

## Appendix D – Community Engagement Summary Table

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
City of Sydney Council (CoS)	Virtual meeting on 18 May 2022 between Project Team and CoS's Planning Team	This initial meeting provided the Project Team with an opportunity to brief CoS on the Project and discuss the planning approval pathway.	N/A
	Virtual meeting on 20 June 2022 between Project Team and various CoS Departments including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning;</li> <li>Urban Design; and</li> <li>Heritage</li> </ul>	<u>Facades</u> : The current scheme as proposed incorporates several materials and textures that overcomplicate the facade. The development should consider simplicity in refined design and the use of high-quality materials to achieve the requirements of design excellence in the <i>Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (SLEP 2012)</i> . It is recommended that the design reduces the number of materials used, particularly along the Burrows Road frontage.	The facades of the development and proposed materials have been refined in response to the feedback from CoS. Revised elevations were provided to CoS on 2 September for further review.  The design excellence provisions of the SLEP 2012 are addressed in the EIS and Design Statement.
	Letter dated 13 July 2022 provided by CoS summarising issues discussed during pre-lodgement meeting.	<u>Visual impact</u> : In regard to bulk and scale, further consideration should be given to the siting of the ancillary buildings along the northern boundary of the site. If possible, the pump room and fire sprinkler tanks should be swapped to improve views to the site from Burrows Road.	The pump room and sprinkler tanks have been swapped as recommended by CoS.
		<u>Traffic and parking</u> : Based on the documentation provided for consideration on 9 June 2022, no major issues are raised with the proposal in regard to transport planning.	Noted
		For the deliveries using semi-trailers, any future application will need to be accompanied by documentation showing the swept paths entering, travelling through and exiting the site.	A full swept path analysis accompanies the Traffic and Accessibility Impact Assessment (TIA).
		The application will need to demonstrate that the driveway widths are sufficient for manoeuvres entering and exiting the site via	Swept paths for access to the site via Campbell Road accompany the TIA.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		<p>Campbell Road and that there are sufficient clearances from the building envelope and from any vehicles parked at the rear of site. If there is any impact to on-street parking, a Traffic Management Plan is required to be prepared to allow the semi-trailers to access the site.</p>	<p>CoS's comment regarding the Traffic Management Plan is acknowledged and will be addressed accordingly if required.</p>
		<p>The on-site car and bicycle parking for staff and visitors must comply with the corresponding SLEP 2012 and <i>Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP 2012)</i> requirements.</p>	<p>A total of 35 car spaces are proposed. The proposed development will not exceed the maximum number of car spaces for industry pursuant to Clause 7.8 of the SLEP 2012.</p> <p>The proposed bicycle parking complies with the SDCP 2012. A total of 24 bicycle spaces are proposed based on a maximum of 32 staff on-site.</p>
		<p><u>Waste collection</u>: The building design must also consider the provision of an on-site loading area for day-to-day servicing and waste collection.</p>	<p>A dedicated loading area for deliveries and waste collection is proposed adjacent to the fire services pump room.</p> <p>The Waste Management Plan (<b>WMP</b>) addresses and complies the <i>City of Sydney Guidelines For Waste Management In New Developments 2018</i>.</p>
		<p><u>Contributions</u>: In accordance with Section 2.1 of the City of Sydney Development Contributions Plan 2015, the method of calculation is based on the maximum workforce occupancy rate per square metre of gross floor area and there is no opportunity to vary the calculation method.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p><u>Wayfinding</u>: Consideration should be given to wayfinding within the site, particularly for pedestrian entering the site directly for Burrows Road, staff and visitors entering via the rear carpark and cyclists</p>	<p>A Wayfinding Strategy accompanies the Architectural Plans.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		being directed into secure bicycle parking and end of journey facilities.	
		<p><u>Signage</u>: Must comply with the requirements of the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012. Any proposed business signage should consider the relevant requirements in the DCP, particularly regarding illuminated signage, business identification signage and top of building signs.</p>	<p>The proposed signage on the building is documented in the signage plans. The signage generally complies with the SDCP 2012 and an assessment in accordance with the advertising and signage provisions of <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021</i> is provided at <b>Appendix C</b>.</p>
		<p><u>Landscaping and trees</u>: CoS encourages the retention of any mature and healthy trees on site. Any tree removal or works near existing trees should be supported by an arborist report. Additionally, any landscaping of the site should be designed in accordance with CoS's Sydney Landscape Code.</p>	<p>The proposal requires the removal of the following trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Four street trees to accommodate the two vehicle access points. Whilst none of these trees are of high retention value, we note that one is considered of medium retention value.</li> <li>▪ Two trees within the north-west corner of the site. These trees are low or medium retention value.</li> <li>▪ Two trees towards near the southern (rear) boundary of the site. These trees are both identified as Environmental Pest/Noxious Weed and a priority for removal.</li> </ul>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		<p>The 10m foreshore setback from Alexandra Canal should ideally be embellished with native trees with generous canopy coverage complemented with native grass species that have low levels of maintenance and ability to sustain extreme climatic conditions. Further, the positioning of the trees should be sited as far back from the canal edge to allow any future cycleway and pedestrian link that is ultimately envisaged to occur along its banks.</p>	<p>An Aboricultural Impact Assessment accompanies the EIS and details the condition of the existing trees to be removed.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping has had regard to CoS's Landscape Code and includes the following as shown on the landscape concept plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Subject to approval by CoS, three new street trees are proposed along the Burrows Road frontage.</li> <li>▪ The replacement tree planting equates to a ratio of approximately 5:1.</li> <li>▪ Deep soil equates to 18.5% of the site area.</li> <li>▪ Canopy tree cover of 15% of the site area will be achieved within 10 years.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed landscaping within the foreshore setback is documented in the Landscape Plans that accompany the State Significant Development Application (<b>SSDA</b>). The landscape design makes provision for a future cycle and pedestrian link along the canal banks.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		<p>From a landscaping point of view, this portion of the site should ideally be embellished with native trees with generous canopy coverage complemented with native grass species that have low levels of maintenance and ability to sustain extreme climatic conditions. Further, the positioning of the trees should be sited as far back from the canal edge to allow any future cycleway and pedestrian link that is ultimately envisaged to occur along its banks.</p>	<p>CoS's recommendations have been addressed in the Landscape Plans that accompany the SSDA.</p>
	<p>Virtual meeting on 26 July 2022 between the CoS Social Strategy Team and Urbis' Community Planning Team.</p>	<p>Discussions held to inform the preparation of the SIA. This included gaining an understanding of the local community and any potential social impacts or considerations from CoS's Representatives perspective and what potential measures could be used to enhance positive impacts and manage negative impacts.</p> <p>Key themes discussed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Environmental sustainability</u>: including an opportunity for solar power generation.</li> <li>▪ <u>Community education</u>: Potential for traineeship or community education about the project and future operations.</li> <li>▪ <u>Innovation</u>: The proposed use being appropriate for this area. There is a desire for increased tech and innovation within the City of Sydney, and this site will be a contributor.</li> <li>▪ <u>Traffic and transport</u>: public and active transport access to and from the site and the availability of parking.</li> </ul>	<p>These matters have been addressed in the SIA that accompanies the SSDA.</p>
	<p>Email correspondence from CoS on 16 August 2022.</p>	<p>CoS to provide further information on the restrictive covenant associated with the landscaped setback to Alexandra Canal.</p>	<p>The Landscape Plans have been prepared having regard to the recommended spacings and species.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		Replacement planting for street trees a should be proposed in accordance with the <i>City of Sydney Street Tree Master Plans 2011</i> and be supported by an arborist report.	
	Virtual meeting on 9 September 2022 between Project Team and various CoS Departments including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Planning;</li> <li>▪ Urban Design;</li> <li>▪ Tree Management;</li> <li>▪ Landscape;</li> <li>▪ Public Domain;</li> <li>▪ Water Assets; and</li> <li>▪ Waste.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Waste</u>: Requirements for waste storage areas.</li> </ul>	Required waste storage areas have been addressed in the WMP that accompanies the SSDA.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Substations</u>: Consider opportunities to incorporate within the design.</li> </ul>	The substation design and location is dependent on the technical specifications from Ausgrid. The substations have been set back behind the front building line and views of the substations from the public domain will be filtered by the landscaping within the front setbacks.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Landscape</u>: CoS generally agreed that the proposed planting scheme and landscape setback are acceptable. Canopy that falls outside of the site cannot be included in 15% canopy cover.</li> </ul>	The tree canopy cover satisfies the 15% requirement as specified in the SDCP 2012.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Facades</u>: Further modulation of Burrows Road frontage required to break up length of development.</li> </ul>	The design has been further refined and modulated to address the length of Burrows Road façade.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Stormwater</u>: Further consultation with CoS is required to discuss the drainage system.</li> </ul>	The applicant has undertaken further consultation with CoS to reach in-principle agreement on the proposed stormwater management system.
	Email correspondence between CoS's Public Domain and Water Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Request to build over existing easement / pipe</u></li> </ul>	The stormwater management system has been refined in consultation with CoS and is

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	Teams and LOGOS on 13 September 2022.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The easement terms require CoS approval of any build over.</li> <li>- Although there is currently part of an existing building over the easement, the form of the existing building is different (open portal frame ancillary building) and does not significantly impede access to the pipe as the proposed new building would.</li> <li>- The pipe services a trapped low point on Burrows Road and is a critical asset; where a more accessible route for this pipe is available it should be taken.</li> <li>▪ <u>Proposed realignment of CoS pipe through the western edge of the site</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The section of the realigned pipe running parallel to Burrows Road should be located under the kerb in Burrows Road where possible. This will increase maintenance accessibility, reduce the area of the site burdened by the easement and allow more deep soil space in the building setback for screening planting.</li> <li>- Proposed easement shall comply with the Sydney Streets Technical Specification.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <u>Flood risk</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flood model results currently show shallow overland flow through the site below the 150mm depth threshold mapped in the reports on the City's website.</li> <li>- The flood impact assessment of the proposal shall consider the change in site levels and the realignment to the pipe draining Burrows Road. Flood modelling shall be used to demonstrate compliance with the City's Interim Floodplain Management Policy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>documented in the Civil Plans that accompany the SSDA.</p> <p>The Flood Assessment included within the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan includes flood modelling and demonstrates compliance the CoS <i>Interim Floodplain Management Policy</i>.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
Environment and Heritage Branch	Email correspondence between Anne Clements & Associates and DPE on 21 and 26 September 2022.	<p>The BDAR Waiver was submitted to DPE for consideration.</p> <p>At the time of preparing the EIS, a response from the Environment and Heritage Branch had not been received.</p>	None at this time.
Heritage NSW	<p>Telephone call between Artefact and Heritage NSW on 24 August 2022</p> <p>Email correspondence between Artefact and Heritage NSW on 16 September 2022.</p>	<p>Heritage NSW confirmed that once the SSD documentation is lodged with DPE, it will be referred to Heritage NSW for review and comments would be included in the SEARs.</p> <p>The following supplementary information or clarifications were recommended as part of the SSDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SoHI, including archaeological assessments (historical and Aboriginal).</li> <li>▪ Confirmation of the location of the existing second stormwater outlet</li> <li>▪ Photographs of the existing stormwater outlets</li> <li>▪ Explanation for why a larger diameter pipe is required for the new outlet compared to the existing outlet pipes (525mm diameter vs 450mm diameter)</li> <li>▪ Explanation of the term ‘birdmouthing’ on section in drawing CO14585.00-DA47-A.</li> </ul>	<p>In response to the matters raised by Heritage NSW, the following responses were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A SoHI accompanies the SSDA.</li> <li>▪ The location of the existing stormwater outlets will be shown in the architectural plans.</li> <li>▪ Photographs of the existing stormwater outlets will be included in the EIS and SoHI, and were provided to Heritage NSW.</li> <li>▪ The larger pipe size is to ensure the same hydraulic conveyance capacity as the existing system when accounting for the longer length of pipe, and the additional changes in direction. These differences reduce the overall conveyance capacity and if the pipe diameter remains at 450mm it would result in adverse impacts to the street drainage system.</li> <li>▪ The term is “bird-mouthing”. It refers to the condition where the pipe is not cut off</li> </ul>



Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
			flush to the wall resulting in the pipe projecting proud of the wall like a “bird-mouth”. The design ensures the pipe is flush to the face of the wall for conveyance and aesthetic reasons.
Sydney Water	Email correspondence between Sydney Water and Costin Roe Consulting dated 28 June 2022	<p>Sydney Water confirmed that on-site detention is not required for any development at 28 – 30 Burrows Road, Alexandria.</p> <p>The applicant is in the process of preparing an Out of Scope Works application to Sydney Water.</p>	Consultation with Sydney Water is ongoing regarding the proposed works in the vicinity of Alexandra Canal.
TfNSW	Email correspondence between TfNSW and Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd dated 5 September 2022	<p>TfNSW advised that there do not appear to be any significant traffic and parking concerns noting the traffic generation and location of the site on a regional classified road.</p> <p>TfNSW advised that internal review was ongoing given proximity to WestConnex.</p>	LOGOS Development Management and Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd ( <b>CBRK</b> ) have undertaken consultation with TfNSW. Matters raised by TfNSW have been incorporated into the TIA for the proposed development.
	Email correspondence between TfNSW and Colston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd dated 21 September 2022	<p>TfNSW reviewed the material and advised that the proposed application has a negligible impact to the surrounding classified road network. As such, TfNSW has no requirements for the application.</p> <p>The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including, driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements in relation to landscaping and/or fencing, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1- 2004, AS2890.6-2009 and AS 2890.2-2018 for heavy vehicle usage.</p>	The car parking areas will comply with the relevant Australian Standards as required and is documented in the TIA.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
NSW Fire & Rescue	None	It is expected that the SSDA will be provided NSW Fire & Rescue as part of the formal public exhibition process. Any issues raised by the agency will be addressed as part of the Response to Submissions.	The applicant is committed to working with NSW Fire & Rescue to address any matters raised following the public exhibition process.
Ausgrid	New connection application submitted to Ausgrid on 28 March 2022  Design Related Serviced Offer provided by Ausgrid on 30 March 2022	Ausgrid has confirmed that three chamber substations are likely to be required for the proposed development in accordance with current network standards.	Consultation with Ausgrid regarding the connection will be ongoing as part of the next phase of detailed design.
Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council (MLALC)	On-site meeting on 1 June 2022.  Consultation as documented in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR)	The MLALC is a RAP for the Project and were provided with the proposed Aboriginal heritage assessment methodology and draft ACHAR as part of the consultation process.  No specific issues were raised by MLALC.	None.
Surrounding owners and occupier	Letter box drop to surrounding properties coordinated by Urbis' Engagement Team	At the time of preparing the EIS, one response was received from a neighbour, who requested further consultation regarding an existing sewer easement on the adjoining property.	The applicant is committed to working together with adjoining property owners and Sydney Water to determine an appropriate sewer solution.  The applicant will continue to reach out to surrounding local landowners, businesses and stakeholders as the project progresses.