

Attachment A

**Ultimo Pyrmont Planning Framework and Central
Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020
Amendments - Summary of Submissions and
Responses**

Summary of submissions and responses

Engagement activity

From 1 October to 13 November 2024, we asked the community to comment on the draft Ultimo Pymont Planning Framework. The table below provides an overview of the activities undertaken.

Activity	Outcome
Sydney Your Say webpage The webpage and online feedback form was open for feedback from 1 October to 13 November 2024.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3,636 unique page views• 989 document downloads
Interactive map An interactive map with drawings that summarise the proposed changes to planning controls was included on the consultation webpage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1,738 total visits• 797 unique users
Information video Explainer video outlining the approach used to prepare the planning controls was posted on the webpage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 562 views
Map / photo gallery A set of maps explaining the selection process followed when deciding which sites to consider in the study was also on the webpage.	
Notification letter A notification letter was sent to owners and occupants in the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 19,720 letters sent
Email notification to stakeholders A notification email advising the proposal was open for comment was sent to local community groups, subscribers and people who made a submission during the early engagement phase.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• sent on 3 October 2024• 418 recipients
E-newsletters Sydney Your Say newsletter – October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• sent on 18 October 2024• 5,136 subscribers
Online information session The session guided participants through the webpage and each available document plus how to make a submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• held 14 October 2024• 12 pax
Media release / announcement Media release sent out 4 October.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• coverage by Channel 7 and trade magazines including The Urban Developer, Build Australia and Architecture AU

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions

254 submissions were made by email and survey response. 23 submissions were in support of the proposal, 72 were neutral and 148 submissions raised objection. In addition, 11 submissions were received from public authorities and government agencies.

Submissions were received from:

Individuals	207
Building representatives (including developers, landowner representatives, owners' corporations and strata committees)	28
State Government agencies	11
Community groups, advocacy bodies, and organisations	8
Total	254

The following table summarises the topics raised in these submissions and provides a response. The table is organised into three sections:

- General – comments relating to the proposal in its entirety or in a general sense
- Site specific – comments relating to a site or group of sites
- State Government submissions – those from Government agencies

General comments and responses

Submissions summary	Response
General - Support for the planning framework	
<p>23 submissions - General support for the planning framework.</p> <p>The planning controls will provide for housing and employment growth in a location with excellent amenity, close to existing infrastructure and services, supported by an increase in public transport capacity and local infrastructure investment.</p> <p>It was acknowledged that the planning controls had been carefully crafted to minimise impacts on the existing community and generally looked to promote place improvements, including more trees, more open space, widened footpaths and streets with access to daylight and comfortable wind conditions.</p>	Support noted.
General - Density, infrastructure and traffic	

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p>33 <i>submissions</i> – Ultimo and Pyrmont already support a large population and are high density. Concern about the impact of increasing density on existing residents.</p> <p>Need to consider cumulative impacts with Fish Markets, Blackwattle Bay and Harbourside developments.</p>	<p>The NSW Government’s Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy was prepared in expectation of the proposed Metro West station.</p> <p>A new Metro station at Pyrmont will drive demand for additional people to live, work, visit and move businesses to the area, which is already one of Australia's most successful urban communities, home to 18,000 residents and 34,000 workers.</p> <p>The City's approach looks to accommodate this growth in a way that is place-led and people-focused.</p> <p>Blackwattle Bay, the fish markets, Harbourside Shopping Centre, the Star, the Ultimo Indigenous Residential College and the new Pyrmont Metro Station sites have all been rezoned by NSW Government. These are not part of the City’s review of planning controls, but they will contribute to the growth and change envisaged by the NSW Government’s Place Strategy. In terms of infrastructure planning, growth on these and other government sites in the area has been considered by the City in its preparation of the proposal and the Pyrmont Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan.</p>
<p>55 <i>submissions</i> - Population growth must be supported by infrastructure, amenities and services. Pyrmont and Ultimo are already underprovided for. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 <i>submissions</i> - need for more primary and secondary schools • 15 <i>submissions</i> - need for more or upgraded parks and green space • 14 <i>submissions</i> - concern about strain on the power grid • 8 <i>submission</i> - need for better walking and cycling infrastructure • 6 <i>submissions</i> - the lack of capacity of public transport infrastructure, including the light rail, the loss of the 501 bus and a lack of accessible ferries. <p>Infrastructure should be built ahead or at least alongside additional residential.</p>	<p>NSW Government infrastructure</p> <p>Infrastructure such as public transport, hospitals and schools are the responsibility of the NSW Government. Through their submissions agencies confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSW Education - The demand for primary school students may be accommodated by existing assets. Upgrades of existing high schools are required. These upgrades are currently not funded and will be subject to future planning and consultation. Education infrastructure is addressed in the main assessment report. • Transport for NSW – Eight initiatives are underway to upgrade transport infrastructure capacity and crossings, including completion of the foreshore link and increasing the L1 Inner West Light Rail frequency. Furthermore, the Metro will significantly improve public transport accessibility. The City’s position in relation to Transport for NSW infrastructure is addressed in the main assessment report.

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sydney Water – did not raise objection to the proposal. They have requested detailed growth data from the City which the City will provide. This will enable the appropriate planning of water, waste water and sewage infrastructure. <p>Some of the authorities identified standard processes that will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications, including, protection of airspace and asset requests, flood impact and risk assessments, noise and air quality assessments and connection applications to Sydney Water.</p> <p>The NSW Government’s Place Strategy was supported by a Utilities Infrastructure Assessment (UIA). The UIA addressed water, sewer, electricity, gas and telecommunications capacity and demand in the area. Interviews were undertaken with service providers at the time to determine existing capacity issues, planned projects and to discuss the project in general. The UIA then provide an analysis of the infrastructure upgrades required over the life of the Place Strategy to service the growth envisaged.</p> <p>Local infrastructure</p> <p>Councils are responsible for the provision of local infrastructure such as local roads, parks, cycle ways, public domain and community facilities.</p> <p>To ensure growth in Ultimo and Pyrmont is supported by local infrastructure, the Draft Ultimo Pyrmont Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan 2023 has been prepared. This contributions plan will enable the City to levy a contribution of up to 3 percent of the development cost on new development to generate approximately \$148 million in contributions towards infrastructure over the life of the plan to 2041.</p> <p>The draft contributions plan includes a schedule of works which responds to the infrastructure demands arising from expected population growth. The schedule of works lists the infrastructure items that money collected through a contributions plan will be used to fund. The schedule of works for Ultimo and Pyrmont seeks to:</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make capacity improvements to both the northern and southern sections of Wentworth Park, to enable this open space to continue to meet demand for active and passive recreation • make capacity improvements and upgrades to three existing community facilities so that they can continue to provide the community with spaces for indoor activities and meetings • enable public domain improvements and tree planting to improve public amenity • improve connectivity through dedicated cycleways; and • implement drainage upgrades and stormwater quality improvements. <p>The City has little control over the timing for contributions income, with contributions becoming payable at the construction certificate stage of developments. The City aims to minimise lag between the payment of contributions by developers and their allocation towards infrastructure.</p> <p>In some circumstances to assist in the timely delivery of infrastructure, the City forward funds infrastructure and then uses the contributions plan to recoup costs associated with that infrastructure.</p>
<p><i>46 submissions</i> -There is traffic congestion and difficulty parking currently. Concern about impact of increased population and workers on traffic and parking.</p> <p>Bank Street is mentioned as a particular pinch point.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - support all sites except Bank Street and 100 Harris, due to the impact on traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Ultimo Pymont is already a highly walkable neighbourhood. The Pymont Metro Station, opening in 2032 as part of Sydney Metro West, will significantly improve public transport access and further support walkability.</p> <p>The NSW Government has funded a new commuter ferry wharf to connect the Sydney Fish Market to the harbour, along with major upgrades to the Wentworth Park light rail stop. These upgrades include new lifts, ramps, platforms, lighting, landscaping and signage, improving safety, accessibility and usability for over six million annual visitors.</p> <p>In 2024, the NSW Government finalised the Pymont-Ultimo Transport Plan, setting out 55 initiatives for a sustainable, multi-modal transport network to support growth. Key actions include investigating the pedestrianisation of Union Street and widening Pymont Bridge Road footpaths between the new Metro station and relocated Fish Market.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>The City will continue to advocate for the full and appropriate delivery of these initiatives.</p> <p>The City has delivered a separated cycleway on Mary Ann Street, linking south to Jones Street, west to Glebe via Kelly Street, and east to the City via the Goods Line and Darling Harbour.</p> <p>With community support, the City is advocating for active travel and public domain improvements around Pymont Metro. Priorities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 30km/h speed limits around the Metro station• pedestrianisation of Union Street• wider footpaths on Edward Street and Pymont Bridge Road, and• a separated cycleway on Bridge Road alongside both Metro sites. <p>The City is also seeking improvements around the new Fish Market, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• safer walking routes to public transport stops via Pymont Bridge Road, Bridge Road and Wattle Street• reversal of Transport for NSW's decision to retain the Wattle St/Bridge Rd slip lane• clarity on plans to increase L1 light rail service capacity and improve access at Fish Market and Wentworth Park stops, and• a separated cycleway (rather than a shared path) outside the Fish Market, continuing directly along Pymont Bridge Road to Pymont Bridge. <p>The City continues to advocate for restoring Glebe Island Bridge as a direct walking and cycling link between Bays West and the City. This would unlock local connections to open space, community facilities and future schools on both sides of the bridge.</p> <p>The City has no plans to create additional road space in Ultimo Pymont. Instead, it is investigating improvements such as Union Street pedestrianisation, a Pymont Bridge Road cycleway, and in-road tree planting by reallocating vehicle lanes.</p> <p>The City has implemented parking controls to reduce reliance on private vehicles, including time-of-day restrictions, parking ticket pricing, and kerbside priority for goods and services. Planning policies also apply maximum parking rates, require on-site car share bays, and</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>mandate bicycle parking for new developments.</p> <p>Under the City's neighbourhood parking policy, new residential flats and commercial/retail premises are ineligible for parking permits, further reducing on-street demand. Public transport improvements associated with Sydney Metro will also reduce the need for driving into or out of Ultimo Pymont.</p> <p>Transport for NSW has confirmed it is no longer pursuing a new Western Distributor on-ramp at Pymont. However, it is still proposing to remove the zebra crossing and restrict the right-turn from the Pymont Bridge Road off-ramp. These changes would divert traffic through Harris Street, increasing volumes in the heart of Ultimo Pymont and undermining walkability and liveability.</p> <p>Transport for NSW has advised that the Western Distributor project is under review and no decision has been made on whether it will proceed. If it does, construction would not occur until after the Sydney Fish Market relocates to Bridge Road in late 2025. The City continues to oppose the project and advocates for solutions that prioritise safety for people walking, cycling and using public transport.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggestion that carshare requirements should be proportional to number of units without a parking space, (rather than proportional to total car parking spaces which it is currently).</p>	<p>The City's carshare DCP controls were not the subject of the public exhibition and are beyond the scope of the exhibited amendment. These controls were recently reviewed and updated as part of the City's June 2025 Policy and housekeeping amendments.</p>
<p><i>3 submissions</i> - Support delivery of continuous foreshore path.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>6 submissions</i> - Support the closure of greyhound racing site and the expansion / improvement of Wentworth Park.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Support delivery of Pymont Street Park and recommend allocating developer levies to fund the construction of a road/cycleway tunnel.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The road/cycleway tunnel requested is under the Pymont Bridge Road intersection with Darling Drive, Murray Street and Union Street. The submissions notes that such a tunnel would divert a significant amount of traffic and improve pedestrian movement. The City agrees that the intersection in question is poor and presents as a car dominated environment that is difficult to navigate for people walking and</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>cycling. The NSW Government’s Pymont-Ultimo Transport Plan does include initiatives that may improve this situation including delivering a new cycling facility to complete missing link on Darling Drive on approach to Murray Street / Union Street intersection. The biggest barrier for the intersection however is Darling Drive, which is a NSW Government owned street.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggested against opening up the covered walkway to the John Street pocket park as it becomes very difficult for pedestrians when it rains.</p>	<p>The northern setback at 14 Quarry Master Drive is required to achieve the 15% deep soil target for redevelopment sites. It will also improve daylight and visibility into the John Street Pocket Park pedestrian bridge, enhancing safety. The deep soil zone enables tree planting in line with the City’s design principles. While a covered walkway could restrict tree planting, a pedestrian awning could be potentially considered at the detailed development application stage.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> – Would like to see the Jones Street pocket park fixed up with proper fencing.</p>	<p>The cliff face on the northern edge of Jones Street Pocket Park is owned by the NSW Office of Strategic Lands. In March 2025, Jones Street Pocket Park was closed/partially closed in order for repair works on the cliff wall to be undertaken. This included installation of a temporary fence. The works are ongoing and will likely be completed in November 2025.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - The walking and cycling path along Pymont Bridge Road from where it crosses Bank St to Wattle St could be improved with better signage and resurfacing. Also extend the 'green man' timer for crossing Bank Street please.</p>	<p>Pymont Bridge Road in this location is a NSW Government owned and managed State road. The surrounding area and roadways will undergo change in the coming years with redevelopments at Blackwattle Bay, the new Sydney Fish markets and potentially as a result of the Western Distributor “improvements” project.</p> <p>With community support, the City is advocating for active travel and public domain improvements related to Pymont Metro. Related priorities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wider footpaths on Pymont Bridge Road • a separated cycleway on Bridge Road • safer walking routes to public transport stops via Pymont Bridge Road, Bridge Road and Wattle Street • reversal of Transport for NSW’s decision to retain the Wattle St/Bridge Rd slip lane, and

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarity on plans to increase L1 light rail service capacity and improve access at Fish Market and Wentworth Park stops.
<p><i>1 submission</i> - The City should fund Pymont Community Centre from the surplus budget. Remove recoupment from the infrastructure and instead use the developer levies to fund Maybanke indoor Sports and Recreation Centre.</p>	<p>The Draft Ultimo Pymont Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan 2023 includes the Pymont Community Centre Upgrade as a recoupment works item in the schedule of works for which the City. This means that the City has forward funded the upgrade works but will recoup the costs through local infrastructure contributions.</p> <p>The Pymont Community Centre Upgrade has recently been completed. The upgrade will support the needs of future population increases, as well as the needs of the existing community, and the City considers that it is reasonable to recoup the costs of delivering this important infrastructure through development contributions.</p> <p>The Draft Ultimo Pymont Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan 2023 schedule of works also includes upgrades to the Maybanke Community Centre's outdoor facilities to increase capacity for sports and outdoor exercise. The estimated time frame for delivery is between 2036-2041, which is based on where the project is currently up to in project planning and when contributions funding is likely to become available. The City has also secured additional indoor recreational facilities as part of the redevelopment at 14-26 Wattle Street, including two indoor sports courts to be owned and operated by the City. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>
General - Character	
<p><i>24 submissions</i> - Concern that the building types and architectural styles will change the peninsula's character.</p> <p>A desire to keep the village feel.</p> <p>Concern about impacts of the proposal on streetscapes and heritage areas.</p>	<p>Pymont and Ultimo include a mix of architectural styles, building types, and scales. The controls have carefully considered the impacts of development envelopes on character, heritage items and heritage conservation areas. Individual site controls have been developed to provide for sympathetic development outcomes.</p> <p>Development adjoining heritage areas and heritage conservation areas has largely been avoided.</p> <p>The main development type to be undertaken in heritage conservation areas and on heritage items is the proposed small lot housing type.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>This development type is based on historical subdivision patterns in the area.</p> <p>This planning proposal also preserves the industrial heritage of Ultimo Pymont, for example, targeted changes to planning controls of 28-48 Wattle Street require the preservation and restoration of heritage significant fabric while maximising floor space. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p><i>3 submissions</i> - Treat the harbour as a natural asset and public good. It has strong historical value - indigenous and European. The topography, foreshore and harbour should be preserved and enhanced.</p>	<p>The building envelopes and controls proposed for the specific sites ensure that public views and access to the harbour are maintained or enhanced, access to foreshore areas is not altered, and the historical significance of the harbour for both Aboriginal communities and the role it played within European occupation are acknowledged.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> – Concern about the crime rate, dumping and lack of community cohesion in the area. Concern that development will further increase these issues. Would like to see public domain improvements (lighting, parklet, CCTV, art) to create a sense of pride.</p>	<p>The City’s proposal is supported by a new local development contributions plan, expected to generate around \$148 million for local infrastructure. Of this, almost \$89 million will fund open space and public domain upgrades, including streetscape works on Harris Street and improvements near the new Pymont Metro station. All works will be designed with community safety in mind. The proposed planning controls also apply Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles, ensuring through-site connections are highly visible, well-lit, and universally accessible.</p>
General - Building heights	
<p><i>22 submissions</i> - Proposed building heights across the proposal are out of step with existing buildings and context. A dislike of tall buildings / towers.</p> <p>This does not include objections to height of specific buildings, which are included below.</p>	<p>New height controls are proposed for certain sites across Ultimo and Pymont. These are site specific. They have been designed taking into account specific site constraints and responding to the overarching design considerations.</p> <p>Detailed urban design analysis for each site has ensured that taller buildings are located and shaped so they respect privacy, minimise overshadowing of existing residential development and open space, maintain or enhance public view corridors and conserve heritage. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p>14 submissions - Concern about overshadowing and loss of sunlight. Concern about loss of views and privacy.</p>	<p>Building envelopes have been modelled on a site-by-site basis to minimise overshadowing to existing residents and important public parks and places.</p> <p>The proposed building envelopes have been designed in alignment with NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide and the City's Development Control Plan including building separation, visual privacy, and solar and daylight access. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p>2 submissions - Proposed building heights are not aligned with the PPPS. Objection to the introduction of the 'height transition zone' which contradicts the priorities of the PPPS. The proposal does not deliver on a gentle transition</p>	<p>Each of the envelopes proposed by the City comply with the Height Strategy set out in the NSW Government Pyrmont Peninsula Urban Design Report. The 'height transition zone' forms part of the NSW Government's height strategy, which permits buildings at a minimum of RL90 in height in this area. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>
General - Zoning and land use	
<p>20 submissions - There is low demand for commercial/office space, noting the high vacancy rate and post-Covid working patterns. The evidence underpinning the PPPS housing and jobs targets is outdated.</p>	<p>The City was set a target for commercial floor space within the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy and the associated Ministerial Direction, which was underpinned by an Economic Development Strategy produced by NSW Treasury. The Economic Development Strategy states that it factors in the impacts of Covid in its employment forecasts.</p> <p>The Ministerial Direction requires all planning proposals in Ultimo Pyrmont demonstrate how they meet the objectives of the Place Strategy, including job targets. The focus for the City has been on meeting the required job targets in the most appropriate way.</p> <p>Demand for office floor space will be determined by the market and will change as the population grows. The proposed controls create capacity for office floor space to be provided when and if the market determines.</p> <p>Submissions were made in relation to 3 sites in mixed use zones, which had alternative controls exhibited to incentivise commercial development. A post-exhibition change is proposed to amend the base controls for these 3 sites, providing the flexibility of a residential or commercial option. This objection is addressed further in the main report.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p>6 submissions - Zoning should be more flexible (MU1) to support financial viability of the development and allow developers to respond to demand.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Furthermore, a post-exhibition change is proposed to add business premises as an additional permitted use for 26-38 Saunders Street and 14 Quarry Master Drive, in addition to the 3 sites exhibited.</p> <p>Permitting business premises on these sites will support more vibrant and active streets and providing better access to local services.</p>
<p>General - Housing and affordable housing</p>	
<p>11 submissions - Concern about the redevelopment of residential buildings and the displacement of existing residents.</p>	<p>Planning controls allow for future redevelopment, but they do not mandate development. Most of the sites in the planning proposal with existing residential buildings are strata. Legislation allows strata to collectively sell or redevelop with a 75% majority vote.</p>
<p>8 submissions - There is a housing crisis. The proposal should do more to address that.</p>	<p>The planning proposal aims to facilitate new homes in an appropriate location near existing and proposed infrastructure. The amended planning proposal will assist in facilitating 1,268 to 1,524 additional dwellings in a variety of different forms. The City's proposed Stage 2 process may also deliver additional homes.</p>
<p>5 submissions - The proposal should provide social / affordable housing and accommodation for essential workers.</p>	<p>Where there is an uplift in residential development potential an additional 9% Affordable Housing Contribution will be levied on the additional floor space. This is in addition to a base level contribution of 3%. This will be used to help fund affordable housing programs across the City of Sydney local area.</p> <p>Beyond contributions, the City also supports the provision of affordable rental housing through grants to non-government organisations and subsidising the sale or long term lease of council owned land to community housing providers.</p> <p>The City's proposed Stage 2 process may also deliver additional social and affordable rental housing homes.</p>
<p>2 submission - The additional 9% affordable housing contribution is too high and may make development unfeasible in current market conditions, preventing delivery of new homes.</p>	<p>The planning proposal enables additional height and FSR in appropriate locations across Ultimo and Pyrmont. The 9% additional affordable housing contribution is to be applied to key sites which will receive residential uplift. This is consistent with the requirements of the existing City of Sydney Affordable Housing</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p><i>1 submission</i> - a more workable model is Infill Affordable Housing models that provides stock to Community housing providers for 15 years.</p>	<p>Program, which accounted for the feasibility of such a contribution requirement when it was introduced in 2020.</p> <p>The City does not support a time limited affordable housing infill model as affordable housing will eventually be lost and unlikely to be replaced. Key workers and other community members who need affordable housing will be forced out of the area. The City requires purpose built affordable housing to be provided in perpetuity.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Support for the requirement to pay additional contributions for sites that benefit from uplift, to enable the delivery of more affordable housing.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Suggest suggests that we identify sites and mandate landowners to provide public/affordable housing.</p>	<p>Where there is an uplift in residential development potential an additional 9% Affordable Housing Contribution will be levied on the additional floor space. This is in addition to a base level contribution of 3%. This will be used to help fund affordable housing programs across the City of Sydney local area.</p> <p>The City's proposed Stage 2 process may deliver additional social and affordable rental housing homes on sites owned by Homes NSW and City West Housing, a community housing provider. None of the sites subject to the current proposal are owned by Homes NSW or a community housing provider.</p>
General - More development or a different outcome	
<p><i>10 submissions</i> - Would like to see more development. The planning proposal should be more forward thinking and ambitious, increasing development potential generally across the area.</p>	<p>The planning proposal responds to housing and jobs targets set in the Place Strategy and by the NSW Government for the City of Sydney as a whole. The proposed building envelopes maximise development capacity onsite, within our design considerations agreed with the community.</p> <p>The City's proposed Stage 2 process may deliver additional floor space for jobs and homes.</p>
<p><i>10 submissions</i> - Would prefer a different distribution of heights or density. Some suggested more density should be near the Metro Station, others suggested increases in Ultimo. Others suggested a more even spread.</p>	<p>The City has undertaken detailed urban design analysis throughout its review. The envelopes proposed respond to site-specific constraints and respond to priorities and design considerations directly identified to us through engagement with residents, landowners and community groups. The planning controls</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>minimise overshadowing to existing neighbouring properties in line with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide and minimise overshadowing to important parks and places. They are designed to ameliorate wind impacts in streets, preserve and enhance public views and respond to areas of established significant character.</p> <p>The City's proposed Stage 2 process may deliver additional floor space for jobs and homes.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Recommends more flexibility in the controls rather than being tied to the site-specific envelope DCP, noting sites will still go through development assessment.</p>	<p>By resolving Apartment Design Guide and DCP compliance at the plan-making stage and embedding this in planning controls, the City provides greater certainty and efficiency. Landowners and the community can be confident that key issues such as overshadowing, wind, and apartment separation have already been addressed, enabling a more streamlined development application process. DCP controls must be applied flexibly and proposals that meet their objectives can still justify reasonable alternatives.</p>
<p><i>2 submission</i> - Overshadowing and solar access planes should be considered in balance with need for new homes.</p>	<p>Overshadowing and solar access have been carefully balanced with the need for new housing. While the proposed planning controls will result in some overshadowing, it has been minimised through compliance with the Apartment Design Guide and the City's DCP—both well-established benchmarks. Overall, the City's proposal delivers more floor space than required to meet the housing and jobs targets set in the NSW Government's Place Strategy, with the Stage 2 process offering potential for even greater capacity.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Inconsistency with the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy. All sites 'capable of change' should receive uplift.</p>	<p>The City reviewed nearly every site in Ultimo and Pyrmont to identify the most sensitive ways to accommodate the growth set out in the NSW Government's Place Strategy. We began with sites flagged in the Strategy as capable of change, then extended our assessment to additional sites identified through our own review. Each site was initially considered and discussed with landowners and the community. Where planning control changes were appropriate, urban design testing was undertaken. Some sites were reviewed but not advanced, as they were found unsuitable for change; these are documented in the City's</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	exhibited <u>Sites reviewed but not changing</u> document.
<p><i>1 submission</i> – A response to the review of TfNSW car parking levy scheme and a suggestion that funding and Government resource could be put towards assisting in repurposing commercial car parks into residential/commercial buildings to help meet housing shortages in prime locations.</p>	<p>This submission concerns the commercial car park at 360 Harris Street, which is strata subdivided with individual ownership of car spaces. The objector requests that the City encourage its conversion to accommodation, likely residential. They cite the Transport for NSW Parking Space Levy (PSL), a State tax on commercial car parking in areas well served by public transport. The PSL aims to reduce car use and funds transport projects such as walking and cycling infrastructure. However, the levy and its use are matters for the NSW Government.</p> <p>The site at 360 Harris Street is outside the City’s planning jurisdiction and zoned under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Precincts – Eastern Harbour City) 2021. The City therefore cannot amend planning controls for the site. While the SEPP permits residential use, any development application for conversion would need to demonstrate compliance with the Apartment Design Guide, including minimum residential amenity standards.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Concern about some sites having their FSR decreased by having the design excellence bonus applied.</p>	<p>The base FSR for sites between 525 and 547 Harris Street, Ultimo is proposed to change from 3.5:1 to 3.3:1; 549-559 Harris Street from 4:1 to 3.61:1; and for 561-577 Harris Street from 4.1:1 to 3.41:1. The proposal involves a minor reduction in base FSR on these sites, which is of minor significance compared to the increased real development outcomes provided by the other proposed changes to planning controls on these sites, including increasing the height limit from 22 to 42 metres. The proposed height and FSR for these sites is informed by a detailed urban design analysis, guided by the principles of the Urban Design Study to maximise development within constraints across the Pyrmont peninsula. In addition, the base FSR plus design excellence bonus has been planned for these sites. Development in accordance with the current height limit on these sites would not require a competitive design process. However, development with the proposed height limits would require a competitive design process and be eligible for 10% additional design excellence floor space.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p>1 submission – An Unsolicited Proposal for Edgecliff has been submitted.</p>	<p>The proposal relates to Edgecliff and is beyond the scope of the exhibited proposal.</p>
<p>1 submission – Glebe Island - what is the point of creating parklands and walkways around a proposed 24/7 industrial site that will generate pollution and introduce trucks?</p>	<p>This submission appears to relate to Glebe Island and its existing industrial and port operations. The NSW Government is currently considering the future of Glebe Island, likely through a Stage 2 Bays Precinct Masterplan. The open space proposed in the exhibited plans is considered sufficiently separated from industrial uses at Bays West to ensure its amenity is not impacted.</p>
<p>6 submissions – Suggest development would be better located somewhere else with less impact on residents, for example Glebe Island.</p>	<p>This planning proposal addresses the housing and jobs targets for Ultimo and Pyrmont set out in the NSW Government's Place Strategy. By advancing a precinct-wide approach, the City can guide growth sensitively, consistent with the Strategy, informed by community engagement, and underpinned by best-practice design. Without this framework, planning would be left to individual landowners or the NSW Government. In addition to the City's planned growth in Ultimo and Pyrmont, further development will occur through NSW Government initiatives at Glebe Island, the Camperdown Road dive site, other State Significant precincts and sites, and through the City's response to LGA-wide targets.</p>
<p>1 submission – Questioning what value the heritage conservation areas provide to society during a housing crisis. They often result in either run down housing or luxury single family homes.</p>	<p>The planning proposal includes new planning controls for some heritage items and sites within conservation areas. The City's heritage conservation areas are the home for approximately 84,000 people and provide workplaces for almost 60,000 people. Conservation areas are more than a collection of individual heritage items. The City's conservation areas provide housing at the highest population densities in Australia and continue to house an increased population, some at rates greater than the metropolitan average rate of increase. The small lot sizes, variety of accommodation types and over two centuries of accumulated growth have produced successful urban environments that continue to accommodate change and warrant protection.</p>
<p>1 submission – Opposes universally requiring upper-level setbacks as they increase construction costs, increase susceptibility of the building to water ingress, reduce thermal</p>	<p>The City's proposal does not impose upper-level setbacks across all sites. Where setbacks are included in the exhibited DCP, they are typically used to maximise floor space below a</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
<p>efficiency and reduce floor space. The desire for consistent street wall height should be considered in balance with the housing crisis.</p>	<p>solar plane protecting sunlight access to important parks, places, or existing residences. A blanket removal of setbacks would significantly reduce achievable floor space. Setbacks have also been applied where appropriate to transition to lower-scale residential areas (e.g. 46–48 Pymont Bridge Road and 446–456 Wattle Street) and to manage vertical additions to heritage items, protecting their setting and curtilage from key street views.</p>
General - Construction	
<p><i>20 submissions</i> - Concern about construction related disruption to residents and existing businesses. Concern about dust and noise pollution.</p>	<p>The impacts of construction will be managed. We have regulation in place for construction sites to manage noise levels, traffic, access, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>From our discussions with landowners and developers involved in the sites, timescales vary greatly with some seeking to construct soon and others in the long term.</p>
<p><i>4 submissions</i> - Concern about replacement of buildings which are in good condition and greenhouse gases resulting from development.</p>	<p>Planning for growth requires us to look to the future. Changing the planning controls allows for sites to redevelop but does not mandate it. Landowners can redevelop at a point which suits them, for example once the building reaches the end of its lifespan, or once an increase in the number of homes warrants the redevelopment. The planning controls also don't require full demolition of existing structures. There have been examples across the City of redevelopments including the retention and adaption of existing structures.</p>
General - Consultation	
<p><i>7 submissions</i> - Insufficient public consultation. Residents of surrounding buildings were not notified. The exhibition period was too short to put in a considered response.</p>	<p>In May 2022 the City started consultation with community and stakeholder groups about the strategic review. 25,400 letters were sent to landowners and tenants inviting them to participate and register for updates. We held meetings with residents and landowners to understand their concerns, interests and perspectives on how to best accommodate growth and change in Ultimo and Pymont. This early engagement influenced the proposal and is summarised in our exhibited Early Engagement Report.</p> <p>The planning proposal, draft DCP and draft contributions plan were publicly exhibited for 31 working days from 1 October 2024 to 13</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>November 2024 in accordance with the Gateway Determination and the City's Community Participation Plan.</p> <p>19,720 notification letters were sent to landowners and occupants of surrounding properties. A notification email to 418 recipients was sent to local community groups and subscribers registered to receive project updates.</p> <p>The City hosted an online information session on 14 October 2024. City staff presented on the proposed planning controls and answered questions from attendees.</p>

Site specific comments

Summary of submission	Response
Gateway building, 1-27 Murray Street - 50 submissions	
<p><i>40 submissions</i> - Concern about the displacement of existing residents.</p> <p>The Gateway building has been home to residents for nearly 25 years. Redevelopment would impact the community and social fabric.</p> <p>Residents value their community and lifestyle.</p> <p>Concern about residents not being able to afford alternative accommodation in Pymont, if displaced.</p> <p>Concern about government forcibly acquiring people's homes.</p>	<p>Planning controls allow for future redevelopment, but they do not mandate development. The Gateway building is strata owned. Legislation allows strata to collectively sell or redevelop with a 75% majority vote. If the majority of owners do not want to redevelop, the building will not be redeveloped. This site is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p><i>36 submissions</i> - High vacancy rates indicate low demand for additional office space.</p> <p>Post-Covid working patterns have decreased demand. Despite the changing context, the proposal for this site has remained unchanged since the PPPS.</p> <p>Due to viability, achieving owner consensus for redevelopment would be very difficult if the site is rezoned for commercial use.</p> <p><i>32 submissions</i> - Lack of support for the rezoning of the site to commercial only. If the site is to be rezoned, it should remain mixed use.</p> <p><i>20 submissions</i> - Sydney is facing a housing crisis. Redeveloping the Gateway site as a commercial office would result in the loss of 89</p>	<p>The Ministerial Direction requires long-term planning. The Place Strategy provides a growth framework to 2041 and is supported by the NSW Treasury Pymont Peninsula Economic Development Strategy, which forecasts \$4.9 billion in additional economic output if commercial floor space is delivered to support 23,000 new jobs. The Strategy incorporates the impacts of COVID on employment and floor space demand.</p> <p>In response to submissions, the City has amended the proposal to allow mixed-use residential development on the subject site, in addition to the previously exhibited commercial proposal. These amendments increase the height for a mixed use residential project from 30 metres to approximately 87 metres and an increase in FSR from 2.5:1 to 5:1 - will allow</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
<p>residential units, exacerbating the current housing shortage.</p>	<p>the market to determine the future use of this site, if the current owners choose to sell. This site is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p><i>32 submissions</i> - Concern about the proposed building envelope and its impact on Pyrmont's character.</p> <p>Concern that the 21-storey building height will result in overshadowing and wind, as well as aesthetic impacts.</p> <p>A desire for Pyrmont to retain its village feel, rather than becoming an extension of the CBD with commercial towers.</p> <p>Concern about impacts on the heritage listed Pyrmont Bridge Hotel, Maritime Museum and Darling Wharves, as well as historic streetscapes.</p> <p>A lack of alignment with the PPPS, which envisions low-rise buildings near the harbourside.</p>	<p>Ultimo Pyrmont will experience significant growth and change due to the NSW Government's investment in a new Metro station, its Place Strategy, and the Ministerial Direction requiring future planning to accommodate new jobs and housing.</p> <p>By advancing a precinct-wide planning proposal, the City can guide growth sensitively consistent with the Place Strategy, informed by community engagement, and based on best practice design. Without this approach, future planning would be left to individual landowners or the NSW Government.</p> <p>The Ministerial Direction requires the City's planning proposal to be consistent with the NSW Government's Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy, and in particular, the Height Strategy set out in the Urban Design Report.</p> <p>The City's exhibited and amended planning proposal sets building heights below those permitted by the NSW Government's Height Strategy.</p> <p>Full details of the City's proposed heights, where they are lower than those permitted by the NSW Government, are provided in the Urban Design Study (Attachment G to the main report). The reduced heights primarily protect solar access to parks and public places and minimise overshadowing of existing homes. This approach is consistent with the Place Strategy (which identifies key parks and places to protect), the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide, and the City's Development Control Plan.</p> <p>This site is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p><i>21 submissions</i> - The building is in good condition. Investment has been made into its upkeep. Demolishing it for a new commercial structure would be wasteful and contribute unnecessarily to greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Planning for growth requires us to look to the future. Changing the planning controls allows for sites to redevelop but does not mandate it. Landowners can redevelop at a point which suits them, for example once the building reaches the end of its lifespan, or once an increase in the number of homes warrants the redevelopment. The planning controls also don't require full demolition of existing structures. There have been examples across</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	the City of redevelopments including the retention and adaptation of existing structures.
<p>20 submissions - From previous rounds of engagement, resident concerns have been overlooked or not adequately addressed.</p>	<p>During early engagement, concerns were raised about new planning controls for the site. These were addressed in the City's pre-exhibition report to Council, which sought approval to publicly exhibit the proposal so that a broader view could be sort. The exhibition process allowed full consideration of new controls and broader community feedback. In response, the City has amended the proposal to enable a mixed-use residential outcome. While this will not satisfy all objectors—some of whom prefer no change—the City considers new controls essential. This block is the largest development site near the proposed Pyrmont Metro Station and was identified in the NSW Government's Place Strategy for significant height increases under their Height Strategy. Neighbouring sites will benefit from this policy shift, and the block presents an opportunity to greatly improve its interface with the public domain. The revised controls deliver better light rail access, stronger north–south connections, and a larger, greener, and more sunlit public space. Not progressing with the site means these outcomes will not occur. The site is discussed further in the main report.</p>
<p>5 submissions - The exclusion of 1-27 Murray Street from the Ultimo Pyrmont Strategic Review documentation raises questions about the review process. Why was this site omitted when neighbouring properties, such as 80-100 and 137 Murray Street, were evaluated?</p>	<p>This submission relates to the City's exhibited document <u>Sites reviewed but not changing</u>. 1-27 Murray Street is not included because new planning controls have been prepared for the site.</p>
<p>2 submissions - If it is rezoned, the height should be higher to make the project commercially viable.</p>	<p>The height of the proposal has been maximised within the City's design considerations. Any additional height would overshadow neighbouring residential apartments to the couth creating additional shadow in non-compliance with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide.</p>
<p>2 submissions - The demolition of 1-27 Murray Street and 2 Edward Street threatens to obstruct access to Pyrmont Bay Station, the nearest light rail station during construction. There has been limited consideration of the impacts of this.</p>	<p>Pyrmont Bay Light Rail stop may or may not need to be closed if the sites redevelop. This would be a matter for Transport for NSW who have strict requirements in regard to construction in close proximity to rail corridors.</p>
<p>1 submission - Vehicular access to the Gateway building is via 2 Edward Street. No</p>	<p>1-27 Murray Street benefits from an access easement across 2 Edward Street for vehicular</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
<p>analysis has been carried out to show how residents would access their car parking should 2 Edward Street be redeveloped.</p>	<p>access. Any redevelopment of 2 Edward Street will need to consider access arrangements for 1-27 Murray Street in accordance with the existing access easement.</p>
<p>1 submission - Supports the proposal for the Gateway building.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
Quarry Master Drive and Saunders Street precinct - 64 submissions	
<p>38 submissions - Access into and out of the peninsula is very limited and the Quarry Master Drive area is a cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Additional high-rise development would place pressure on local streets.</p> <p>Saunders Street now with the bike lane is one lane for two-way traffic, further limiting capacity and parking.</p> <p>There is already very little on street parking.</p> <p>Traffic will also be made worse by changes to the Western Distributor and the Fish Markets redevelopment.</p>	<p>The City's general comments on traffic, access, and parking are further addressed in the main report. For the Quarry Master Drive and Saunders Street precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the precinct will primarily be accessed on foot, by bicycle, or via public transport • it is approximately 100 metres from the existing Fish Market Light Rail stop and 600 metres from the future Pymont Metro Station • the precinct is well-served by walking and cycling infrastructure, including the separated Saunders Street, Miller Street, and Union Street cycleways providing direct access to Pymont Metro and the Sydney CBD • under current maximum car parking controls, the precinct will generate minimal additional vehicle movements • Saunders Street is narrow and left turn only at Miller Street; most vehicular traffic will use Quarry Master Drive and Bank Street, wider two-way roads connecting to surrounding suburbs.
<p>37 submissions - Proposed building heights will reduce sunlight into apartments. This will prevent sustainable energy generation through installation of solar panels.</p> <p>Public and open spaces will be overshadowed, and sky views will be obstructed.</p> <p>Overshadowing will impact the flora and fauna in Carmichael Park, Knoll Park & Saunders Cliff-Face Pocket Park.</p> <p>Bank Street and Saunders Street will be very dark. A wind tunnel will be created.</p>	<p>Additional overshadowing of living rooms and private open space of adjoining residences has been minimised, in accordance with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide and the City's Development Control Plan.</p> <p>Street setbacks and tower placement have been carefully designed to allow more sunlight into the streets, ensuring that more than half of surrounding streets receive at least 2 hours of sunlight in midwinter.</p> <p>As the sites are south of Knoll Park, Carmichael Park, and Quarry Master Drive open space, no additional overshadowing will occur on these areas.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>Ensuring good design for wind has been an important design consideration for the City. The City's draft planning controls were developed with reference to prevailing wind conditions on a site-by-site basis, incorporating best-practice measures such as appropriate tower setbacks above podium levels.</p> <p>The exhibition period allowed site owners to undertake more detailed wind modelling of the City's exhibited controls. This highlighted where some adjustments were needed to achieve a safe and comfortable public domain that supports pedestrian activity. The adjustments are detailed in the main assessment report.</p>
<p><i>37 submissions</i> - Objection to the proposed height and FSR increases for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26-38 Saunders Street • 140-148 Bank Street site • 1-33 Saunders Street <p>And to a lesser extent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 Quarry Master Drive (only 2 submissions) 	<p>The objections have been addressed in the Quarry Master Drive and Saunders Street precinct comments in the main report.</p> <p>Each of the listed sites were identified by the NSW Government for new planning controls as sites capable of change. They were not identified by the City.</p> <p>The City has undertaken detailed urban design analysis, informed by advice from the City Design Advisory Panel Subcommittee, community consultation and internal experts in heritage, trees, public domain, transport, access, urban analytics, economics and planning.</p> <p>This process resulted in the exhibited heights and FSR, which the City has deemed acceptable.</p>
<p><i>30 submissions</i> - Concern about view loss, loss of privacy and impact on property values.</p> <p>The proposal will obscure views of the city skyline and Blackwattle Bay. The proposal does not encourage view sharing.</p> <p>Without the view, the value of the property would be reduced. Owners have invested significantly to secure the view, with the reassurance of the height limit.</p> <p>Occupants of the new towers will see into existing units.</p>	<p>The proposed planning controls maintain required separation distances between existing windows and balconies and the new building envelopes to ensure visual privacy and adequate outlook, in line with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p>Some private view loss will occur, mainly of distant views over existing private sites. The Place Strategy prioritises protecting and enhancing public views over private ones. All sites subject to planning control changes were identified by the NSW Government's Place Strategy. The City's proposal remains within the NSW Government Height Strategy. Taller buildings have been located to minimise overshadowing of homes and public spaces and to increase sunlight in streets. The proposal also improves local outlooks by</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>providing views of more trees and active streets. Overall, the private view loss is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Potential impacts on surrounding property values are not considered a planning matter.</p>
<p><i>18 submissions</i> - Concern about sustainability of redeveloping buildings in good condition.</p> <p>"The greenest building is the one that already exists".</p>	<p>Planning for growth requires us to look to the future. Changing the planning controls allows for sites to redevelop but does not mandate it. Landowners can redevelop at a point which suits them, for example once the building reaches the end of its lifespan, or once an increase in the number of homes warrants the redevelopment. The planning controls also don't require full demolition of existing structures. There have been examples across the City of redevelopments including the retention and adaption of existing structures.</p>
<p><i>17 submissions</i> - Would like a fair and equitable distribution of development potential.</p> <p>The proposal benefits one block (26-38 Saunders Street) at the expense of others. Residents of neighbouring buildings (for example 2-10 and 14 Quarry Master Drive), are impacted negatively without receiving any benefit.</p> <p>Suggest redistribution of height to more evenly share development potential.</p> <p><i>16 submissions</i> - Site specific comments relating to 14 Quarry Master Drive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases in height and FSR are marginal, due to solar access to buildings to the south. • FSR increase is much lower than suggested in the PPPS. • This is in part because of the reduced footprint to accommodate open space and a through site link. • Redevelopment is highly unlikely to be economically viable with this small uplift, meaning it will not translate into actual housing • Concern about the loss of value for residents <p>There were a few different suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 submissions suggested the site be excluded from the proposal 	<p>The City reviewed all sites within the precinct. At 14 Quarry Master Drive, the maximum possible uplift has been accommodated while adhering to design considerations. The site is too small to support a taller building without unreasonably overshadowing existing residences to the east.</p> <p>Sites at 2–10, 120, and 122 Quarry Master Drive would require amalgamation to accommodate any significant increase beyond current development. With approximately 66, 111, and 139 apartments on these sites, respectively, it is unlikely that such amalgamation would occur within the lifespan of the Place Strategy. Having reviewed these sites, they are not recommended for planning control changes.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 submissions suggested exploring options for height / FSR to be increased to improve viability. 5 submissions suggested an increase could be accommodated by 1-33 Saunders Street being zoned commercial only to alleviate the overshadowing constraint. <p>4 submissions suggested removing the green spaces and through site link to retain the current building footprint.</p> <p>1 submission - 2-10 Quarry Master Drive should also receive uplift in height and FSR.</p>	
<p>16 submissions - A 33-storey tower is inconsistent with the character of the area. Proposed building heights exceed the natural quarry cliff top.</p> <p>The challenges of being in a Quarry - low levels of light, echo and noise, poor communications - will be exacerbated by this development.</p> <p>The precinct was designed as a 'height-tiered community' to balance density with liveability.</p> <p>The proposal mirrors Blackwattle Bay which is very different in character from the Peninsula.</p>	<p>Ultimo Pyrmont will experience significant growth and change due to the NSW Government's investment in a new Metro station, its Place Strategy, and the Ministerial Direction requiring future planning to accommodate new jobs and housing. This includes an inevitable contextual change for the Quarry Master Drive and Saunders Street precinct with the NSW Government approved Blackwattle Bay site.</p> <p>The City has undertaken detailed urban design analysis, informed by advice from the City Design Advisory Panel Subcommittee and internal experts in heritage, trees, public domain, transport, access, urban analytics, economics and planning.</p> <p>This analysis, inline with our adopted design considerations, has led to the following in relation to the Quarry Master Drive and Saunders Street precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional overshadowing of living rooms and private open space of adjoining residences has been minimised, in accordance with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide and the City's Development Control Plan street setbacks and tower placement have been carefully designed to allow more sunlight into the streets, ensuring that more than half of surrounding streets receive at least 2 hours of sunlight in midwinter the proposed planning controls maintain required separation distances between existing windows and balconies and the new building envelopes to ensure visual privacy and adequate outlook, in line with

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p>In relation to noise within in the precinct, residential dwellings are generally not sources of intrusive noise. The future DA process may offer other opportunities for noise attenuation when the detailed design of the development is known.</p>
<p><i>6 submissions</i> - There is a lack of demand for commercial space. Targets were set pre-pandemic and do not reflect current realities.</p> <p>There is no need for local retail spaces at ground floor. In the area, many shops are vacant, and businesses are short lived. And more retail is being provided in the Fish markets redevelopment.</p>	<p>The City was set a target for commercial work space within the Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy and the associated Ministerial Direction, which was underpinned by an Economic Development Strategy produced by NSW Treasury. The Economic Development Strategy states that it factors in the impacts of Covid in its employment forecasts.</p> <p>The Ministerial Direction requires all planning proposals in Ultimo Pyrmont demonstrate how they meet the objectives of the Place Strategy, including job targets. The focus for the City has been on meeting the required job targets in the most appropriate way.</p> <p>Demand for office and retail floor space will be determined by the market and will change as the population grows. The proposed controls create capacity for office and retail floor space to be provided when and if the market determines.</p> <p>Planning for increased retail and business premises floor space is important in an area increasing in density. Permitting retail and business premises on these sites supports more vibrant and active streets and providing better access to local services for existing and future residents.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Support development. It is well located. Council has achieved a good balance. The building form prioritises light into the street.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Support the proposal for 26-38 Saunders Street. Proposes 2 changes to the envelope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the tower floorplate through a small reduction in open space and a reduction of setback from 9m to 6m at the western boundary • Increase the height of the podium from 6 to 8 storeys 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Reduced tower setbacks and an increased podium height cannot be accommodated without creating unsafe wind conditions at street level and an inappropriate amount of overshadowing for neighbour residential properties.</p> <p>Detailed wind modelling identified the need for a two-level void above the podium to mitigate wind impacts within the street. To</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the FSR <p>These changes would result in a 16% increase in the number of apartments, supporting the financial viability of the redevelopment.</p>	<p>accommodate this, height and FSR are slightly increased, remaining under the NSW Government's Height Strategy with no additional impacts.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Amended controls are sought for a mixed-use option with an 8:1 FSR and building height of 120m. The reference scheme includes two residential towers and two commercial towers. One of the commercial building acts as a barrier to manage noise from the Anzac bridge.</p>	<p>The owner seeks controls significantly different to those exhibited. The City proposes to retain the exhibited controls but include the site in a Stage 2 review.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggestion of alternative approach: slender tall towers closer to Bank Street, instead of bulky large towers to maximise view sharing and not 'crowd' in Saunders Street.</p>	<p>The concern here relates to the proposed form of 1-33 Saunders Street and the resultant private view, solar access and privacy impacts.</p> <p>The exhibited building envelope for 1-33 Saunders Street has been designed in alignment with NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide including building separation, visual privacy, and solar and daylight access.</p> <p>Some private view loss will occur. The Place Strategy prioritises protecting and enhancing public views over private ones. 1-33 Saunders Street was identified by the NSW Government's Place Strategy. The City's proposal remains within the NSW Government Height Strategy. Taller buildings have been located to minimise overshadowing of homes and public spaces and to increase sunlight in streets. The proposal also improves local outlooks by providing views of more trees and active streets. Overall, the private view loss is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Potential impacts on surrounding property values are not considered a planning matter.</p>
<h3>12 Pyrmont Street</h3>	
<p><i>3 submissions</i> - Support for the envelope which minimises overshadowing, conserves the heritage structure and responds positively to the context.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggests the setbacks are overly conservative and that there would be more job creation with larger floorplates. Suggests reducing the setbacks to 15m and increasing FSR to 4.6:1, while retaining the view corridor, solar access to neighbours and deep soil area.</p>	<p>The City has considered the request and has concluded that the setback as exhibited are appropriate. The upper level setback above the heritage item will ensure the protection of the items setting and curtilage when viewed from surrounding streets. It will also ensure the structural integrity of the heritage item and limit the need for significant structural interventions</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	into existing heritage fabric. The setback to Jones Bay Road is essential in order to provide protection to an existing private tree and separation for existing residential properties on Pymont Street. The height of the proposed street wall along Jones Bay Road responds to and extends the existing street wall.
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Support for the measures put in place to reduce impacts on 14, 16 & 18 Pymont Street, the identified open spaces and deep soil requirements, protecting the view corridor and protecting existing trees. Notes the urban design, biodiversity, and health benefits of open green spaces.</p>	Support noted.
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Concern about the proposed height and FSR increases. Mentions impact on views, privacy and property value. Notes that 12 Pymont Street was not included in the PPPS and questions its inclusion.</p>	<p>The City reviewed nearly every site in Ultimo and Pymont to identify the most sensitive ways to accommodate the growth envisaged by the NSW Government. We began with sites highlighted in the Place Strategy as candidates for additional jobs and homes, then extended our review to other sites, including 12 Pymont Street. This site contains the heritage-listed 'Slades Building,' a three-storey Federation-style warehouse that is vacant and in poor condition. It is further constrained by a light rail easement, boundary view protections, and an irregular lot shape, making redevelopment under existing controls highly unlikely. To incentivise the conservation, adaptation, and reuse of this important heritage building, the City prepared new planning controls. The exhibited height and FSR were determined through the design review process and represent a sensitive approach to enabling change without unreasonable impacts on views or privacy. Potential effects on surrounding property values are not a planning matter.</p>
Harris Street group	
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - The Harris Street group is too tall. It is incompatible with the surrounding buildings, in particular heritage houses. Additional on street parking would be needed and would impact Hackett Street. It will impact views for Cadigal Avenue looking towards the city.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - Previous work on the Harris Street group found that 12-storeys was inappropriate. Hackett Street requires a sensitive response as it is narrow and has</p>	<p>The height of the buildings proposed along Harris Street responds to the existing heights of nearby buildings extending the existing street wall.</p> <p>The Harris Street buildings transition down in height to minimise overshadowing of existing lower scale residential properties to the west.</p> <p>The rear setback provides deep soil for the planting of trees to Hackett Street. The rear lane setback is publicly accessible open space that extends the public space of Hackett Street.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
<p>heritage buildings. The envelope should taper and have easements to Hackett Street.</p>	<p>Any requirement for easements is a matter for consideration at development application stage.</p> <p>The City has implemented parking controls to reduce reliance on private vehicles, including time-of-day restrictions, parking ticket pricing, and kerbside priority for goods and services. Planning policies also apply maximum parking rates, require on-site car share bays, and mandate bicycle parking for new developments.</p> <p>Under the City's neighbourhood parking policy, new residential flats and commercial/retail premises are ineligible for parking permits, further reducing on-street demand.</p> <p>Any view impact from Cadigal Avenue as a result of development on Harris Street is considered to be acceptable.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Seeking amended controls for 535-547 Harris Street, increasing the FSR to 3.61:1 and increasing the building height from 1 storey to 4, 5 and 7 storeys. The proposed envelope maintains the 15% deep soil and does not give rise to additional overshadowing.</p>	<p>The request for additional FSR and height has been considered and is considered unjustified. The increases requested would result in a building envelope incapable of complying with the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Seeks amended controls for 562-576 Harris Street, increasing FSR to 2.42:1 for non-residential, to maximise efficient use of the land. Suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the height design excellence bonus is retained and the requirement for a competition is removed. • The requirement for 10% deep soil is removed and greening ambitions are achieved through a green roof and/or walls. • Vehicular access to the site should be permitted from the Systrum Street frontage and deleted from the Macarthur Street frontage. 	<p>In response to detailed design development and a landowner request to pursue a hotel use instead of residential it is proposed to increase the FSR from 2:1 to 2.7.5:1 but retain the exhibited maximum height and planning envelope.</p> <p>Hotels can accommodate more floor space per level within the exhibited envelope. The additional FSR applies only to commercial use and does not increase impacts.</p> <p>The requirement for 10% deep soil is retained inline with the City's agreed design considerations.</p> <p>Vehicular access is maintained from Macarthur Street frontage in line with existing access arrangements. This ensures that the deep soil area to Systrum Street can be maintained and is considered to be a better heritage response.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - There is a large fossil fuel tank under 594 Harris Street which seems dangerous near to residents. This building is being vacated - could the tank be decommissioned?</p>	<p>This is a matter for consideration under any future development application for the site.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
Pymont Village / John Street group	
<p>4 submissions - Concern about the impact of the John Street group on the local character and heritage streetscape.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - The heights of the terraces at 79-93 John Street should be no higher than the lowest height in the affordable housing opposite.</p>	<p>79–93 John Street currently contains eight terrace houses in pairs, originally two storeys with at least one attic addition. The terraces are isolated and have no historic or heritage value. The City proposes planning controls for four residential buildings of 5–7 storeys, incorporating 15% deep soil on site. Together, the buildings would create a street wall comparable in height to that opposite on John Street. While the new buildings may be visible in the background from Harris or Pymont streets, they will not appear dominant or detracting. Instead, they represent sensitive, well-designed mid-scale infill that delivers much-needed housing.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Generally felt the heights and envelopes proposed were appropriate.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Support for the proposed planning controls for 80-84 Harris Street. Notes that sandstone cottage at 82 Harris should be retained and addressed sensitively.</p>	<p>Support noted. The heritage significance and protection of 82 Harris Street will be an important consideration at development application stage.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Propose a maximum height increase for 86-92 Harris in line with the existing height of 100 Harris Street and in response to design development.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - Seeks amended controls for 86-92 Harris Street, increasing the height to 33m and FSR to 3:1. The proposed envelope maintains the through site link, commercial land use and deep soil.</p>	<p>In response to detailed design development, the City supports adjustments to the proposed controls for 86-92 Harris Street, including DCP envelope changes, a height increase from 27 to 33 metres and an FSR increase from 2.3:1 to 3:1. These changes can be accommodated without additional negative impacts on surrounding properties and the public domain. This issue is dealt with in the main assessment report.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - 100 Harris Street is an example of successful transformation of a heritage warehouse to commercial use. Oppose any increase in height at 100 Harris Street and recommend retention or replacement of the existing building at the same heights</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - New controls sought for 100 and 130 Harris Street. Suggests rezoning from E2 to MU1, with 39m height and 4.9:1 FSR to allow for a co-living development.</p>	<p>The majority of 100 Harris Street is currently occupied by the heritage-listed Federation Warehouse style former woolstore of “Schute, Bell, Badgery and Lumby Woolstore”. The former woolstore has been recently restored and refurbished as a commercial office space. To the south of the heritage building is a multi-storey carpark, with two levels of commercial above.</p> <p>The City’s proposal for 100 Harris is limited to the multi-storey carpark/commercial portion of the site. The City proposed planning controls to accommodate a 7-10 storey commercial building. The height of the building fits</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>comfortably among the existing and proposed street wall height of buildings in the vicinity.</p> <p>Sites with existing commercial zoning, like 100 Harris, will continue to prohibit residential development. These sites anchor one of Australia's largest creative media employment clusters. The amended proposal retains a critical mass of new commercial floor space within walking distance of Pymont Metro Station, promoting public transport use for workers and customers. It supports a self-sustaining workplace precinct in a premium harbourside location, with a mix of building types in high demand by industry. The DCP changes requested as part of the submission are also not supported. Changes to height in storeys was requested in support of a residential scheme. These changes were based on the proposed change of use. As the change of use is not supported, the change in height in storeys is not justified.</p>
48 Pirrama Road	
<p><i>4 submissions</i> - Objection to the proposed height of 48 Pirrama Road. It will be out of step with other buildings. It will block views and decrease privacy. In line with the Strategy, building heights should decrease as they approach the water.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - the impacts of redeveloping 48 Pirrama Rad are not worth minimal improvement to the view and open green space. The John Street view corridor should not be applied to the redevelopment of existing buildings.</p>	<p>The Ministerial Direction requires the City's planning proposal to align with the NSW Government's Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy, particularly the Height Strategy in the Urban Design Report. The City's exhibited and amended proposal sets building heights below those allowed under the Height Strategy. At 48 Pirrama Road, heights have been limited to protect solar access to Pymont Bay Park, establish a podium consistent with the Star and REVY buildings, and respect the foreshore setting. The site is sufficiently distant from residential properties to avoid unreasonable impacts on private views or privacy. The building envelope is also set back to the west to preserve a John Street public view corridor, which the City considers important to maintain.</p>
Other site-specific comments	
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Supports the proposal. An alternative envelope is put forward for 13A-29 Union Street consolidating the dual towers and increasing and relocating the deep soil planting to the south. Controls for 50m height and 4.3:1 + design excellence FSR are sought.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>In response to submissions, the City has amended the proposal to allow a mixed-use residential development outcome on this site as it has an existing mixed-use zoning. This is in addition to the previously exhibited commercial proposal. Based on the City's design considerations a mixed use residential outcome for the site can reasonably accommodate an</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	FSR of 5:1 and an overall height of 45 metres. This is less than the exhibited commercial height and FSR for the site, with a smaller planning envelope, and as such will have minimal additional environmental impacts.
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Seeks amended controls for 20-80 Pymont Street, the Star casino site, to allow for residential and mixed uses. This would help deliver much-needed housing, while continuing to meet design requirements like minimising overshadowing and increasing open space.</p>	<p>The City met with the Star in response to their submission and invited them to advance their own separate planning proposal request for their site with the City.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - The proposed Star Hotel at the bulk indicated is inappropriate in the context and a blight on view lines from Pymont and elsewhere.</p>	<p>Noted. The Star hotel was approved by the NSW Government and is not the subject of the City's proposal.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Puts forward an alternative envelope for 28-48 Wattle Street, a heritage listed former wool store with a sawtooth roof.</p>	<p>The exhibited planning controls have been adjusted following detailed design development and heritage and structural advice to allow for a north-south oriented built form option. This option was supported by the City's Design Advisory Panel and will be further tested through a design competition and development application. The amendment remains below the exhibited maximum height and does not create additional overshadowing to Wentworth Park, Quarry Green or nearby residences. It results in an amended DCP envelope and an increase in the maximum FSR from 4.1:1 to 4.5:1. This adjustment is discussed further in the main report. An exemption to the Wentworth Park Sun Access Plane has been accommodated in the planning proposal to permit the reconstruction of original historic turrets along the Wattle Street facade.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - E2 Commercial Centre zone which applies to 60 Union Street and sites around the Metro is too restrictive, particularly given the housing shortage and the challenges facing the commercial office market. Seeks rezoning to MU1 for 60 Union Street.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - Change the zoning of 2 Edward Street from Commercial Centre to Mixed Use to encourage provision of more housing near the Metro station in Union Street.</p>	<p>At this time, the proposed change in zoning is not supported. The City was set a target for commercial floor space within the Pymont Peninsula Place Strategy and the associated Ministerial Direction, which was underpinned by an Economic Development Strategy produced by NSW Treasury. The Economic Development Strategy states that it factors in the impacts of Covid in its employment forecasts.</p> <p>The Ministerial Direction requires all planning proposals in Ultimo Pymont demonstrate how they meet the objectives of the Place Strategy, including job targets. The focus for the City has been on meeting the required job targets in the most appropriate way.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>Demand for office floor space will be determined by the market and will change as the population grows. The proposed controls create capacity for office floor space to be provided when and if the market determines.</p> <p>Sites with existing commercial zoning, like 60 Union Street and 2 Edward Street, will continue to prohibit residential development. These sites anchor one of Australia’s largest creative media employment clusters. The amended proposal retains a critical mass of new commercial floor space within walking distance of Pymont Metro Station, promoting public transport use for workers and customers. It supports a self-sustaining workplace precinct in a premium harbourside location, with a mix of building types in high demand by industry.</p> <p>As other NSW Government employment precincts shift toward residential use, including at Blackwattle Bay (320 dwellings replacing 1,500 jobs) and the Central State Significant Precinct (Tech Central, 28,000 to 2,400 jobs), long-term employment planning in Pymont, at the centre of the “Harbour CBD” and “Innovation Corridor,” is increasingly important.</p> <p>The West Metro business case assumed additional commercial floor space would be delivered in Pymont. Providing employment floor space near metro stations increases patronage. New metro stations have proven transformative for commercial investment and city mobility. For example, the Waterloo Metro station has attracted \$288 million in commercial development, creating 1,430 jobs in the Botany Road Precinct since the City’s commercial planning controls were introduced in 2022.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Objection to height of One Darling Island because of the loss of public and private views.</p>	<p>No planning control changes are proposed for 1 Darling Island Road.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Notes significant changes in housing and employment needs since the studies that informed the PPPS. Suggests the non-residential requirement be removed for 46-48 Pymont Bridge Road.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggests the site should be rezoned commercial centre.</p>	<p>In response to submissions, the City has amended the proposal to allow mixed-use residential development on 46-48 Pymont Bridge Road which has an existing mixed-use zoning. This is in addition to the previously exhibited commercial proposal. Based on the City’s design considerations a mixed-use residential outcome for the site can reasonably accommodate an FSR of 3.41:1 and an overall height of 38 metres. This is less than the exhibited commercial height and FSR for the</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>site, with a smaller planning envelope, and as such will have minimal additional environmental impacts.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - object to the heights increasing in Ultimo, because it would be to the detriment of the area's character.</p>	<p>Ultimo will experience significant growth and change due to the NSW Government's investment in a new Metro station, its Place Strategy, and the Ministerial Direction requiring future planning to accommodate new jobs and housing.</p> <p>By advancing a precinct-wide planning proposal, the City can guide growth sensitively consistent with the Place Strategy, informed by community engagement, and based on best practice design. Without this approach, future planning would be left to individual landowners or the NSW Government.</p> <p>The Ministerial Direction requires the City's planning proposal to be consistent with the NSW Government's Pyrmont Peninsula Place Strategy, and in particular, the Height Strategy set out in the Urban Design Report.</p> <p>The City's exhibited and amended planning proposal sets building heights below those permitted by the NSW Government's Height Strategy.</p> <p>Full details of the City's proposed heights, where they are lower than those permitted by the NSW Government, are provided in the Urban Design Study (Attachment G to the main report). The reduced heights primarily protect solar access to parks and public places and minimise overshadowing of existing homes. This approach is consistent with the Place Strategy (which identifies key parks and places to protect), the NSW Government's Apartment Design Guide, and the City's Development Control Plan.</p> <p>This site is addressed further in the main report.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - 20-28 Bulwara Road should retain its Residential zoning and be mandated for Public Housing</p>	<p>The City's proposal rezones 20-28 Bulwara Road from R1 General Residential to MU1 Mixed Use. This is to permit a broader range of commercial uses in a location with employment uses to across the road to the east and west. Whilst residential remains a permitted use on site, the City's proposal provides a floor space and height incentive for a non-residential outcome. This is because the configuration of the site and its relationship to neighbouring</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	<p>sites doesn't suit a larger residential outcome. A larger residential development on this site would fail to meet Apartment Design Guide amenity requirements, would struggle to meet deep soil requirements and would likely have greater impact on historical fabric on site. Any commercial redevelopment of the site will still be the subject of an affordable housing contribution.</p>
Additional sites put forward for review	
<p><i>3 submissions</i> - New controls sought for 1-19 Allen Street and 313-369 Harris Street. The existing buildings are older and in need of renewal. They are well located, near to shops, services and transport. The buildings are not heritage listed. When combined, they could accommodate growth. With the Western Distributor to the south, they are not constrained by overshadowing requirements.</p> <p><i>1 submission</i> - More development could be accommodated in Pymont along Harris Street between Allen and Fig Streets. This could revive a quiet area and spread development more equitably.</p>	<p>1-19 Allen Street is an existing residential strata with ~78 apartments. The strata has requested a review for potential new controls. The site is not a heritage item or within a heritage conservation area.</p> <p>313-369 Harris Street is an existing mixed-use residential strata with ~136 apartments and 20 commercial units. The strata has requested a review for potential new controls. The site is not a heritage item or within a heritage conservation area.</p> <p>Following an initial review, additional density and height may be appropriate on these sites and the City will investigate them through a Stage 2 process, to be reported back to Council and publicly exhibit.</p>
<p><i>1 submission from City West Housing</i> - Suggest their sites be reviewed for uplift to allow for renewal and deliver more affordable housing. Suggested amended controls to allow an increase in density for: 15-17 Jones Street, 14A Quarry Master Drive, and 56 Harris Street (also known as 88 John Street). Also suggests that it may be possible to manage overshadowing through different form for 17-21 Pymont Bridge Road.</p>	<p>Following an initial review the City met with City West to discuss their submission, and it was agreed that one of their sites, 56 Harris Street warranted further investigation. The City will investigate additional density and height on this site through a Stage 2 process, to be reported back to Council and publicly exhibit.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - 290 Harris Street - Would like an increase in allowable height to add 2 storeys to the existing 2 storey building. This aligns with the surrounding context.</p>	<p>290 Harris Street is a contributory Victorian terrace in a heritage conservation area. It is part of a consistent intact row of 2-storey terraces, and an additional 2 storeys is not considered appropriate.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - New controls sought for 123 Harris Street, a heritage item in a terrace with 121-127 Harris Street. Suggests increasing height restriction above 12m.</p>	<p>121-125 Harris Street is a listed heritage item within a heritage conservation area. The site sits directly opposite Union Square and is an important building in terms of framing the square. The request for additional height was not supported by any substantive evidence or</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	justification. A height increase is not supported under the current proposal.
<p><i>1 submission</i> - Suggest 344 Bulwara is redeveloped as it is in a poor state of repair and could accommodate more density.</p>	<p>344 Bulwara Road is an existing mixed-use residential strata with ~98 apartments and 4 commercial units. A unit owner has requested a review for potential new controls. The site is not a heritage item or within a heritage conservation area.</p> <p>Following an initial review, additional density and height may be appropriate on the site and the City will investigate them through a Stage 2 process, to be reported back to Council and publicly exhibit. The site may have limited potential for additional yield once overshadowing to Mary Ann Street Park and 383-389 Bulwara Road are modelled.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - It seems that 562-606 Harris Street has been excluded - why? Prime opportunity.</p>	<p>562-570 Harris Street have been proposed for additional height and floor space. 578 to 606 Harris Street is a listed heritage item within a heritage conservation area. The request for additional height was not supported by any substantive evidence or justification. A height increase is not supported. Any height increase is likely to unreasonably overshadow existing residential properties to the east, in noncompliance with the Apartment Design Guide.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - New controls sought for 463-467 Harris Street, a corner site adjacent to identified sites. Suggest height of 27-30m and FSR of 3.5:1.</p>	<p>A corner site adjoining a row of eight where new controls have been prepared. The landowner seeks controls consistent with the adjoining sites. The site is not a heritage item or within a heritage conservation area.</p> <p>Following an initial review, the City is broadly supportive of additional density and height on this site and will investigate it through a Stage 2 process, to be reported back to Council and publicly exhibit.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - New controls sought for 43 and 45 Murray Street to increase height and FSR. Proximity to Metro means its an opportunity for new housing.</p>	<p>Following an initial review the City is not supportive of new planning controls for the subject sites. The request for new planning controls was not supported by any substantive evidence or justification. Additional height on the site is limited by the need to maintain solar access to neighbouring residential properties to the west and south in compliance with the Apartment Design Guide. The two sites are considered to be too small to accommodate towers. They would result in non-compliant tower setbacks, blank tower side walls and</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Summary of submission	Response
	poor activation at street level with dominant vehicular access and servicing.
<p><i>1 submission</i> - suggests the Novotel Car Park on Murray Street would be a prime location for development.</p>	<p>The Novotel site is not within the City's planning jurisdiction under Sydney LEP 2012. Any change in planning control or development application would be led by the NSW Government.</p>
<p><i>1 submission</i> - New controls sought for 74-84 Union Street, given proximity to the Metro Station and other sites. Suggests 6:1 FSR and 42m height.</p>	<p>Following an initial review the City is not supportive of new planning controls for the subject site. The request for new planning controls was not supported by any substantive evidence or justification. Additional height on the site is limited by the need to maintain solar access to neighbouring residential properties to the south in compliance with the Apartment Design Guide. Additional height in this location would also be contrary to the long-standing planning and urban design objective to limit the height of development along the northern edge of Union Street and important public space on the doorstep of the new Metro. The site is adjacent to heritage listed terraces and a hotel and additional height in this context is not supported.</p>
<p><i>2 submissions</i> - Suggest the re-development of the Council depot site at corner of Wattle Street and Wattle Crescent.</p>	<p>10A Wattle Street is located on the eastern side of Wattle Street, opposite Wentworth Park. It is an irregular shaped site with a 32 metre frontage to Wattle Street that narrows to a point at the rear.</p> <p>The site is positioned in between Wentworth Park light rail stop to the south and an existing residential flat building to the north with an in-part nil boundary setback. Apartments in the adjoining residential flat building benefit from views and access to light and air across the subject site.</p> <p>The site primarily zoned SP2 Classified road, which prohibits and residential or substantial commercial development. The zoning is for the purposes of a potential future on/off ramp to the Western Distributor.</p> <p>The City through Transport for NSW Pyrmont Ultimo Transport Strategy work have advocated for future ramp to not be pursued in a hope that the site would be used for a more productive use. Even with a rezoning however the sites contextual constraints mean its future use would be limited.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

State Government submissions

Submission summary	Response
State Government agency submissions	
<p><i>NSW Department of Education</i> - The department has reviewed existing assets, current projects, planning actions and demand projections, as well as analysed the original dwelling yields under the PPPS.</p> <p>While the demand for primary school students may be accommodated by existing asset, upgrades of existing high schools are required. These upgrades are currently not funded and will be subject to future consultation and detailed planning.</p> <p>The department is committed to working with Council to ensure schools are supporting community needs and continue to be appropriately resourced to respond to student population changes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This submission is addressed in the main assessment report.</p>
<p><i>Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts</i> - To enable consideration of airspace protection or National Airport Safeguarding Framework (NASF) related issues in more detail, we encourage the City of Sydney Council to engage with Sydney Airport during any subsequent design / development application stages.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>
<p><i>Heritage NSW</i> - We support the inclusion of heritage conservation as one of the principles of the proposal.</p> <p>We recommend that any future development that involve excavation are required to consider the risk of harm to Aboriginal objects.</p> <p>We encourage proponents to engage with the NSW Government Architect's Designing with Country guideline.</p> <p>We support the proposed inclusion of controls to manage potential archaeological deposits in the DCP. Controls to safeguard unanticipated finds should also be included.</p> <p>We note that the precinct contains 8 State Heritage Register (SHR) items. We understand that these have been considered and that no changes to controls for state heritage items are proposed. We recommend that if works are proposed which impact on any SHR items that a Statement of Heritage Impact (SOHI) should</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submission summary	Response
<p>be prepared. If the SOHI identifies impact on potential historical archaeology, a historical archaeological assessment should be prepared.</p> <p>If any significant maritime heritage items or relics are likely to be, then a Maritime Archaeological Research Design and Excavation Methodology (MARDEM) must be undertaken.</p>	
<p><i>Fire and Rescue NSW</i> – We recommend that booster assemblies be installed on the hydrant and sprinkler systems. Further that they are enclosed in cabinets in accordance with the requirements of the relevant Australian Standards. The enclosure of the Booster Assemblies will enhance the design outcomes for buildings and assist in protecting these firefighting facilities from damage and vandalism.</p> <p>We also recommend that the design and layout (footprint) of new development provides safe and efficient access for emergency service vehicles and in particular fire brigade vehicles in line with the Fire Safety Guideline – Access for fire brigade vehicles and firefighters.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>
<p><i>Transport for NSW</i> - TfNSW supports the proposal and will continue to collaborate with the Council to promote sustainable transport options and improve place outcomes. Several initiatives are underway including upgrading crossings and connections to Wentworth Park and Fish Markets, completion of the foreshore link and increasing the L1 Inner West Light Rail frequency.</p> <p>TfNSW supports Council’s proposal to widen footpaths and creating pedestrian through links, as well as the establishment of progressively lower car parking rate requirements.</p> <p><i>Sydney Metro</i> - Sydney Metro is Australia’s biggest public transport project. Pyrmont Station is one of nine stations along the Sydney Metro West alignment. Sydney Metro supports the Council’s proposal.</p> <p>Planning controls have been amended to unlock capacity for a future residential tower above the Pyrmont Station eastern site to a height of 110 metres. Sydney Metro is currently progressing a Concept SSDA for an Over Station Development on the eastern site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p> <p>The City will share the requested information with Sydney Metro in relation to the proposed draft controls.</p> <p>The City’s planning controls have been designed to minimise overshadowing to existing and planned residential projects, including the Metro station tower. An amendment to the LEP to reference future residential projects is not considered warranted.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submission summary	Response
<p>The proposal seeks to introduce the Harwood Street view corridor, which crosses the eastern most tip of the Pymont Metro site. The podium is already approved under the Stage 3 CSSI. Sydney Metro requests further detail on the methodology and technical inputs used to define the proposed Harwood Street view corridor and its extent.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal seeks to establish height and floor space ratio (FSR) uplift at various sites located to the immediate north of the Metro site, including 60 Union Street and 1-27 Murray Street. Given the proximity and the imminent determination of the Concept SSDA, consideration should be given to amenity and solar access for future residents. It is requested that Council provide Sydney Metro with details of the extent of potential overshadowing and amend the objectives in the proposed LEP to acknowledge 'existing and future' residential properties.</p> <p>Sydney Metro requests that for future detailed applications comply with the provisions of the Sydney Metro Underground Corridor Protection Guidelines and Sydney Metro At Grade and Elevated Sections Guidelines. Applicants are to engage in discussions with Sydney Metro in relation to the location and nature of substratum structures.</p>	
<p><i>Sydney Water</i> – Sydney Water supports government-backed growth initiatives within our area of operations, striving to provide timely and cost-effective water and wastewater infrastructure without undue impacts.</p> <p>Our preliminary assessment indicates that water and wastewater servicing should be available for the proposed development. Future amplification, adjustments, deviations and/or minor extensions works may be required. Due to the volume of individual developments proposed and their locations, it is advised that feasibility applications are carried out for the developments in advance of DAs to ensure efficiencies in programming any asset upgrades, to prevent disruption and duplication of works.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>
<p><i>Homes NSW</i> – The following sites owned by Homes NSW (formerly Land and Housing Corporation) have potential for increased</p>	<p>Following an initial review the City met with Homes NSW to discuss their submission, and it was agreed that two of their sites, 1-7 Henry Avenue and 26-52 Mount Street warranted</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submission summary	Response
<p>height and FSR and should be included in the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 86-118 Bowman Street, Pyrmont • 26-52 Mount Street, Pyrmont • 336-368 Jones Street, Pyrmont • 528-538 Jones Street, Ultimo <p>Homes NSW would welcome the opportunity to collaborate with Council.</p>	<p>further investigation. The City will investigate them through a Stage 2 process, to be reported back to Council and publicly exhibit.</p>
<p><i>Civil Aviation Safety Authority - CASA</i> has reviewed the proposal and notes the maximum proposed building height is RL120m. The Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) for Sydney Airport is RL 156m. Therefore, the buildings would be under the OLS and will not need to be assessed under the Airspace Regulations. Aviation Safety is not an issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>
<p><i>Sydney Airport</i> - The height of Sydney Airport's Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) over the area ranges in height from 130-156m AHD. Any proposed structures that will penetrate the OLS will be subject to the Federal AIRPORTS (PROTECTION OF AIRSPACE) REGULATIONS 1996.</p> <p>Construction cranes may be required to operate at a height significantly higher than that of the proposed development and consequently, may not be approved. Sydney Airport advises that approval to operate construction equipment (ie cranes) should be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>
<p><i>NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA)</i> - In the instanced of rezoning land use to commercial and mixed use, EPA recommends the use of guidance material to mitigate potential impacts, including: Noise Guide for Local Government (EPA, 2023) and Local Government Air Quality Toolkit (EPA).</p> <p>For residential development, the EPA recommends that Council review the noise limits for development in proximity to busy roads contained in SEPP (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021, as well as the NSW Road Noise Policy and Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline.</p> <p>The EPA also notes there is a likelihood of contamination issues across the proposal area due to historical industrial uses. Refer to Resilience and Hazards SEPP 2021 and the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The guidance and toolkits referenced have been relied upon in the preparation of the draft planning controls. All of the planning controls are in strict compliance with additional standard process needed to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submission summary	Response
<p>Managing Land Contamination: Planning Guidelines. The EPA must be notified of contamination that meets certain triggers.</p>	
<p><i>Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, Biodiversity, Conservation and Science (BCS) Group –</i> BCS recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a detailed flood impact assessment be conducted for each site during the DA stage • flood risk to pedestrians be considered. Recommends DAs locate pedestrian entrances away from locations of high flood hazard • consideration be given to ensuring that site access is provided via frontages away from significantly flood affected areas • Notes DAs proposing the demolition of built structures may impact habitats for microbats, including several threatened species. Specific guidelines and surveys are recommended to assess and mitigate impacts on their habitats. <p><i>NSW State Emergency Services –</i> SES note the Flood Impact and Risk Assessment and recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring that all openings to basements (ramp, vents, etc) are situated above the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF), or reconsidering basement carparking if this is not feasible. • ensuring that appropriate land use decisions are made at the rezoning stage, rather than relying on “<i>appropriate building design</i>” to mitigate identified flood risks. • note development strategies relying on deliberate isolation or sheltering in buildings surrounded by flood water are not equivalent, in risk management terms, to evacuation. <p>pursuing site design and stormwater management that reduces the impact of flooding and minimises any risk to the community, where relevant</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>These standard process will need to be undertaken prior to lodgement and during the assessment of future development applications.</p> <p>Planning for flooding at the City of Sydney is guided by the Interim Floodplain Management Policy, which was prepared in accordance with the NSW Government Floodplain Development Manual 2005. In accordance with the interim policy, the City has prepared floodplain management plans covering eight local catchments, which are supported by publicly available detailed flood studies, which are updated regularly.</p> <p>Also, in accordance with the interim policy, development applications must comply with Section 3.7 ‘Water and Food Management’ of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 and clause 5.21 ‘Flood planning’ of Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012. These controls require certain development to prepare a site-specific flood study in accordance with the state government floodplain development guidelines and may use the data contained in the City’s detailed flood studies.</p> <p>Separate to this planning proposal, the City has recently updated its general flooding planning controls. Part of that project was an update to the water and flood management controls in the DCP. The proposed controls migrate the provisions of the interim policy into the DCP, along with updates to better manage heritage items and introduce criteria for design requirements, practical precautions and access arrangements for development at risk of flooding. The City has undertaken an assessment of the proposed controls against the updated NSW Flood Risk Management Manual and Flood Prone Land Policy and confirms they are compatible.</p> <p>The area subject to this planning proposal is covered by the City’s Blackwattle Bay catchment and Darling Harbour catchment flood studies.</p> <p>Using this data, the City has undertaken internal analysis of flooding risk at the sites</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submission summary	Response
	<p>identified as capable for change as part of this planning proposal. Where appropriate, flood planning levels and freeboard levels have been factored into the urban design analysis and development of built form controls.</p> <p>These levels are not explicitly expressed in this planning proposal, as it is more appropriate that a detailed flood study establish the levels at development application stage. This will allow a more detailed level of assessment, evidence gathering and flexibility in meeting the objectives of the planning controls. However, by assuming expected levels in the urban design analysis, the City can have better certainty that the proposed built form outcomes will be achievable when the flood planning levels are established at development application stage.</p>

Summary of submissions

Draft amendments to Central Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020

The draft amendments to Central Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020 were publicly exhibited from 1 October to 13 November 2024. The public exhibition was advertised on the City's "Sydney Your Say" webpage. The project was included in the October edition of the Sydney Your Say eNewsletter sent on 18 October 2024 to 5,136 subscribers.

In response to this public exhibition, 2 submissions were received via email from individuals.

The following table summarises the topics raised in these submissions and provides a response.

Submissions summary	Response
General - Support	
<p>Highly supportive of levies that will help fund a more community focused city. We should be building more cycle lanes, removing on street parking, decreasing speed limits and making footpaths wider.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The draft amendments to the Central Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020 do not include changes to the Plan's levy rates or its schedule of works.</p> <p>This Plan has been in force since November 2021, with development contributions being used to fund a wide range of infrastructure in Central Sydney, including open space upgrades, road and traffic improvements (such as cycleways), community facilities and public domain improvements.</p>
General – Comments	
<p>Developers should be charged the maximum – double the percentages listed in the draft documents.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The draft amendments to the Central Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020 do not include changes to the Plan's levy rates.</p> <p>The Plan's levy rates are the maximum permitted under Section 209(1) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021.</p>
<p>How are developers held accountable after their project has been approved and completed, to ensure they carry out their contributions commitments.</p>	<p>Infrastructure contributions under the Central Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2020 are payable prior to the issue of a construction certificate for building works approved via development applications, or prior to the commencement of works associated with complying development certificates. This means that developers must pay their contributions prior to commencing any building</p>

Summary of submissions and responses

Submissions summary	Response
	<p>works. Certifiers must sight evidence that contributions obligations have been met.</p> <p>In instances where developers have not paid the required contributions but have commenced building works, the City takes action to ensure all contributions obligations are met.</p>