

# Attachment E

<b>Submissions</b>
--------------------

**From:** Planning Systems Admin <planningsystemsadmin@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> on behalf of Planning Systems Admin <planningsystemsadmin@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au> <Planning Systems Admin <planningsystemsadmin@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>>  
**Sent on:** Monday, March 31, 2025 10:47:19 AM  
**To:** DASubmissions <DASubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** FW: Submission - D/2025/184 - 12-20 Rosebery Avenue ROSEBERY NSW 2018 - Attention Harry Choi

-----Original Message-----

From: 郑建程 <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Monday, 31 March 2025 3:56 AM  
To: DSubmissions <DSubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au>  
Subject: Submission - D/2025/184 - 12-20 Rosebery Avenue ROSEBERY NSW 2018 - Attention Harry Choi

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 support the development very much. But during the renovation, I don't know whether the noise can be controlled. Because there are a lot of UNSW students living in this area, if the noise is too loud, it will greatly affect our students' study and life. Also, whether the emission of pollutants can be controlled during the renovation, pollutants will affect our health, especially for international students like us, it will be very complicated to seek medical treatment.

In addition, I have some suggestions. The renovation will definitely have an impact on us, so I think the developer and the government need to bring us some convenience and compensation. Secondly, I think there are not enough pedestrian areas in this area. There are no crosswalks and traffic lights. So every time we go out, it is always inconvenient and dangerous.

We are very happy to open a coffee shop. If we can open supermarkets, restaurants and other convenient places, it will definitely be a great convenience for us.

**From:** Addison McGovern <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Addison McGovern  
<[REDACTED]> <Addison McGovern <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent on:** Saturday, April 5, 2025 11:38:16 AM  
**To:** dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au  
**Subject:** Submission - D/2025/184 - 12-20 Rosebery Avenue ROSEBERY NSW 2018 - Attention Harry Choi

**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,

In relation to document: [D/2025/184 - Traffic Impact Assessment - Appendix 18\\_Traffic\\_Assessment\\_12-20\\_Rosebery\\_Ave\\_Rosebery.pdf](#)

Under section 3.10 Road network impacts, the recommendation by JMT Consulting states that "The traffic generation analysis demonstrates that the proposal would result in a **reduction** in peak hour traffic generation when compared to existing conditions. It can therefore be concluded that the proposal will not impact the operation of the surrounding road network and no further traffic analysis or modelling is required."

I disagree with the above statement and note that there are already significant traffic impacts on Dalmeny Avenue, and increasing the number of vehicles that will be utilising this local street will have a detrimental impact on the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle movement in and around Dalmeny Avenue.

In conjunction with the developments that are occurring on and around the intersection of Dalmeny Avenue and Epsom Road, it would be short-sighted to assume that this development would not have an impact on peak-hour traffic generation and to state that it would result in a reduction, is beyond the realm of the existing reality of residents and visitors to Dalmeny Avenue.

Further traffic analysis is required, or at a minimum, a revisiting of the modelling provided. An additional assessment from an independent third party would be the preferred analysis.

Kind regards,

Addison McGovern

Ph: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

**From:** Dean Connelly <[REDACTED]> on behalf of Dean Connelly  
<[REDACTED]> <Dean Connelly <[REDACTED]>

**Sent on:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025 8:10:51 AM

**To:** dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

**Subject:** Submission - D/2025/184 - 12-20 Rosebery Avenue ROSEBERY NSW 2018 - Attention Harry Choi

**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 Harry,

Dalmeney Avenue is already an incredibly busy road due to high density apartments and the fact that it is a cul-de-sac / no through road. If possible, it would be great if the entrance to this new building could be on Rosebery Avenue, avoiding further road noise on Dalmeney Avenue.

We're also worried about the lack of natural light / view with an 8 storey apartment going in.

Thank you,

Dean

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

**Sent on:** Wednesday, April 23, 2025 9:47:52 PM

**To:** dasubmissions@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au

**Subject:** Submission - D/2025/184 - 12-20 Rosebery Avenue ROSEBERY NSW 2018 - Attention Harry Choi

**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 Harry,

I am writing to you with respect to D/2025/184 at 12-20 Rosebery Avenue which is currently on public exhibition.

I am a resident located across the road at Unit 303/101 Dalmeny Avenue. I am supportive of the need for increased housing supply and am generally supportive of the development application.

I do however have the following comments for Council's consideration when assessing this application:

### 1. Solar Access

Whilst there has been detailed solar analysis conducted through the pre-DA stage it'd be good to ensure throughout DA assessment opportunities to minimise overshadowing to 101 Dalmeny Avenue are further explored.

It is positive to see the DA design submitted has utilised articulation and setbacks of the building in such a way to address some solar compliance concerns but it is unclear whether this is sufficient in addressing the report "s1776\_12-20 Rosebery Ave Shadow Report\_230815". I haven't been able to locate this report online but it'd be good to ensure Council assessment officers review the referenced report to ensure alignment.

Further to this it is positive to see ADG solar compliance is seemingly maintained for 3 of the 6 most impacted apartments (subject to Council review) . However the development will cause overshadowing that impacts not just these apartments but the majority of apartments facing Dalmeny Avenue when solar access is considered beyond 3pm. Where possible it'd be great for the applicant and Council to consider how the design can be further optimised to not just seek adherence with ADG (and associated 9am-3pm assessment) but to also target minimising solar access impacts so they are not worse than the current undeveloped scenario. Appreciate this is not possible to do when constructing a new building above the existing commercial building's height but where further improvements can be made this would be greatly welcomed.

Some areas recommended to be explored further include the following:

- **Articulation**(breaking down the massing through recesses, voids and articulation to allow more light to reach neighbouring properties as well as avoiding solid or monolithic walls)
- **Setbacks**(reviewing current setbacks from property boundary and upper levels and assessing whether greater setbacks are possible from either the street frontage height or upper levels.
  - Council should also consider the permissible height limit for 57-65 Epsom Road in its assessment as if / when developed this may cause further adverse impacts. If possible it'd be good to ensure some additional setbacks from the North Eastern corner from the development at 12-20 Rosebery Avenue are explored so there is more space for solar access in the future where both developments occur.
- **Materials**(exploring light-colour or reflective facade materials to bounce light towards neighbouring properties as well as using varied materials)

### 2. Privacy

Good to see many design aspects have been worked through to ensure suitable privacy for neighbouring properties. Where the opportunity exists, it'd be great to ensure during assessment period any further optimisation is explored including window placement, modulation and offset of balconies as well as landscape buffers.

### 3. Tree Retention

Positive to see some significant trees fronting Dalmeny Avenue are proposed for retention. However there are a number of trees close to the property boundary proposed for removal. Where possible it'd be great for these to also be maintained but understand if this is not possible from a constructability perspective based on the final approved building footprint. An option that could be explored includes whether the basement footprint can be refined to avoid disturbance to the tree root zones of trees currently proposed for removal. Where trees are approved for retention if / when the application is approved, Council should condition the DA such that adequate protection provisions are in place during construction.

Your consideration of the above is much appreciated, if you'd like to clarify any of the comments please don't hesitate to reach out.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted Signature]