

Attachment D

Summary of submissions

Summary of submissions: 150 Day Street, Sydney



Activities to support the consultation

On 18 and 22 September 2025, the Central Sydney Planning Committee and Council respectively, approved the Planning Proposal – 150 Day Street, Sydney for public authority consultation and public exhibition.

A gateway determination was received from the Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure dated 27 January 2026. This included requirements for public exhibition and identified the relevant agencies to be consulted.

The consultation period ran from 18 March to 20 April 2026. The following activities were undertaken to support the consultation:

- A webpage and survey were created for people to review the planning proposal and supporting documentation and provide their feedback. The webpage can be accessed at <https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/policy-planning-changes/your-say-proposed-changes-planning-controls-150-day-street-sydney>. There were 263 views of the webpage and 120 document downloads.
- A notification letter was letterbox dropped to property owners and occupiers within a 75-metre radius of the site boundary, informing them of the planning proposal. 1,007 letters were sent. An example of the notification letter can be found at Appendix A.
- The project was included in the April edition of the Sydney Your Say eNews sent on 8 April 2026 to 3,985 subscribers. This provided a link to the webpage and survey. An image of the post can be found at Appendix B.
- The Planning Proposal was referred to the following government agencies for consultation and comment:
 - Ausgrid
 - Department of Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Water (DCCEEW)
 - NSW State Emergency Service
 - Sydney Water
 - Transport for NSW
- A submission was received from Placemaking NSW, the adjoining landowner and NSW government agency with responsibility for Darling Harbour.

What the community told us

We received a total of 52 submissions from the community, 6 responses from government agencies and one response from the proponent.

Of the 52 submissions from the community, 48 were opposed to the proposal and 4 were supportive.

Issues raised in submissions are summarised below.

Table 1. Responses from government agencies

Agency	Submission and response
Ausgrid	Ausgrid reviewed the planning proposal but did not provide any specific feedback or recommendations for this stage of the proposal. A list of development consent conditions was provided for consideration with any future development application.
City response	The response was noted and the information provided to the proponent.
Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)	DCCEEW reviewed the proposal with specific reference to flood risk management and made the following recommendations: - Update the Flooding section of the draft DCP to state that where flood gate protection measures are proposed, those measures must be designed and implemented to provide an appropriate level of protection for long-term climate change conditions, and be consistent with the provisions of the <i>draft NSW Climate Change and Natural Hazards State Environmental Planning Policy</i> and <i>Draft Climate Change Scenario Guidelines</i> (DPHI, February 2026). - Update the Flooding section of the draft DCP to require that the Flood Emergency Response Plan: - references flood warning systems that are relevant and reliable for the flooding mechanisms at this location - be developed in consultation with hotel management and should include procedures for the operation, regular testing and maintenance of mechanical flood protection systems, including flood gates, to support the effectiveness of the shelter-in-place strategy - be reviewed annually and after significant flood events. - Update Section 3 of the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 to delete references to the Floodplain Development Manual 2025 and Flood Prone Lands Policy and instead refer to the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy and <i>Flood Risk Management Manual</i> (DPE, 2023).
City response	Policy and Housekeeping Amendments to the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and Development Control Plan 2012 were approved by Council in June 2025 and are currently with the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure for drafting and finalisation. These Policy and Housekeeping Amendments update references to state government policies and strategies as sought by DCCEEW in their submission. Further amendments will be considered following the finalisation of the Climate Change and Natural Hazards SEPP and Climate Change Scenario Guidelines. A new DCP section 'Design to reduce risk and hazard' has been introduced as part of the Policy and Housekeeping Amendments which requires a Plan of Management to accompany any development application that includes flood control devices and systems. This plan must be assessed and approved concurrently with the application. The Plan of Management is to provide comprehensive details about the flood control devices and systems used, including all safety measures, and a plan for how the flood control device or system is to be appropriately maintained and

Agency	Submission and response
	managed over the life of the development. If approved, a condition of consent will require compliance with the approved Plan of Management. The draft DCP for the site, at Attachment B, has been updated to reference the Policy and Housekeeping Amendments to Sydney DCP in line with the information sought by DCCEEW and clarified the appropriate reference documents.
NSW State Emergency Service	The NSW State Emergency Service reviewed the proposal and attached Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (FIRA), and provided the following feedback and recommendations: • Further consideration be given to the impacts of climate change in line with updated NSW Government guidelines, including increases to the PMF in line with the latest Australian Rainfall and Runoff (ARR) Guideline. • Further consideration be given to the risks of prolonged flooding, as historical events often have longer times of isolation than modelled events. • Request further information regarding over-floor flooding risks, including depths and durations of any over floor flooding, and a sensitivity test to understand the risks in the case of failure of proposed flood gates. • Reconsider passive protection rather than flood gates as such barriers can restrict safe access to emergency services and restrict safe egress for people experiencing a secondary emergency like a medical incident. Instead, site design should be reconsidered to reduce flood risk, ensure safety features for lifts and all openings to the basement are situated above the PMF or 1% AEP plus freeboard, whichever is higher. If this is not feasible, basement carparking should be reconsidered. • Recommend including alternative triggers in the “Flood Response Actions” table in the FIRA. According to the table, Stage 2 of the Flood Emergency Response Plan is only triggered when: ○ NSW SES issues a red ‘EMERGENCY’ warning, or ○ Flood barriers are activated. The nature of flash flooding means it may occur with limited or no warning, so staff should undertake Flood Response Actions without waiting for official warnings from SES or the Bureau of Meteorology. It is unclear whether the flood gates are proposed to be automatically or manually activated. Regardless, Flood Response Actions should not wait for their activation as such mechanical devices may fail. • The FIRA should also be updated to: ○ clarify the meaning of ‘accessible egress for mobility-impaired users’, ensuring that such access does not rely on electricity and is clearly identifiable with signage. ○ clarify how internal fire suppression systems would not be reliant on mains pressure that may fail, and who has responsibility for ensuring this. ○ ensure any flood-resilient generators or battery systems for critical power are located above the PMF and demonstrate consideration of any risks associated with these power sources (eg fuel storage and ventilation).
City response	The planning proposal requires the substantial retention of the existing structure, reducing the ability to respond to flood risk through design. The Sands Street loading dock floor level cannot be raised due to limited space and the need to maintain gradient compliance with the road level. Further, the Sands Street low

Agency	Submission and response
	point cannot be raised due to existing adjacent properties and loading dock entrances. Similarly, the need for the entrance to the basement to be flush with the existing road and the lack of internal space or headroom prevents the existing ramp being raised or lengthened to provide a crest above the flood level. In response the basement is to be valet-operated only, with access restricted to trained staff. An updated Flood Impact and Risk Assessment (FIRA) as part of a future DA will be required to incorporate updated climate change scenarios and demonstrate that modelling of a 6-hour duration PMF storm event is sufficient to understand flood risk on the site. If not, modelling of PMF storm events of longer duration will be required. The new DCP section 'Design to reduce risk and hazard', included in the Policy and Housekeeping Amendments, provides guidance for the use of flood control devices such as flood gates. It also requires a Plan of Management providing comprehensive details about any flood control devices and their ongoing operation. The FIRA submitted with any future DA will need to demonstrate compliance with the amended Sydney DCP and include a Plan of Management to be approved concurrently with the DA. The site specific DCP, at Attachment B, has been amended to include reference to the 'Design to reduce risk and hazard' guidance and includes a requirement for the FIRA to include consideration of over-floor flooding risks and a sensitivity test. Other recommendations for amendments to the Flood Response Actions table, clarifications on accessible egress and internal fire suppression systems, and the locations of back-up power sources, have been provided to the proponent for inclusion in the FIRA submitted as part of a future DA.
Placemaking NSW	Placemaking NSW (PMNSW) supports planning proposals that facilitate the development of additional hotel accommodation near Darling Harbour. As owner of the parcel of land located on the western side of the proposal, PMNSW must grant landowner's consent prior to any works being undertaken on its land. PMNSW supports the public domain upgrade works on the western side of the proposed development. The concept of a gully environment and the introduction of appropriate planting on the ground plane is generally supported. However, any works on PMNSW land will need to be developed in collaboration with, and approved by, PMNSW as landowner. Furthermore details of the party responsible for the ongoing maintenance of all future public domain, landscaped areas, and public art are included in any future DA application. PMNSW supports the proposed introduction of public art at the site as proposed under the Preliminary Public Art Strategy. However, the Public Art Strategy must acknowledge that any public art delivered on PMNSW-owned land will need to be developed in consultation with PMNSW as landowner with PMNSW to be represented on the art selection panel responsible for selecting the final artworks to be installed. PMNSW recommends that the proponent broaden their assessment of flooding, solar amenity impacts and wind to include the area to the immediate west and southwest of Darling Harbour. PMNSW requests the opportunity to collaborate on the assessment and management of these potential amenity impacts in its role as an adjoining landowner and key stakeholder in the precinct.

Summary of submissions: 150 Day Street, Sydney

Agency	Submission and response
City response	PMNSW's support for the proposed land use and for the public domain and public art strategies is noted. Consultation with PMNSW will continue as the proposal progresses to DA stage and no activities on PMNSW land will take place without landowner's consent. With regard to flooding issues, as there is no proposed change to the existing building extent at the ground floor plane, there will be no change in flood behaviour compared with existing conditions. This means there will be no flood impact on PMNSW property as a result of this proposal. Section 5.1 of the Flood Impact and Risk Assessment, at Attachment A12, undertakes a preliminary stormwater flood mitigation assessment and concludes that due to high cost and disruption, and minimal scope for meaningful improvement, stormwater upgrades are not proposed as part of the proposal. However, this may be reconsidered at later stages and PMNSW will be consulted along with other affected government agencies. Overshadowing analysis of Darling Quarter and Tumbalong Park will be included as part of any future DA following the completion of the competitive design process. Wind analysis of the proposal, at Attachment A8, included wind testing locations along the Harbour Street frontage of Darling Quarter, the pedestrian footbridge above Harbour Street, and the pedestrian connection between Druitt Street and Cockle Bay. In all cases, the proposal was found to generate minimal impact, and locations beyond these sites should not be affected. These testing locations are consistent with the requirements of Sydney DCP.
Sydney Water	Sydney Water reviewed the planning proposal but did not provide any specific feedback or recommendations for this stage of the development. General information and advice was provided regarding water and wastewater for future stages of the development.
City response	This response was noted and the information forwarded to the proponent.
Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	The proposal to construct additional floors above the existing building must ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the Cross City Tunnel or associated structures. Further consultation with TfNSW and Transurban will be required once more detailed information is available, including a comprehensive construction impact assessment report. The developer will be required to enter into an interface agreement with Transurban due to the proximity of development with the Cross City Tunnel. A Construction Impact Assessment checklist has been provided outlining documentation that may be necessary at a future stage. Any projections or overhangs, such as louvres, windows or other façade elements, on the northern building façade must not encroach into TfNSW property nor pose safety risks to traffic using the Western Distributor. TfNSW does not support any encroachment into its property and requires that the development is constructed fully within the subject site. TfNSW contractors use Day Street and TfNSW land (underneath and beside the Western Distributor) to carry out regular inspection and maintenance. Any public domain works, such as upgraded paving, public art and landscaping on TfNSW land must not inhibit access to vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians and is to be designed and constructed to withstand vehicular loads. Any public domain works

Agency	Submission and response
	proposed on structures associated with the Cross City Tunnel, such as retaining or partition walls, will require consultation and approval of Transurban and TfNSW at a future stage. TfNSW is the roads authority for Day Street and Bathurst Street, and a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) will be required to enable the delivery of road works, including public domain works, on these roads. The Transport Impact Assessment indicates that the existing Porte Cochere and exit ramp is to be removed which would result in a single lane ramp from the basement to Day Street, to be used only by valets. Any private structure or equipment to give effect to this arrangement, such as traffic signals or boom gates and barriers, must be wholly located within the subject site. The removal of the porte cochere may exacerbate traffic conditions in Day Street. It is recommended that the proposed pick up/drop off parking bays in Day Street demonstrate sufficient capacity to accommodate future demand, considering peak demands and queuing impacts. The preparation of a parking management strategy and road safety audit is recommended for access and parking arrangements on Day Street. The strategy and audit should be finalised and approved by TfNSW at the planning proposal stage. Any road or pavement markings can only be installed with TfNSW approval. The preparation of a detailed signage and linemarking plan is recommended, with approval by TfNSW at the planning proposal stage to ensure alignment between applicant and TfNSW. SIDRA models should be updated to provide movement summaries for 2034 'without development' scenarios, and to correct the operating assumptions of the Day Street/Bathurst Street intersection.
City response	It is expected that excavation on site will be minimal due to the building retention approach of the development. Some excavation will be required to expand and strengthen foundations. Consultation requirements with TfNSW and Transurban are noted and the Construction Impact Assessment checklist has been forwarded to the proponent. The objection to any encroachment of the building façade into TfNSW property is noted, and the site-specific DCP at Attachment B and the Building Envelope drawings at Attachment A4 have been amended to remove the 450mm façade articulation zone previously illustrated. Consultation requirements with TfNSW and Transurban regarding any public domain works on TfNSW land are noted. An addendum to the Transport Impact Assessment has been provided and is at Attachment A27, which updates the SIDRA modelling as requested. In addition, a queuing analysis has been conducted to assess the capacity of the hotel drop-off bays in Day Street if the porte cochere were to be removed as proposed in the reference design. The analysis finds that, under the typical hotel drop-off operation assuming a 2-minute service time, all forecast vehicles can be accommodated within the four proposed drop-off bays, with no queueing expected. A further assessment was undertaken using a conservative 5-minute service time to represent a worst-case scenario where all 45 forecast hotel drop-off vehicles arrive during the AM peak hour and occupy a drop-off bay for 5 minutes. Under this scenario, the proposed drop-off bays are expected to be fully occupied, with up to two vehicles queueing at the 95% confidence level. The analysis also demonstrates that there is sufficient overflow space on Day Street and for additional vehicles to queue without impacting the Day Street/Bathurst

Agency	Submission and response
	Street intersection. Engagement with TfNSW will continue to align inputs into the design competition and any future DA.

Table 2. Responses from organisations

Applicant	Submission and response
Mecone (on behalf of the proponent)	As drafted, the LEP provision identifies a maximum FSR of 13.5:1. This is inclusive of 0.33:1 for end of trip facilities or 752m² (after accounting for a 10% Design Comp bonus). 752m² is equivalent to more than half of the B2 level which is not feasible for the adaptive reuse and hotel development. Following additional information requested, bike parking was revised and relocated to B1 to satisfy traffic comments to ensure suitable bike path movements. Consequently, the proposed facilities are split across B1 and B2 and would not strictly satisfy the requirements of clause 6.6 of Sydney LEP. Furthermore, the combined area would be less than 752m² (B2 end of trip area is currently 216m²) and as such, the proposal would not be able to realise the GFA identified in the reference scheme. As such, we request that clause 4(d) of the example clauses in Appendix 1 of the Planning Proposal be struck out and 0.3:1 added to 2.97:1 FSR (new total 3.27:1) in 4(b) noting: • Clause 6.6 is an incentive FSR clause for end of trip facilities in commercial premises only. Hotels are not commercial premises and as such this clause is not applicable to the project. • The reference scheme demonstrates and is able to comply with the minimum end of trip requirements in the DCP. Provision of 0.33:1 FSR for end of trip facilities is excessive for hotel development and would mean the loss of hotel floor space or back of house which is crucial to the viability of the scheme. • Given the adaptive reuse nature of the development, co-located bike parking and amenities is difficult to achieve whilst also accommodating suitable bike path, car parking and necessary plant, and building strengthening.
City response	Appendix 1 of the Planning Proposal represents an example of potential drafting for the LEP amendment. However, the Section 4 Explanation of Provisions and Appendix 1 of the Planning Proposal have been amended in response to this submission to remove the application of end of journey floor space to the site, while noting that: • the overall FSR allowable under the Sydney LEP will remain 13.5:1, and • any future DA will still need to satisfy the requirements to provide end of trip facilities in accordance with section 3.11.3 of Sydney DCP.
Racing NSW	Racing NSW formally objects to the proposal on the grounds that: • 51 Druitt Street, headquarters of Racing NSW, was not assessed as part of the View Sharing Analysis (at Attachment A10). Their offices currently enjoy clear outlooks over Darling Harbour with strong access to natural light. The proposed height of 150 Day Street would obstruct these views and light. The

Applicant	Submission and response
	conclusion of the analysis that none of the affected views would be considered as iconic, scenic or highly valued is not accepted. - the proposed increase in height and floor space represents an excessive uplift that is not appropriately balanced with the surrounding built form. - they are concerned the significant increase in height and bulk will exacerbate wind impacts, with the Pedestrian Wind Environment Study (at Attachment A8) noting that existing wind conditions exceed comfort and safety standards at point around 150 Day Street. - the scale of the proposed redevelopment will necessitate a prolonged and complex construction program, causing noise, vibration and dust, and disrupting building operations, traffic and pedestrian movements. - approval of a significant uplift of this nature risks establishing an undesirable precedent for similar increases in height and density across the surrounding precinct. The building height control should not be altered and remain at 45 metres.
City response	The planning proposal acknowledges the impact on views. While the View Sharing Analysis at Attachment A10 only made specific reference to impacted residential properties, it is clear that the commercial building at 51 Druitt Street will likely have its current westerly views obstructed. 51 Druitt Street should retain partial views of Cockle Bay as it is located slightly to the north of 150 Day Street. Because of the location of 150 Day Street, any increase in building height will result in impacts to views currently enjoyed by 51 Druitt Street. The proposed height is consistent with the surrounding context including 298 Sussex Street measuring RL 97.9m, 58-60 Bathurst Street measuring RL 91.3m, and the Darling Park commercial buildings between RL 95.9m and RL 132.2m, all higher than this proposal at RL 87.7m. It should be noted that the maximum height proposed of RL 87.7m does not apply across the whole site due to the application of the no additional overshadowing protections to Sydney Square, Town Hall Steps and future Town Hall Square. Along the northern boundary, closest to 51 Druitt Street, the maximum height of the building envelope is reduced to RL 66.9m. The City's planning framework does not protect private views. Section 5.3 of the Planning Proposal demonstrates how the proposal supports the strategic direction of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy and City of Sydney Economic Development Strategy by prioritising employment growth and increasing capacity, also contributing to the State Government's target for increasing hotel room supply by 40,000 statewide. In particular, obstructing future development on the site on view loss grounds is contrary to the objective of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy "to ensure that new development is not impeded by the preservation of private views". With consideration of the proposed building height and its context, and the clear strategic direction of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy and Economic Development Strategy, the view loss is considered reasonable. More information on views can be found in Table 3 of this document. 51 Druitt Street's access to direct sun will not be affected by this proposal. A separation of almost 45m between 51 Druitt Street and the built form of 150 Day Street, across Sussex and Sands Streets and a row of private properties in between, will ensure sufficient light and air to 51 Druitt Street and is consistent with Sydney DCP. The Pedestrian Wind Environment Study, at Attachment A8, demonstrates the proposal can deliver wind conditions equivalent to or improved on current

Applicant	Submission and response
	conditions, consistent with the requirements of the Sydney DCP. Wind tunnel testing of the proposed building envelope resulted in modifications to the massing. Further wind testing will take place at DA stage to ensure that wind conditions are acceptable. The proposal to increase the FSR control from 9.9:1 to 13.5:1 is consistent with other commercial developments in Central Sydney and aligns with the Central Sydney Planning Strategy to prioritise employment growth and increase capacity in Central Sydney. The maximum height of RL 87.7m has been tested to ensure that it can accommodate the proposed floor area, and the height is consistent with the maximum heights of surrounding buildings as mentioned above. Construction impacts, including noise and changes to pedestrian movements, will be considered as part of any future Development Application. This will include the implementation of a Construction Management Plan prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate.

Table 3. Responses from individual submitters

Issue	Key themes	City response
Overshadowing and loss of natural light	44 submissions were received raising concern the proposal would increase overshadowing of apartments in neighbouring buildings. 35 objections were received from the residents of Millennium Towers at 289-295 Sussex Street and 1 objection from Maestri Towers at 298 Sussex Street, 6 objections were received from the residents of the Crowne Plaza at 60 Bathurst Street, and 2 objections from 267 Sussex Street. Key issues raised by residents include a loss of sunlight to apartments, diminishing residential amenity and increasing health risks. Submissions also raised concern the proposal	Section 5.4 of the Planning Proposal, at Attachment A, outlines the overshadowing impact of the proposal. The overshadowing impact to Millennium Towers at 289-295 Sussex Street is acknowledged. The building is currently non-compliant with the Apartment Design Guide, with only 37% of apartments receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter. The proposal increases the number of apartments that receive less than 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter by 12, or 3.7%. Maestri Towers at 298 Sussex Street is currently non-compliant with the Apartment Design Guide with only 29% of apartments receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter. The proposal increases the number of apartments that receive less than 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter by 6, or 2.1%. Millennium Towers and Maestri Towers were originally approved in 1995 and 1997 respectively, before the implementation of the current Sydney DCP and Apartment Design Guide. They were not designed nor oriented to maximise direct sun access at midwinter. Any increase to building height at 150 Day Street would increase overshadowing at midwinter to these residential properties. This means that no additional development for commercial activity can take place at 150 Day

Summary of submissions: 150 Day Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
	would result in the overshadowing of Bathurst and Sussex Street at street level, including a number of mature trees.	Street without accepting overshadowing impacts in this Central Sydney location. At the time of the construction of Millennium and Maestri Towers, the applicable development control was to protect a minimum of 2 hours direct sun access on the autumn equinox (21 March). If the proposal were to be assessed according to the controls in place at the time of the buildings' original design and construction, the proposal would cause no change to the number of apartments receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight on the equinox. The planning proposal found no overshadowing impact to the Crowne Plaza building at 60 Bathurst Street between the hours of 9am to 3pm at midwinter and no change to the number of apartments receiving more than 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter. Due to the northerly orientation of all living spaces at 267 Sussex Street, 20 out of 21 apartments currently enjoy more than 2 hours of direct sunlight at midwinter and there is no change to this as a result of the planning proposal. Street trees are chosen to cope with the difficulties of the urban environment, including shadows and wind. Trees located along Day Street and Harbour Street will retain substantial midwinter sun should the proposal proceed, and trees along Bathurst and Sussex Streets are already fully overshadowed at midwinter by neighbouring buildings, including 289-295 Sussex Street and 298 Sussex Street.
View loss	38 submissions were received raising concerns about the loss of views to Darling Harbour, Cockle Bay and Tumbalong Park from existing apartments, and subsequent impact on residential amenity, desirability and property values. The submissions included 33 from Millennium Towers at 289-295 Sussex Street, 4 submissions from 60 Bathurst Street and 1 submission from 278 Sussex Street.	The planning proposal acknowledges the impact on views, as demonstrated in the View Sharing Analysis at Attachment A10. Referring to the view sharing planning principle established by Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council, while none of the views were identified as 'iconic', the total loss of partial water views of Cockle Bay and the partial loss of whole views of Tumbalong Park to the west were assessed as having moderate to severe impact. These views are currently obtained from front boundaries and from living spaces, accentuating the level of impact. The fourth step of the Tenacity planning principle is to assess the reasonableness of the proposal causing the impact. This planning proposal would increase the height of buildings control applying to the site from 45m to RL 87.7m (about 85m). This height is consistent with the surrounding context. The building height control to the east of Sussex Street is 110m, with 298 Sussex Street measuring

Issue	Key themes	City response
		RL 97.9m and 58-60 Bathurst Street measuring RL 91.3m, both higher than this proposal. The Darling Park commercial buildings to the north of the site reach between RL 95.9m and RL 132.2m. Millennium Towers at 289-295 Sussex Street is RL 74.5m, which exceeds the planning control on the site of 50m. The Tenacity planning principle requires an assessment of whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity while reducing the impact on the views of neighbours. Because of the location and orientation of the site, any increase in height will result in impacts to the views currently enjoyed by properties on Sussex and Bathurst Streets. The maximum height possible on the site has already been limited by the application of the no additional overshadowing protection to Sydney Square, Town Hall Steps and future Town Hall Square, which means that the maximum height of RL 87.7m does not apply across the whole site. Along the northern boundary, the maximum height of the building envelope is reduced to RL 66.9m. The subject site is strategically located between the major tourism infrastructure of Darling Harbour, the transport infrastructure of Town Hall, and the commercial and retail centres of the CBD. As established in section 5.3 of the Planning Proposal at Attachment A, the proposed development is consistent with the strategic direction established by the Central Sydney Planning Strategy and the City's Economic Development Strategy. In particular, the Central Sydney Planning Strategy seeks to prioritise employment growth and increased capacity in Central Sydney. The Economic Development Strategy encourages the growth of the tourism sector and precincts with strong sector specialisations. Therefore, the proposed land use is appropriate for the location. The views currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties on Sussex and Bathurst Streets are uncharacteristic of their CBD location. The City's planning framework does not protect private views. An objective of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy is "to ensure that new development is not impeded by the preservation of private views". To inhibit the development potential of 150 Day Street to protect these private views is unsustainable considering the strategic importance of the land and its ability to contribute to economic growth and job creation in Central Sydney. With consideration of the proposed building height and its context, the

Summary of submissions: 150 Day Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
Bulk and scale	37 submissions were received raising concern with the proposed height and FSR, stating that the height, density and scale was inconsistent with neighbourhood character.	site restrictions that prevent a different design from achieving the same development potential while reducing impact on views for neighbours, and the clear strategic direction of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy and Economic Development Strategy, the view loss is considered reasonable.
		The proposal to increase the FSR control from 9.9:1 to 13.5:1 is consistent with other commercial developments in Central Sydney and aligns with the strategic direction of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy to prioritise employment growth and increase capacity in Central Sydney. The maximum height of RL 87.7m has been tested to ensure that it can accommodate the proposed floor area. The site will remain subject to the no additional overshadowing controls protecting sun access to Sydney Town Hall steps, Sydney Square and future Town Hall Square. The maximum height of RL 87.7m is consistent with the existing heights of surrounding buildings. Millennium Towers at 289-295 Sussex Street is at RL 74.5m which exceeds the current height of buildings control of 50m. The height of buildings control to the east of Sussex Street is 110m, with 298 Sussex Street at RL 97.9m and 58-60 Bathurst Street at RL 91.3m.
Transport	35 submissions were received regarding transport and access issues, particularly increase of traffic on Bathurst Street and surrounding roads, impact on off-site parking due to the lack of parking on site, and pedestrian congestion on footpaths and nearby intersections. One submission was received in support of the proposal, noting the opportunities to improve pedestrian access, particularly the underpass from Druitt to Day Street.	The Transport Impact Assessment, at Attachment A11, finds that the proposal will generate an additional 23 vehicle trips per hour during the morning peak period, and an additional 13 vehicle trips per hour during the evening peak period. This level of traffic generation is acceptable, considering the Day Street/Bathurst Street intersection currently experiences excellent operating conditions with substantial spare capacity. The site's location within walking distance of major transport infrastructure, namely Town Hall Station 300 metres to the west, encourages the use of public transport. This is consistent with the strategic direction of City Plan 2036 and Sustainable Sydney 2030-2050: Continuing the vision, to locate development and growth in areas with existing transport infrastructure. Development on this site also represents an opportunity to improve the public domain and pedestrian linkages between the City and Darling Harbour, including along Bathurst Street, which can be secured as conditions of consent with any future Development Application.

Summary of submissions: 150 Day Street, Sydney

Issue	Key themes	City response
Planning merit	33 submissions were received raising concern about the planning merit behind the proposal, criticising the proposed tourist and visitor accommodation land use in a housing crisis, and the use of a spot rezoning rather than a precinct wide approach. One submission was received which supported the proposed land use in this location.	The planning proposal at Attachment A demonstrates how the proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Greater Sydney Region Plan, Eastern City District Plan, City Plan 2036, Sustainable Sydney 2030-2050: Continuing the vision, Central Sydney Planning Strategy and City of Sydney Economic Development Strategy. In particular, the Central Sydney Planning Strategy seeks to prioritise employment growth and increase capacity in Central Sydney and the City of Sydney Economic Development Strategy seeks to support efforts to create world class visitor services and promote areas with strong sector specialisations such as the tourism sector in Darling Harbour. It is also in alignment with the NSW Government's Visitor Economy Strategy 2030 Review, which sets objectives to increase hotel room supply statewide by 40,000. These are strategies which apply across the entire Central Sydney precinct.
Construction noise	One submission was received raising concerns about the impact of construction noise on neighbouring buildings.	Construction impacts, including noise and changes to pedestrian movements, will be considered as part of any future Development Application. This will include the implementation of a Construction Management Plan prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate.
Planting and public domain	One submission was received which supported the proposed increases to greenery and planting on the building and in the surrounding public domain.	This submission is noted.

Appendix A



City of Sydney
Gadigal Country
456 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000

+61 2 9265 9333
council@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au
GPO Box 1591 Sydney NSW 2001
cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

18 March 2026

Our Ref: X090796

Proposed changes to planning controls for 150 Day Street, Sydney

We invite your feedback on proposed changes to the planning controls for 150 Day Street, Sydney.

The proposal is to increase the maximum height from 45m to about 85m and the maximum floor space ratio from 9.9:1 to 13.5:1. This is equivalent to 8,200sqm more floor space.

The changes will support the retention and adaptive reuse of the existing 11-storey hotel and allow 11 more storeys for hotel uses.

The public consultation documents include a planning proposal to amend the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and a draft development control plan. We also seek your feedback on a draft planning agreement for affordable housing contributions.

Your feedback will be reported to Council and the Central Sydney Planning Committee. If Council approves this planning proposal, it can amend the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 on behalf of the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.

How to give feedback

You can view the proposal and give feedback at sydneyyoursay.com.au by **5pm on Monday 20 April 2026**.

Feedback can be made online, by email or post to: Project Officer, City Engagement, City of Sydney, Town Hall House, Level 7, 456 Kent Street, Sydney NSW 2000.

Feedback should quote 'Reference X090796 – 150 Day Street, Sydney'.

For more information or any queries about this project, please contact our planner James Dirickx-Jones on 02 9265 9333 or sydneyyoursay@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Pechey".

Ben Pechey
Executive Manager
Strategic Planning and Urban Design

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

Appendix B



Image: Hassell

Proposed changes to planning controls for 150 Day Street, Sydney

These changes will preserve the existing 11 storeys and allow an 11-storey extension for the hotel.

Review the proposal and share your thoughts by Monday 20 April.

[Read more](#)