

Appendix E - Schedule of Design Guide Changes

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
DPHI Comments		
Setbacks	The amended DG seeks to swap upper -level setbacks with new “street wall ” provisions. While the Rezoning Report states that taller elements of buildings will be set back behind the street walls, it is not clear how the DG will achieve this. The DG should be updated to be clear on how buildings will differentiate the street walls and taller building elements	Figure 13a has been added to the Revised Design Guide (refer to Appendix D) to introduce upper-level setbacks along George Street. Section 4.3.1.2 of the RtS Report provides a detailed assessment of the proposed control. In response to comments received from TfNSW, Figure 13 has also been updated to increase the setback to McEvoy Street for buildings located in Blocks 9 and 10. Refer to Section 4.1.1.4 of the Rts Report.
Retail	The Department is supportive of the future retail mix to provide affordable options for lower -income households such as low -cost food retailers, second -hand retail, and community or not -for -profit operators. To support the delivery of these outcomes, the Department requests that clear provisions and implementation mechanisms be incorporated into the DG.	The Revised Design Guide does not amend controls relating to the retail mix when compared to the 2022 Design Guide. It is noted that the Design Guide already includes provisions at Section 3.1.1(4), Section 3.1.1(6), Section 5.3.3(1), Section 5.3.3(2)(b) and Section 5.3.3(5) to ensure that a diverse range of retail uses are provided to support the local area, particularly with respect to George Street. Additionally, as outlined in the Social Impact Response Letter (refer to Appendix H), a Retail Strategy is being prepared which will ensure long-term affordable retail and service options are provided within the precinct. This requirement will be embedded within the SIA and has therefore now been adopted within the Revised Design Guide. The future retail mix will be determined subject to market demand.
Social impact	A key response identified in the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) is to achieve a tenure -blind approach to the built form within the precinct. To support this outcome, the Department requests clear provisions and implementation mechanisms be incorporated into the DG.	The Revised Design Guide continues to include references to a tenure blind design approach throughout its objectives and principles (refer to Principle 3.1.2(8), Objective 5(g) and Objective 8.12(e)). No change is proposed to the 2022 Design Guide in this regard, and the project will continue to demonstrate that irrespective of tenure, all residential development will be of high quality. Accordingly, no additional provisions are proposed beyond what was included in the 2022 Design Guide.

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
Flexibility	The updated DG introduces additional qualifying wording such as 'where possible' to provisions such as sections 7.1 and 8.5.3. While the Department acknowledges this seeks to add flexibility, the DG already has provisions that allow for this under Section 1.7. The Department considers these changes to be superfluous and recommends Homes NSW removes this additional wording to maintain clarity and consistency in the document.	The Revised Design Guide has been updated to remove 'where possible' wording that was introduced by the Rezoning Proposal and Concept SSDA.
Deep Soil	The revised DG's deep soil mapping proposes deep soil above areas mapped for basements. Areas above basements are generally not considered to be deep soil areas. The Department requests clarification on how these deep soil outcomes would be achieved in practice. It is also noted that, as the proposal seeks both rezoning and concept approval, consistency is required between the DG, the Concept Plan and any future detailed development applications. The Department recommends that the deep soil mapping be reviewed and refined to ensure it accurately reflects achievable outcomes and aligns consistently across all approval stages. The Department also recommends further consideration be given to planting in through - site links.	To avoid confusion, references to deep soil have been removed from the Concept SSDA Envelopes prepared by SJB (refer to Appendix C). Figure 16 of the Revised Design Guide (refer to Appendix D) includes a varied legend so that the colouring between deep soil and planting on structure is more clearly differentiated. Aspect Studios has confirmed that no deep soil zones are proposed on top of basements (refer to Appendix G). There was a minor discrepancy between the deep soil percentage provisions within Table 5 of the Revised Design Guide and the Public Domain and Landscaping Report submitted with the EIS. Section 4.3.7.3 of the RtS Report explores this matter in more detail. It is however noted that Table 5 of the Revised Design Guide has been updated as part of this submission to reflect the figures as provided within the Public Domain and Landscaping Report (Appendix G of the EIS).
Heritage	The updated DG seek to remove requirements to step development down to heritage items. The Department recommends this clause be retained to ensure adequate transition between developments and heritage items, noting part 1.7 of the DG allows for a flexible approach	The Department's comments regarding the transition between new development and heritage items are noted. Section 3.1.2(4) of the Revised Design Guide has been drafted to allow for a stepped transition between taller buildings and heritage items, while retaining flexibility in how an appropriate transition is achieved.
Through-site link	The Department understands Homes NSW is redesigning block 8 to reintroduce a southern through -site link to improve permeability and address CPTED concerns. The Department supports this approach and requests the through -site link to be reinstated and reflected consistently across the DG and Concept Plan.	An additional north/south through-site link is proposed between Buildings 8AB1 and 8AB2 to improve the permeability of the site and reduce the potential entrapment point to the south of Cooper Place. Figures 4, 6 and 9 and Table 4 of the Revised Design Guide have been updated accordingly. Section 4.3.6.1 of the RtS Report addresses this matter in further detail.

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
City of Sydney	The updated DG seeks to amend requirements on street design, including Sections 7.1 and 7.3. The City has raised concerns with these changes and has provided detailed comments on the DG more broadly. The Department recommends that Homes NSW work collaboratively with the City to address these concerns and ensure any proposed amendments are acceptable.	Table 2 has been updated within the Revised Design Guide to reflect the street design as agreed with the City of Sydney Public Infrastructure Working Group. A response to each of the matters raised by the City of Sydney with respect to Street Design have been addressed within the Addendum Public Domain and Landscape Report prepared by Aspect Studios (refer to Appendix G).
City of Sydney Comments		
3. Urban Strategy		
Figure 2	Add legend to figure	No change is proposed. It is noted that the absence of a legend is consistent with the matching Figure included within the 2022 Design Guide.
4. Staging and Implementation		
Figure 4	An easement is to be shown at the south of Block 8A from the small park to an adjoining street to address flooding and reduce the risk of entrapment. This is suggested in Figure 151 of the Public Domain and Landscape Report. All other relevant figures in the Design Guide are also to be updated.	The Public Access which was shown between Buildings 8AB1 and 8AB2 in Figure 151 of the Public Domain and Landscape Report has been included as a through-site link in response to the City's feedback. This has been updated throughout the Revised Design Guide (Figures 4, 6 and 9 and Table 4) and within the relevant supporting documentation. Section 4.3.6.1 of the RTS Report also details the provision of the additional through-site link.
4.2(2)(c)	Include 'educational establishments' in discussion of distribution of non-residential floor space.	This has been added to the Revised Design Guide (refer to Appendix D), as also referenced by the Concept SSDA.
5. Land Use		
Figure 5	Reinstate 'Park' to legend	This has been added to the Revised Design Guide (refer to Appendix D).
5.3.4	Reinstate requirement of active frontages to be consistent with Active Frontage controls of SDCP 2012	Clause 7.27 Active Street Frontages of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 (the LEP) includes site specific provisions relating to active street frontages. It is noted the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (the DCP) limits the proposed uses that are counted as "active". It is therefore proposed to delete this provision to enable further uses to be provided on the site, beyond what is identified within the DCP, consistent with Clause 7.27 of the LEP. Therefore, no further changes to the submitted Revised Design Guide are proposed in this regard.
7. Public Space		
7.1(1)	Deletion of "City of Sydney" and inclusion of "prepared by Aspect Studios dated February 2026" is not supported. This is not consistent	The Public Domain Concept Plans have been developed in coordination with the Public Infrastructure Working Group (PIWG) as required by the

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
	with the requirements of the VPA. While the VPA sets out a process for a to develop the design of the roads, any design is to be consistent with the City Design Guide and specifically with the City of Sydney Waterloo Estate (South) Public Domain Concept Plans referred to in that document. It is understood a Public Infrastructure Working Group has been established to guide the development of the design.	VPA. The post-Concept SSDA submission PIWG technical review package is included as Appendix G for further reference. The Waterloo South Road Design Process Map within the VPA does not include any design by the PIWG, rather a role to provide recommendations and advice. The PIWG reviews and meetings undertaken by the project team have been outlined in Appendix G. Furthermore, as per the VPA, the City of Sydney will prepare public domain and civil concept plans for each park. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the Design Guide to reference the Public Domain Concept Plans prepared by Aspect Studios as they reflect the outcomes of the PIWG. The Revised Design Guide has been updated to reference the date of the revised Public Domain Concept Plans submitted with this Response (refer to Appendix G).
7.3.2(3)	The inclusion of the proposed wording implies that any changed traffic arrangements would be at the City's or TfNSW's cost. If the parties agree to these changes in a timely manner, the works should be incorporated with other public domain works. Text change suggested from "left turn into George Street" to "left-in/ left-out arrangement at George Street" which reflects the City's intention to pursue with Transport for NSW in ongoing discussions.	Control 7.3.2 (3) has been updated within the Revised Design Guide from "options for a left turn into George Street" to "options for a left-in/ left-out arrangement at George Street" to reflect the City's intention to pursue the opening with Transport for NSW in ongoing discussions.
Figures 8(a) – (h)	Replacement of street section drawings not supported. Drawings should include context of adjoining buildings from ground to at least two storeys above street wall. Proposed drawings fail to communicate any information relevant to building design or assist in understanding the quality of the public domain. All typical building sections must be reintroduced, accounting for known flood planning levels, privacy provisions at ground level. This is to ensure the Design Guide clearly informs the desired built outcome. Include John Street section (with noted amendments)	The 2022 Design Guide drawings included adjoining buildings as contextual information only and were not intended to represent the focus of the sections. The revised street section drawings are located within Section 7.3 – Street, pedestrian and cycle network, and are primarily intended to illustrate the proposed street environment, including road geometry, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, and the relationship between the public domain elements. An additional street cross section for John Street has been included in the Revised Design Guide at Figure 8(i) (refer to Appendix D).

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
		In response to feedback received from the City of Sydney and the PIWG, the street cross sections for Wellington Street and Cooper Street North have been updated, in addition to the street specifications in Table 2. Further consideration has also been given to ensuring the Design Guide appropriately communicates key design outcomes, including the relationship between the public domain and adjoining development, flood planning requirements, and privacy considerations (refer to Appendix D).
Figure 9	Add notation at intersection of George /McEvoy Streets “Potential left-in/ left-out”	Figure 9 of the Revised Design Guide has also been updated to include the notation “possible future left-in/ left-out arrangement at George Street” to enable flexibility in the future should the opening of George Street be pursued.
7.3.4	Add through-site link from small park to George/McEvoy as per discussion in Figure 4 above. Table to be updated to include details of additional through-site link.	Figures 4, 6 and 9 and Table 4 have been updated in the revised Design Guide (refer to Appendix D).
7.4	Include canopy cover targets: • 15% in private property • 70% within streets • 55% within neighbourhood parks • 70% within pocket parks	No changes have been proposed to the 2022 Design Guide in this section of the Revised Design Guide, and no further changes are proposed. Aspect Studios have prepared a response to this item within the Addendum Public Domain and Landscape Report (refer to Appendix G). This is also further explored within Section 4.3.7.2 of the RtS Report.
8. Building layout, form and design		
General objectives	Include requirement to achieve apartment mix described in the SDCP 2012	The requirement to achieve the apartment mix specified in the SDCP 2012 has not been included in the Revised Design Guide, as the final dwelling mix will be determined through the detailed design of each block and should retain sufficient flexibility to respond to market demand, social and affordable housing needs and site-specific design considerations.
8.2(4)	Deletion not supported. Communal open space and associated structures and lifts are to be compliant with height controls.	The Rezoning Proposal has been updated to remove the request to amend Clause 7.29(6) to allow communal open space and associated structures to be excluded from the maximum building height controls. As such, communal open space and associated structures are required to be within the maximum building heights established by Clause 4.3 of the LEP. The Revised Design Guide continues to delete provision 8.2(4) as it would duplicate the definition of building height as established by the Sydney

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
		LEP 2012, which measures the maximum building height to the highest point of the building.
8.3	- Reinstate 'Upper level setback' definition. - Removal of all references to upper level setbacks above street wall heights are not supported. Reinstate controls to upper level setbacks and relevant figures. All relevant drawings throughout the Design Guide should be updated to include built forms with these setbacks.	The definition of upper-level setback has been reinstated, and a reference has been added to refer to the additional Figure which outlines the proposed upper-level setbacks along George Street.
	Add provision that awnings and colonnades must be designed in accordance with the relevant design provisions of the SDCP 2012.	This provision has not been adopted, noting that no equivalent requirement was included in the 2022 Design Guide.
8.5.3	Reinstate 'continuous, unbroken'. This design feature is necessary to mitigate noise impacts from McEvoy Street	The amended wording and associated controls achieve the intended acoustic mitigation outcome while providing greater flexibility to deliver an improved built form.
8.11(1) and (4)	Deletion not supported	The deletion of this wording is supported by an Addendum Acoustic Impacts Letter (refer to Appendix O). Section 4.3.3.4 of the RtS Report further expands upon the acoustic amenity within the precinct.
8.12 General	Amendments to this section are not supported. Comments below are in response to existing approved Design Guide	The provisions relating to design excellence within the Revised Design Guide reflect the provisions within the Design Excellence Strategy that supports the Rezoning Proposal (refer to Appendix N of the EIS).
8.12.1(3) – (5)	8.12.1(3) – (5) Replace these provisions with confirmation that no bonuses are applicable to any site.	It is appropriate to update the 2022 Design Guide provisions to reflect the proposed strategy submitted with the concurrent Rezoning Proposal
8.12.2	8.12.2 The standalone Design Excellence Strategy should not be approved or endorsed, and all design excellence strategy	
8.12.2 (1) – (4)	(refer to Appendix 1 of CoS submission)	
Figure 20 (existing)	Retain image	
8.1.2(5) Retain existing provision (5) relating to ESD and renumber to (12)	8.1.2(5) Retain existing provision (5) relating to ESD and renumber to (12)	This provision is retained as 8.12.2(8).
9. Transport, movement and parking		
9.1	- Include reference that the provision of loading spaces must be consistent with TfNSW's Urban Freight Forecasting Model - Include a requirement that bicycle parking must be provided within developments in accordance with the SDCP 2012	This has not been included in the Revised Design Guide. It is noted that the Concept SSDA meets the minimum recommendations of the TfNSW Freight Forecaster as per the Transport Impact Assessment submitted with the EIS.

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
		Section 9.1(1) of the revised Design Guide confirms that Provisions relating to 'Transport and parking' in Sydney DCP 2012 apply to Waterloo Estate (South).
10. Urban ecology		
Provisions	- Canopy cover targets as per comment in Section 7.4 - Include minimum soil volume targets	No changes have been proposed to the 2022 Design Guide in this section of the Revised Design Guide, and no further changes are proposed. Aspect Studios have prepared a response to this item within the Addendum Public Domain and Landscape Report (refer to Appendix G). This is also further explored within Section 4.3.7.2 of the RtS Report.
11. Environmentally sustainable development		
11.2.2	Include a provision that all blocks must be designed to accommodate the City of Sydney's standard waste collection vehicle size (10.6m) and a minimum vertical clearance of 4m	No additional provisions to be included in the Revised Design Guide, however as detailed in Section 4.3.5 of the RtS Report, the Concept SSDA has allowed for 10.6m waste collection vehicles, and as such provides the necessary clearances and swept paths.
12. Stormwater and flood management		
Figure 19 (previously Figure 22)	- Replace reference to 'Bioswale' with 'Raingarden' - Raingardens should be shown on both the northern and southern sides of John Street - Raingardens require further analysis and design development (eg topographical, hydrological, water quality etc). It is assumed that a better outcome would be to disperse the raingarden WSUD elements throughout the precinct to correspond to different catchment areas of each street - Overland flow path arrow shown between 8A and 8C from the intersection of George and McEvoy Streets is not possible given the building footprint abuts the Ausgrid substation. This causes extra flooding on the substation lot which is against Objective (b) of Section 12 Stormwater and flood management - Include reference to possible detention basin in new park	The legend associated with Figure 19 has been updated to include raingarden instead of bioswale. To ensure consistency with the PIWG coordinated Public Domain package (refer to Appendix G) rain gardens are shown on both the northern and southern sides of John Street within Figure 19. Detailed design of raingardens will occur as part of the future detailed SSDAs. It is assumed the city are referring to the overland flow path between Building 8AB3 and the Ausgrid substation. The detailed design of Building 8AB3 will ensure that overland flow paths can be maintained in accordance with relevant stormwater and flooding principles (refer to Section 4.3.9 of the RtS Report). No detention basin is proposed within the new park (refer to Section 4.3.9.3 of the RtS Report).

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
Applicant Led Changes		
Figure 3 – Street blocks and building lots	Re-label Block 2G as Block 2C.	Reason for update This was updated in the Urban Design Report submitted with the EIS however was not translated into the Revised Design Guide.
Figure 6 – Active frontages	Update extent of mapped active frontage	Reason for update To ensure consistency between the revised LEP map and the Revised Design Guide. Refer to Section 3.1.1 of the RtS Report.
Figure 13 – Streetwall height	Update legend for yellow represent 8 storeys rather than 4 storeys	Reason for update The submitted Revised Design Guide included yellow as 4 storeys, however this was included in error as all other documentation represented yellow as 8 storeys (refer to the Urban Design Report submitted with the EIS). Accordingly, this amendment seeks to update this inconsistency to ensure the design guide reflects the intended outcome for buildings marked with a yellow maximum street-wall height.
Figure 15 – Roof level communal open space and green roofs	Deletion of communal open space from rooftop of Building 8AB2, southern podium of Building 8AB1 and rooftop of Building 8CB1.	Reason for update This reflects the detailed design development for Stage 1 (Block 8). Further justification is provided in Sections 3.1.2 and 4.3.3.6 of the RtS Report.
Figure 18 – Carpark locations and entries	Additional vehicular entrance points shown within Block 8.	Reason for update This reflects the detailed design development for Stage 1 (Block 8), which has evolved in response to feedback received from the City of Sydney. Following discussions with the Applicant, the City requested that the Block 8 basement be amended to avoid extending beneath Cooper Place, thereby maintaining separation between Blocks 8B and 8C. Accordingly, a new entry is proposed for Block 8B to provide independent access and facilitate the future separation of these basements through subsequent detailed applications.
Figure 19 – Stormwater	Deletion of overland flow paths across through site links within Blocks 9 and 10.	Reason for update This reflects the detailed design development for Stage 1 which has found that due to level changes across the precinct, the through site links will only capture local run off. Overland flow will be captured by the remaining flow paths within the precinct as illustrated in Figure 19.

Topic/Section	Comment	Applicant Response
Section 9.2	Insert control 9.2(15) to provide flexibility to consolidate the proposed car share parking spaces within Block 9.	<i>Reason for update</i> As detailed in the Transport Impact Assessment (refer to Appendix CC of the submitted EIS), retail car parking within the precinct is proposed to be consolidated within Block 9. It is also proposed that the car share parking spaces allocated to each block may be consolidated within the Block 9 basement, as this will be the publicly accessible basement within the precinct.