

# **Attachment A**

**Summary of Submissions  
55 Pitt Street, Sydney**

## Attachment A

### Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
1.	Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications	<p><b>Sydney Airport controlled activity</b> – The proposed change to the maximum permissible building height will result in a penetration of prescribed airspace for Sydney Airport. Prescribed airspace includes the airspace above any part of either an Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) or Procedures for Air Navigation Services - Aircraft Operations (PANS-OPS) surface for the airport.</p> <p>Construction of a development to a height above 156 metres AHD would result in an intrusion into the OLS and as such, constitute a controlled activity under the Act. Controlled activities cannot be carried out without prior approval from the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications.</p>	Noted. A detailed development application will require concurrence from Sydney Airport as the proposed works penetrate the Operations Limitation Surface height of 156 metres. This is consistent with clause 7.16 of the LEP and under the Airports Act 1996.
2.	Transport for NSW	<p><b>Raise no significant issues</b> – Note the site is within the Sydney Metro corridor. Any future development applications must comply with relevant guidelines and be referred to TfNSW and Sydney Metro. A detailed development application is to include a Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment to identify traffic and transport impacts associated the proposed development.</p> <p><b>Shared / Pedestrian zones</b> – Section 6.1.5.2 of the draft DCP states that the building is to be planned and designed to accommodate the future conversion of Dalley and Underwood Street into shared and/or pedestrian zone with associated stormwater works.</p> <p>Any approved shared zones would need to be designed and implemented in accordance with TfNSW Technical Direction 2016/001 (TD). TfNSW would be pleased to review any application for a shared zone which includes an investigation on whether the circumstances justify the application for such a facility. If the traffic flows are higher than what is recommended in the TD, then further justification would need to be provided to TfNSW on why the shared zones would be appropriate.</p>	Noted. A traffic and transport assessment is a standard requirement for large applications.
3.	Heritage NSW	<p><b>Tank Stream</b> – The subject site is located directly adjacent to the State Heritage Register (SHR) listed 'Tank Stream' (SHR 00636), which runs under Pitt Street directly to the east of the site.</p> <p>It is understood that the development permitted by the planning proposal would include three levels of basement consisting of an off-street loading dock, end of trip facility and car parking. Given the vicinity of the proposed basement to the 'Tank Stream' care must be taken to avoid any impacts on this important State Heritage Register item.</p> <p>We note that the Heritage Impact Statement identified the following mitigation measures in relation to the Tank Stream:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on the Tank Stream or within its 3m curtilage (protection zone) must be avoided.</li> <li>• development work within a 10m buffer zone should be approved by a suitably qualified structural engineer in accordance with the Tank Stream CMP (2005), and</li> <li>• consultation with Sydney Water will be required for the Stage 2 DA and for any investigative works that may impact on the Tank Stream.</li> </ul> <p>The above controls are considered appropriate and acceptable.</p>	Noted. A provision has been included in the DCP to ensure Heritage NSW is consulted in preparation of the detailed development application to minimise impacts on the Tank Stream.

**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p><b>Historical Archaeology</b> – It is noted the preliminary analysis undertaken for the Heritage Impact Statement concluded there was potential for historical archaeology within the subject site, and the Stage 2 DA should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be informed by a detailed historical archaeological impact assessment in accordance with NSW Heritage Division guidelines, and</li> <li>• consultation with the NSW Heritage Division (now Heritage NSW) to agree on recommended mitigation and management strategies.</li> </ul>	Noted. The draft DCP has been updated to ensure the landowner consults with Heritage NSW while preparing the detailed development application.
		<p><b>Local Heritage</b> – the site is also located nearby to several Local heritage items listed on Council’s LEP. As these items are listed under your LEP, Council is the consent authority, and the assessment and consideration of any impacts rests with Council. Prior to finalisation of the planning proposal, Council should be satisfied that all necessary due diligence, assessments and notifications have been undertaken.</p>	Noted
4.	Sydney Metro	<p><b>Concurrence/consultation-</b> Sydney Metro is the relevant rail authority for the Sydney Metro – City &amp; Southwest rail corridor for the purpose of the Infrastructure SEPP. Sydney Metro understands that the Planning Proposal proposes to amend base controls for the subject site stipulated by the Sydney LEP 2012. The proposal aims to deliver approximately 70,000sqm of commercial office floor space in a new 50 storey tower with ground floor retail and active uses opening to new and upgraded public domain, pedestrian colonnade and through-site link. As this is a Planning Proposal, the provisions of clause 86 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) do not apply. However, future development applications with more than 2 metres of excavation will trigger concurrence under the Infrastructure SEPP.</p> <p>Sydney Metro requests consultation with the Applicant prior to a DA being lodged to assess and review interfaces between a proposed development and Sydney Metro infrastructure.</p>	Noted. While future development will trigger concurrence requirements with Sydney Metro, the DCP has been updated to include a provision to ensure Sydney Metro is consulted during preparation of the detailed development application to further ensure impacts to the Metro corridor are minimised.
5.	Civil Aviation and Safety Authority	<p><b>Sydney Airport controlled activity</b> – At this stage, CASA has no objections to the proposal however, once the building has been assessed from an obstacle perspective, mitigations such as obstacle lighting may be required.</p> <p>It is assumed that the maximum building height is 232m above ground level, which could make the maximum height approximately 250m above Australian Height Datum. At this height, the building will infringe prescribed airspace for Sydney Airport as it will penetrate the Obstacle Limitation Surfaced known as the Outer Horizontal Surface (elevation 156m AHD). The proposal will therefore require a controlled activity approval from the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications (DITRDC) under the Airports (Protection of Airspace Regulations) 1996 (the Airspace Regulations).</p> <p>In accordance with the Airspace Regulations, when the height of the development has been confirmed, the proponent should seek the controlled activity approval through Sydney Airports Corporation Ltd (SACL). SACL will confirm the infringement and obtain comments from stakeholders, including CASA and Air Services Australia and refer the application to DITRDC. CASA will assess the building from an obstacle perspective when a request for comment is received from CASA.</p>	Noted. A detailed development application will require concurrence from Sydney Airport as the proposed works penetrate the Operations Limitation Surface height of 156 metres. This is consistent with clause 7.16 of the LEP and under the Airports Act 1996.
6.	Sydney Water	<p><b>Storm and waste water servicing</b> – Sydney Water has no objection to the proposal, however, due to its scale and complexity, we request that the proponent lodges a Feasibility study with Sydney Water for the proposed development. The proponent should contact a Water Servicing Coordinator to lodge this study on their</p>	Noted. The future development application will require approval from Sydney Water. A provision is included in the DCP to ensure appropriate consultation is undertaken.

**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>behalf. Any potential upsizing of our local assets or limitations in our system will be defined with the Feasibility process.</p> <p><b>Stormwater</b> – As the subject proposal is to increase the Floor Surface Ratio and the building height, Sydney Water has no specific stormwater requirements for this proposal. If any proposed development is going to generate trade wastewater, the developer must submit an application requesting permission to discharge trade wastewater to Sydney Water’s wastewater system. The applicant must wait for the approval and issue of a permit before any business activities can commence. Detailed requirements, including any potential extensions or amplifications, will be provided once the development is referred to Sydney Water for a Section 73 application. More information about the Section 73 application process is available on our web page in the Land Development Manual.</p>	

**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
7.	Landowner	<p><b>Heritage floor space</b> – Further clarity around the operation of HFS is sought. It is noted that amended Clause 6.25 proposes for Clause 6.11 to continue to apply. Is it the intent that HFS will apply to the 10% design excellence floor space? The proposed wording suggests will only be applicable to accommodation floor space.</p> <p>Is there also a need for amended Clause 6.25 to include reference to 6.11A as being applicable?</p>	<p>The planning proposal does not seek to change the application of the existing heritage floor space provisions as contained in clause 6.11 of the LEP or as it applies in relation to design excellence floor space. This planning proposal will amend the APDG provisions to detail the proposed planning envelope for 55 Pitt Street and direct future development to the operation of the heritage floor space scheme pursuant to clause 6.11 of the LEP, which details how heritage floor space applies in relation to design excellence floor space</p> <p>The alternative heritage floor space allocation scheme provides temporary measures as an alternative to allocating HFS for new developments in Central Sydney pursuant to clause 6.11A of the LEP. The scheme was introduced to address a shortage of available HFS for which a developer is required to demonstrate real and ongoing efforts to acquire HFS were made and they were unable to secure the required amount. The alternative arrangements are secured through a planning agreement and are triggered by a modification application to amend the relevant condition in the development consent.</p> <p>As such, it is not necessary to modify this planning proposal to reference the alternative scheme as this will need to be addressed following a detailed development application, and only as required.</p>
		<p><b>Lanes development floor space</b> – The proponent's original planning justification report proposed an amendment to the Lanes Map (Sheet 14) within the LEP in order to reflect the proposed Queens Court Through-site link/laneway. The planning proposal that was progressed and placed on exhibition did not however propose any amendment to the Lane Map. This appears to be an error and accordingly it is requested that Council amend the Lanes Map accordingly.</p>	<p>The planning proposal has been updated to include the extended Queens Court through-site link on the Lanes Map and the draft provisions have been amended to include reference to clause 6.8 of the LEP to reflect the application of lanes development floor space as initially omitted.</p>
		<p><b>Queens Court – glazed awning</b> – The Streets, Lanes and Through Site Links - Option B Figure 6.8A includes a reference and section of the proposed through-site link. It is recommended that this Figure (specifically through-site link C) is updated to include reference to the glazed awning and ensure better alignment with the DCP text.</p>	<p>Provision 6.1.5.2(18)(c) of the draft DCP currently states that a high-level glazed roof/awning is to be included above the Queens Court through-site link at a minimum height of 10 metres above ground level. This is to ensure that Queens Court continues to feel as an outdoor space to pedestrians and diners and a visual connection from any double-height retail spaces is maintained to maximise activation.</p>
		<p><b>Queens Court – glazed awning</b> – It is noted that the proposed section 6.1.5.2 (18)(c) identifies a minimum height for the Queens Court glazed awning of 10m. The indicative design prepared in support of the planning proposal includes the glazed awning with a height sitting around 9.2-9.7m above ground level. This aligns well with the juncture of the level 2 floor level. It is recommended that reference to 10m is amended to reflect the indicative design (i.e. the awning having a minimum height of approx. 9m or to align with the level 2 slab level).</p>	<p>In their submission, the landowner states that while this remains their intention, the indicative design indicates that the roof/awning is able to align with the juncture between the first and second floors at a height of 9.2 metres above ground level. As such, the provision and relevant figure in the draft DCP has been updated to reflect the above.</p>
		<p><b>Queens Court – activation</b> – Mirvac fully supports the intent to activate the through-site link through a range of fine grain uses. Given site constraints however there are significant challenges in being able to accommodate such uses within the basement. Mirvac's focus will therefore be on investigating opportunities for double height spaces at ground and first floors. Acknowledging this, there may be some benefit in providing flexibility to utilise basement or level 1 in Section 6.1.5.2 (18)(b).</p>	<p>The provisions in the draft DCP seek to maximise the amount of retail activation that fronts the Queens Court through-site link by encouraging double height retail spaces that may link from the ground floor to the basement or first floor.</p> <p>It is however unlikely that retail space may be accommodated in the basement of the future building due to site constraints and the potential for flood water inundation. As such, this provision has been reworded to provide flexibility in the provision of fine grain retail fronting the through-site link.</p>
		<p><b>Queens Court – activation</b> – The DCP requirement for connected ground and basement / first floor retail spaces may also limit the ability to qualify for Lane Development floor space e.g. having space less than 100sqm. It is requested the Council review the wording accordingly.</p>	

**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p><b>Design excellence</b> – It is recommended that Council review Section 6.1.6.4 to ensure the correct LEP reference is made i.e. reference to Clause 6.25(3A)(d) rather than 6.21(7)(b)?</p> <p>Reference 6.21 (7)(a) not applying may not be necessary given proposed amended LEP Clause 6.25 covers this off.</p>	<p>The intent of the draft amendments to the LEP as contained in the planning proposal is to ensure the operation of the existing provisions, located elsewhere in the LEP, are applied as per their current operation. As such, the draft provisions for the subject site directs and references the relevant clauses where necessary.</p> <p>The draft provisions and the DCP have been updated to reference the relevant design excellence and APDG clauses where necessary to provide additional clarification. The draft provisions in the planning proposal directs to applicable clause for the application of additional floor space should the building exhibit design excellence.</p>
		<p><b>Draft voluntary planning agreement</b> – Annexure C in the draft VPA which contains Drawing SSK 006 – Instruments Plan. It is confirmed that it is the intent that the owner of the Mirvac owned land will have the burden of maintaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the land over which the Lane Works and Blast Wall will be located including the public access through site link; and</li> <li>• the Telstra colonnade including public access.</li> <li>• Whilst this is marked as items (2), (4), (6), and (8) on the “SSK 006 – Instruments plan” in Annexure C to the Draft VPA, those numbers depict the general area where the maintenance obligation will apply. However, the burden of that maintenance covenant is intended to fall on the Mirvac Land. That is, the positive covenant instrument will be registered on the Mirvac Land as per the amended plan included at Attachment A but the maintenance is to occur on the area subject to the through site link, Lane Works, Blast Wall and Telstra colonnade. This has been made clear within the amended plan and the note to item [2] and [4] and [8].</li> </ul> <p>Further, we note that the Blast Wall (if constructed) will extend beyond Queen’s Court. In which case Mirvac will enter into an arrangement with the owner of Lot B DP 104160 (Ausgrid) to also ensure that that portion of the Blast Wall is maintained by the owner of the Mirvac Land.</p> <p>In summary, it is requested that SSK 006 – Instruments Plan Revision 6 is replaced with the attached updated plan (SSK 006 – Instruments Plan Revision 8) in order to more accurately convey the maintenance arrangements and obligations committed to by Mirvac.</p>	<p>Noted. No objection to these minor changes is raised by the City as they will not change the public benefits and the VPA will be amended prior to execution.</p>
8.	Adjacent landowner	<p><b>Tower massing impact on Underwood Street</b> – The tower element of the proposed building envelope is setback 3 and 4 metres from Underwood Street. This can be compared with the former APDG controls for a tower on the 55 Pitt Street site which had a setback of 8 metres.</p> <p>The proposed tower separation results in reduced amenity for Underwood Street in terms of sun and daylight access to public places. Sky views are significantly reduced, resulting in an erosion of the benefits from the wider Underwood Street footpath. This reduction in daylight can be seen in the following diagrams.</p> <p>It is submitted that consideration should be given to the tower setback from Underwood Street and retaining the previous APDG tower setback of 8 metres.</p>	<p>Setbacks help manage impacts to amenity and environmental conditions, including wind, daylight access and privacy. The draft Strategy generally recommends an 8 metre setback and allows setbacks to be varied where the proposal can demonstrate equivalent daylight access is maintained compared to the performance of a base case envelope.</p> <p>The planning proposal was accompanied by a daylight analysis in the Urban Design Study that compared the impact of the planning envelope on daylight levels in the public domain as compared to the base case envelope. The analysis demonstrated that overall, the proposal is capable of maintaining equivalent levels of daylight access to surrounding public domain and is considered acceptable. Furthermore, the east-west section of Underwood Street will include a publicly accessible colonnade, replicating the current pedestrian conditions. Increasing the tower setbacks on the northern boundary will not result in a significant increase to pedestrian daylight levels along the colonnade. It is noted that both towers include limited setbacks as a result of limited site area and tower floor space requirements. The adjacent tower includes a nil setback along its southern</p>
	Adjacent landowner	<p><b>Tower setback and privacy</b> – The proximity of the two towers results in adjoining office areas in close proximity. The impact is ameliorated by the majority of each adjoining building elevation being taken up by the building cores, however the privacy to office areas in the south eastern corner of the Sydney Place floorplate is compromised as a result. Measures can be readily incorporated into the detailed design of 55 Pitt</p>	

## Attachment A

### Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<p>Street to enhance the amenity and function of the north east corner of the office floors in any new building. This can be achieved as an outcome of the competitive design process.</p> <p>Council is requested to ensure that there is a requirement in the future design competition to consider features in the north east corner to maintain privacy between the buildings. This should be a requirement of the design competition brief.</p>	<p>boundary, however as this is predominantly building core privacy concerns are limited to the north-east corner of the subject site. The Building Design provisions in the DCP has been updated to ensure sufficient treatments are included to minimise any privacy impacts to adjacent towers</p>
	Adjacent landowner	<p><b>Function of Underwood Street</b> – Council is requested to amend Figure 6.8A – Streets, Lanes and Through Site Links – Option B of the Draft Sydney DCP 2012 for 55 Pitt Street to correct the legend to Lane Type C which is the east west section of Underwood Street. The notation for “F” should be altered as follows:</p> <p>Shared service road 5m. <del>No vehicle access 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday.</del></p> <p>Underwood Street carries two-way vehicle movement to the vehicular entrance to Sydney Place and 24 hour access to this vehicular entrance is required.</p>	<p>Regulation of the use of the roadway takes place under the Roads Act 1993 and is not governed by the planning controls. The planning controls set out the available space of the roadway suitable for its intended future use. The draft DCP includes a provision to ensure development on site will not impact the future conversion of adjacent roadways to shared zones. The draft DCP has been updated to remove reference 'No vehicle access 8am-6pm Monday to Friday' from the legend in Figure 6.8A as it relates to Lane type C for the east-west section of Underwood Street.</p>
	Adjacent landowner	<p><b>Amendments to drafting instructions</b> – Table 1 of Council’s Planning Proposal – 55 Pitt Street, Sydney provides drafting instructions for proposed amendments to the APDG provisions in Sydney LEP 2012. The following clarifications to these drafting instructions are requested:</p> <p>6.25(3A) - Correct the first sentence to remove redundant words.</p> <p>6.25(3A)(d) - Add clause reference number at the end of this paragraph – perhaps clause 6.21.</p> <p>6.25(8)(b) - Correct this paragraph to refer to subclause (8) rather than clause (6.25) and or insert reference to block 5. Current wording can mean the clause applies to all of the APDG site with the planning proposal specific to 55 Pitt Street (block 5).</p> <p>6.25(8)(c) - For the same reason, this subclause should only apply to block 5 and not the subject land to which clause 6.25 applies.</p>	<p>The City’s response to the requested amendment is included below:</p> <p>Clause 6.25 (3A) - the planning proposal has been updated to delete (shown as strikethrough) the duplicate words;</p> <p>Clause 6.25 (3A)(d) – noted, the draft provisions in the planning proposal have been updated (shown in italics) to reference the specific clause as follows "building demonstrating design excellence as defined under clause 6.21(9)";</p> <p>Clause 6.25 (8)(b) - clause 6.25 (8) defines block 5 and includes lot descriptions, the ensure the draft provisions are clear, the planning proposal has been updated to include "sub" clause in 6.25 (8)(b); and</p> <p>Clause 6.25 (8)(c) - to ensure the land to which these provisions apply, the planning proposal has been updated to include "sub" clause in 6.25 (8)(c).</p>
9.	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> – I think it is fantastic! Sydney needs more of this quality high rise development. It is a Global City and needs to retain its competitiveness. Taller, greener, more efficient towers with more public space opened up between them instead of rubbish 70's concrete buildings would improve the CBD immensely.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposal to increase building height and floor space is consistent with the aims of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy which allows development potential for the site and opportunities for economic growth in Central Sydney on suitable sites.</p>
10.	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> – I think this is a positive development. For too long I believe the CBD has been too "short" which has resulted in the inefficient use of space in the CBD. If anything, my main criticism is the height limits should be increased.</p>	
11..	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> – I believe the proposal of a 232m office tower at 55 Pitt street should get the green light and be built, as it will help Sydney and its economy, and provide more future opportunities for jobs.</p>	
12.	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> – As a City of Sydney resident and property owner, I’m supportive of this endeavour. Include Seismic-design; and Allow "sun light through".</p>	
13.	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> – I totally agree as the increase of population is a fact and the height of 232 still is very reasonable</p>	
14.	Individual	<p><b>Support additional height/density</b> - I support the proposal to increase the floor space ratio and height to permit the development of a commercial office tower of up to 232 metres high at 55 Pitt Street, Sydney.</p>	

## Attachment A

### Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
		<b>Economic benefits</b> – I believe this is a state-significant site and the new proposal will positively impact the skyline and will provide necessary local improvements to the streetscape and accessibility in the area.	Noted. Capacity for employment growth in Central Sydney is important to ensure the New South Wales economy is capable of delivering the necessary resilience and future growth for recovery. This planning proposal provides for additional employment floor space to increase the capacity of new jobs and investment.
15.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> – There is no valid reason and nothing unique being provided to allow the height of the building to be increased above 110m. The same rules should apply to this development. COVID has shown that office space is likely to be less utilised into the future,	The subject planning envelope, at 232 metres in height and as a commercial office tower, will be consistent with its surrounding context. The site is located in a tower cluster area, identified in the Strategy and draft Central Sydney planning proposal. Tower clusters have been designated as locations where additional building height and density may be accommodated without overshadowing key public spaces and deliver additional employment generating floor space. Such projects are required to deliver key sustainability targets and ensure the protection of acceptable public domain amenity. The height of the tower is also consistent with the heights envisaged under the Strategy for this location.
16.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> – No. Keep it as it is. 232m is too tall.	
17.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> - The planning controls should not be “unlocked” for this development. The local amenity improvements should be provided with the development meeting existing planning controls.	
18.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> – I am against this height for the city. There is shadow impact, and its over development of the area	
19.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> – Increasing the tower size to 232 meters will add no benefit to the future of Sydney. It is also extremely close to existing buildings. Future generations of employees will forever be looking across at another building. Adjacent buildings will also be heavily restricted of natural light, privacy, and views will be blocked. I heavily oppose these height increase changes. The past agreed LEP for put in place for reasons listed above.	The planning proposal introduces an alternative building height of 232 metres for the subject site, by amending the APDG provisions in the LEP. By delivering significant public domain improvements, new pedestrian laneways and other links throughout the site, the proposal delivers on the objective for clause 6.25 of the LEP and as such meets the requirements for additional building height at this location.
20.	Individual	<b>Excessive height/density</b> – I’m in the middle of Sydney [York street] 12 years ago because I wanted all the benefits the city of Sydney said they were interested in. Since then all they have done is obliterated the environment Sun is only a bonus when I take the Manly ferry or the botanical gardens.	The proposed indicative development concept includes a maximum building height of 232 metres on no more than 44% of the block, to accommodate up to 50 storeys of new office floor space. New active uses and ground floor retail will be included in the podium, which will front an upgraded public domain, comprising of a new north-south through-site link achieved by extending Queens Court north to form a new connection with Underwood Street, which will feature an east-west pedestrian colonnade. These new pedestrian connections will connect to the wider pedestrian laneway network that is currently being delivered across the APDG block, providing more accessible open space and activated pedestrian laneways that will be suitable for outdoor dining.
		<b>Adverse amenity impacts</b> – Cycleways and roads don’t enhance they are just tunnels for winds. Perth was known as the widest city in the world in the 70S. City of Sydney, congratulations your high towers not only mean lights on during the day but blown above the speed limit when going out, I suppose wind power is a green effect will be your argument. It is obvious that the shape and positioning create wind and shadow. Get out of your offices and take a walk on a nice day. Of course, you will need a jumper and heavy shoes to protect from wind and shadows.	The planning proposal delivers on the objective of the APDG block by providing for additional building height in a high-quality built form that delivers an improved public domain which consists of new pedestrian connections. Future development is located on the site where a tower has been envisaged since the controls were initially developed.
21.	Individual	<b>Adverse amenity impacts</b> – Too high. The human scale is being lost all over the city. Too high causes more overshadowing and greater wind sheer and wind tunnel effect.	The proposal is also consistent with a key move of the Central Sydney Planning Strategy in that additional building height and density may be unlocked where it will not result in adverse wind and daylight impacts in the public domain. The proposed indicative scheme has been developed in collaboration with the landowner to minimise any adverse environmental impacts, including excessive wind speeds. To ascertain the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding environmental amenity, the Strategy establishes a base case building envelope, to which the planning envelope is to demonstrate improved or equivalent performance.
22.	Individual	<b>Adverse amenity impacts</b> – The street frontage setbacks are inadequate and do not provide sufficient open space sky views to pedestrians in the public space.	The planning proposal was accompanied by a daylight analysis included in the Urban Design Study that found that the proposed planning envelope will maintain equivalent daylight levels in the public domain surrounding the site as the base case envelope under the Strategy. The planning envelope is outlined in this planning proposal and is therefore consistent with the requirements for daylight



**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
			<p>levels under the Strategy.</p> <p>A detailed Wind Impact Assessment accompanied the planning proposal, which included an assessment of pedestrian wind comfort levels. The assessment included a wind tunnel equivalence test to determine the impacts of the proposed envelope on wind conditions. The assessment found that public domain conditions would generally remain suitable for pedestrian walking activities, however there were some areas that required mitigation to ensure the wind conditions matched the character of that location. For example, while conditions would remain calm in Dalley Street and Underwood Street, a high-level glazed roof/awning above the enhanced Queens Court through-site link would provide for a comfortable environment that is suitable for dwelling and outdoor dining, which would complement the fine-grain retail spaces that are proposed to front the laneway. As such, the draft DCP includes provisions for a high-level glazed roof/awning above the Queens Court through-site link.</p> <p>The planning proposal was accompanied by an Urban Design Study that included a detail shadow analysis that demonstrated the proposed planning envelope will not result in any additional overshadowing to nearby identified places, including Macquarie Place Park and Australia Square.</p>
	Individual	<p><b>Ecological Sustainable development</b> – I do not support the proposed changes as the consideration of ecologically sustainable development is too simplistic and uninformed. It is essential that a development of this magnitude is completed with a central focus on ESD. The NABERS and green star systems have serious flaws that this proposal.</p>	<p>The proposed development concept is required to achieve the set ecological sustainable development targets, which have been agreed to and secured through a planning agreement. The target ESD ratings are consistent with the City's sustainability targets and include a 5.5 star NABERS energy rating, 4 star NABERS water rating and 6 star Green Star office rating. The NABERS and Green Star initiatives are considered industry standards and widely used on new and existing developments across New South Wales, Australia and internationally as they are well-suited for inclusion in planning controls than other measures due to their certainty for landowners.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the criticisms of the NABERS and Green Star rating systems, the draft DCP includes measures to ensure future development on site will deliver significantly improved environmental performance and sustainability outcomes. The proposal includes further ESD initiatives that go beyond the above programs. The Ecologically Sustainable Design Statement that accompanied the planning proposal details the specific sustainability initiatives that are to be implemented throughout the whole lifecycle of the building. Initiatives secured in the VPA as part of Green Star system include construction environment management, building metering and monitoring systems and operation waste management to divert from landfill in the operation phase. The ESD provisions in the DCP ensure that future development on site will net-zero carbon, zero waste and water efficient outcomes.</p>

**Attachment A**  
**Summary of submissions: 55 Pitt Street**

No.	Submitter	Submission	Response
23.	Individual	<p><b>Heritage</b> – The building that I believe should be listed is at 51-57 Pitt St. It is a medium rise building in the Post War International style and is a perfect complement to (and every bit the equal of), the Former Qantas House on Chifley Square and the AMP Building. It is also one of the few (and potentially destined, in time, to be potentially the only) remaining example of the medium-rise office buildings that once dominated the area between Circular Quay and Bridge St.</p> <p>I also note that according to the Council on Tall Building and Urban Habitat, a single developer owns the building in question and the adjoining property to the north, with a vision to rebuild both. If 51-57 Pitt St received heritage classification, the developer could potentially utilise the heritage floor space scheme to avoid losing-out overall.</p> <p>I do not work in any area to do with urban planning or design, I am simply a proud citizen of this city who believes passionately in the need to preserve our significant architectural heritage.</p>	<p>In 2017-2018, the City conducted a review of modernist buildings within the local government area, to ensure that the best examples of this architectural period were identified, assessed and heritage listed to ensure their conservation. This review included an assessment of many buildings of this architectural style and 49A-57 Pitt Street was not identified for heritage listing in the recent proposal.</p> <p>Demolition of all buildings on the land has been anticipated in the vision for the APDG block in the LEP and DCP to facilitate the redevelopment of the whole block and deliver significant improvements to the public domain and pedestrian network. Furthermore, the planning proposal was accompanied by a Heritage Impact Statement which did not consider any of the existing buildings on site to be of sufficient significance to justify its retention or listing.</p>
24.	Individual	<p><b>Design excellence</b> - The Design Excellence Strategy should include criteria of Diversity &amp; Inclusion for the Invited Competitors and the Jury - including a gender target of 40/40/20. A diverse community requires a diversity of built form practitioners to create our urban environs.</p>	<p>The Design Excellence Strategy will be finalised following the completion of the public exhibition of the planning proposal. The current policy does not require the jury details to form part of the strategy. Nevertheless, the proponent has put forward a jury with equal gender representation. The draft update to the Design Excellence provisions for tower cluster areas includes requirements for equal gender representation and will be implemented following adoption by Council.</p>