

ATTACHMENT 5

**Planning Proposal 1/21 to amend North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013
Summary of submissions received during public exhibition period
(17 August – 28 September 2022)**

The following criteria are used to analyse all submissions received, and to determine whether or not the plan would be amended:

1. The Planning Proposal to amend North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013 **would be** amended if issues raised in the submission:
 - a provided additional information of relevance.
 - b indicated or clarified a change in government legislation, Council's commitment or management policy.
 - c proposed strategies that would better achieve or assist with Council's objectives.
 - d was an alternate viewpoint received on the topic and is considered a better option than that proposed in the Planning Proposal or;
 - e indicated omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.
2. The Planning Proposal to amend North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013 **would not be** amended if the issues raised in the submission:
 - a addressed issues beyond the scope of the Planning Proposal.
 - b was already in the Planning Proposal or will be considered during the development of a subordinate plan (prepared by Council).
 - c offered an open statement, or no change was sought.
 - d clearly supported the Planning Proposal.
 - e was an alternate viewpoint received on the topic but the recommendation of the Planning Proposal was still considered the best option.
 - f was based on incorrect information.
 - g contributed options that are not possible (generally due to some aspect of existing legislation or government policy) or; involved details that are not appropriate or necessary for inclusion in a document aimed at providing a strategic community direction over the long term.

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9058 086	1	Resident/Owner	Privacy	Concerned that the proposed height of the building would allow for overlooking into the private balcony	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	Concern that the height of building would result in the loss of natural light to balcony.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties.	N/A	2E
9057 319	2	Wollstonecraft Precinct Committee	Crows Nest Village/2036 Plan	The proposed rezoning from the NSLEP 2013 from 16m to 54m will forever create a precedent for other developments along the Pacific Highway and inevitably contribute to extend the changed character of Crows Nest village which is on its doorstep. St Leonards is the predominant centre with large developments to transition in height, bulk and scale from the highway to surrounding neighbourhood areas The proposed rezoning will forever change the character of adjoining residential properties in Sinclair Street It is a poor planning outcome	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development.	N/A	2E
			Building Height/Bulk And Scale	Its transition of extra height should be reduced (not increased) to meet the objectives of reducing building heights as development moves away from the Crows Nest station	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to	N/A	2E

2

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Creating a visual wall impact to those properties in Sinclair Street despite its 10 metres setback from the western property boundary	ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan		
			Solar Access	Impact adversely on properties to the south-west in Sinclair Street Wollstonecraft by way of denying all existing solar access in the early mornings,	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street..	N/A	2E
			Access Issues	Create access issues on the joint carriage way that have not been demonstrated as being resolved, given that all vehicular access (private cars and commercial delivery vehicles) will be required to share this carriageway into the future and during construction.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Process/2036 Plan	The decision to have this proposal proceed to Gateway Determination was taken without regard for the NSW Premier's Priorities that amongst other things requires that the NSW government puts the community at the centre of everything they do. In that regard, the decision to finalise the 2036 Plan with increased height of 5 more storeys than provided in the draft plan was a critical error and should be reversed. Council report predates all documentation.	increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. Noted.	N/A	2G
			Council Report Predates Draft VPA And Documents.	Justifies the Planning Proposal by making links with development such as the "Fiveways" site as similar. These applications are primarily for mixed use and largely residential proposals and not commercial uses. The argument is not justified. The traffic and parking study has a number of errors which lead to drastically incorrect conclusions about how the redevelopment could support active transport and cycling in particular	Noted. The Council report is an appendix and was drafted prior to the negotiation of the VPA that was placed on public exhibition.	N/A	2C
			Documentation Quality		Noted. See 2.1.12 of Council report.	N/A	2C
			Inconsistencies Within Traffic And Parking Study	The study claims that there is no cycling infrastructure in the close vicinity of the development. This is incorrect. Sinclair Street contains an uphill fully separated contraflow cycleway from Bruce Street to Shirley Rd. Cyclists heading south downhill currently use the general traffic lane. This forms part of a signposted cycle route through the low traffic backstreets of North Sydney, Waverton and Wollstonecraft connecting Mount Street to St Leonards Station and links a number of key locations including Cammeraygal High School (now years 7-9 campus),	Noted. See section 2.1.2 and 2.1.12 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				North Sydney Demonstration School and Mater Hospital. It also provides a connection to the key upcoming cycleway along West St (recently approved for public consultation on 26th September 2022) that will have a large number of children using it since the Cammeraygal High School 10-12 years were moved to the old TAFE site. This route, and Sinclair Street in particular, provides a safe, low traffic route for nonhardcore cyclists and particularly children and women who aren't confident enough to ride along the Pacific Hwy. The study implies that a cycleway will be provided along the Pacific Hwy. While this is likely to be correct between Milsons Point and West Street, the cycleway won't continue further north due to heritage listed buildings preventing the necessary works to place a cycleway around the bus stops. The cycle route will divert cyclists along West Street and through the back of Crows Nest to connect to St Leonards. This means that any cyclists needing to continue north and continue to the schools, Mater hospital, Crows Nest Metro Station and other locations on the western side of the Pacific Hwy and are even more dependent on this existing, low traffic, backroad route. Contrary to the claim that the majority of the traffic is expected to turn into Bruce St from the Pacific Hwy, cars approaching the site from the north will need to access the site by driving down Sinclair Street section of the cycling route from Shirley Rd. Additionally, almost all the traffic leaving the site (not turning left from Bruce onto the Pacific Hwy) will need to head back down Bruce Street and then along the lower end of Sinclair Street cycling route			
			Impacts To Cyclists		See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				(where there isn't even a separated cycleway) to use the traffic lights at Rocklands Rd. It's likely that even cars wanting to turn left into Pacific Hwy and then use the right-hand turn lane into Alexander St will also use this route because of too many lanes of traffic to get into the RH turn lane from Bruce St. All these extra vehicles will make this existing, critical, low car traffic cycling route that is currently used by less-experienced riders much more dangerous. It also provides a huge disincentive for senior Cammeraygal High School students who have had their campus moved to the old TAFE site at the north end of West St to cycle once the West Street cycleway is complete. Rather than make cycling more accessible as the study claims, a thorough analysis of the actual cycle routes and users surrounding the site demonstrates clearly that this development will lead to a large negative impact on cycling along the critical Sinclair Street route and generally in the area from the increase in car traffic induced by the 100+ increase in parking spaces on site The huge requested huge increase in parking spots is particularly galling considering that the whole reason the heights have been dramatically increased is because it's supposedly so close to the metro that cars aren't needed. Rather than an increase, there should have been a significant reduction in spots (which the proposed amendments to the DCP are proposed to rectify)	and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage.	N/A	2E
			Traffic And Parking		See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development		

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recomm ended Action	Criteria
					can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			Voluntary Planning Agreement/Public Benefit	Offer is very different to initial offer. VPA is not beneficial to Council and is a win-win for the applicant	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
			Economic Advice Report/Commercial Floor Space	It is not needed because there is insufficient evidence of enough jobs being created within the 2036 Plan of the type in this proposal to support even the minimum Gross Floor Area space of 21,258 Sqm Concerns that the report has excluded the non residential GFA approved in the Crows Nest OSD. The findings are not accurate to justify further commercial floor space. Based on the 2036 Plan and the research behind these numbers, it is apparent that there will be low demand from within the Precinct for office space of the type described by this planning proposal. Jobs will need to be imported from outside the precinct. The intention is to import jobs from other commercial office areas including the North Sydney CBD	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950- 3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m2 of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the	N/A	2E

7

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				which itself, has recently completed a very large increase in office space as mandated by the NSW government. Consequently, workers from well outside the 2036 Plan area will travel by public transport to work in Crow's Nest. Because North Sydney CBD has sufficient commercial office space capacity there is no need for such a large development as defined in this PP1/21. Especially when considering the large amount of office space in the Crows Nest station OSD. Concern with height and scale of the building and that the height was 8 storeys under the draft 2036 Plan but has now increased to 13 storeys. No documents provided to justify the change. Bulk and scale does not fit in with the character of the area. The development must be broken up so it is not so imposing when viewed from the Pacific Hwy and Shirley/River and Falcon Streets.	Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment		
9057 318	3	Resident/Owner	Height And Scale	The building should be setback further above the 3m podium similar to the 17 storey building on the Pacific Highway. The building height could be reduced as the applicant proposes to increase the FSR by using below ground space.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan Noted. See Section 2.1.7 of Council Report It is considered that the proposed building has been reasonably articulated in an attempt to reduce the overall apparent bulk and appearance of the structure. The draft Site Specific DCP includes provisions that open spaces nearby to residential properties be appropriately mitigated and managed and that landscaping is used to provide appropriate amenity and to soften the appearance of any future structure through the use of planter boxes on the	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Precedent/2036 Plan	The proposal would set a undesirable precedent for the Pacific Highway and does not respond to the fine scale buildings along the Pacific Highway and heritage conservation areas surrounding the site.	podium and terraces to facilitate mature vegetation. Additionally, other measures to ensure adequate levels of privacy to surrounding properties and their adequacy would be assessed in detail at the development application stage See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
9057 316	4	Resident/Owner	Height And Scale	The proposed increase in the maximum Height of Buildings from 16m to 54m is completely excessive. The excessive height, bulk and scale of the proposed building envelope will result in significant adverse amenity impacts on the neighbouring properties in Sinclair Street including loss of solar access. Bulk and scale does not fit in with the character of the area. The development must be broken up so it is not so imposing when viewed from the Pacific Hwy and Shirley/River and Falcon Streets.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				The excessive height, bulk and scale of the proposed building envelope will result in significant adverse amenity impacts on the neighbouring properties in Sinclair Street including loss of solar access.			
			Sunlight Access	This will mean that many properties in Sinclair St will not have any solar access till after 2.00pm on most days of the year.	Noted, See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E
			Desired Future Character/Precedent/2036 Plan	The proposal fails to provide a reasonable transition to the Sinclair Street properties. This will destroy the urban character of Sinclair St. The amended proposed height of 54m is inconsistent with Council's desired future character for this part of the Pacific Highway and will set an unacceptable precedent for future development in this locality.	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
9057 315	5	Resident/Owner	Traffic	Traffic- The report states that there will be 'negligible traffic impact' I totally disagree with this statement. Bruce Street is a small street and is accessed by residents and patients of the Mater Dialysis Unit. This will impact the traffic massively driving down Bruce Street to the Highway.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			Sunlight Access	Sunlight/shadowing increasing the building height from 16m to 54m will mean that the residents of Sinclair Street will lose the sunlight, especially because these properties have a north aspect. This is the main reason we purchased these properties because of the aspect and the light and sun from the north. By taking this away it will stop residents entertaining and using their yards. Especially in the winter, as the properties will be difficult to heat..	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Privacy	The new height of this proposed properties will also cause privacy issues and these backyards will be overlooked by the workers. Totally unfair for all residents	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Wind Tunnel	The height of this building will also create a wind tunnel which we do not want.	Noted. See Section 2.1.11 of Council Report. Council is satisfied that the wind assessment report provided is sufficient and that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application on the site.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Infrastructure/Public Benefit	Infrastructure – We currently have issues parking on our street now, with the increase of traffic and additional people in the area, our infrastructure will be compromised. local community feedback, people want more parks, ovals and green space not more high rise concrete towers!	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			2036 Plan	The 2036 LEP refers to high rise development between St Leonards Station and the Crows Nest Metro. 270 Pacific Highway is outside of this parameter and further south of the Crows Nest Metro.	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
			VPA Proposed/ Public Benefit	In summary, what the community wants and needs far outweighs the \$1 - \$3 million price tag on offer to the government to proceed with this development! If this development proceeds, it will open the flood gates for further high-rise development in the area.	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Please listen to the people in our community and what they want... and this is not it	discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.		
9057 314	6	Resident/Owner	Loss Of Privacy	I am concerned the new development will reduce the privacy of the unit due to the overlook of the proposed development site.	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Views	I am concerned it will also effect the outlook from the property as well as the surrounding balcony due to the sheer size of the proposed development.	Noted. See Section 2.1.14 of Council Report. the proposal will have some impacts on the outlook of surrounding properties. However, this is largely a result of the increased height of the building as foreshadowed in the 2036 Plan, with the existing buildings on the site still likely having impact on view potential of surrounding properties. As such, it is not expected that the proposal will result in any significant view loss to surrounding properties. Further considerations of view loss could be addressed in greater detail in any future development application that may occur on the site.	N/A	2E
			Desired Future Character Of Crows Nest/ 2036 Plan	Being a regular visitor to the Crows Nest area I feel the proposed development does not conform with local surrounding historic sites or the current village feel of the suburb, due to the modern large-scale design that is being proposed. I feel the site could be developed in a way that is more cohesive to fit in with the current local surrounding buildings and	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				within or near the height restrictions that are currently prescribed for the site.	merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development		
9057 313	7	Resident/Owner	Height Of Buildings	While it is reasonable for the height of the existing development to be increased, it is excessive for the increase to be 13 storeys. The 8 storeys originally submitted in the draft 2036 plan is a fair compromise based on required office space, other building heights and ability for the surrounding streets to cope with the increased traffic.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	The dramatic increase in height will significantly impact the solar access for residents in Sinclair Street but also create a large disincentive for installing rooftop solar panels (or at least delaying them) on the existing residential buildings.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E
			Traffic And Parking Report	The traffic and parking study has a number of errors which lead to drastically incorrect conclusions about how the redevelopment could support active transport and cycling in particular. The study claims that there is no cycling infrastructure in the close vicinity of the development. This is incorrect. Sinclair Street contains an uphill fully separated	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions	N/A	2E

14

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				contraflow cycleway from Bruce Street to Shirley Rd. Cyclists heading south downhill currently use the general traffic lane. This forms part of a signposted cycle route through the low traffic backstreets of North Sydney, Waverton and Wollstonecraft connecting Mount Street to St Leonards Station and links a number of key locations including Cammeraygal High School (now years 7-9 campus), North Sydney Demonstration School and Mater Hospital. It also provides a connection to the key upcoming cycleway along West St (recently approved for public consultation on 26th September 2022) that will have a large number of children using it since the Cammeraygal High School 10-12 years were moved to the old TAFE site, via Hazelbank Pl and also Ridge St. This route, and Sinclair Street in particular, provides a safe, low traffic route for non-hardcore cyclists and particularly children and women who aren't confident enough to ride along the Pacific Hwy. The study implies that a cycleway will be provided along the Pacific Hwy. While this is likely to be correct between Milsons Point and West Street, the cycleway won't continue further north due to heritage.	are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Negative Impacts On Cyclists/Cycling Infrastructure	It also provides a huge disincentive for senior Cammeraygal High School students who have had their campus moved to the old TAFE site at the north end of West St to cycle once the West Street cycleway is complete. Rather than make cycling more accessible as the study claims, a thorough analysis of the actual cycle routes and users surrounding the site demonstrates clearly that this development will lead to a large negative impact on cycling along the critical Sinclair Street route and generally in the area from	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These		

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				the increase in car traffic induced by the 100+ increase in parking spaces on site. This load will increase once the WHT is opened because the exit onto Falcon Street will funnel an even more cars down Shirley Street and into Sinclair Street, rather than up the Pacific Hwy and directly into Bruce St. Additionally, almost all the traffic leaving the site (not turning left from Bruce onto the Pacific Hwy) will need to head back down Bruce Street and then along the lower end of Sinclair Street cycling route (where there is not even a separated cycleway) to use the traffic lights at Rocklands Rd. It's likely that even cars wanting to turn left into Pacific Hwy and then use the right-hand turn lane into Alexander St will also use this route because of too many lanes of traffic to get into the RH turn lane from Bruce St. All these extra vehicles will make this existing, critical, low car traffic cycling route that is currently used by less-experienced riders much more dangerous.	combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage.		
			Reduction Of Scale And Car Parking Spaces	Based on this, I request the increase in height should be much more moderate and that rather than increase, the number of car parking spaces should be significantly reduced from its current levels given that the justification for the height increase is that the building is close to the upcoming Crows Nest Metro Station in order to maintain the safety of inexperienced and children cyclists currently (and future users) using the Sinclair Street route listed buildings preventing the necessary works to place a cycleway around the bus stops.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Impacts To Cyclists	The cycle route will divert cyclists along West Street and through the back of Crows Nest to connect to St Leonards. This means that any cyclists needing to continue north and continue to the schools, Mater hospital, Crows Nest Metro Station and other locations on the western side of the Pacific Hwy and are even more dependent on this existing, low traffic, backroad route. Contrary to the claim that the majority of the traffic is expected to turn into Bruce St from the Pacific Hwy, cars not approaching the site by heading north up the Pacific Hwy will need to access the site by driving down Sinclair Street section of the cycling route from Shirley Rd.	proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage.	N/A	2E
9057 311	8	Resident/Owner	Traffic Impacts	I oppose the development of 270-272 Pacific Highway due to the resulting increased road traffic it will create on Rocklands Road, Sinclair Street and Bruce Street. As my apartment fronts Rocklands Road, the increase car usage will increase disruptive traffic sound within my unit.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
9057 310	9	Resident/Owner	Impact To Character Of Crows Nest/ 2036 Plan	The proposed plan will change the character of the surrounding Sinclair Street Wollstonecraft and the Crows Nest neighbourhood. The 2036 plan being finalised with 270-272 Pacific highway with 13 Storeys limit was a mistake and should be reversed back to the 8 storeys as in the draft.	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	The proposed plan will deny the solar access of Sinclair Street in the early morning.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E
			Insufficient Jobs Created To Support The Change/Commercial Floor Space	According to the St Leonards Crows Nest 2036 plan, there are insufficient jobs created to support the change from the original 5 storeys to 16 storeys	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950-3,020 jobs	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9055 891	10	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building	Having lived through the planning process for the past 8 years as an owner on Sinclair Street directly affected by the proposed development, I am astonished by the lack of consideration /justification for the increase in height from 5 to 13 storeys. In 2020, when the 2036 Plan was in draft and we were invited to make submissions, the owners on Sinclair Street made a joint submission to which we received no reply. The decision made by the NSW Government to significantly increase the height from 5 to 13 storeys was made without giving consideration to local council votes, actual residents submissions, a Planning Study, Traffic Study, or any consideration for the surrounding suburbs. For these reasons North Sydney Council unanimously voted against PP1/21, only for the 'developers' to bypass council and go directly to the NSW Government, again, where it has been automatically referred for public exhibition. This planning proposal should not have been	in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m² of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				able to progress unchallenged to public exhibition stage. The objective is to pack as much height and FSR into the site as possible. For the developers to ask for an extra 5m height over the already gross overreach of the 2036 plan, "to provide for flexibility", and to increase FSR by adding 3 levels underground, is unquestionably serving only one purpose and that is to maximise the profits for the developers / NSW Government. The fact that the Planning Proposal is seeking increased FSR via an extra 3 levels underground without proper enquiry into the proposed use of the 3 underground levels shows a lack of due consideration. The increase in height is unjustified over-development and the scale and size of the development will significantly degrade the present amenity enjoyed by the residents on Sinclair Street along with surrounding suburbs, impacting traffic and solar, and introducing congestion and noise not currently experienced by those who live here. The planning proposal therefore should be rejected.			
			Solar Access	I also challenge the consideration given to Solar impact. A 13 storey building atop the ridge on Pacific Highway will cast the suburb of Wollstonecraft below into darkness until midday. The area currently enjoys sunshine from 8am in the morning. The solar impact study attached to the planning proposal is again, inadequate.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E
			Traffic Impacts	The traffic study commissioned by the developers is a shell of a report, it has no substance and is completely inadequate. I have great concern over the impact a	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

20

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				proposed development of this size and scale, on this site, in this location, will have on traffic throughout North Sydney, Crows Nest, Wollstonecraft, Lane Cove and St Leonards. Pacific Highway is the main artery between St Leonards and North Sydney and the proposed site is within 50m of the cross roads of Falcon Street, Shirley Road and Alexander Street, all of which are critical for people commuting to and from the City, and across the North Shore. These streets already bottleneck in peak hour, further blockage will result in commuters diverting through the backstreets of Wollstonecraft to avoid the traffic. Rocklands Rd, Sinclair St and Shirley Rd are the only entry points to Wollstonecraft, all of which will be significantly impacted.	The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			Pedestrian Safety For Vulnerable Users	The site is also within 100m of the Mater Hospital and North Sydney Girls High School, increased congestion at the corner of Rocklands Road and Pacific Hwy poses a significant risk to pedestrians.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple, and direct access points to the site. These combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Commercial Office Space	There is no justification for a 13 storey commercial building development in this location. You only need to look at the Crows Nest, let alone the CBD. When the Crows Nest Metro station is completed it will be only two stops to Barangaroo where there is currently an abundance of excess vacant office space. Most residents of the area work in the CBD. For the avoidance of doubt, we do NOT want a 13 storey residential building!	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950-3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m2 of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment	N/A	2E
			Public Benefit	There is no benefit to the community in this Planning Proposal.	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
9055 890	11	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building	Having lived through the planning process for the past 8 years as an owner on Sinclair Street directly affected by the	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

22

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				proposed development, I am astonished by the lack of consideration /justification for the increase in height from 5 to 13 storeys. In 2020, when the 2036 Plan was in draft and we were invited to make submissions, the owners on Sinclair Street made a joint submission to which we received no reply. The decision made by the NSW Government to significantly increase the height from 5 to 13 storeys was made without giving consideration to local council votes, actual residents submissions, a Planning Study, Traffic Study, or any consideration for the surrounding suburbs. For these reasons North Sydney Council unanimously voted against PP1/21, only for the 'developers' to bypass council and go directly to the NSW Government, again, where it has been automatically referred for public exhibition. This planning proposal should not have been able to progress unchallenged to public exhibition stage. The objective is to pack as much height and FSR into the site as possible. For the developers to ask for an extra 5m height over the already gross overreach of the 2036 plan, "to provide for flexibility", and to increase FSR by adding 3 levels underground, is unquestionably serving only one purpose and that is to maximise the profits for the developers / NSW Government. The fact that the Planning Proposal is seeking increased FSR via an extra 3 levels underground without proper enquiry into the proposed use of the 3 underground levels shows a lack of due consideration. I also challenge the consideration given to Solar impact. A 13 storey building atop the ridge on Pacific Highway will cast the	The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Solar Access		Noted, See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report.		

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				suburb of Wollstonecraft below into darkness until midday. The area currently enjoys sunshine from 8am in the morning. The solar impact study attached to the planning proposal is again, inadequate.	This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.		
			Traffic Impacts	The traffic study commissioned by the developers is a shell of a report, it has no substance and is completely inadequate. I have great concern over the impact a proposed development of this size and scale, on this site, in this location, will have on traffic throughout North Sydney, Crows Nest, Wollstonecraft, Lane Cove and St Leonards. Pacific Highway is the main artery between St Leonards and North Sydney and the proposed site is within 50m of the cross roads of Falcon Street, Shirley Road and Alexander Street, all of which are critical for people commuting to and from the City, and across the North Shore. These streets already bottleneck in peak hour, further blockage will result in commuters diverting through the backstreets of Wollstonecraft to avoid the traffic. Rocklands Rd, Sinclair St, and Shirley Rd are the only entry points to Wollstonecraft, all of which will be significantly impacted.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Pedestrian Safety For Vulnerable Users	The site is also within 100m of the Mater Hospital and North Sydney Girls High School, increased congestion at the corner of Rocklands Road and Pacific Hwy poses a significant risk to pedestrians.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage.		
			Commercial Office Space	There is no justification for a 13 storey commercial building development in this location. You only need to look at the number of vacant commercial premises in Crows Nest, let alone the CBD. When the Crows Nest Metro station is completed it will be only two stops to Barangaroo where there is currently an abundance of excess vacant office space. Most residents of the area work in the CBD. For the avoidance of doubt, we do NOT want a 13 storey residential building!	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950- 3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m2 of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment	N/A	2E
			Public Benefit	There is no benefit to the community in this Planning Proposal.	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with	N/A	2E

25

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Overdevelopment/2036 Plan	The increase in height is unjustified over-development and the scale and size of the development will significantly degrade the present amenity enjoyed by the residents on Sinclair Street along with surrounding suburbs, impacting traffic and solar, and introducing congestion and noise not currently experienced by those who live here. The planning proposal therefore should be rejected.	Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall. See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
9055 826	12	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building	Having lived through the planning process for the past 8 years as an owner on Sinclair Street directly affected by the proposed development, I am astonished by the lack of consideration /justification for the increase in height from 5 to 13 storeys. In 2020, when the 2036 Plan was in draft and we were invited to make submissions, the owners on Sinclair Street made a joint submission to which we received no reply. The decision made by the NSW Government to significantly increase the height from 5 to 13 storeys was made without giving consideration to local council votes, actual residents submissions, a Planning Study, Traffic Study, or any consideration for the surrounding suburbs.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria	
				For these reasons North Sydney Council unanimously voted against PP1/21, only for the 'developers' to bypass council and go directly to the NSW Government, again, where it has been automatically referred for public exhibition. This planning proposal should not have been able to progress unchallenged to public exhibition stage. The objective is to pack as much height and FSR into the site as possible. For the developers to ask for an extra 5m height over the already gross overreach of the 2036 plan, "to provide for flexibility", and to increase FSR by adding 3 levels underground, is unquestionably serving only one purpose and that is to maximise the profits for the developers / NSW Government. The fact that the Planning Proposal is seeking increased FSR via an extra 3 levels underground without proper enquiry into the proposed use of the 3 underground levels shows a lack of due consideration.				
			Solar Access	I also challenge the consideration given to Solar impact. A 13 storey building atop the ridge on Pacific Highway will cast the suburb of Wollstonecraft below into darkness until midday. The area currently enjoys sunshine from 8am in the morning. The solar impact study attached to the planning proposal is again, inadequate.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E	
			Traffic Impacts	The traffic study commissioned by the developers is a shell of a report, it has no substance and is completely inadequate. I have great concern over the impact a proposed development of this size and scale, on this site, in this location, will have on traffic throughout North Sydney, Crows Nest, Wollstonecraft, Lane Cove and St Leonards. Pacific Highway is the main artery between St Leonards and North	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions	N/A	2E	

27

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Sydney and the proposed site is within 50m of the cross roads of Falcon Street, Shirley Road and Alexander Street, all of which are critical for people commuting to and from the City, and across the North Shore. These streets already bottleneck in peak hour, further blockage will result in commuters diverting through the backstreets of Wollstonecraft to avoid the traffic. Rocklands Rd, Sinclair St, and Shirley Rd are the only entry points to Wollstonecraft, all of which will be significantly impacted. The site is also within 100m of the Mater Hospital and North Sydney Girls High School, increased congestion at the corner of Rocklands Road and Pacific Hwy poses a significant risk to pedestrians.	are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage. Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950- 3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby	N/A	2E
			Pedestrian Safety For Vulnerable Users				
			Commercial Office Space	There is no justification for a 13 storey commercial building development in this location. You only need to look at the number of vacant commercial premises in Crows Nest, let alone the CBD. When the Crows Nest Metro station is completed it will be only two stops to Barangaroo where there is currently an abundance of		N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				excess vacant office space. Most residents of the area work in the CBD. For the avoidance of doubt, we do NOT want a 13 storey residential building!	Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m2 of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report		
			Public Benefit	There is no benefit to the community in this Planning Proposal.	In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Overdevelopment/2036 Plan	The increase in height is unjustified over-development and the scale and size of the development will significantly degrade the present amenity enjoyed by the residents on Sinclair Street along with surrounding suburbs, impacting traffic and solar, and introducing congestion and noise not currently experienced by those who live here. The planning proposal therefore should be rejected.	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development		
9055 788	13	Resident/Owner	Existing Structure	The existing structure, which is proposed to be replaced with a new taller structure, already dominates our local environment and is less than 10 meters from the rear boundaries to 14 houses along Sinclair Street. Residents along our street already have to deal, on a daily basis, with issues such as privacy, solar access and congestion.	Noted	N/A	2C
			Privacy	Privacy (those in the commercial building have a direct view into our backyards);	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	Solar access (the existing structure blocks the sunlight almost entirely until the afternoon hours);	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically Sinclair Street.	N/A	2E
			Traffic Generation/Congestion	Despite this, the applicant's traffic report concludes (at 6.2) that: The Traffic and Parking Study concluded that the impacts of the planning proposal are negligible and are able to be mitigated by the existing and planned infrastructure. There is nothing negligible at all about this issue. The potential impact on residents is both clear and significant. To give those	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number	N/A	2E

30

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				councillors unfamiliar with the laneway a sense of what I am describing, it is a narrow laneway which is already burdened day and night with commercial traffic (i.e. large trucks and other commercial vehicles), making the free access to and from our garages difficult at the best of times. These issues will only be compounded with both a large-scale demolition/construction site and any commercial premises with even more occupants (and, therefore, traffic and parking needs). As I hope can be seen, the traffic issue alone represents a powerful basis to reject this PP though there are others well (solar, privacy, incompatibility with the built environment). Our primary position remains that this PP should be rejected	of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			Requirement For An Independent Traffic Report For Council's Consideration.	However, if not rejected, the secondary position is that council cannot approve this PP in the absence of a further opinion which can shed some light on the traffic issue (and the obvious problems associated with it). Only with a further independent traffic report can councillors be satisfied that all interests have been appropriately considered. It is an approach which promotes both transparency and fairness for all parties concerned.	Noted	N/A	2G
9055 756	14	Resident/Owner	Height Of Buildings	I am concerned regarding the proposed height of the development It would be great to see a proposal that is much more modest in height. 10 stories at a maximum a compromise between the developers wishes and closer in keeping with the 2036 plan for Crows Nest.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Desired Character Plan	Having recently visited the St Leonards area I was disappointed to see how the recent developments has destroyed the suburb due to the severe overshadowing, lack of open green space and increased airflow, creating air tunnels between buildings. It feels oppressed, cold, dark and a place that is not one someone would like to come and visit. I hope this would not happen to our vibrant Crows Nest. As developers continue to push the envelope of height restrictions it creates a standard that they can keep increasing heights as others developers have done previously, this is especially evident in this proposal. They in several occasions make reference to the height of the panorama building and the five way proposed development to justify their huge increase in their building height above current restrictions. Which really doesn't positively impact the local area only positively impacts the developers profits. Having read the 2036 plan it is my understanding that the Crows Nest area is to remain a village residential feel with lower height restrictions on buildings as a transition between the higher density builds in North Sydney and St Leonards	of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
			Overshadowing	Having a look at the plan the developers have not considered the over shadowing in the morning of the 1 story houses on Sinclair Street and the several single dwelling houses in the surrounding area	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Public Green Space/ Public Benefit	They haven't considered the need for increased publicly accessible open green spaces in the area.	access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Heritage	Nor have they considered trying the blend in and be cohesiveness with the look and feel of the historical Crows Nest area and the local vibe of our community	See Section 2.1.10 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development Having regard to the specific architectural design and materials, it was noted that the awning height should match the heritage item to the north and should be of a design that responds to the form and materials of surrounding awnings, that the character of any future podium respond to the character of	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					surrounding shopfronts, that the proposal include less glazing and more of a solid style and that any future building materials used should reflect the character of the Crows Nest area including exposed brick among other materials. Council is satisfied that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application and should not preclude the proposal from progressing.		
			Vpa/Public Benefit	I also found the voluntary planning agreement monetary contribution to be a joke, for the size of the proposed development. The contribution is minuscule and nowhere near enough to make a real positive impact to any local infrastructure project or any real benefit to the local community.	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
9055 746	15	Resident/Owner	Light Pollution	Such a building will dramatically increase the light pollution.	See Section 2.1.9 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site..	N/A	2E
			Height Of Building	The proposed height of 59m is excessive and completely against the local residents and North Sydney Council's vision for that area of Pacific Highway.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report.		
		Commercial Space	Floor	St Leonards and North Sydney already provide commercial centres.	The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950-3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m ² of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report	N/A	2E
		Impact On Local Amenities/ Public Benefit		The impact on amenities for a building of such excessive height, bulk and scale, have not been completely considered.	In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Drainage Issues	The size and scale of the building, built on the Pacific Highway ridge line, will create drainage issues for properties to the west.	work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall. Noted. See Section 2.1.13 of Council Report.	N/A	2E
			Overshadowing	The development will cause shadowing and loss of solar access to neighbouring properties. Increasing the maximum Height of Buildings to such an extent, will set an unacceptable precedent for future developments in Crows Nest. Such a building will negatively impact the much-treasured Crows Nest village atmosphere.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties. See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
9053 932	16	Resident/Owner	Overshadowing Of 258 And 250 Pacific Highway	Although the proposal notes solar compliance for the houses on the site's west, Sinclair Street, overshadowing of 258 and 250 Pacific Highway has not been considered within the proposal. The residences at these two addresses contain over 100 people.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Additionally, a reduced set back from the site's western boundary (laneway access from Bruce Street) will result in increased overshadowing of the residences of 258 and 250 Pacific Highway. The site's south boundary is 258 Pacific Highway, a narrow predominately residential apartment block. There is a light void between 258 and 250 Pacific Highway to allow sunlight to the apartments on the north side of 250 Pacific Highway (also a residential apartment block) and to the residences of 258. This proposed 54m high development will have a huge impact on these residences to the south as the sun will be blocked for most of the day, especially in winter (blocked for 70% plus).	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties. The concerns in relation to impacts to a void between 258 and 250 Pacific Highway that currently allows for sunlight to the apartments on the north of 250 Pacific Highway would be further investigated through detailed solar access modelling of any future development application proposal.	N/A	2E
			Lack Of Parking	The other concern is the proposed development whilst adding between 730 and 1154 jobs will only add another 102 parking spaces. The parking in the surrounding streets such as Bruce and Sinclair and further into Gillies are already at capacity Monday to Friday.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9053 931	17	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building	Increasing the maximum Height of Buildings Map from 16m to 54m, would seem to be a massive increase in scale & bulk of any building on the site.	proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report	N/A	2E
			Building Height And Bulk And Scale	Increasing the minimum Non-residential Floor Space Ratio Map from 0.5:1 to 5.6:1, and then a further Site-specific clause allowing a maximum FSR of 6.02:1. Again this allows for a massive increase in scale from what is currently allowable.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			210-220 Pacific Highway As An Example Of Local Building Heights	Any reference in the report to the 17 storey building at 210-220 Pacific Highway as an example of local building heights. This building was a residential redevelopment of an existing over height hotel building. A new build 17 storey building would never have been allowed here under the current planning rules.	Noted	N/A	2C
			Traffic	I believe this will have a significant impact on our building. Page 36 of Appendix 7 paragraph 5.2.4. This correctly notes that "Given the left-in left-out configuration at Bruce Street / Pacific Highway, incoming southbound traffic may turn right at Rocklands Road (the next intersection to the south) and access Bruce Street via Sinclair Street and the outgoing	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				southbound traffic will also use the same route and signals at Rocklands Road to turn right to Pacific Highway. "It then notes that "The resultant additional traffic would be therefore less than 40 vehicles in each direction given a peak hour trip generation of 80 vehicle trips (assuming some traffic does not use Pacific Highway, such as Falcon Street, Shirley Road). This increment of the traffic volume on the surrounding road network is expected to be negligible based on speed and traffic volume analysis in Section 3.6." They have obviously not experienced the peak hour traffic snarls on Rockland Rd. It notes that "The exit movement from Bruce Street - Pacific Highway - Alexander Street to access Falcon Street requires a three lane changing manoeuvring within a short spacing of the intersections. However, given relative low demand, the opportunity to undertake this movement safely can be created by gaps of traffic created at the intersection of Pacific Highway / Rocklands Road	maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			Rocklands Rd And Impacts On School Queuing, Traffic, Accidents	The Sinclair / Rockland junction is often busy with hospital entry traffic (many not familiar with the area). Drivers regularly cut the corner when entering Sinclair from Rocklands. Rocklands Rd east of Sinclair is narrow between street parking & parking bays and has no centre line marking, which often leads to idiots driving up the centre of the road. Rockland / Pacific is usually backed up, especially in the mornings. Made worse by parents illegally stopping near the top to drop kids off. Drivers doing illegal U turns at the lights or at the top of Rocklands Rd. The pedestrian crossings are packed with school kids entering / exiting North Sydney	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Girls & nearby Cammeraygal school. I've seen a number of close calls & accidents at this junction.	can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			VPA Is Sufficient	The offer of a VPA of a minimum \$1m with the potential for a maximum of \$3m, if the site is allowed to be developed to its full potential. How can this not be considered anything other than a sweetener to influence the decision making process	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
9053 930	18	Resident/Owner	Building Height	The height would severely limit the light and sunshine for the surrounding residences particularly as it is on a ridge. During covid we all realised how important it is to have natural light and sunshine for our mental health. A tall building, such as that proposed, would shadow a lot of residences, not just those on Sinclair St.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Privacy	It would also severely impact the privacy of all residences in all directions, including	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Traffic	all the apartments down Shirley Rd and other nearby roads. Blinds would forever have to be closed so as to avoid being viewed from multiple higher apartments. The traffic around the streets would be chaotic. Unless the residents are coming from south on the highway they will have to do rat runs around the local streets or turn right from Shirley Rd to access the parking. Shirley Rd is already constantly at a standstill as the left hand lane waits for the left hand light to change and the right lane is full of all the cars avoiding the wait. Allowing cars to then turn right into Sinclair will create a continual traffic jam down Shirley and River Road. Other cars will take all the back roads and create traffic around Mater Hospital delaying urgent access to the hospital.	Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours. See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Lack Of Parking	Parking is already non existent and workers/residents without an official carpark will further clog the streets.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Precedent/ Loss Of Crows Nest Village Atmosphere/ No Justification For Planning Proposal	If this proposal is approved it will set a precedent for the rest of the highway in Crows nest and we'll end up with a whole suburb cast in shade and a long wall of buildings with dark, windy areas surrounding them. Crows Nest is the only area that has a vibrant, busy village atmosphere and it would be devastating to lose that. North Sydney and St Leonards are deserted. No amount of brochures advertising about extra cafes and retail space creating any 'atmosphere' will actually become a reality. St Leonards and North Sydney are excellent examples of overdevelopment leading to a lifeless suburb. People need to have sunshine, see the sky, breathe, and not be blocked in by tall buildings. With the development of business and residential towers in the surrounding suburbs there is no justification for additional towers in Crows Nest. Lane Cove is also building massive apartment blocks just down the road so the development for housing is well and truly covered. We cannot let this amendment happen and destroy Crows Nest No matter what the design the building will be a wall creating dark, cold streets and completely out of place in a suburb with older homes and smaller apartment blocks.	can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9053 929	19	Resident/Owner	Overshadowing Of 258 And 250 Pacific Highway	Although the proposal notes solar compliance for the houses on the site's west, Sinclair Street, overshadowing of 258 and 250 Pacific Highway has not been considered within the proposal. The site's south boundary is 258 Pacific Highway, a narrow predominately residential apartment block There is a void between 258 and 250 Pacific Highway to allow sunlight to the apartments on the north of 250 Pacific Highway (also a residential apartment block) and to the residences of 258. This proposed 54m high development will have a considerable impact on these residences to the south as the sun will be blocked for most of the day, especially in winter.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties.	N/A	2E
			Light Void Between 258 And 250 Pacific Highway Impacted	Additionally, a reduced set back from the site's western boundary (laneway access from Bruce Street) will result in increased overshadowing of the residences of 258 and 250 Pacific Highway	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties. The concerns in relation to impacts to a void between 258 and 250 Pacific Highway that currently allows for sunlight to the apartments on the north of 250 Pacific Highway would be further investigated through detailed solar access modelling of any future development application proposal. Noted. See Section 2.1.7 of Council Report It is considered that the proposed building has been reasonably articulated in an attempt to reduce the overall apparent bulk and appearance of the structure. The draft Site Specific DCP includes provisions that open spaces nearby to residential properties be appropriately mitigated and managed and that landscaping is used to provide appropriate amenity and to soften the appearance of any future structure through the use of planter boxes on the	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Lack Of Parking	The other concern is the proposed development whilst adding between 730 and 1154 jobs will only add another 102 parking spaces.	podium and terraces to facilitate mature vegetation. Additionally, other measures to ensure adequate levels of privacy to surrounding properties and their adequacy would be assessed in detail at the development application stage See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed number of parking spots is for proof of concept only. Council has included provisions to reduce the number of parking spaces per Council's policy and given that the site is facing significant uplift due to the location within 400 metres to Crows Nest Station the proposal in its current form is supported.	N/A	2E
9050 349	20	Resident/Owner	Overshadowing/Light Pollution	The proposed building will adversely affect properties to the west in that it will a. Dominate the Pacific Highway ridge line b. Cause shadowing and loss of solar access to residential properties to the west c. Dramatically increase the light pollution for properties to the west.	Noted. See Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.3, and 2.1.9 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Loss Of Crows Nest Village Feel/ 2036 Plan	The proposed building will a. Negatively impact the much-treasured Crow's Nest village atmosphere b. Detract from the nearby important heritage sites.	See Section 2.1.8 and 2.1.10 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development Having regard to the specific architectural design and materials, it was noted that the awning height should match the heritage item to the north and should be of a design that responds to the form and materials of surrounding awnings, that the character of any future podium respond to the character of surrounding shopfronts, that the proposal include less glazing and more of a solid style and that any future building materials used should reflect the character of the Crows Nest area including exposed brick among other materials. Council is satisfied that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application and should not preclude the proposal from progressing.		
9049 125	21	Resident/Owner	Overshadowing/Light Pollution	The proposed building will adversely affect properties to the west in that it will - Dominate the Pacific Highway ridge line - Cause shadowing and loss of solar access to residential properties to the west - Dramatically increase the light pollution for properties to the west The proposed building will	Noted. See Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.3, and 2.1.9 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Loss Of Crows Nest Village Feel/ 2036 Plan		See Section 2.1.8 and 2.1.10 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				a. Negatively impact the much-treasured Crow's Nest village atmosphere b. Detract from the nearby important heritage sites.	The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development Having regard to the specific architectural design and materials, it was noted that the awning height should match the heritage item to the north and should be of a design that responds to the form and materials of surrounding awnings, that the character of any future podium respond to the character of surrounding shopfronts, that the proposal include less glazing and more of a solid style and that any future building materials used should reflect the character of the Crows Nest area including exposed brick among other materials. Council is satisfied that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application and should not preclude the proposal from progressing.		
9049 115	22	Resident/Owner	Solar Access	As described in the Architecture and Urban Design Report, we will lose significant amounts of solar access. In mid-winter we will no longer have direct sunlight into our back yard until after 1.00	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				pm, meaning our principal private space will have significantly less than 3 hours of sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm. This is approximately 1.5 hours less than currently and due to the angle of the sun at this time, means that we will get less than 30 minutes of direct sunlight into the house!	includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties		
			Traffic	It is reasonable to expect significantly more traffic along Sinclair St and Bruce St as people attempt to enter the new development. We live on the corner of these two streets so will have more traffic noise to contend with.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Loss Of Privacy	Increased loss of privacy to our backyard due to the height of the proposed development and number of windows facing towards us.	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Visitor Parking	Parking for visitors is already difficult in our area and will only get worse with more residents.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed number of parking spots is for proof of concept only. Council has included provisions to reduce the	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					number of parking spaces per Council's policy and given that the site is facing significant uplift due to the location within 400 metres to Crows Nest Station the proposal in its current form is supported. The number of off street parking/visitor spaces will be determined at the development application stage. See Section 2.1.9 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site..	N/A	2E
			Construction Activity/Nuisance	1-2 years of construction activity with attendant noise and dust with all construction traffic driving past our house on Sinclair St, Bruce St and the site access behind our property. Note that previous nearby developments on Pacific Highway have led to increased amounts of rubbish on the Bruce St nature strip as tradies park there early in the morning.			
			VPA Not Sufficient	In addition, compared to the property values in the area, a voluntary monetary contribution of between \$1M and \$3M is insignificant compared to the scale of the development and the amount of infrastructure Council would need to provide or upgrade to cater for the increased population and usage of the surrounding area.	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
9041 106	23	Resident/Owner	Overshadowing	If Council allows a complex with a 54-metre-high tower to be built on the Site, this is likely to create considerable overshadowing to the east and west of the Site. This will be particularly detrimental for residential properties located to the west of the Site on Sinclair Street.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Wind Tunnel	If Council allows a complex with a 54-metre-high tower to be built on the Site, this is likely to create a "wind tunnel" effect with increased wind speed from all directions. This will have a detrimental impact on pedestrians along the Highway and for commuters waiting at the government bus stop opposite the Site on the Pacific Highway. If Council allows a complex with a 54-metre-high tower to be built on the Site, this will constitute in layman's terms, a considerable overdevelopment which is not in keeping with the height of the apartment buildings standing to the north and south of the Site.	access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties Noted. See Section 2.1.11 of Council Report. Council is satisfied that the wind assessment report provided is sufficient and that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application on the site.	N/A	2E
			Overdevelopment			N/A	2E
9034 487	24	Resident/Owner	Loss Of Village Atmosphere Of Crows Nest/Precedent/2036 Plan	The proposal will significantly increase the scale and size of the development of the site (i.e. intended 13 level building) which will have negative impacts on the community by detracting from the village atmosphere of Crows Nest, which is critical to its identity, and enjoyment of residents. This type of development should be more targeted to the St Leonards or North Sydney business district. Setting a precedent for future planning proposals and developments along the Pacific Hwy corridor to St Leonards which negatively impacts the area and compounds the issues noted above.	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
			Wind Tunnel	Creating a wind tunnel along the Pacific Hwy corridor (a problem which is already experienced close to St Leonards station), thereby negatively impacting walkability,	Noted. See Section 2.1.11 of Council Report. Council is satisfied that the wind assessment report provided is sufficient and that this matter can be addressed in	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Traffic Impact	and patronage of shops and cafes near the area. Increasing traffic in the Pacific Hwy / Falcon Street intersection, which is already a busy area, and is close to the fire station. This intersection already supports traffic towards Neutral Bay, North Sydney, and the City, and is currently a bottle neck.	greater detail in any future development application on the site. See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Pedestrian Safety	Pedestrians frequent this crossing, and it is known that walkability of the area (connecting residents on the Wollstonecraft side to the Crow's Nest side) is adversely impacted.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars towards cyclists using the existing cycling infrastructure. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site as well as provide safe, simple and direct access points to the site. These combined with existing DCP controls would be sufficient. It is considered in this instance that the impacts toward cyclists and pedestrians should not preclude the planning	N/A	2E

50

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9021499	25	Resident/Owner	Traffic	Traffic impact assessment - The report states that there will be 'negligible traffic impact' and I strongly disagree to this statement. Bruce Street is a small, suburban street accessed by residents and those accessing small local businesses as well as the Mater Dialysis Unit (end of laneway behind the proposed development) and Mater Hospital (end of Sinclair Street). Excessive numbers of heavy vehicles required during construction would significantly impact both residents and local businesses. The rear lane access utilised by the Mater Dialysis Unit, local residents of Sinclair Street requiring rear lane access and Young & Rashleigh Wine Merchants (2 Bruce St) will all be significantly impacted with limited or no access at various times throughout the day.	proposal from progressing. These matters and would be thoroughly assessed at the development application stage. See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Construction Traffic	During construction in a practical sense, access to vehicles will simply not be feasible. If you have a look at the photos attached, you will see that the narrow rear lane access is not suitable for these types of heavy vehicles. The other issue is you're unable to turn right onto Pacific Highway and have to drive down Sinclair Street towards the Mater Hospital, then turn left onto Rocklands Road to then turn right onto Pacific Highway. This will create significant traffic congestion for hospital patrons as well as local residents. There will also be flow on impacts to other already congested streets such as River Road and there will	See Section 2.1.9 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site..	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				be increased utilisation of back streets to avoid bottle necks throughout Wollstonecraft, Waverton, Crows Nest and Lane Cove. Also what about the large number of children walking to schools - Will increased infrastructure such as crossings be put in place to accommodate the additional cars?	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Sunlight Access	Sunlight - increasing the building height from 16 metres to 54 metres will mean little or no sunlight to local residents on Sinclair Street. This proposal is nearly 3.5 times the current height. This is not good for the mental health of those impacted. With the majority of properties on Sinclair Street being semis, the sunlight from the rear of the properties (on the Pacific Highway side) is relied upon. This will mean less or not time enjoying our backyard in the warm sun, less sunlight, less time outside entertaining family and friends. Local children in the street play in the sunlight in the rear laneway and this will be taken away from them. With little to no sunlight, this will mean more reliance on heaters and dryers to dry our clothes and keep our properties warm during Winter months as the result of little to no sunlight.	Noted, See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Wind Tunnel	The other impact will be the creation of a 'wind tunnel' down Pacific Highway which residents have already spoken up about and are strongly against.	Noted. See Section 2.1.11 of Council Report. Council is satisfied that the wind assessment report provided is sufficient and that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application on the site.	N/A	2E
			Lack Of Infrastructure/ Public Benefit	Lack of Infrastructure - The proposed building will result in an increase in more people in the area. What additional infrastructure will be built to accommodate the additional people in the area? The current infrastructure as it stands does not cater for an increased population. I am doubtful that the proposed number of cycling spaces/lockers will be utilised - people are simply too frightened to ride on Sydney roads during peak times. What bikes paths connect with this site? None! People will have to be confident enough to ride along Pacific Highway during peak hour to obtain access to their new workplace. Put simply, the area is close to maximum population capacity and a building of this size will result in over population that the current infrastructure cannot handle.	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Commercial Office Space	Current office utilisation - what is the current occupancy rate of the 270 Pacific Highway building? I would suggest it would be at 50% or less as a result of my observations of minimal businesses having their lights on in the late afternoon/evening. If the building has a low occupancy rate, why would we make it even bigger? Many people work from home now - according to the ABS 2021 47% of employees now have a flexible working arrangement, so why is more office space required?	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950-3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m ² of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment		
			Lack Of Green Space/Public Benefit	Lack of green space - where is the proposal for additional parks in the local area? If you listen to local community feedback, people want more parks, ovals and green space not more high rise concrete towers!	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Site Outside Of 2036 Plan/Precedent	The 2036 LEP refers to high rise development between St Leonards Station and the Crows Nest Metro. 270 Pacific Highway is outside of this parameter and further south of the Crows Nest Metro. If this development proceeds, it will open the flood gates for further high rise development in the area. Please listen to the people in our community and what they want... and this is not it!	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			VPA Not Sufficient	what the community wants and needs far outweighs the \$1 - \$3 million price tag on offer to the government to proceed with this development!	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
9014 626	26	Resident/Owner	Traffic	Traffic impact assessment - The report states that there will be 'negligible traffic impact' and I strongly disagree to this statement. Bruce Street is a small, suburban street accessed by residents and those accessing small local businesses as well as the Mater Dialysis Unit (end of laneway behind the proposed development) and Mater Hospital (end of Sinclair Street). Excessive numbers of heavy vehicles required during construction would significantly impact both residents and local businesses. The rear lane access utilised by the Mater Dialysis Unit, local residents of Sinclair Street requiring rear lane access and Young & Rashleigh Wine Merchants There will also be flow on impacts to other already congested streets such as River Road and there will be increased utilisation of back streets to avoid bottle necks throughout Wollstonecraft, Waverton, Crows Nest and Lane Cove Bruce St will all be significantly impacted with limited or no access at various times throughout the day, during construction In a practical sense, access to vehicles will simply not be feasible. If you have a look	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See Section 2.1.9 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				at the photos attached, you will see that the narrow rear lane access is not suitable for these types of heavy vehicles. The other issue is you're unable to turn right onto Pacific Highway and have to drive down Sinclair Street towards the Mater Hospital, then turn left onto Rocklands Road to then turn right onto Pacific Highway. This will create significant traffic congestion for hospital patrons as well as local residents.			
			Sunlight Access	Sunlight - increasing the building height from 16 metres to 54 metres will mean little or no sunlight to local residents on Sinclair Street. This proposal is nearly 3.5 times the current height. This is not good for the mental health of those impacted. With the majority of properties on Sinclair Street being semis, the sunlight from the rear of the properties (on the Pacific Highway side) is relied upon. This will mean less or not time enjoying our backyard in the warm sun, less sunlight, less time outside entertaining family and friends. Local children in the street play in the sunlight in the rear laneway and this will be taken away from them. With little to no sunlight, this will mean more reliance on heaters and dryers to dry our clothes and keep our properties warm during Winter months as the result of little to no sunlight	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Lack Infrastructure/ Public Benefit	What about the large number of children walking to schools - Will increased infrastructure such as crossings be put in place to accommodate the additional cars? The proposed building will result in an increase in more people in the area. What additional infrastructure will be built to accommodate the additional people in the	Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with	N/A	2E

56

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				area? The current infrastructure as it stands does not cater for an increased population. I am doubtful that the proposed number of cycling spaces/lockers will be utilised - people are simply too frightened to ride on Sydney roads during peak times. What bikes paths connect with this site? None! People will have to be confident enough to ride along Pacific Highway during peak hour to obtain access to their new workplace. Put simply, the area is close to maximum population capacity and a building of this size will result in over population that the current infrastructure cannot handle. The other impact will be the creation of a 'wind tunnel' down Pacific Highway which residents have already spoken up about and are strongly against	Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.		
			Wind Tunnel Effect	Current office utilisation - what is the current occupancy rate of the 270 Pacific Highway building? I would suggest it would be at 50% or less as a result of my observations of minimal businesses having their lights on in the late afternoon/evening. If the building has a low occupancy rate, why would we make it even bigger? Many people work from home now - according to the ABS 2021 47% of employees now have a flexible working arrangement, so why is more office space required?	Noted. See Section 2.1.11 of Council Report. Council is satisfied that the wind assessment report provided is sufficient and that this matter can be addressed in greater detail in any future development application on the site.	N/A	2E
			Commercial Office Space		Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950- 3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m² of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Lack Of Green Space/ Public Benefit	Lack of green space - where is the proposal for additional parks in the local area? If you listen to local community feedback, people want more parks, ovals and green space not more high rise concrete towers!	planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment Noted. See Section 2.1.4 of Council Report In relation to the lack of infrastructure, strain on existing infrastructure and lack of cycling infrastructure, the proceeds of the Voluntary Planning Agreement and other applicable Section 7.11 levies would go towards improving existing infrastructure in accordance with Council's Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020. Council will also work with relevant service providers and state agencies to address any infrastructure shortfall.	N/A	2E
			Precedent/2036 Plan	The 2036 LEP refers to high rise development between St Leonards Station and the Crows Nest Metro. 270 Pacific Highway is outside of this parameter and further south of the Crows Nest Metro. If this development proceeds, it will open the flood gates for further high-rise development in the area. Please listen to the people in our community and what they want... and this is not it!	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development	N/A	2E
			VPA Not Sufficient	What the community wants and needs far outweighs the \$1 - \$3 million price tag on offer to the government to proceed with this development!	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.		
9014 661	26 (copy)	Resident/Owner	Same Submission 26 As				
9021 480	26 (copy)	Resident/Owner	Same Submission 26 As				
9017 433	27	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building	I object to the proposed changing of the height limit at this site and sites nearby. Topographically this is amongst or close to the highest points in Crows Nest. Allowing buildings greater than 16 metres will not only dominate the landscape at this point of the suburb but set a precedent for further high rise development nearby. This high point of the landscape should be protected from high rise development to avoid further crowding of the Pacific Highway. Further north skyline has been sacrificed to high rise, it should be banned from moving south past the Crows Nest Village at this elevated point, as this sets a precedent to then allow filling in the gap between Bruce St and the planned Metro Station with buildings of equal or greater height.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report	N/A	2E
			Loss Of Crows Nest Village Atmosphere And Precedent/ High Rise On Ridge/ Objection To 2036 Plan Height Control	This destroying the village atmosphere of Willoughby Rd shops and creating a city landscape in what is a residential community and village. I urge all members of Council and state Planning Panels to consider the precedent and bigger picture of the area. High rise should be restricted to the topographical dips along the Pacific	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				Highway to avoid creating a dark, wind tunnel like St Leonards has become Developers are welcome to redevelop properties in this area but the height restrictions must not be negotiable, the legacy effect to the area will be tragic. Keep the height restrictions in place from Albany St, south to Bruce St and resist the corrupted State Governments influence on behalf of, and for, the benefit of property developers.	and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development		
9014 651	25 (copy)	Resident/Owner	Same Submission 26 As				
9013 938	28	Resident/Owner	Height Of Building/ Bulk And Scale/ Overdevelopment	The approval of this planning proposal with a over 300% increase in North Sydney Local Environmental 2013 height standard, and an a ten fold increase in the FSR standard is a greedy gross overdevelopment of the site. The approval of this planning proposal will result in a severe loss of amenity to the surrounding buildings in relation to overshadowing, loss of privacy (overlooking), visual bulk, undesirable increase in traffic . It is my opinion that the justification for such a large variation from Council's height and FSR standard is totally unacceptable. Notwithstanding its location on Pacific Highway, at most, a minor variation to the height standard to allow a six storey development on this site may be considered reasonable in view of the existing development in the area and the current height and FSR standards for the nearby adjoining sites in the vicinity	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Non-Residential FSR/ Loss Of	The increase in height from the permitted 16m to 54m and increase in non-	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

60

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Crows Nest Village/ Atmosphere/Precedent/2036 Plan	residential floor space from 0.5:1 to 5.6:1 will allow a development that will be totally out of character with the village atmosphere of Crows Nest . This type of development is more appropriate in St Leonards. Approval of this proposal will result in an undesirable precedent for such further development in Crows Nest. Approval of this proposal will result in an undesirable precedent for such further development in Crows Nest.	The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development		
			Overshadowing	The approval of this planning proposal will result in a severe loss of amenity to the surrounding buildings in relation to overshadowing, loss of privacy (overlooking), visual bulk, undesirable increase in traffic .	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Privacy	The approval of this planning proposal will result in a severe loss of amenity to the surrounding buildings in relation to overshadowing, loss of privacy (overlooking), visual bulk, undesirable increase in traffic.	See Section 2.1.6 of Council Report Noted. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to protecting privacy of adjoining neighbours.	N/A	2E
			Traffic	The approval of this planning proposal will result in a undesirable increase in traffic in Crows Nest and surrounding locality	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation.	N/A	2E

61

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
9013 938	28 (copy)	Resident/Owner	Same Submission 25				
9012 116	29	Resident/Owner	Overdevelopment, Access To Light, Overshadowing	This is a totally inappropriate and appalling PP. The council has height regulations for very good reasons that relate to populations density, resources for local residents, access to light, overshadowing, noise and traffic. All of these important aspects would be severely impacted in an extremely negative way which was clearly why the council rejected the PP in the first place.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties	N/A	2E
			Height Of Building	The increase in height grossly in excess of the current height limit - an already generous 16 metres with the suggestion of an increase to 54 metres. This proposal should be rejected without further consideration and right of appeal as totally inappropriate for the area and site location.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP.	N/A	2E
			Noise And Traffic Impacts	In addition to gross over-crowding, increased noise and pollution, the traffic in	In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				the area is already severely congested and would surely mean total gridlock for this location.	The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		
			VPA Not Sufficient	The trivial amounts mentioned in the VPA would in no way help ameliorate the huge impact of such a massive development and are laughably inadequate.	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a short period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
			Reject	Either way, this PP proposal should be again rejected with a clear message that avaricious property developers should respect council guidelines and the wishes of the local population.	Noted	N/A	2C
9073 900	30	Sydney Water	Water Wastewater Servicing	And Potable water servicing to the site should be available via a 100mm CI/CL water main (laid in 1922) on Falcon St.	See section 2.2.1 of Council Report Noted.	N/A	2A

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recomm ended Action	Criteria
			Trade Wastewater	Amplifications, adjustments, and/or minor extensions may be required. Wastewater servicing should be available via 225mm VC wastewater mains (laid in 1892, 1893 and 1900) within the property boundary. Amplifications, adjustments, and/or minor extensions may be required	See section 2.2.1 of Council Report Noted.	N/A	2A
			General Information On Legislative Matters Relating To Approval And Use Of Sydney Water Services	The submission includes general information on legislative matters relating to approval and use of Sydney Water services and information on how to send through DA plans for approval. These include the following topics: - Sydney Water Servicing - Building Plan Approval - Trade Wastewater Requirements - Backflow Prevention Requirements - Water Efficiency Recommendations Contingency Plan Recommendations	See section 2.2.2 of Council Report Noted. This will be dealt with at the DA stage.	N/A	2A
9073 904	31	Sydney Airport Corporation	No Objections	No objection to the erection of this development to a maximum height of 150 metres AHD. The approved height is inclusive of all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, TV antennae, construction cranes etc.	See section 2.2.2 of Council Report Noted.	N/A	2A
9073 905	32	Sydney Airport Corporation/CASA	No Objections	No objection to the erection of this development to a maximum height of 150 metres AHD. The approved height is inclusive of all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, TV antennae, construction cranes etc.	See section 2.2.3 of Council Report Noted.	N/A	2A
9066 852	33	Resident/Owner	Concerns Regarding Scale of Development And	I'm writing to express my concern over new proposed developments around 270-272 Pacific Highway. This include	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report.	N/A	2A

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Similar Developments In Area/2036 Plan	Planning Proposal 1/21 - 270-272 Pacific Highway which I was informed of via post and the progress of this from being rejected by council through to that being overturned by various authorities. What concerns me even further are the following links which look to propose large developments at 286 Pacific Highway at the HCA previous site of North Shore Gas Co Office.	The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development.		
9073 906	34	Viva Energy Australia	No Objection Development Raised.	No vegetation will be planted within 3m either side of the pipeline (distance is calculated from the outermost point of the pipeline) - Any vegetation planted between 3-6m from the pipeline must be low lying with a non-invasive root system and discussed with Viva Energy Australia prior to planting. - The applicant must lodge a Dial Before You Dig, prior to commencement of any works and advise Viva Energy Australia of any works or activity intersecting or within 10m of a viva energy pipeline at least 2weeks prior to commencement - The applicant must contact viva and apply for permits by emailing dbydnsw@vivaenergy.com.au (To avoid delays in processing of your permits please ensure you include a full scope of works including all offsets/alignments/depths and details of the equipment and materials you propose to use)	See section 2.2.2 of Council Report Noted.	N/A	2A

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				- No fencing or structures are to be installed across and or within the pipeline corridor and easement/s whichever is greater. - No stockpiling or equipment to be stored or cross over pipeline and associated corridor/easement.			
9059 031	35	Resident/Owner	Crows Nest Village/2036 Plan	The proposed rezoning from the NSLEP 2013 from 16m to 54m will forever create a precedent for other developments along the Pacific Highway and inevitably contribute to extend the changed character of Crows Nest village which is on its doorstep. St Leonards is the predominant centre with large developments to transition in height, bulk and scale from the highway to surrounding neighbourhood areas The proposed rezoning will forever change the character of adjoining residential properties in Sinclair Street It is a poor planning outcome	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development.	N/A	2E
			Building Height/Bulk And Scale	Its transition of extra height should be reduced (not increased) to meet the objectives of reducing building heights as development moves away from the Crows Nest station Creating a visual wall impact to those properties in Sinclair Street despite its 10 metres setback from the western property boundary	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recomm ended Action	Criteria
			Solar Access	Impact adversely on properties to the south-west in Sinclair Street Wollstonecraft by way of denying all existing solar access in the early mornings.	acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street..	N/A	2E
			Access Issues	Create access issues on the joint carriage way that have not been demonstrated as being resolved, given that all vehicular access (private cars and commercial delivery vehicles) will be required to share this carriageway into the future and during construction.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.	N/A	2E
			Process/2036 Plan	The decision to have this proposal proceed to Gateway Determination was taken without regard for the NSW Premier's Priorities that amongst other things requires that the NSW government puts the community at the centre of everything they do. In that regard, the decision to finalise the 2036 Plan with increased height of 5 more storeys than	Noted.	N/A	2G

67

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Council Report Predates Draft VPA And Documents.	provided in the draft plan was a critical error and should be reversed. Council report predates all documentation.	Noted. The Council report is an appendix and was drafted prior to the negotiation of the VPA that was placed on public exhibition.	N/A	2C
			Documentation Quality	Justifies the Planning Proposal by making links with development such as the "Fiveways" site as similar. These applications are primarily for mixed use and largely residential proposals and not commercial uses. The argument is not justified.	Noted. See 2.1.12 of Council report.	N/A	2C
			Inconsistencies Within Traffic And Parking Study	The traffic and parking study has a number of errors which lead to drastically incorrect conclusions about how the redevelopment could support active transport and cycling in particular The study claims that there is no cycling infrastructure in the close vicinity of the development. This is incorrect. Sinclair Street contains an uphill fully separated contraflow cycleway from Bruce Street to Shirley Rd. Cyclists heading south downhill currently use the general traffic lane. This forms part of a signposted cycle route through the low traffic backstreets of North Sydney, Waverton and Wollstonecraft connecting Mount Street to St Leonards Station and links a number of key locations including Cammeraygal High School (now years 7-9 campus), North Sydney Demonstration School and Mater Hospital. It also provides a connection to the key upcoming cycleway along West St (recently approved for public consultation on 26th September 2022) that will have a large number of children using it since the Cammeraygal High School 10-12 years were moved to the old TAFE site.	Noted. See section 2.1.2 and 2.1.12 of Council Report.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				This route, and Sinclair Street in particular, provides a safe, low traffic route for nonhardcore cyclists and particularly children and women who aren't confident enough to ride along the Pacific Hwy. The study implies that a cycleway will be provided along the Pacific Hwy. While this is likely to be correct between Milsons Point and West Street, the cycleway won't continue further north due to heritage listed buildings preventing the necessary works to place a cycleway around the bus stops. The cycle route will divert cyclists along West Street and through the back of Crows Nest to connect to St Leonards. This means that any cyclists needing to continue north and continue to the schools, Mater hospital, Crows Nest Metro Station and other locations on the western side of the Pacific Hwy and are even more dependent on this existing, low traffic, backroad route. Contrary to the claim that the majority of the traffic is expected to turn into Bruce St from the Pacific Hwy, cars approaching the site from the north will need to access the site by driving down Sinclair Street section of the cycling route from Shirley Rd. Offer is very different to initial offer. VPA is not beneficial to Council and is a win-win for the applicant	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Economic Advice Report/Commercial Floor Space	It is not needed because there is insufficient evidence of enough jobs being created within the 2036 Plan of the type in this proposal to support even the minimum Gross Floor Area space of 21,258 Sqm Concerns that the report has excluded the non residential GFA approved in the Crows Nest OSD. The findings are not accurate to justify further commercial floor space. Based on the 2036 Plan and the research behind these numbers, it is apparent that there will be low demand from within the Precinct for office space of the type described by this planning proposal. Jobs will need to be imported from outside the precinct. The intention is to import jobs from other commercial office areas including the North Sydney CBD which itself, has recently completed a very large increase in office space as mandated by the NSW government. Consequently, workers from well outside the 2036 Plan area will travel by public transport to work in Crows Nest. Because North Sydney CBD has sufficient commercial office space capacity there is no need for such a large development as defined in this PP1/21. Especially when considering the large amount of office space in the Crows Nest station OSD.	reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E
9059 030	36	Resident/Owner	Sunlight Access	The development would completely rob residents of Sinclair St, and also those residents of Gillies St whose units have an easterly aspect, of any morning sun. This will have an especially devastating effect on residents for whom morning sun is their only solar access.	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street..	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Bulk and Scale/ Height 2036 Plan	be totally out of scale with - and therefore visually overwhelm - the existing residences in Sinclair and Gillies St (primarily single storey semi or detached houses and 3-4 storey apartment blocks). I also object, as a matter of principle, on the grounds that the 13 storey height exceeds the maximum height limit of 8 storeys proposed in the Draft St Leonards Crows Nest 2036 Plan - in itself a compromise supported by North Sydney Council, following extensive community consultation. That compromise was made in good faith in recognition of the need for increased development while preserving at least some solar access and related amenities to existing residences. The subsequent decision by the DPE to further arbitrarily increase the height limit to 13 storeys without any further consultation, in my view, was unacceptable and should be subject to ongoing challenge.	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Traffic	lead to an unacceptable increase in vehicle congestion in Sinclair St which is currently a relatively quiet and safe street that has with a separate cycle path and attracts considerable pedestrian traffic, including people accessing the Mater Hospital complex and nearby schools.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
9050 981	37	Resident/Owner	Bulk and Scale/ Height 2036 Plan	The proposed rezoning from the NSLEP 2013 from 16m to 54m will forever create a precedent for other developments in the area and inevitably contribute to ruin the character of Crows Nest village which is one of the few remaining mixed use retail/commercial precincts of its size in Sydney. The rest have all been deveoped into giant generic shopping malls limited to franchise retail with no variation and lacking individualism.	measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Commercial Space	It is not needed because there is insufficient evidence of enough jobs being created within the 2036 Plan of the type to support even the minimum Gross Floor Area space of 21,258 Sqm (~1,200 jobs)	Noted. See section 2.1.5 of Council report. The 2036 Plan has the objective of providing an additional 1,950- 3,020 jobs in Crows Nest by 2036 whilst maintaining the village atmosphere along Willoughby Road and promoting standalone commercial sites closer to the Crows Nest Station. Additionally, the North District Plan has set planning priorities that 16,500 jobs be provided within the wider St Leonards and Crows Nest Precinct by 2036 and encourage innovation and growth within the eastern economic corridor. The Planning Proposal would result in the creation of 22,853m2 of commercial floor space in Crows Nest and in close proximity to the	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			2036 Character/ Street	St Leonards is the predominant centre with large developments already sacrificed to the development gods, there is no need to begin setting the precedent to facilitate mowing down the rest of the Pacific Highway and turn eventually turn Crows Nest village into a Stockland Mall one day. The proposed rezoning will forever change the character of adjoining residential properties in Sinclair Street	Crows Nest Station. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the 2036 Plan, North District Plan, and local planning priorities under the North Sydney LSPS in regard to employment See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development.	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	will a. impact adversely on properties to the south-west in Sinclair Street Wollstonecraft by way of denying all existing solar access in the early mornings,	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street..	N/A	2E
			Access	create access issues on the joint carriage way that have not been demonstrated as being resolved, given that all vehicular access (private cars and commercial delivery vehicles) will be required to share this carriageway.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions. Noted.		
			2036 Plan Process	The decision to have this proposal proceed to Gateway Determination was taken without regard for the NSW Premier's Priorities. The decision to finalise the 2036 Plan with increased height of 5 more storeys than provided in the draft plan was an error and should be reversed. Further more I cannot believe we have a development application system where the Voluntary Planning Agreement essentially evidences a 'legalised bribe' for increased developer contributions tied to increased guaranteed square metres approved by Council and State governments !		N/A	2G
			VPA	For example: this Voluntary Planning Agreement has been amended and legally qualified to ensure that it will guarantee the applicant will only contribute a maximum of \$3 million upon achievement of a certain sqm of gross floor area (GFA). It is an attempt to ensure that Council will not reduce the bulk of the scale of the development without financial consequences. Development in the State of NSW seems no longer to be about benefiting communities and the improvement of infrastructure and lifestyle, but simply about exploiting areas with high lifestyle amenity for the benefit of development corporations. Governments.	See section 2.1.4 of Council Report. It is noted that the real estate market can fluctuate wildly within a brief period of time, thus quickly dating valuations. Notwithstanding this, the valuation at the time was made in good faith and has been the basis for initial VPA discussions. It would be inappropriate to reconsider the agreement at this time, having regard to the fact that it is entirely possible that the market could have gone backward rather than forward which under this logic may also warrant a reconsideration to reducing the contribution.	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
				both Local and State must fight to return 'development' to mean the improvement of a Community lacking in something. NOT how much can be profited out of an existing Community at the expense of the residents.			
9098 823	38	Hayberry Precinct Committee	Bulk and Scale/ Height 2036 Plan	It is too bulky It is out of scale with the surrounding Streetscape It would present as a long wall of Development facing Pacific Highway Has no gaps between buildings as currently exist between buildings	See Section 2.1.3 of Council Report. The development would have additional overshadowing and visual bulk impacts, however, attempts have been made to ameliorate these would through a staggered form of the building envelope as detailed in the draft Site Specific DCP. In consideration of the surrounding controls and development, the proximity of the site to the Crows Nest Metro station and the consistency with the overarching strategic document, it is considered that the proposed height is acceptable in the context of the provisions of the 2036 Plan	N/A	2E
			Crows Nest Village/2036 Plan	Will set a precedent for other development in Crows Nest	See Section 2.1.8 of Council Report. The site itself is unique given its location on the fringe of the Crows Nest commercial area, being bordered by commercial uses to the east and by residential uses to the west and mixed use uses to the north and south of the site. Proposals are assessed on a site-by-site basis and are considered on their merits with regard to relevant controls and surrounding context. In this instance, the proposal is considered to be located within an unusual context and demonstrates compliance with the vision and principles of both the 2036 Plan and	N/A	2E

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
			Setbacks/Podium	Setbacks from podium are insufficient.	as such will not set a precedent for surrounding development. Noted. See Section 2.1.7 of Council Report It is considered that the proposed building has been reasonably articulated in an attempt to reduce the overall apparent bulk and appearance of the structure. The draft Site Specific DCP includes provisions that open spaces nearby to residential properties be appropriately mitigated and managed and that landscaping is used to provide appropriate amenity and to soften the appearance of any future structure through the use of planter boxes on the podium and terraces to facilitate mature vegetation. Additionally, other measures to ensure adequate levels of privacy to surrounding properties and their adequacy would be assessed in detail at the development application stage	N/A	2E
			Solar Access	Will increase overshadowing to Residential areas to the west and south	Noted. See Section 2.1.1 of Council Report. This will be addressed as part of the assessment of any future DA at the site. It is also noted that the site-specific DCP includes reference to ensuring sunlight access of a minimum 2 hours between 9am and 3pm to adjoining properties specifically those on Sinclair Street..	N/A	2E
			Parking	the lack of sufficient vehicle parking to accommodate employees tenants and visitors (many intra state) vehicles which will increase pressure on surrounding streets.	See section 2.1.2 of Council Report. The proposed access arrangements are expected to sufficiently manage traffic and access such that there will not be a significant impact resulting from cars using the existing access points to Bruce	N/A	2E

76

ECM No	No.	Name and Address	Issue/Theme	Key Points Raised	Council Response	Recommended Action	Criteria
					Street from the private laneway be maintained. Additionally, DCP provisions are recommended to reduce the number of car parking spaces on the site which would address the concerns in respect to traffic generation. It is considered in this instance that traffic impacts resulting from the development can be appropriately managed by way of proposed access arrangements, sufficient signage, and traffic calming measures where appropriate and that in context of the wider road network the proposal would not result in a noticeable increase to traffic when compared to existing conditions.		