



Coded Summary of Individual Submissions

31 May 2021 – 30 September 2021

**Project: Draft Edgecliff Commercial
Centre Planning and Urban Design
Strategy**

HPE CM Record Number:

24/56491



Explanatory Note:

Coded Summary of Individual Submissions

To enable collation of data, the comments made in submissions are summarised into main issues using the following codes:

B: Built form

Height, density, appearance, views, amenity impacts

CH: Character and heritage

Scale, interface, potential heritage and character buildings

CI: Community infrastructure

Public domain, community and recreation facilities, affordable and diverse housing

C: Congestion

Traffic volumes, intersection wait times, noise and pollution

P: Parking

Lack of parking, high demand and conflict

S: Solar

Overshadowing and need for solar access

TOD: Transport oriented development

Higher density around public transport

U: Centre needs upgrade

Pin: Reference to a specific place rather than an issue

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID001	Individual	Comment	Built form; Character; Congestion; Solar; Additional submission attached to survey			Loss of ambience (CH) High-rise incompatible with low rise 19th century residential area/ambience (B) No space for an effective transition or buffer zone (B) COVID - changing work patterns and need for density (B) Noise from traffic and ventilation (B) Adverse property values (O) External health impacts of commercial ventilation (O) Traffic pollution will be exacerbated (C) Loss of winter sun in streets, houses and yards, Trumper Park (S)
CID002	Consultant/ Owner	Request				136-148 New South Head Road (Pin) Existing 14.5m and 1.25:1, Heritage Item Draft - no change to controls - Precinct 4 Local Commercial Core Request 46m (12 storey) and 5:1 FSR and Precinct 2 Mixed Use Corridor Include as key site/alternate wording for flexibility (can be used for other sites) Suggest station area be named Commercial Heart 5% affordable housing unreasonable
CID003	Individual	Comment	Congestion; Parking;			Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Active transport is not a solution - people will want to drive to the shops (C) Parking demand won't be met - problems will be exacerbated (P) Higher density should not be permitted until existing problems addressed (C,P)
CID004	Individual	Comment	Congestion; Pin;			Getting into Edgecliff Centre is already a problem - will be exacerbated (C) Consider using turn left lane on Darling Point Road for access to New McLean Street (Pin)
CID005	Individual	Comment			Pin;	Object to including Rushcutters Bay Park in a document about Edgecliff Centre (Pin)
CID006	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion;			High-rise will be an eyesore (B) Maximum five storeys (B) Will destroy the character of the suburb (CH) Noise pollution from construction (B) Overcrowded trains at peak hour at Edgecliff Station (CI) Public plaza and rooftop space above bus interchange are great ideas (CI)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID007	Individual	Object	Built form; Character;			High-rise will be an eyesore (CH) Maximum five storeys (B) High-rise will destroy the art deco character of the suburb (CH) High-rise will be ghettos (B) Proposal won't address housing need (B) Need properties big enough/suitable for families as well as couples/singles (B)
CID008	Individual	Support		TOD; Pin;		Focus residential and commercial expansion at Edgecliff Centre to fulfil targets and keep Double Bay, Rose Bay and Vaucluse villages safe from over-development (TOD, Pin)
CID009	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Pin			Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Public transport is not always an option and active transport won't solve traffic congestion (C) Deliveries by truck and refuse collection will increase (B) Edgecliff Centre is run down and could use some modification/enhancement within existing height/scale and still deliver satisfactorily to the community (Pin)
CID010	Individual	Comment			Congestion;	Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Traffic pollution will be exacerbated (C)
CID011	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Parking;			High-rise will be an eyesore (B) 26 storeys is far too high for this area (B) Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Parking demand won't be met - problems will be exacerbated (P) Attached submission also as dropped pin
CID013	Individual	Comment			Congestion; Parking; Pin;	Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Intersection of DPR, NMS and NSHR has been troublesome for years (C) One-way Darling Point Road (north) and Mona Road (south) (Pin) Active transport is not a solution - people will want to drive to the shops (C) Active transport not an option for some due to level of ability and topography (C) Parking strategies won't address parking demand (P)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID014	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion;			Another 23 storey eye sore (we already have one) (B) Over development of the current site (Edgecliff Centre?) (B) Traffic is already choked up and to further choke the entry point to the Eastern Suburbs makes no sense at all (C)
CID015	Individual	Comment			Built form;	Find it strange Council proposes 89m (30 storey) east of two storey terraces (B)
CID017	Individual	Object	Built form; Character;			Object to increased height to Edgecliff Station and surrounding area (B) Woollahra, Paddington, Rushcutters Bay precincts last of the true village communities in Sydney built on heritage foundations, increasing the population in the area will seriously erode the beauty of the area and impact those that reside in the precinct (CH) For many years Woollahra Council has protected the natural heritage of our community, with an emphasis on the village atmosphere, by not allowing overcrowding and unsightly developments (CH)
CID018	Individual	Object	Built form; Character;			Object to increased height to Edgecliff Station and surrounding area (B) Woollahra, Paddington, Rushcutters Bay precincts are last of the true village communities in Sydney built on heritage foundations, increasing the population in the area will seriously erode the beauty of the area and impact those that reside in the precinct (CH) For many years the Woollahra Council has protected the natural heritage of our community, with an emphasis on the village atmosphere, by not allowing overcrowding and unsightly developments (CH)
CID019	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion; Solar; Owner's view;			The suggested height is unacceptable (B) Congestion will be exacerbated (C) Woollahra Council has always believed in protecting heritage of Paddington, Woollahra and Edgecliff amongst others (CH) Loss of sunlight to dwellings (S) Would block resident's iconic views of the harbour (OV)
CID020	Individual	Object			Built form; Community infrastructure;	Will not provide high level social/visual amenity (B) Suggest maximum 5 storey on NSHR, limit apartment built forms, up to 35 storey, above rail corridor (B) Forced amalgamations would allow a more co-ordinated and cohesive strategy to be developed (B) Question locating residential adjacent/overlooking NSHR and Viaduct - will be tenanted dormitories (B)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						Improving streetscape within precinct/immediately around Edgecliff Station should be mandatory (CI)
CID021	Consultant/ Owner	Request				113 NSHR Existing 14.5m and 2.5:1 (Site O) Draft - - Precinct 4 Local Commercial Core 34m (10 storey) and 4.5:1 FSR Request 15 storeys
CID022	Consultant/ Owner	Request				193-201 NSHR Existing 14.5m and 1.5:1 Part of (Site E) Draft - - Precinct 3 Paddington Gateway 34m (10 storey) and 3.5:1 FSR Request 20 storeys - 5 storeys commercial and residential on above
CID023	Consultant/ Owner	Request				193-201 NSHR Existing 14.5m and 2.5:1 (Site O) Draft - - Precinct 4 Local Commercial Core 34m (10 storey) and 4.5:1 FSR Request 20 storeys - 5 storeys commercial and residential on above 164 NSHR Existing 14.5m and 1.5: FSR Draft - not identified as a key site Request 15 storeys
CID024	Consultant/ Owner	Request	Attached submission also to survey			Refer to CID022 and CID023 Request that height for 193-201 NSHR is more than 10 storeys
CID025	Individual	Object	Congestion; Parking; Pin; Owner's vista; Solar;			Indicates street closure lower end of Great Thorne St to be reopened - object (Pin) Tower block will destroy my bridge view and impact other residents' views (OV) Will overshadow entire Edgecliff Glebe and other surrounding suburbs (S) Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Parking strategies won't address parking demand - problems will be exacerbated (P) Ocean Street slip lane proposal - will increase congestion without benefit (Pin)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID026	Individual	Object	Built form; Owner's vista; Solar;			26 storeys will destroy my view of the city and the Harbour (OV) High rise development along NSHR - will lose the entire eastern view (OV) Edgecliff Court will be surrounded by high rise concrete and glass monstrosities - will block views and sunlight (OV, S)
CID027	Individual	Comment			Community infrastructure; TOD; Additional submission attached to survey and contributed to BIKEast submission	Will not satisfy cycling needs - undermines high quality amenity and safety for walkers (CI) Significant omissions for active transport and lacks appropriate cycling facilities (CI) Shared path low-standard option - undermines walkability, amenity and walkers/riders safety - riders will avoid indirect and steep routes (CI) Important to finalise a land use and density plan that has status otherwise ad-hoc developer pressures will break through with little public benefit and possibly poor/over development - need action plan Council should negotiate with State a new approach to management of the main road, seeking reassignment of roadway space and reducing speed, to take up the opportunities available to making the Edgecliff Commercial Centre and its redevelopment a success and great outcome for the community and travellers
CID028	Individual	Support		Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Pin; TOD;		Put high-density residential near transport and strengthen inner-city urban quality (TOD) Don't spend on other urban design features, such as planting/parks/public art, while NSHR amenity compromised by saturation level traffic (C) Improve pedestrian movement and high-quality design standards for new built form on NSHR - use other development/funds to off-set ECC long-term poor urban quality (CI) Ocean Street traffic calming from Oxford Street to NSHR to address through traffic being encouraged to use Oxford Street for regional east-west vehicle travel rather than New South Head Road (Pin) For improved pedestrian safety and general amenity - remove slip lane from Ocean Street to NSHR, redesign Glenmore Road/NSHR intersection, widen north and south footpaths on NSHR from NBR to Manning Road (Pin) Upgrade Trumper Park and, in particular, return defunct Paddington Bowling Club into passive recreational open space (Pin) Don't support traffic management measures that increase the capacity or speed of traffic along NSHR or that compromise vehicular access and movements for Darling Point and Paddington residents (CI)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID029	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Existing 23.5m and FSR 1.5:1 (approved FSR is 2.9:1) Draft - 24m (7 storey) and 2.5: FSR Precinct 2 Mixed Use Corridor Request 24m and 3.42:1 FSR (reflects DA226/2021) Requested FSR to get built form within height 7 storey stepping to 4 storey on 90 NSHR All commercial
CID030	Individual	Comment	Built form; Community infrastructure; Solar;			Illustration shows two excessively tall, odd-shaped residential built forms over the bus station, which will create wind vortex problems for pedestrians (B) Overshadowing on south/ east/ west (S) Bleak and unattractive public plaza would be harsh and unusable for pleasant public activities - traffic noise and fumes from NSHR (CI)
CID031	Individual	Comment	Built form; Solar;			45 storeys too high adjacent to heritage houses in Cameron and Glebe Streets (B) Transition from 45 storey modern Built form to two/three storey Victorian terrace (B) Balconies at that height are useless due to winds (B) Ranelagh at 27 storeys sticks out like a sore thumb (B) Victorian terrace houses would be overshadowed for most of the year (S) Adjacent houses will suffer from the negative effects of wind tunnels (B) Seems like excessive density for the area (B) The built form is not enjoying 100% tenancy rates at the moment (B)
CID032	Individual	Support		TOD;		In favour of concentrating population growth around transport hubs (TOD) Edgecliff with its train station and bus terminal is a perfect place for more apartments, offices and service retail (TOD)
CID033	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Parking;			No more apartments - will exacerbate traffic and parking problem (B, C, P)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID034	Individual	Support			Community infrastructure; Parking; Upgrade;	Proposal considerably improves the vicinity and gives it much more of a village feel and more of a destination place (B) Number of new residents should be identified (B) Parking issues to be resolved (P) Sporting facilities such as squash court needed (one squash court/9000) (CI)
CID035	Group	Comment			Community infrastructure;	Does not provide for separated cycle paths (CI) Does not align with Woollahra Draft Integrated Transport Strategy (CI) Does not reflect or commit to integration of the Principle Bike Network along this key east-west route linking the Eastern Suburbs with the CBD (CI) Shows no cycle infrastructure - Section 5.11 Transport does not mention cycling (CI)
CID036	Individual	Comment			Built form; Character; Solar;	40+ storeys would be disastrous for surrounding heritage dwellings (B,) Overshadowing of dwellings and loss of air/sunlight (S) Preserve heritage and make the most of what we have (CH) We don't want a repeat of what's happened at Bondi Junction (B)
CID037	Individual	Support		TOD;		Put development around Edgecliff Station as it is important transport hub (TOD) More quality high-rise residential and office space - less cars needed (TOD)
CID038	Agency	Comment			Community infrastructure;	Detailed comments in relation to Edgecliff Station and bus interchange; bicycle network; walking and cycling connectivity; tree planting; public transport; road network improvements; road reservations. (CI)
CID039	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Owner's vista;			Apply reasons to refuse 45 storeys to Strategy - 83m higher than most train stations (B) Would affect my view of the Opera House and Harbour Bridge (OV) Past high-rise towers are intrusive (B) 26 and 14 storeys along NMS detrimental to the character of the precinct (CH) Impact on adjoining residential properties and pedestrian experience (B) Increased density will multiply issues in an area already densely populated/constrained (B)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID040	Individual	Object	Congestion; Pin;			Needs careful consideration of the traffic which is already at limit (C) Particularly dangerous at intersection of DPR and NMS (Pin)
CID041	Individual	Comment			Built form; Community infrastructure; Parking; Pin;	No built form should be higher than 180 Ocean St (14 storeys) scaling down NSHR (B) Paris and Rome achieve high density with 8 storeys (B) Increase commercial development, not residential (B) Reduced car parking rates result in streets being overwhelmed (P) Close to station zones should be reduced to half hour parking (Pin) Highest built forms on NSHR not NMS to avoid overshadowing Paddington (Pin) Design excellence - use Govt. Architects Branch (B) Public space needs to be at ground level - roof level seldom used, towers create wind and open space around them have limited use (CI) Affordable housing - is this public housing/how will it be managed? Nothing in Woollahra is affordable (CI)
CID042	Individual	Comment			Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Solar;	Control development to avoid adverse effect on character/quality of lifestyle (B) Strategy essential to ensure appropriate development at Edgecliff Maintain built form heights at current permitted levels along NSHR (B) Will get unlimited height proposals in the future under greater height (B) Residential and commercial space appropriate at transport hub (TOD) Minimise parking space, encourage car sharing facilities/EV charging capacity (P) Pedestrian and cycle access, and bike parking essential (CI) Bike parking to facilitate public transport use (CI) Affordable housing should be a priority and provision well above the proposed 5% (CI) Integrate community facilities - much needed child care close to public transport hub ideal (CI) Provide roof top garden space (CI) Integrate tree planting and appropriate landscaping of NSHR into the Strategy (PD) Design of development to relate to residential streets to the south aesthetically and practically (B) Design excellence desirable - must include how any development at Edgecliff addresses the way it relates to the community around it, how it impacts on the communities around it especially in respect of solar access, accessibility and the interface with the residential streets to the south (B) Improve footpath (north) and give priority to pedestrian access to the Centre from the roads that feed towards it from Darling Point and Double Bay (Pin)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID043	Form Letter	Object	Built form; Owner's vista; Parking;			<p>Concerned about development next to (both sides) and across from Bayside (B)</p> <p>Bayside sits on sand, with shaking when foundations constructed next door (B)</p> <p>Monitoring Bayside for cracks or other damage (B)</p> <p>Taller Built forms will impact Bayside owners' views (OV)</p> <p>Additional development will exacerbate parking problems (P)</p> <p>No parking for tradespeople (P)</p> <p>Note: Form letter refers to construction of the car wash at 79-81 NSHR, a single storey Built form, as causing vibration to Bayside (CN)</p>
CID044	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID045	Form Letter	Object	Bayside - rewrite of form letter			Refer CID043
CID046	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID047	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID048	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID049	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID050	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Request heights/built form envelopes for Edgecliff Centre, Eastpoint Shopping Centre and bus interchange be reconsidered Prefer Scenario 1 of SJB study for the Edgecliff Centre as it presents significant benefits in built form, urban design, reduced impact on neighbouring communities, less overshadowing and the loss of view corridors. Enables improvement to station access. Support restriction of parking to reduce traffic generation and suggest restricting retail to what's existing would assist
CID051	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID052	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID053	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Solar;			Built form will cause major disruptions to access and traffic conditions to NSHR, Ocean Street, DPR, Paddington and Surry Hills as people try to gain access to the city via alternate routes (C) Will set a precedence to the surrounding areas for similar applications (B) Have shopping precincts in Double Bay/Bondi Junction that service local community (B) Have high density in the LGA - will add unnecessary pressure on local community/rate payers (B) Will block sun and light to many of the surrounding homes and streets (S) Only people it will benefit are the developers and not the local community (O)
CID054	Individual	Comment		Built form;		Current services in Edgecliff Centre (medical, legal, accounting, offices) - significant increase in residents in Double Bay/Edgecliff and clients using train will need these (B) Need for/loss of services if changing Edgecliff Centre to purely residential and retail (B) Retail and residential are well catered-for in the Centre and in Double Bay area (B)
CID055	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID056	Individual	Comment			Community infrastructure;	Retain mobility access to [Edgecliff] Centre - mature age resident using the centre on almost daily basis and used by visitors - need pedestrian mobility pathway entrance to and from transport, post office, shops or services. Retain lifts and escalator convenience for any travel baggage as well as shopping stroller (M, Pin)
CID057	Individual	Object	Owner's vista;			High-rise on Edgecliff Centre will block owner's Harbour view and reduce property value from Fullerton Street (OV)
CID058	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion; Solar;			Out of scale and character with current development and surrounding housing (CH) Will overshadow houses to the south (S) Will create unsightly and overdeveloped wind tunnel blocking sunlight (B) Area will not accommodate more traffic without severely inconveniencing residents and those who pass through the area on their way to work/schools (C) Will exacerbate congestion - highly developed and populated area - Council should act to alleviate congestion problems, not exacerbate them (C) Edgecliff Station over-crowded in peak - added risks/complications of COVID-19 - does not warrant more population in already congested area (C) Not another Chatswood/Bondi Junction - unsightly, cold, concrete, wind tunnelled streets (B)
CID059	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID060	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Edgecliff is long overdue for redevelopment (U) Need higher density and more residents to support better shopping with strong retailers (U) The plan is a good start and support the plan but it needs more (U)
CID061	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support draft Strategy recommendations (U) Edgecliff is long overdue for redevelopment (U) The plan is a good start but it needs more (U) As Council does not want development in Double Bay, Edgecliff is ideal and obvious location U) Edgecliff has huge potential and this is important step to using and enhancing our local area (U)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID062	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support draft Strategy recommendations (U) Edgecliff is long overdue for upgrade and redevelopment (U) The plans will increase the vibrancy of the area (U)
CID063	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support draft Strategy recommendations (U) Edgecliff is long overdue for upgrade and redevelopment (U) The plans will increase the vibrancy of the area (U)
CID064	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; Retail;		Support draft Strategy recommendations (U) Edgecliff is long overdue for redevelopment (U) Spend a significant time in the centre and looking forward to much needed upgrade (U)
CID065	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; Retail;		Support the plan but it needs to go further (U) Should be extended in area and heights allowable - density must also be increased (U) Need higher density and more residents to support better centre with strong retailers (U)
CID066	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; Retail;		Support the plan but it needs to go further (U) Should be extended in area and heights allowable - density must also be increased (U) Edgecliff is long overdue for upgrade and redevelopment (U) Need higher density and more residents to support better centre with strong retailers (U) Bring back life to this strategic area (U) Would take away from the heavy Double Bay development (Pin)
CID067	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support draft Strategy recommendations (U) Underwhelming, dated and lacks amenity required of gateway/train station development (U) Opportunity to commence revitalisation and put the precinct on a route that will deliver additional dwellings, office accommodation, retail and amenity that the area has lacked for decades (U) Need significant investment to transform Edgecliff for community, businesses and visitors with high-quality and convenient amenity and surrounds (U)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID068	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support the plan but it needs to go further (U) Like to know if it will actually happen as proposed or will it be diluted? As Council does not want development in Double Bay, Edgecliff is ideal and obvious location (U) Don't delay - upgrade would enrich the area (U)
CID069	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		Support material upgrade to the Edgecliff precinct - existing properties are tired and waste of potential for such a fantastic location (U) Opportunity to create a modern and vibrant residential and commercial hub (U) Would help strengthen local economy as has occurred with the revitalisation of Double Bay (U)
CID070	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD		Highly encouraging of the strategic vision to develop the Edgecliff Corridor (U) Bare bones of the transportation hub and shopping facilities provide a platform to reinvigorate the whole area with appropriate housing that is conveniently located close to these amenities (U) Will create a far tighter community and friendly neighbourhood, that also have wonderful park and water facilities nearby (U) Area has long fallen behind neighbouring areas in being able to produce flourishing community (U) Combination of infrastructure, housing, retail, commercial space and open green areas for local events (such as markets) would be brilliant for the area (U) Look forward to hearing more exciting developments on this vision (U)
CID071	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Support the proposed Draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Planning and Urban Design Strategy (U) Desperately needed and long overdue (U)
CID072	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		New development long overdue and desperately needed (U) Think it's the best idea I've heard about all week (U) Don't think anyone in the area can disagree this is a long time coming and desperately needed (U) Please make this happen as soon as possible (U)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID073	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Support draft Strategy recommendations (U)</p> <p>Area presents as drab and impractical for visitors and residents - dated amenities and facilities (U)</p> <p>As a gateway to Eastern Suburbs, complete overhaul of amenities and infrastructure required (U)</p> <p>Anchored by high frequency heavy rail, don't understand why high density residential is not permitted along the arterial road (TOD)</p> <p>Would provide convenient, readily accessible and more affordable accommodation options for many people that currently cannot afford to purchase in the area (B)</p> <p>More affordable accommodation close to the city would save considerable travel time for employees and increase the available pool of skilled employees willing to travel into the city (TOD).</p>
CID074	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Edgecliff is the place to allow higher built forms and increased density to make it an even better commercial and residential hub (TOD)</p> <p>Edgecliff area has not changed in decades - time the area got higher density with new modern Built forms or modern additions to current Built forms (U)</p>
CID075	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID076	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID077	Group	Comment		Community infrastructure;		Detailed submission regarding cycling and pedestrian infrastructure (CI)
CID078	Individual	Comment	Community infrastructure;	Community infrastructure;		Detailed submission suggesting a performing arts centre for Edgecliff Centre 9CI)
CID079	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Edgecliff is the gateway to Eastern Suburbs and long overdue for complete revamp (U)</p> <p>Need improvement of commercial and residential amenities - not good enough for business (U)</p> <p>Draft Strategy is a good start but encourage council to be bold in developing the area to attract more residents, businesses and world class services that an area such as Edgecliff deserves (U)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID080 & CID012	Individual	Object	Congestion;			<p>Unbearable traffic noise including aircraft overhead and ever increasing size of vehicles on Ocean Street regardless of the impact on the lives of people living along it (C)</p> <p>What traffic and noise management plans are propose for this huge development (C)</p> <p>Better for those with vested interests and certainly not the people whose lives and homes are impacted by even contemplating approving a development such as this (O)</p> <p>Will significantly impact on my quality of life (B)</p>
CID081	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043
CID082	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Support proposed Draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Planning and Urban Design Strategy (U)</p> <p>Would provide needed and long overdue improvement to prominent corridor (U)</p> <p>LGA in need of improved commercial and retail infrastructure to service local community (SA)</p> <p>Makes sense to build on existing and under-used Edgecliff precinct (U)</p> <p>Success depends on critical mass of residential stock - further increase in density and heights allowable best guarantee of long term success (U)</p> <p>Edgecliff natural location for redevelopment and by increasing the density of residential stock in this particular part of the LGA in concert with improved retail experience there will be a lesser impact on traffic more broadly in the LGA (U)</p> <p>Double Bay has experienced similar renaissance as a place for the community to congregate (Pin)</p>
CID083	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		<p>Support draft Strategy recommendations (U)</p> <p>Edgecliff is long overdue for redevelopment (U)</p> <p>Plan should be extended in area, heights and density allowable (U)</p>
CID084	Form Letter	Object				Refer CID043

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID085	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		Support proposed Draft Edgecliff Commercial Centre Planning and Urban Design Strategy (U) Plan is a good start and more can be done as this is a key place to do it (TOD). Improve the Edgecliff Centre and surrounds - the flow of people, no street crossing lights at the end of roads is a problem, need redevelopment to provide more retail and residential (U) Major train station - so much potential unused (TOD)
CID086	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			Don't want another soulless Bondi Junction, Chatswood (B) Overshadowing Trumper Park and Oval (S)
CID087	Individual	Comment		Built form; Solar;		Understand State Government pressure to meet housing targets 26-storey tower on the ridge - out of character with surroundings - will dominate view of the ridge line from Trumper Park, Trumper Oval and surrounding streets with a northerly aspect (B) Will overshadow low-rise heritage built forms to south, Trumper Park and Oval (S) Lower 26 to 20-storey and increase 14 to 20-storeys - will reduce length of shadow (B,S) Support elliptical towners - can Woollahra Council assure residents that it will enforce the elliptical built form line and not allow developers to build across the entire lot (B) Question reference to Ranelagh (RN)
CID088	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Increased density will support commercial improvement - good outcome for existing and new residents (U)
CID089	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Solar;			Will exacerbate congestion (C) Will overshadowing Trumper Park (S) Limited green space for the already high-density local population - extra residents will put more pressure on - important to maintain the wellbeing of the neighbourhood (B)
CID090	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			This proposal is totally inappropriate due to the scale compared to the rest of the built forms in proximity (B) The built form will overshadow the oval and bush lands (S)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID091	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Pin;			<p>Edgecliff population density is four times that of the LGA - should not increase significantly (B)</p> <p>Clarify meaning of Gateway - is Edgecliff a gateway? What are the implications of this for the area? (B)</p> <p>Question aim to Create a sense of identity along New South Head Road (B)</p> <p>Aim to Create public spaces for gathering not a good idea in light of Covid19 (O)</p> <p>Aim to Investigate potential sites for uplift more jargon like Gateway, with no explanation (B)</p> <p>Aim to Investigate mechanisms to capture any increased value to benefit the residents and workers within the area - who would be asked, as resident I have not been consulted ()</p> <p>Question aim to Strengthen the centre's civic, health and employment role - with Coles dominance and demise of smaller retail, the centre is increasingly becoming a Coles centre ()</p> <p>Consider health/wellbeing issues and changing work patterns post Covid19 (O)</p> <p>Need greater transition/buffer/noise barrier to reduce service truck/traffic noise/inconvenience (B)</p> <p>Close Arthur Street at roundabout - reopen towards Great Thorn Street to create large green space to help reduce emissions from the increased number of trucks (Pin)</p> <p>Bus interchange is for people coming from Watsons Bay to Edgecliff and transferring to train - interchange occurs at Bondi Junction/Town Hall/Central (Pin)</p>
CID092	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Parking; Solar;			<p>Recognise the need for long-term planning for Sydney and the LGA</p> <p>Merit in developing some low rise built forms on NSHR but no merit in built forms up to 14 storeys (B)</p> <p>6 storey is adequate (refer development bounded by NSHR, Neild Ave and Boundary St (B)</p> <p>Eastpoint is 14 storey and should be the highest built form in the corridor (B)</p> <p>26 storey on Edgecliff Centre grossly out of proportion with the neighbouring built forms (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre could do with more commercial space but not high rise apartments (B)</p> <p>Proximity to public transport would ensure commercial space is highly sort after (TOD)</p> <p>Edgecliff proposal would see all of forecast population growth in a 1km strip (B)</p> <p>Traffic pre-COVID was already chaotic with school and transport drop offs morning and night (C)</p> <p>Parking in New McLean St, Cameron St and other close buy streets is already at a premium (P)</p> <p>Let's keep the village atmosphere that Edgecliff has and not turn it into another Bondi Junction (CH)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						<p>Station and bus interchange will be inadequate to handle increased volume of commuters (B)</p> <p>26 storeys would cast a large shadow to the southern side of the Edgecliff Centre (S)</p> <p>Ranelagh result of poor planning (B)</p> <p>New Maclean St/New South Head Rd needs addressing now and even more so once any development is finalised (C)</p> <p>Most pressing is Edgecliff Centre proposal from an unknown/offshore developer to build 26 storey (B)</p>
CID093	Individual	Support			Built form; Character;	<p>Overrides its aim to look after natural environment and that there be no inappropriate high rise/overdevelopment (B)</p> <p>New development not balancing protection of leafy character with destruction of trees/grass (CH)</p>
CID094	Individual	Object	Built form; Pin;			<p>Heights on Sites A & B do not achieve key commitment to Conserve and enhance existing heritage and transition built form sensitively to the adjoining heritage conservation areas – no additional height here as it would wall off amphitheatre/vistas between Harbour and Paddington HCA – built forms should only be as high as the viaduct (2 & 3 storey) (B)</p> <p>RE2 zoning on Site A (car wash) ‘proper’ due to height of current development (B)</p> <p>Reduce Edgecliff Centre from 26 storeys to 12 storeys, halve all other heights (B)</p> <p>Aim: Future built form will frame views into the ECC from the west and sensitively respond to the mature Moreton Bay Fig trees that line the edge of Rushcutters Bay Park - this fact was initially identified in White City 90s development and still applies (Pin)</p> <p>Western Gateway starts at intersection of Oswald Street and NSHR not at Site B (Pin)</p> <p>Sandstone should be used to compliment any built form constructed east of the original pub on the corner of Glenmore Road and NSHR - important gateway to Woollahra Council LGA (Pin)</p> <p>Need to address unfortunate built form of mixed use development (B)</p> <p>Topography is steeper than ‘sloping’ and should be referred to as such (Pin)</p> <p>26-32 NSHR good built form taken care of is likely to remain (Pin)</p> <p>2A Mona Street – heritage built form, one side changed while most of the remainder is extant (Pin)</p> <p>2-18 NSHR should be replaced to address the park sensitively, including sandstone (Pin)</p>
CID095	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion;			<p>Precinct is unattractive and in need of an upgrade, welcome greening public spaces, footway upgrades and Built form design improvements within current Built form heights (B, U)</p> <p>Excessive wait time at NMS intersection disadvantage to locals - congestion will be</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
			Owner's vista; Upgrade;			<p>exacerbated (C)</p> <p>Brutal public domain along NSHR (noisy, busy thoroughfare, clearway zones and poor air quality) at odds with artist's impression showing outdoor dining potential (B)</p> <p>Lacking in village character (such as Double Bay/Glebe) - Edgecliff Centre is key local hub and refuge (Pin)</p> <p>Proposed community facilities in Edgecliff Centre are lacking in detail (CI)</p> <p>Height would impact residents' amenity through overshadowing, blocking views and sunlight (S, OV)</p> <p>Tower proposal in the Commercial Centre would shadow dwellings and Trumper Park (S)</p>
CID096	Group	Comment			Community infrastructure;	<p>Consider allowing for creation of additional educational facilities in the precinct (E)</p> <p>Shortage of school spaces - appropriate zoning would allow for this need to be met in some way (E)</p> <p>Actively looking for new premises for a preschool/primary school in the Eastern Suburbs (E)</p> <p>Rising property market, competition from developers and scarcity of appropriately zoned sites creates significant barriers to providing additional educational services (E)</p> <p>Edgecliff's proximity to transport and parklands make it ideal for educational facilities (E)</p> <p>Already precedent for schools in high rise, designs use balconies/roof terraces for outdoor/green space</p> <p>Smaller scale community schools with student numbers of approximately 200-300 can co-exist comfortably with commercial tenants and residents and create a more integrated community atmosphere (E)</p>
CID097	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Town centre is dated and in need of overhaul (U)</p> <p>Support apartments in proximity to trains and buses – makes most sense to encourage public transport use and help alleviate congestion (TOD)</p> <p>Unrealistic to suggest we stop growth in our area and would like to see growth in Edgecliff (TOD)</p> <p>Fantastic initiative - would like to see more of this type of development instead of small villages (TOD)</p>
CID098	Individual	Comment	Congestion; Parking; Pin;			<p>Transport Study does not sit with Future Transport Strategy 2056 as road network current and forecast over capacity - what is the plan for its future as a major arterial connector to and from the east of the CBD, either alone or in conjunction with other modes of transport? Ignoring this obvious tension seems likely to drive inadequate solutions (C)</p> <p>GTA Study geographic area limited, question currency/adequacy of 2016 traffic counts - traffic movements have increased markedly since 2016 with intensive</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						<p>development (C)</p> <p>Superficial analysis (Page 46 GTA) of turn right from NMS into NSHR (C)</p> <p>Trelawney/Ocean Street right turn already congested - forecast over capacity will exacerbate this (C)</p> <p>No reference to traffic movements associated with Ascham School student drop off/pick up (C)</p> <p>Queues to access Ascham compounds existing/post development over capacity (C)</p> <p>Proposed DPR limitations may have minor effect - limiting impact of increased traffic volumes from additional residential vehicles (C)</p> <p>Fails to consider commuter parking in Albert St/commuters competing with residents/visitors (P)</p> <p>Parking demand won't be met - problems will be exacerbated (P)</p> <p>Constructive observations/proposals regarding pedestrian network, particularly safety (C)</p> <p>Omission re tension between pedestrians and six-lane arterial connector (NSHR) (C)</p> <p>Traffic not conducive to pedestrian activation along NSHR (C)</p> <p>No removal of Ocean Street left turn - erosion of ability to access the shops by vehicle (Pin)</p> <p>Removing left turn unworkable unless Ocean Street is downgraded - could not operate as a major corridor without turn left capacity (Pin)</p>
CID099	Consultant/ Owner	Request				<p>Fails to achieve strategy objectives in relation to station precinct - missed opportunity to resolve many issues affecting the precinct</p> <p>Request heights and Built form envelopes for Edgecliff Centre, Eastpoint Shopping Centre and bus interchange be reconsidered</p> <p>Prefer Scenario 1 of SJB study for the Edgecliff Centre site as it presents significant benefits in built form, urban design, reduced impact on neighbouring communities, less overshadowing and the loss of view corridors. Enables improvement to station access.</p>
CID100	Consultant/ Owner	Request				<p>Existing 12m and 1.5:1 FSR</p> <p>Draft - no change to controls, Precinct 3 Paddington Gateway - 2 storey street wall</p> <p>Request 23m(6 storey) and 3:1 FSR</p> <p>Retain heritage Built form with new levels above</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID101	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Existing 6.5m and 0.5:1 FSR Draft - no change to controls Precinct 3 Paddington Gateway - 2 storey street wall Request 20m (5 storey) and 3.5:1 FSR Retain heritage Built form with new levels above
CID102	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Parking; Solar; Upgrade;			Edgecliff Centre redevelopment above current envelope will set precedent for NSHR and the area, height of other built forms approved and delivered 25-50 years ago (B) 7.5:1 FSR/26 levels excessive – out of character with conservation and surrounding built forms (B) No urban benefit for the site/area. No social/economic benefit to the residents/area in exchange for density. Urban design outcome doesn't provide acceptable areas back to the community (B) Will overshadow many existing residences, across Trumper Park, NMS and Ocean Avenue (S) Will remove sunlight creating a cold and windy precinct like Bondi Junction (B) Road network doesn't support current density/traffic, will be exacerbated by increased residential (C) Numerous examples of density and traffic problems – Chatswood, Bondi Junction (C) Cumulative traffic impact of approved and future projects on New South Head Road (C) NMS beyond capacity - significant safety issues - particularly the right turn to NSHR (C) Traffic congestion and safety - children crossing, Ascham. Collisions already occur at DPR/NMS (C) Traffic lights at NMS were moved 10 years ago and this has not improved traffic circulation (C) Retail car park should be larger to cater to wider community - not just those within short walk (P) Restricted parking to prevent traffic impact flawed as current traffic around EC doesn't work now (P) Rail tunnel does not prevent more car parking - could be above ground in podiums as required (P) Retail/commercial car park always full - proponent's consultants ignore these elements - surveys should be taken that also consider the usability of spaces (P) Need high standard low-rise luxury residential and mixed use development to bring new life (U) Eastern Suburbs commercial high vacancy levels - 2,893sm2 retail insufficient and

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						17,600m2 commercial excessive given workplace of the future. Further retail space required for the area (B)
CID103	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Existing 14.5m and 1.25:1 FSR, Heritage Item Draft - no change to controls Precinct 3 Paddington Gateway - 2 storey street wall Request 23.6m (7 storey) and 3.5:1 FSR Retain heritage Built form with new levels behind Architectural concept provided
CID104	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		Edgecliff tired and dated in comparison to Double Bay (U) Edgecliff well overdue for urban renewal, bring more people and energy to the place (U)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID105	Individual	Comment			Built form; Congestion; Parking;	Support draft plan to avoid ad-hoc proposals, heritage conservation, commercial sites to remain close to train/bus station, improvement to community amenity, greening and access to parks, excellence in design which can accommodate proximity to heritage neighbourhood (B) Height and bulk on ridge will make built forms even more prominent, especially for those who live down slope to the south and for those driving past to the Eastern Suburbs (B) Reduce built form height as much as possible - especially proposed 26 storeys (B) Traffic strategies won't address congestion - problems will be exacerbated (C) Parking demand won't be met - problems will be exacerbated (P) Ensure that adequate parking is within the redeveloped Edgecliff Centre (P)
CID106	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; Community infrastructure; TOD;		Edgecliff falling behind other centres like Double Bay – strategy should be more ambitious (U) Edgecliff should be a place people want to work and live, and a place for people to meet (U) Fantastic location with station and space around (TOD) Widening and greening footpaths will make it safer for pedestrians (CI)
CID107	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			26m Edgecliff Centre - intrusive/out of proportion to area - precedent for uplift on nearby sites (B) Should be no more than two storeys higher than the existing office Built form (B) Adjoining neighbourhoods will no longer be a 'great place' with enormous Built form looming over (B) Ranelagh not a benchmark - was an aberration in the 1970's but it is setback from NSHR/other Built forms - slim enough not to intrude too much into the streetscape (B) Two hours of direct sunlight poor compensation for the amount of sunlight currently experienced in the properties to the south (S)
CID108	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion; Parking; Solar;			Object to increased height and FSR and increased residential development - retain current and low density (B) Overshadowing Trumper Park and Paddington HCA (S) Loss of heritage - needs more appraisal (CH) Congestion and increase in parking requirements in adjacent areas (C, P) Loss of private amenity : tyre repair, car servicing workshop, petrol station, gyms (CI) Need indoor sports complex (including netball, basketball, skateboard park, swimming pools, martial arts), post office, bank Retain public amenity, village and heritage character (CH) More open green spaces and spaces for public art (CI)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID109	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Recognise importance of ECC within Woollahra LGA and its potential to contribute to meeting objectives of the Sydney Metropolitan Plan and Eastern City District Plan Additional 1237.8m2 GFA on Edgecliff Centre insufficient to make redevelopment commercially viable Existing FSR is 3.4:1 (not 2.5:1 as assumed in ECCS) FSR would need to be 5.4:1 (increase equivalent to increase from 2.5:1 to 4.5:1 proposed in the ECCS)
CID110	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Existing 14.5m and 1.5:1 FSR (2:1 on 115 NSHR) Draft - 34m and 2.5:1 FSR Precinct 2 Mixed Use Corridor Request 42m (11 storeys) and 3.6:1 FSR
CID111	Individual	Comment			Congestion; Parking; Solar;	Removal of Ocean Street slip lane will restrict traffic flow east-west along NSHR (C) Reducing residential parking requirement would greatly increase on-street parking (P) 26 and 14 storey towers will project lengthy shadows over Trumper Park (S) Loss of sun will have undesirable effects on recreational activities in the park (tennis centre, community garden, the Victor Trumper Oval and bushland activities (S)
CID112	Individual	Support		TOD; Upgrade;		Edgecliff perfect location for renewal and increased density given train, bus and shopping hub (TOD) More residents (with various dwelling options) and workers should be encouraged (TOD) Additional residential will support better shopping for locals, other shoppers and commuters (U) Density/quality Built form design will enhance important Eastern Suburbs transport/shopping/living hub (TOD) Support wide section of Edgecliff and especially New South Head Road redevelopment - rather than piecemeal proposals - better outcome will be achieved when the area is reviewed as a whole (U)
CID113	Individual	Object	Built form;			Damaging effect on neighbourhood and environment - not justified by the amount of housing (B) Height and extent of land included too great (B)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID114	Individual	Comment			Built form; Community infrastructure; Solar;	Overshadowing of Trumper Park (S) 26 storeys excessive, appearing to match [Ranelagh] - don't repeat this mistake (B) Need more emphasis on the human scale of the area not towers (B) Concern planning agreements only voluntary and public improvements will be 'possibly encouraged' (CI)
CID115	Individual	Object	Built form; Character;			Understand redevelopment of the area is necessary Object to size of the proposed development - Edgecliff Centre? (B) Not sympathetic to the area and will not enhance the general amenity of Edgecliff (CH)
CID116	Group	Object	Built form; Character;			Rose Bay Residents Association Collaborated with and support Vacluse West Residents Association objection Does not adequately consider negative impacts on residents of Rose Bay, Vacluse and Watsons Bay Refer to reasons in report on 203–233 NSHR dated 1/2/2021 and Woollahra Local Housing Strategy 2021
CID117	Individual	Comment			Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion;	Need Federal, State and the Local government funding for infrastructure (CI) Congestion - consider a tunnel for through traffic or flyover from NMS to DPR (C) Pedestrian crossing NSHR - flyover from NMS to DPR would also benefit pedestrians or pedestrian bridge from first floor of Edgecliff Centre with a lift to the street level (C) Buses essential - anything to lessen volume of traffic will greatly aid safety and speed of buses (C) 45 storeys on Edgecliff Centre too high - don't want skyscrapers in the area (B) No left/right turn from DPR might ease congestion, right from NMS might become straighter NSHR (Pin)
CID118	Individual	Object	Built form; Character;			Development in and around Edgecliff is too large in volume and footprint (B) May damage local amenity / environment, even as far as Jersey Road (CH)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID119	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Parking			<p>Appreciate need to redevelop EEC and need for a plan</p> <p>Ignores current traffic congestion (C)</p> <p>Adequate parking for residential and commercial has not been addressed (P)</p> <p>Less attractive to commercial tenants unless there is plenty of easily accessible public parking (P)</p> <p>Even if pedestrian traffic increases, parking has to be adequate to cope with increase in density (P)</p> <p>Ignores property values, will never be affordable, put affordable housing in less expensive precinct (B)</p> <p>Reducing parking will reduce developer costs but will not create affordable housing (B)</p>
CID120	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade;		<p>Seen how these plans can transform areas like Double Bay's Kiora Lane and bring back life to business (U)</p> <p>Post COVID need to help small business and local economy (U)</p> <p>Acknowledge disruption/dislike of change, however, we always enjoy the changes when realised (U)</p> <p>Makes communities better/stronger, should be bold in these plans, support/urge more action like this (U)</p>
CID121	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Most sensible location for development, close to public transport, shops and parks - rather than smaller villages like Vacluse and Bellevue Hill (TOD)</p> <p>Many of the built forms, in particularly Edgecliff Centre and station, are eye sore - looking forward to seeing this improved with design excellence being a great initiative of the study (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID122	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Solar;			<p>Will have Pacific Highway (Chatswood/St Leonards) appearance and feel - scar and divide between leafy suburbs of Paddington and Darling Point (B)</p> <p>Could suffer same lifeless plight of other urban renewal precincts with street front activation failing (who wants to sit on a six lane 60kp road - can be a wind tunnel and is not really alfresco (B)</p> <p>While new residents/workers might rely on public transport, weekend congestion will result from high density living placed into existing traffic network with no significant road upgrades (C)</p> <p>Reducing the excessive residential floorspace will assist in alleviating traffic congestion (C)</p> <p>26 floors excessive - will be blight on gateway to Eastern Suburb's skyline - should not exceed 14 (B)</p> <p>Don't repeat mistakes on height of 32 floors (Ranelagh) (B)</p> <p>Should be no reduction in solar access to Trumper Park (S)</p> <p>Provide clearer shadow diagrams uncertain of impact on houses in Paddington (S)</p> <p>Concentrating housing target in one precinct is poor planning outcome, commercial centre should not be dominated by high density residential - reduction in residential will pare back the excessive scale (B)</p>
CID123	Individual	Object	Built form:			Density of housing leading to rapid overburdening of existing parking/transport/green space (B)
CID124	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure;			<p>Refer to Paddington Society Submission (PS)</p> <p>Closure at Arthur/Great Thorne Street not shown clearly and not adequate for traffic access to EC (Pin)</p> <p>Poor pedestrian access from Arthur/NMS to EC - needs footpath, separation of delivery trucks (CI)</p> <p>Ventilation and refrigeration noise (B)</p>
CID125	Individual	Object	Built form;			Extent of uplift not necessary to achieving housing targets (B)
CID126	Individual	Comment		Built form; Congestion; Community infrastructure;		<p>Inadequate traffic strategies - NM Street (C)</p> <p>Question whether people will use streets - topography, pollution (B)</p> <p>Lacks detail on community facilities (CI)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID127	Consultant/ Owner	Request				<p>Support identified density for Edgecliff Centre - suggest one-third non-residential Request 7.5:1 FSR for the site alone (excluding road reservation)</p> <p>Height beyond 86m can be accommodated while achieving/improving on the Strategy's objectives</p> <p>Oppose mandatory amalgamation - need flexibility for feasible outcome</p> <p>Support design excellence in principle</p> <p>Consider site-specific attributes when determining suitability of sites and distribution of public benefit</p> <p>Flexibility in public domain controls to recognise/integrate into functional and site-specific attributes</p> <p>Consider impact-based approach to parking rather than simply reducing car parking rates</p>
CID128	Individual	Support		Centre needs upgrade; TOD;		<p>Edgecliff best placed to deliver houses and jobs in the LGA (TOD)</p> <p>Logical to place density near public transport and access to CBD (TOD)</p> <p>Already a mix of commercial with access to parks and services (TOD)</p> <p>Offers protection of HCAs and smaller centres in the LGA (CH)</p> <p>Existing centre dated, has poor accessibility and underwhelming (U)</p>
CID129	Group	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking; Solar;			<p>Double Bay Residents Association</p> <p>Traffic strategy ineffective to address congestion/generation (C)</p> <p>Active transport strategy ineffective to change mode share (C)</p> <p>Parking strategy ineffective re traffic generation/demand (P)</p> <p>Extent of uplift not necessary to achieving housing targets (B)</p> <p>Not protecting built heritage/character or surrounding HCAs (CH)</p> <p>Maintain visual link between RBP and Wiegall Park with no height increase (B)</p> <p>No mention of units size/mix (B)</p> <p>Affordable housing needed for key workers - 5% not enough (CI)</p> <p>No guarantee of provision for community infrastructure to support density (CI)</p> <p>Need urban services - garages/ tyre/ petrol stations/ hotel (B)</p> <p>Overshadowing Trumper Park and Paddington HCA (S)</p>
CID130	Group	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking; Solar;			<p>Paddington Society</p> <p>Support revitalisation of Edgecliff shopping centre (Eastpoint Food Fair and Edgecliff Centre), affordable housing, new/improved community infrastructure</p> <p>Traffic strategy ineffective to address congestion/generation (C)</p> <p>Active transport strategy ineffective to change mode share (C)</p> <p>Parking strategy ineffective re traffic generation/demand (P)</p> <p>Excessive building bulk for local centre (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						<p>No urban design justification for amalgamation that would remove fine grain - high streets work best with fine grain rather than large retail/commercial floorplates (B)</p> <p>Extent of uplift not necessary to achieving housing targets (B)</p> <p>Ignores/contradicts issues/conclusions of LHS and Council Report on 203-233 NSHR</p> <p>Question consistency with GS Region/Eastern City District Plans/Woollahra LSPS</p> <p>Need detail of how station/ bus interchange can be improved, including relationship to new retail and parking provision)</p> <p>Not protecting built heritage/character or amenity of surrounding HCAs (CH)</p> <p>No heritage study, yet parts of Paddington and Mona Road HCAs, and twelve locally listed heritage items, are in the study area</p> <p>Loss of visual open space link between Rushcutters Bay Park and Wiegall Park, lower Paddington slopes (B)</p> <p>Affordable housing needed for key workers - 5% not enough (CI)</p> <p>Inadequate provision for community infrastructure to support density - need changes to infrastructure contributions (CI)</p> <p>Amenity issues at the interface – noise, deliveries (B)</p> <p>Overshadowing Trumper Park/Oval and Paddington HCA (S)</p>
CID131	Individual	Object	Built form; Parking;			<p>Appreciate need for co-ordinated plan for development of ECC</p> <p>Increasing density will exacerbate parking (P)</p> <p>Reduced parking for smaller units - already shortage in DPR/Paddington/Woollahra/Edgecliff Centre (P)</p> <p>26 storey excessive, six storey desirable along some of NSHR instead of 10 storey (B)</p> <p>Don't need high-rise - keep low density (B)</p> <p>Crowds, greater density and high rise spoil less crowded and relaxing lifestyle and ambiance, Edgecliff should have low density, pleasant shopping environment that has been maintained in Double Bay (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID132	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Owner's view; Solar;			<p>Wall of Built form along NSHR - driving a wedge between Paddington/Darling Point and heritage relationship between Paddington slopes, Trumper Park/Oval, Rushcutters Bay/Creek and Sydney Harbour - also affects public and private views (refer to sketches) (B, OV)</p> <p>Height in valley floor and its lower slopes should not exceed viaduct height - 6 storeys at White City should not set a precedent - 10 storey Site E should not replicate Bayside next door - 8 storey Site I in view line of Glenmore Road - no heritage consideration leaving Paddington HCA - 7 storey Site K entrance to Mona HCA, 11 storey Site Q entrance to Darling Point both inappropriate - impact of four floors on Ascham heritage item - no heritage consideration seems to have been made (B, CH)</p> <p>No urban design justification presented for Built forms up to 26 storeys (B)</p> <p>Heights do not respect surrounding low rise environment - boundary not always defined by streets or rail corridor - conflict at interface - every adjoining property will be negatively impacted (B)</p> <p>Western gateway to Woollahra is Rushcutters Bay Park - no need to 'frame views' with height - just reinforce avenue of trees as a green entrance to Woollahra (B)</p> <p>Paddington does not need a gateway - it is a place to be found and discovered (B)</p> <p>Need understanding of how station/bus interchange can be improved and its relationship to new retail and parking development - existing pedestrian/vehicular system around Edgecliff Centre is poor (B)</p> <p>Connecting NSHR, NMS, Ocean/Cameron/Arthur Streets/Herbert Road can't be resolved without detailed/agreed design for Edgecliff Station/bus interchange (CI)</p> <p>No suggestions to improve NSHR as high road - lower speed, wider footpaths, remove fences (CI)</p> <p>Small portion of footpath is created by what appear to be setbacks on private land (B)</p> <p>No urban design justification for amalgamation pattern - removes fine grain - high streets work best with fine grain, not large retail floorplates (B)</p> <p>Solar access to Trumper Park between 10.00 am and 2.00 pm - should 9.00am to 3.00pm (S)</p> <p>Relies on much maligned 'fast moving shadows' justification for solar impact (S)</p> <p>5% affordable housing is a miserable target (CI)</p>
CID133	Consultant/ Owner	Request				<p>Existing Site A 6.5m, Site B 10.5m and 0.5:1 FSR</p> <p>Draft - Site A 21m and 2:1 FSR, Site B 40m and 5:1 FSR</p> <p>Precinct 1 Western Gateway</p> <p>Request 47m maximum height - flexible distribution</p> <p>Site A 14 storeys and Site B 9 storeys and 4:1 FSR over the whole</p> <p>Built form in the park concept</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID134	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Pin; Solar;			<p>Endorse Paddington/Darling Point Societies' views on deficiencies in draft Strategy and consultation</p> <p>Increases already considerable bulk, 26 storeys conventional shape/height, explore design potential of this and other sites, architectural alternatives to high rise - refer Minister's Urban Design Principles (B)</p> <p>Erroneous assumptions regarding need for high rise residential/commercial above transport hub (B)</p> <p>Need study of solar access and effect on adjacent communities - minimum 2 hours of solar threatens residents' current sunlight - expand to 9am to 3pm, as required elsewhere LGA (S)</p> <p>References to improving amenity are vague - unconvinced about community benefit - should require services, infrastructure and facilities that serve needs of adjacent residential community (CI)</p> <p>Plaza on NSHR - noise/pollution will make it unpleasant place to be - need consultation on defined community facilities/amenity improvements refer to the direction in the Minister's principles (CI)</p> <p>Improve interface between PHCA and Edgecliff Centre - safety, pedestrian access, a/c-ventilation noise, traffic noise/inconvenience (particularly refrigerated trucks), solar access, community amenity (B)</p> <p>Good design to address loading docks/ramps and get balance between local amenity and functionality - reduce cross overs and provide safe pedestrian access (B)</p> <p>Put footpath on north side of NMS - improve pedestrian access (particularly for elderly) (Pin)</p> <p>Move truck access from eastern NMS to eliminate nuisance noise from trucks queuing/idling (Pin)</p> <p>Redesign a/c-ventilation to reduce noise opposite terrace houses on southern side of Arthur Street (Pin)</p> <p>Promote open/green/outdoor/cafe space on northern side of NMS, away from NSHR traffic corridor (Pin)</p>
CID135	Individual	Comment		Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking; Pin;		<p>Title misleading – many may not have commented as it appears to relate to only the [Edgecliff] Centre</p> <p>Taller Built forms should only be at the station - less height than proposed (B)</p> <p>[Ranelagh] height should not be replicated - sore thumb (B)</p> <p>Taller Built forms on ridge highly visible, better to have not much taller than current average (B)</p> <p>Wall of Built forms along NSHR poor entry, mini Bondi Junction - undesirable to visit/live in or nearby (B)</p> <p>Walk along New South Head Road can be pleasant, traffic aside, because of low scale mixed use (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						<p>100 NSHR (10 storeys) out of character - height/bulk overpowering and causes overshadowing (B)</p> <p>Public view of Harbour Bridge (looking west along NSHR) will be lost (B)</p> <p>Reduced parking not a reasonable conclusion - must be more parking (and charging points) (P)</p> <p>Traffic access needs consideration in EC redesign - car needed to get up hill/carry shopping (C)</p> <p>If streets are reconfigured, as much greenery as possible is desirable (CI)</p>
CID136	Individual	Object	<p>Built form;</p> <p>Character;</p> <p>Community infrastructure;</p> <p>Congestion;</p> <p>Owner's vista;</p> <p>Solar;</p>			<p>No rationale for larger hub between CBD and Bondi Junction – no locals have requested it (B)</p> <p>Preserve Edgecliff - upgrade will occur as players appreciate/capitalise on its unique character (B)</p> <p>Council could provide concessions to such developments to encourage protection of character (B)</p> <p>Council to oppose external imperatives, or further modify the plan to lessen its negative impacts (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff precinct is a sufficiently small area to justify it being conserved without material impact on housing targets, to the benefit of Edgecliff community/broader Woollahra/Eastern Suburbs populations (B)</p> <p>EC exemplar of 1970-1980's development – aesthetics, scale and profile of small traders (Pin)</p> <p>Will alter character of streets in PHCA by changing sight lines, overshadowing sunny/airy spaces (CH)</p> <p>Concentrating greatest heights along ridge does not emphasise topography - actually distorts gradual slope to make the gradient much steeper than natural topography (B)</p> <p>Protection of views for existing properties not apparent (OV)</p> <p>Any increase in overshadowing Trumper Park not justified – will destroy bushland habitat (S)</p> <p>Trumper Park/Rushcutters Bay Park already heavily used, substantial increased use unsustainable (CI)</p> <p>Improve street furniture through rates - does not need commercial overdevelopment for funding (CI)</p> <p>Congestion will exacerbated congestion (C)</p> <p>Draughty cafes/plaza on NSHR not improving amenity – traffic fumes, wind and overshadowing (B)</p> <p>Reinstate abandoned Woollahra Station to improve accessibility for residents (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID138	Group	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Character; Congestion; Parking;			<p>Vaucluse West Residents Association</p> <p>Traffic strategy ineffective to address congestion/generation (C)</p> <p>Active transport strategy ineffective to change mode share (C)</p> <p>Parking strategy ineffective re traffic generation/demand (P)</p> <p>Extent of uplift not necessary to achieving housing targets (B)</p> <p>Height and density above usual for a local centre (B)</p> <p>Overemphasis on housing supply to detriment of non-residential (B)</p> <p>Not protecting built heritage/character or surrounding HCAs (CH)</p> <p>Background incomplete (e.g., Eastpoint, 136, 230,240 NSHR)</p> <p>Loss of visual open space link between RBP and Wiegall Park, will disrupt view to/from Paddington (B)</p> <p>Affordable housing needed for key workers - 5% not enough (CI)</p> <p>No provision for community infrastructure to support density - need changes to infrastructure contributions (CI)</p> <p>Need urban services - garages/ tyre/ petrol stations/ hotel (B)</p> <p>Impact on parks (CI)</p> <p>Loss of private recreation zoning (B)</p> <p>Public domain measures not specific or guaranteed (CI)</p> <p>Question shop front activation, linear parks (B)</p> <p>Ambience of Trumper Park and Paddington HCA - will be overshadowed, overlooking Mona HCA (CH)</p> <p>No specifics on unit mix, optimal non-residential uses, size of plaza (B)</p>
CID139	Form Letter	Object				Refer to CID043
CID140	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Community infrastructure Pin;			<p>Don't demolish for high rise Built forms down to Rushcutters Bay - who asked for that (B)</p> <p>Make the area better for people, not worse which is what this extended proposal looks like (B)</p> <p>EC needs upgrade - tired, confusing (drafty stairs to buses, access to Post Office/Aldi) (Pin)</p> <p>Noisy and intimidating on the NSHR footpath - needs improvement (CI)</p> <p>Turning right out of DPR, fighting with turning right out of NMS - needs fixing (Pin)</p> <p>Value the North/South perspective from Paddington across to the Harbour (B)</p> <p>Retrieve public access through White City, and walking path along the drain to the Lord Dudley (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID141	Individual	Comment			Built form; Solar;	<p>Reconsider concept to protect access to natural light/privacy in PHCA streets/dwellings (B)</p> <p>Higher apartment towers will look directly over small homes/private yards in PHCA (B)</p> <p>Will substantially reduce sunlight in heritage neighbourhood - exacerbated by south west slope (S)</p>
CID143	Individual	Comment			Built form;	<p>Reconsider Strategy based on best practice sustainable urban planning/built form - wins for climate/community/development (B)</p> <p>Ribbon development along NSHR not sustainable – sites too narrow for sustainable Built forms (B)</p> <p>Cluster development around EC – enables slender towers with less bulk, more solar access, better views, greater air circulation between Built forms, more opening for deep soil/tree planting (B)</p> <p>Built forms should be designed for sustainability - maximum energy saving/minimum environmental impact/reduced energy use/renewable energy sources/avoid depletion of natural resources (B)</p> <p>Appears to be a focus on roads and car transport - road infrastructure improvements unsustainable - NSHR already grid locked - no mention of Edgecliff Station or discussion with Sydney Rail (C)</p> <p>Does station have capability for increased use associated with Strategy or capability to expand (B)</p> <p>Onsite water retention essential to ensure there is no water runoff to Trumper Oval - Oval and neighbouring homes sometimes inundated during storms (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID144	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion; Parking; Pin; Solar;			<p>Agree with Paddington Society submission</p> <p>Shouldn't be partial to developer's financial interests over the future of the area (B)</p> <p>Built form height excessive - will loom over/overwhelm Trumper Park, will be more urban in feel (B)</p> <p>Huge modern high-rise looming over historic terraces - not a sensitive/respectful integration (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Road already congested - where will extra traffic be diverted to? (C)</p> <p>Resident and visitor parking - Paddington residents often can't find a car space for own vehicle (P)</p> <p>Suspect there would be overshadowing - where are the plans on this? (S)</p> <p>Lack of open space for new residents - require developers to provide sufficient open space nearby (CI)</p> <p>Trumper/Rushcutters parks inadequate - can't be used much of the time as people would like to (CI)</p> <p>Where is the heritage assessment/assessment of the look/impact of high-rise towers on PHCA (CH)</p> <p>Lower-rise built forms with large apartments more suitable for downsizers/families - better character (B)</p> <p>Small apartments attract transient population with little investment or care for the area (B)</p> <p>Investors have little investment in the community and results in a lower degree of maintenance (B)</p> <p>Wall of towers changes connection and views between Paddington and the water (B)</p> <p>Shadowing and loss of outlook for all Paddington residents who walk lower scale streets (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre needs upgrade - lower-rise, more thoughtful proposal to address concerns above (Pin)</p>
CID145	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion; Solar;			<p>Endorse Paddington Society submission</p> <p>Title misleading - not just for shopping area/rail/bus interchange - many residents not aware of scope</p> <p>Few would have concerns about proposals to upgrade Edgecliff Centre (Pin)</p> <p>Inadequate consideration of consequences - concerned about the effect of proposed scale of redevelopment on our neighbourhood - congestion, transport, pedestrian access, parking, heritage, excessive built form bulk, height and overshadowing (B)</p> <p>Wall of built forms along NSHR - will destroy Rushcutters basin form and create barrier between Paddington slopes and Sydney Harbour (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID146	Individual	Comment			Built form; Character Congestion; Parking; Solar;	<p>Out of proportion to historic development in Darling Point, Woollahra and Paddington (B)</p> <p>Tunnel effect along NSHR (refer to Victoria Road through Drummoyne) (B)</p> <p>Will exacerbate congestion (Ocean Street/Avenue) (C)</p> <p>Will exacerbate parking pressures (P)</p> <p>Existing EC appropriate scale for resident's amenity/need for services/grocery shopping (Pin)</p> <p>Woollahra population density already high so future growth potential will be modest (B)</p> <p>Proximity to Bondi Junction will limit commercial appeal for growth in ECC (B)</p> <p>High rise will deny the solar amenity of many properties in the area to the south (S)</p> <p>Western end high rise ugly backdrop to Rushcutters Bay Marina/Cruising Yacht Club (B)</p> <p>Understand need for urban renewal over time, especially where development such as the Eastern Suburbs Railway, has left scars amongst older properties, and where increased commercial demand allows for timely redevelopment (B)</p>
CID147	Individual	Object	Refer CID130			Endorse Paddington Society submission
CID148	Individual	Comment			Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking; Solar;	<p>Agree on need for plan over site specific proposals, heritage conservation, better pedestrian access</p> <p>Doubtful about amalgamated sites - hand out to developers (B)</p> <p>Artist's impression an architectural mess along NSHR (B)</p> <p>Is there to be no more parking for all these built forms? (P)</p> <p>Site S (4 storey) will obliterate the view of Fiona, Site L (10 storey) will overwhelm Cadry's, Site F (5 storey) another distraction to Cadry's - heritage Built forms need curtilage (CH)</p> <p>Open space on windy roof tops might not work in reality (CI)</p> <p>No one will use linear park along NSHR due to traffic impact (CI)</p> <p>NMS only access to parking for services/shopping/residential towers - difficult turning in/out (C)</p> <p>Will obstruct connection between Paddington and Rushcutters Park (B)</p> <p>Only pedestrian access on Glenmore Rd/Neild Ave both traffic through ways that will get more congested with Hakoah and Grammar expansions (Pin)</p> <p>Pedestrian access to Edgecliff Centre from south through HCA needs improving (B)</p> <p>Proposed towers appear differently on your diagrams (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID149	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			<p>Endorse Paddington Society submission</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre needs renewal - amazing lifts installed only a couple of years ago from station level - no issues unless additional height overshadows lower Paddington (Hampden Street area/Trumper Park) for several hours a day (B, S)</p> <p>There has always been a connection to the harbour (B)</p> <p>Railway/existing built forms fit in scale of the landscape - wall of built forms along NSHR not necessary - openness of Rushcutters Bay Park/Weigall Sportsground leads into gentle increase in height up NSHR without the need to reinforce the primacy of New South Head Road as a gateway to the east with additional height (B)</p> <p>Bayside should never have been permitted and should not be a precedent (B)</p>
CID150	Individual	Object	Built form; Parking; Solar;			<p>Not consistent with scale of surrounding area - terraces where sunlight/parking already compromised (B)</p> <p>EC will be overdevelopment – loss of sunlight/privacy to our property/locality (Cameron Street/Bowes Avenue) (B)</p> <p>Swap towers, reduce height significantly to minimise impact on residences to the south (B)</p> <p>Parking even more of an issue in Bowes Avenue as there is no vehicle access (P)</p> <p>Will exacerbate parking problem (P)</p> <p>Need solar studies of the proposal (S)</p>
CID151	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure;			<p>Area does not need scale of development on Edgecliff Centre and high rise on both sides of NSHR (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff/Paddington/Darling Point already high density areas, especially after redevelopment of Advanx Tyres site (Rushcutters Bay) brought hundreds of additional residents (B)</p> <p>Rushcutters Park crowded, especially early morning and weekends (CI)</p> <p>White City development far too ambitious - concerned for Victorian terraces that would be in its shadow and the additional traffic negotiating the narrow streets (B)</p>
CID152	Individual	Object	Built form;			<p>Scale inappropriate for the neighbourhood (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre poorly designed/unattractive, focus on improving it, abandon grander scheme (B)</p>
CID153	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion;			<p>Endorse Paddington Society submission</p> <p>Agree not all properties worthy of retention/Edgecliff Centre needs upgrade, but NSHR is gridlocked (C)</p> <p>Only people benefiting from the currently proposed high-rise blocks, the proposed traffic changes and the resulting dirty, dark and noisy wind-tunnel will be property developers living outside the area (B)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID154	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Pin;			<p>Endorse Paddington Society submission</p> <p>Acknowledged obligation to help limit urban sprawl. However, strategy illogical/destructive</p> <p>Renewal/upgrading aspect of strategy is fine, proposed heights are the problem (B)</p> <p>Number of built forms along NSHR not well designed/noteworthy/prestigious - replacement of outdated/unsightly stock with airy, low-level structures with adequate parking a step forward (B)</p> <p>Suggested 'pedestrian utopia' unrealistic - too unpleasant for people on NSHR due to traffic (CI)</p> <p>Greater setback/rows of trees needed to make canyon habitable to pedestrians/outdoor diners (CI)</p> <p>Removing Ocean Street slip lane will result in north-bound gridlock (C)</p> <p>Triple threats of White City/Weigall rebuild/concrete and glass canyon along NSHR impacting Paddington lower slopes (B)</p>
CID155	Individual	Comment			<p>Pin - refers specifically to Mona Road/Oswald Street/Mona Lane/NSHR area</p>	<p>Gateway to Woollahra/Edgecliff Commercial Centre/approved developments in NSHR, close to White City/Yacht clubs/Rushcutters Bay Park, attractive approach to Mona Road HCA, important entry to Paddington, protects heritage items, historic features, subdivision pattern, variety of Built form materials/styles/forms, shared history, sense of character, place and visual presence (Pin)</p> <p>No through road, pedestrian access to Mona Lane via heritage/new steps, car access to rear of New Beach Road/Oswald Street properties/Council leased land to private garages (Pin)</p> <p>Provide public car parking on the area designated as greenspace - rear to curb to facilitate deliveries to nearby commercial premises - small garden near seat is sufficient greenspace (Pin)</p> <p>Improve pedestrian amenity in Oswald Street - provide attractive/comfortable access to the steps/facilitate views of interesting architecture (Pin)</p> <p>8 Oswald Street designed and owned by Neville Gruzman, mayor of Woollahra (Pin)</p> <p>10 Oswald Street Arts and Crafts with variety of sensitively designed studios/gardens (Pin)</p> <p>Improve visual quality of streetscape - could showcase sandstone walls and heritage terraces on Mona Road with modern extensions overlooking Mona Lane (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID156	Individual	Comment	Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking; Pin;			<p>Limit Sites A and B to height of railway viaduct or previous study limits of 6.5m and 10.5m (B)</p> <p>Will be wall of high rise along NSHR - windswept, shaded canyon akin to Bondi Junction (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre is our main retail - encouraged to see its upgrade is in planning (B)</p> <p>Already congestion between Double Bay/Rushcutters Bay, and access into Edgecliff Centre (C)</p> <p>Inadequate traffic strategy - no capacity in NMS - tweaking nearby streets will only make it worse (C)</p> <p>Inadequate parking strategy - restricting increase at Edgecliff Centre not workable (P)</p> <p>Active transport no solution to congestion - preferred access to Edgecliff Centre is by car despite rail/bus hub - only some access by bus/train/foot - few cyclists no doubt due to steep gradients (C)</p> <p>Need safe pedestrian crossing - bonus for pedestrian bridges (over NMS, NSHR, Ocean Street) (CI)</p> <p>More protection for public views - especially occasional/slot views from ridge through heritage areas (B)</p> <p>Affordable housing contribution of 5% not enforceable (CI)</p> <p>Iconic view shown to the north appears to be from the car wash where the view to the Harbour is blocked by trees (Pin)</p>
CID157	Individual	Object		Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Solar; Upgrade;		<p>Upgrade important for local transport/retail/commercial hub, could take reasonable residential growth with supporting infrastructure (U)</p> <p>Traffic strategies won't address congestion, parking strategies won't reduce traffic generation (C)</p> <p>Support widening right turn from NSHR to NMS, removing right turn from DPR to NSHR, diverting traffic to Mona Road (but capacity unclear), oppose removing slipway at NSHR and Ocean Street (C)</p> <p>Vehicle access to some amalgamated sites unclear (B)</p> <p>Majority of sites will double in height/floor space, will create wall of high rise along NSHR (B)</p> <p>Extent of uplift not necessary to achieving housing targets (B)</p> <p>Impact on low rise HCAs, demolition of contributory items, transition/interface - lack of heritage study (CH)</p> <p>Affordable housing for key workers - 5% not enough (CI)</p> <p>Cutting off Paddington slopes from Rushcutters Bay, disrupting significant views and vistas (B)</p> <p>Overshadowing public/private open space, and north facing habitable space (S)</p> <p>Support street trees, wider/safer pavement, cycleway, coordinated landscaping, urban/street furniture (CI)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
						<p>Question whether people will use streets - topography, pollution. elevated public space on NMS would have more amenity (Pin)</p> <p>Need for outdoor recreation facilities - crowding in Trumper/Rushcutters Bay Parks (CI)</p>
CID158	Individual	Comment			<p>Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion;</p>	<p>Multiple development proposals must be viewed together to appraise impact (B)</p> <p>Lack of proper consultation/design drawings/detail of impact (eg., shadow/seasonal wind direction) (B)</p> <p>Should limit to low/medium density (4-6 storeys) given elevated site/adjacent low rise heritage area (B)</p> <p>Factor in impacts to traffic flow (during construction/post completion) including how traffic moving along NSHR will be impacted by more vehicles leaving/entering a new development (C)</p> <p>Consider retaining essential public services (car/tyre services, petrol stations, hotel) (B)</p> <p>Need 10-15% affordable apartments due to increasing cost of living/need for essential workers (CI)</p> <p>Nexus between population and green space paramount - must consider impact on small amount of green space in the Eastern Suburbs (CI)</p> <p>Development must include appropriate grounds/gardens for future residents and for abating heat island effect caused by urbanisation (B)</p> <p>In summer months front of Eastpoint/Edgecliff extremely hot – extend urban forest to cool the area (CI)</p> <p>Consider impacts to Ascham School (C)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID159	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion;			Height excessive - impact on residents behind (B) Increased traffic congestion already bad (C) Poor turn onto New South Head Road from New McLean Street for shoppers (C)
CID160	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			Development looks unsightly and will be overbearing (B) Overshadowing of neighbouring areas (S) Overcrowding and risk of spread of infection (B) Short period of notice that we were given to object to this
CID161	Consultant/ Owner	Request				Requesting uplift for subject property; Currently R3 and 10.5m - request 20.5m (6 storeys) and 2.5:1 FSR. Create through site link and improve public open space use (Pin)
CID162	Individual	Object	Built form; Solar;			Would cause a terrible district view from many aspects of the local area (B) Similar to the visual problem created by the "jungle of ugly towers" in Bondi Junction (B) Overshadowing and would cause further overcrowding in the Edgecliff precinct (B, S) There was not enough time to object to this proposal
CID163	Individual	Object	Built form;			Adverse impact on amenity - no protection for quality of life/conservation of amenity (B) Affordable housing for key workers - 5% not enough (CI) Excellence not shown in bland, modernist built forms presented in the graphics and models - suggest modernist schemes be subject to contextual constraints/approval by a panel of informed residents (B) Modernism, where it becomes ideological, is ill-equipped to provide urban built environment appreciated by residents - need to impose restrictions (B) Metrics not an appropriate measure of success - one measure of success would be visual harmony and the imaginative use of a limited palette of forms, colours and textures (B)

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID164	Individual	Comment			Built form; Parking;	<p>Agree with certain alterations and urbanisation in certain areas (B)</p> <p>Towers no more than 6 storeys - NSHR can't cope with more residential built forms of 26 storeys (B)</p> <p>Edgecliff Centre could become the car park for residential built form above or even a movie theatre (B)</p> <p>Agree to removing right turn from DPR - would ease traffic to the shopping centres (C)</p> <p>Demand for parking on street (P)</p> <p>Agree to demolish ugly section in front of Ascham but build no more than 4-6 storeys (B)</p>
CID165	Individual	Object	Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking;			<p>Draft Strategy should be revised as the area will be adversely affected</p> <p>Inadequate car parking (P)</p> <p>Impact on traffic flow in the area (C)</p> <p>Local parks - during COVID Rushcutters Bay Park could not cope with use by current residents (CI)</p>
CID166	Individual	Object	Built form; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Solar;			<p>Wall of high-rise similar to Bondi Junction - insensitive to surrounding built environment/HCA (B)</p> <p>Avoid wall of tall built forms on ridge - impacts view from Paddington - repeat of 1970's mistakes (B)</p> <p>Trumper Oval shaded at 9am - doesn't consider early morning use/increases time for dew to dry (S)</p> <p>Traffic strategies inadequate - especially extending right turn into NMS would not address current traffic let alone traffic from two more residential towers and significantly expanded shopping/transportation (C)</p> <p>Improving transport hub, in particular bus interchange - never seems to used multiple bays/lanes (C)</p> <p>Affordable housing for key workers - 5% not enough (CI)</p> <p>Support urban greening but not if trade-off is taller Built forms (B, CI)</p> <p>Greater setback for trees to grow properly - match south side setback on north side of NSHR (CI)</p> <p>Wide treed avenue coming up from Rushcutters Bay would be wonderful welcome to Woollahra (CI)</p> <p>Congratulate Council for rejecting 45 storeys on Edgecliff Centre (Pin)</p> <p>Control visually intrusive telecom aerials - already mar entry to Woollahra (Pin)</p>

CID	Submitter Type	Type of submission	Issues objection	Issues support	Issues comment	Details
CID167	Individual	Object	Built form; Character; Congestion;			High rise does not enhance character (CH) Higher built forms will bring more cars (C) Object to development proposal for Edgecliff Centre - not sure how you create 20 levels of car parking under current built form - support upgrade (currently eyesore) but not higher built form (B) Don't need additional housing as Woollahra already exceeding housing targets (B)
CID168	Individual	Comment			Built form;	Suggest soundproofing dwellings to address noise impact from the shopping centres (B)
CID169	Individual	Comment			Congestion;	Put draft on hold until effective traffic plan to carry existing and future traffic loads (C) Tunnel under Ocean Street intersection to streamline traffic flow - development levy to offset cost (C)
CID170	Individual	Object	Built form; Congestion; Solar;			Object to 46 storey development and general plans around Edgecliff (B) Congestion, overshadowing and wind tunnel (C,S)
CID171	Agency	Comment	Community infrastructure;			Comments regarding need for school infrastructure
CID172	Group	Object	Built form; Character; Community infrastructure; Congestion; Parking;			Darling Point Society Lack definitive details and specific objectives of what is sought to be achieved (B) ECC Strategy should not be considered until the Minster's Urban Design Principles are released in early 2022 (B) Series of random spot rezonings and proposed redevelopments (B) Cumulative adverse impact of proposed future developments demands further public consultation and revision of the strategy with legitimate and professional assessment Need clarification on exclusion of Eastpoint, urban design criteria for building envelopes, community infrastructure, solar access, heritage conservation, built form principles (B) Alternate development models should be analysed such as 4-6 storey with 3:1 FSR (B) Certain to create severe over capacity for the road network, in terms of traffic flow and inadequate parking for both residents and visitors to the commercial sites (C, P)