the heritage area. I estimate the extension will add 30 square metres of glass and wood construction to the western vista.

2. I think the development should adhere to the development standard maximum height of 6 m and that the 7.9 m variation request be denied so as to reduce the negative impact that it will have on the western vista.

Modern developments typically have 2-2.5 metre high ceilings. Having the floor levels of the toilet block match the floor levels of the house is unnecessary and adds significant height to the extension. The stairs between the house and the extension could easily accommodate the floors being at different levels and the overall height of the extension could be significantly reduced without impacting the amenities.

3. This proposal seeks to partition the currently occupied residential house into a residential space and a separate commercial space. I think that this should be given low priority and that attention should first be given to the roof which is in desperate need of repair.

4. If the present owner would repurpose existing rooms within the house for toilets then there would be less demand for toilets and the external presentation of the house would not be compromised.

5. This development proposal shows no consideration whatsoever for the unit owners at Princess Gardens. The two storey toilet block addition will block views from many neighbouring apartments and will reduce property values. The ground floor apartments will also suffer reduced sunlight as a result of the development and yet no shadow diagrams have been provided. At no point has Brian Vincent reached out to the owners at Princes Gardens to discuss the development.

I note that this proposal appears to supersede Intergrated Development Proposal D/2019/1163. The Notice of Determination for D/2019/1163 has the following condition of consent:

(13) DILAPIDATION REPORT

Subject to the receipt of permission of the affected landowner, dilapidation report/s of adjoining buildings, the right of way, infrastructure and landscaping are to be prepared by an appropriately qualified practising structural engineer and submitted for the approval of the Accredited Certifier:

(a) prior to the commencement of demolition/excavation works; and

(b) on completion of construction demolition/excavation works.

I request that this condition of consent be extended to Integrated Development Proposal D/2026/64.

Thank you for taking the time to review my submission.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Sefton