



Internal Ref: EXTERNAL/2024/0023

7 July 2026

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124

ATTENTION: Ingrid Zhu

Dear Ms Zhu,

Inner West Council Response: SSD-78268465 – Newington College Redevelopment (Concept and Stage 1)

Property: 200-244 Stanmore Road and 221-235 Stanmore Road, Stanmore

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the application for the Newington College Redevelopment (Concept and Stage 1) State Significant Development Application (SSDA).

This letter documents the views of Council officers, not of the elected representatives.

Council is supportive of the school's intention to deliver improved facilities for students, staff and the broader school community. Notwithstanding this support, several aspects of the proposal would benefit from further clarification and/or review, as detailed in Attachment A and summarised below:

- Statutory Context
- Design Quality/Built Form and Urban Design / Visual Impact
- Environmental Amenities
- Trees and Landscaping
- Traffic, Transport and Accessibility
- Noise and Vibration
- Stormwater and Wastewater
- Flooding Risk
- Contamination and Remediation
- Waste Management
- Environmental Heritage
- Contributions and Public Benefit

For ease of reference and where possible, the comments in Attachment A are aligned with the key issue and assessment requirements headings in the issued SEARs.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide further comment on the subject proposal.



If you need any further information in relation to the above response, please contact Council's Team Leader, Development Assessment, Kaitlin Zieme on (02) 9392 5379 or email kaitlin.zieme@innerwest.nsw.gov.au.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ruba Osman".

Ruba Osman

Senior Manager –Development Assessment (Acting)

Enclosed

Attachment A: Consolidated Inner West Council Officer comments



Attachment A - Consolidated Inner West Council Officer comments SSD-78268465 – Newington College Redevelopment (Concept and Stage 1)

Issues and Assessment Requirements

1. Statutory Context

Concept Proposal

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) submitted with the application advises that the only DA approvals of relevance to the SSDA are DA201400370 (approved 19 December 2014) and DA201100141 (approved 18 July 2011). The EIS states in relation to DA201400370 that “The Applicant accepts a condition of consent that requires DA201400370 to be modified in accordance with Section 4.17 of the EP&A Act”. Council seeks confirmation of activation of approval and the conditions which the applicant seeks to have overridden or modified as a result of the proposal.

The subject site has also had a number of other applications approved, such as DA201400369. Council requests clarification on whether these other consents have lapsed. If such consents are active, Council also requests further clarification on the relationship between these consents and the proposed works.

To assist in understanding the cumulative impacts especially to Stanmore Road, Council requests a plan identifying all approved works including unconstructed works or works capable of being carried out under existing consents, to demonstrate the full extent of development that may ultimately occur on the site.

2. Design Quality / Built Form and Urban Design / Visual Impact

Concept - Concordia Building (stage 6)

Further detail and refinement are required to demonstrate that the proposed building envelope and massing of the Concordia building presents as an appropriate design response to the site and its context, including the following:

- a) The concept plans do not adequately present the surrounding context, including site topography, the curvature of Stanmore Road and the presentation of adjoining development. For example, No. 237 Stanmore Road appears to be depicted as a two-and-a-half storey building despite presenting as a single-storey dwelling from the street.
- b) Demonstration that the proposed front setback is consistent with, and responds appropriately to, the established streetscape character of Stanmore Road.
- c) Further refinement of the Stanmore Road pedestrian entry to provide a more inviting and legible arrival experience, including consideration of potential safety and amenity impacts associated with congregation at the Stanmore Road frontage, including the potential for patrons or students to spill onto the footpath and road after events.

- d) Further consideration of the bridge lift design to ensure it is more clearly integrated into the public domain, highly visible and legible as a public facility. In this regard, it is recommended the entry is located closer to the public domain.
- e) Additional context plans, sections and visualisations showing the existing built form and surrounding properties to enable assessment of additional impacts arising from the proposal, particularly in regard to the rear and side setback and massing which adjoins residential properties. Such information should demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in unreasonable additional impacts in terms of visual bulk, outlook, views or amenity when compared with the existing situation.
- f) Further refinement of the proposed scale and massing, having regard to the prevailing two storey character of development along the street and amenity impacts. Particular consideration should also be given to the building edges and interfaces with neighbouring residential land to ensure an appropriate built form transition.
- g) Confirmation is requested as to whether the existing telecommunications tower will be retained or removed as part of the proposed redevelopment.

Stage 1 - Sevington Building

Further detail and refinement is required to demonstrate that the proposed detailed design of the Sevington Building represents an appropriate design response to the site and its context, including:

- a) Further refinement of the school's interface with Stanmore Road is required to better integrate with the surrounding streetscape and neighbourhood context. In particular, the northern and eastern elevation of the Sevington Building, which forms the primary façade to Stanmore Road, contains extensive blank wall areas. Given the building will be highly visible from the public domain and read in the round, all visible elevations require further design development to provide a more engaging and welcoming street presence. Greater visual permeability, activation and architectural articulation are required to improve the building's relationship with Stanmore Road and the surrounding public domain, particularly at a pedestrian level.
- b) The submitted materials and finishes schedule does not provide sufficient detail or consistency to confirm the intended final materiality of the building. In particular, discrepancies have been identified between the material schedule, material swatches, architectural elevations and visual representations. This includes the nomination of '03 Terracotta Cladding' to the lower levels and '04 Profiled Aluminium' to the upper level of the Sevington Building, which do not appear to align with the corresponding swatches or are represented inconsistently across the submitted documentation (images below showing three different finishes). Further clarification is required regarding the proposed materials, colours and finishes, including the provision of more realistic swatches and clear differentiation between alternative colour schemes (eg. 05a 05b to distinguish brown or green versions with the specific colour nominated). The cream colour on the corners of the north elevations is not annotated with a material or finish. The materials schedule should be referenced on the corresponding elevations to clearly identify the location and extent of each proposed material and finish.
- c) Further clarification is required on the screening structure to the rooftop courts. It is unclear if the materiality is 07 or 11 or a mixture of both. Further, there appears to be

INNER WEST

an angled detail to the corner of the courts which is unclear if it's a brace or chamfered edged or a change in materiality. Consideration should be given to increasing the setback of the screening structure from the Stanmore Road frontage to reduce any perceived visual bulk.

- d) Justification or refinement regarding the height of the roof plant structure on top of the Sevington Building.
- e) Clarification is required regarding the Stage 1 temporary car park and the proposed restoration of the site following completion of Stage 1. In particular, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate what mechanisms are to be relied upon to ensure the temporary car park will be removed and the tennis courts and landscaping reinstated. Nor have any drawings been provided showing what the reinstated courts, fencing and landscaping will look like. A restoration plan and associated drawings is requested to confirm the final site layout and that a condition is imposed requiring all temporary works (such as the carpark) be removed prior to the occupation of the Sevington Building.



North elevation dwg 01-3101 rev 4 (page 14 of Appendix C Architectural Plans - Stage 1 - Part 1)



Viewpoint 05 photomontage (page 30 of Appendix W Visual Impact Assessment)



View from Stanmore Road (page 30 of Appendix M Architectural Design Report - Part 4)

3. Environmental Amenity

Concept - Concordia Building (stage 6)

It is noted that the EIS includes 9am and 3pm winter solstice shadow diagrams of the proposed Concordia building and states that hourly shadow diagrams are provided in Appendix M. However, the hourly shadow diagrams for the Concordia building cannot be located, only the shadow studies for the Sevington and College Lane buildings. Further, the shadow diagrams do not appear to accurately represent the built forms at 215-219 Stanmore Road (with no. 219 not shown at all) and do not include shadows from neighbouring properties, particularly of concern from 22 Holt Street. Amended shadow diagrams are imperative to understand the cumulative impacts to 215-219 Stanmore Road and the acceptability of the Concordia Building envelope under the concept proposal.

4. Trees and Landscaping

Stage 1 - Sevington Building

Further detail is required to demonstrate that tree retention and canopy objectives are achievable in practice and over the long term. The following comments are provided regarding tree management are to be addressed:

- a) The current documentation does not clearly demonstrate how the fig trees within the Sevington forecourt will be protected in a real-world construction scenario. In particular, inconsistencies remain between the arboricultural, civil, landscape and architectural documentation regarding TPZ and SRZ requirements, and insufficient detail has been provided regarding construction methodologies within or adjacent to root protection areas. Further justification is also required to demonstrate that the proposed forecourt design, including hardstand areas, services and pedestrian activity, will not adversely affect the health and longevity of the trees. As submitted, the long-term retention of the fig trees has not been satisfactorily demonstrated.

- b) Further information is requested demonstrating that the location of the Stage 1 Substation/Electrical kiosk behind Parsonage Building has been fully considered and results in acceptable impacts. Specifically:
 - Associated service trenching has the potential to introduce further disturbance within planting areas and root zones
 - There is no clear indication that cable routing has been aligned with hard infrastructure to avoid impacts to tree planting zones
 - The implications of these works for long-term tree establishment and viability
- c) Further information is requested demonstrating how the proposed construction methodology can be practically implemented while ensuring the long-term retention of existing and proposed trees. Insufficient information has been provided regarding the accommodation of large plant and equipment, including cranes, the movement of demolition and delivery vehicles, and the location of temporary loading, laydown and site establishment areas within a constrained site environment. In particular, it has not been demonstrated how these activities can occur without encroaching into Tree Protection Zones, deep soil areas or planting zones, or otherwise compromising tree retention and establishment objectives. Further arboricultural input is required to demonstrate that construction access, equipment movement, material storage and tree protection measures can be effectively integrated into the Construction Management Plan and maintained throughout all stages of construction.
- d) Further information is requested demonstrating that the cumulative impacts of pruning, root loss, excavation, remediation, service installation and construction activities can be accommodated without adversely affecting the long-term health and viability of retained trees. While the proposed pruning and root impacts may be acceptable in isolation, insufficient information has been provided regarding the extent and location of proposed pruning works, the specific branches affected, and whether alternative construction methodologies have been considered to minimise impacts.
- e) Regarding the Stage 1 temporary car park, Council does not typically support the removal of street trees for temporary vehicle access. However, support may be considered where the proposed tree removal forms part of a broader public domain outcome, including the undergrounding of existing overhead electrical infrastructure on Stanmore Road to facilitate the planting and long-term establishment of larger replacement street trees and an improved tree canopy outcome. Further consideration should be given to locating the vehicular entry and exit point at the same location approved under the 2014 consent to minimise unnecessary tree removal and impacts on existing vegetation.
- f) Further information is requested demonstrating that the proposed planting strategy is capable of achieving the intended canopy outcomes. In particular, clarification is needed to distinguish between genuine deep soil and on-structure planting, including the available soil volumes, depths and continuity for individual trees. Further detail should also confirm which trees are located within true deep soil areas and demonstrate that the proposed soil conditions can support the anticipated canopy growth and long-term viability of the planting scheme.
- g) Further information is requested demonstrating that arboricultural considerations have been appropriately integrated into the Remediation Action Plan (RAP) and associated civil design. In particular, insufficient information has been provided regarding the impacts of excavation and soil remediation works within Tree Protection Zones, the potential loss or degradation of viable root zones, and the implications of proposed



service infrastructure on retained trees. Further arboricultural input is required to inform the RAP and civil documentation, and to demonstrate that excavation, remediation and service installation works can be undertaken without compromising the long-term health and retention of existing trees.

- h) Further information is requested demonstrating that tree protection measures have been appropriately coordinated with the construction and operational requirements of the site. In particular, inconsistencies have been identified between the Tree Protection Plan, Construction Waste Management Plan and Operational Waste Management Plan regarding vehicle access and manoeuvring, waste handling, and material storage areas. Further information is required to demonstrate that these functions can be accommodated without encroaching into TPZs, deep soil areas or proposed planting zones. Additional arboricultural review and coordination is recommended to confirm that tree protection measures can be appropriately implemented throughout construction and operation, and that site activities will not adversely affect the long-term health, establishment and retention of existing and proposed trees.
- i) The submitted documentation positively indicates an intention to achieve no net loss of tree canopy over the long term. However, further information is required to clearly demonstrate how the proposed canopy outcomes will be achieved. In particular, additional detail regarding canopy replacement calculations, a comparison of existing and proposed canopy cover, species selection, and planting stock is requested. This should include consideration of 400L stock sizes and larger advanced trees where appropriate to support the establishment of tree canopy across the site.

5. Traffic, Transport and Accessibility

Concept - Pedestrian Bridge (Stage 6)

Council requests that the following recommendations are secured by conditions of consent:

- a) The bridge being open to the public on a 24/7 basis and including a lift on each side connecting to the public footpath to enable safe and equitable use.
- b) Newington College must be responsible for all care and maintenance of the bridge, lifts, lighting, finishes and associated infrastructure, including maintenance obligations must include graffiti removal, dumped items, cleaning, painting, lighting, lift maintenance and repairs.
- c) No advertising, school branding, naming rights, banners, logos or promotional signage should be permitted on the bridge. Only road-safety or wayfinding signage approved by Council and/or TfNSW may be allowed.
- d) The existing pedestrian bridge structure should be upgraded to include pedestrian safety fencing.
- e) The applicant to enter into an airspace lease with Council for the bridge in accordance with Council's Land and Property Policy.

Please note: No pedestrian fencing is supported on the Stanmore Road footpath as part of the bridge works. If access-control treatment is later required, verge planting may be considered.



Concept - Concordia Building Vehicular Access (stage 6)

Council supports the proposed vehicular access arrangement, being entry from Cavendish Street and left-turn-only exit to Stanmore Road. However, it is acknowledged that this arrangement relies on TfNSW approval for the Stanmore Road left-out exit.

Should TfNSW not approve the Stanmore Road left-out exit, Council does not support the proposed basement carparking consisting of 60 spaces in the Concordia stage of the redevelopment. In that circumstance, all vehicle access and exiting would be required via Cavendish Street, resulting in unacceptable impacts associated with the narrow access handle, increased traffic on the local road network, proximity to nearby schools, and pedestrian safety concerns.

Stage 1 - Traffic and Parking Including Temporary Carpark

The results of the on-street parking occupancy surveys given in S8.9 of the Transport & Accessibility Impact Assessment report (dated April 2026) indicate relatively high on-street parking occupancy rates for the streets surveyed. Unfortunately, the surveys tendered to only survey the northern side of the 400m radius requested.

It is appropriate that further extended surveys are undertaken from 7:00am to 8:00pm on a typical Wednesday and Thursday and between 8:00am to 5:00pm Saturday (outside school holiday periods) of all surrounding streets of a 400-metre radius. Survey data is to include a street-by-street detailed inventory of spaces.

Streets to be included are as those surveyed and the following: Marshall Street, Denning Street, William Street, Bright Street, North Street, Middle Street, East Street, England Avenue, Agar Street, Wemyss Street, Harrington Street and Newington Street (between William Street and Middleton Road and between Browns Avenue and Wemyss Street).

Notwithstanding the above additional information, Council requests that the following recommendations are secured by conditions of consent:

- a) A Green Travel Plan is to include reporting progress on targets to Council and corrective actions should be required if targets are not met.
- b) An updated Operational Traffic and Parking Management Plan, including drop-off/pick-up management, event parking, bus operations, waste/servicing times, monitoring, complaint response, corrective actions and reporting to Council.
- c) The temporary staff car park is acceptable only as a temporary construction measure. The temporary access/driveway must be removed when no longer required, with kerb, gutter, footpath and landscaping reinstated.

6. Noise and Vibration

Stage 1 - Sevington Building

The following comments are provided regarding acoustic impacts are to be addressed:

- a) The consultant establishes criteria for noise emissions from Stage 1 (i.e. use of the sporting facilities of Sevington Court). The selected criteria require that the LAeq noise level from use of the facility must not exceed background + 10 during the daytime and evening (7am to 6pm, and 6pm to 10pm) and background + 5 for morning shoulder (6am to 7am). The consultant has drawn the criteria from the old (superseded) EPA Noise Control Manual, which provided guidance that sporting events could be permitted to run past 6pm if they do not exceed the background level by more than 5 dB for new events, and 10dB for existing events. However, the manual also says in the part preceding this that noise control “*usually is most equitably and effectively achieved by regulation of the frequency and duration of events*”. The proposal for the use of the Sevington Court facility is for use every day of the week, throughout the year, and will include both sporting events as well as all-school assemblies and functions. This is different from existing sporting events that might occur occasionally and just want to run later into the evening, where a higher criteria might be considered reasonable given the exposure to the noise is less frequent. This criteria also doesn't reflect the current proposal for the facility to house functions and all school assemblies, in addition to sport events. As such, a background + 10 criteria is considered inappropriate in this situation. A background + 5 limit is considered to be more appropriate, in reflection of the frequency and duration of the noise that the existing receivers will be exposed to in this case.
- b) The concept proposal involves an increase in student numbers associated with the school. The acoustic report does not appear to include any consideration of the noise impact of this increase on existing receivers near the school, though it is certainly possible the increase will have a negligible impact on overall noise levels. Nonetheless, a statement regarding the impact of increased student numbers should be included in the report.
- c) In addition to the detailed Stage 1 proposal, the concept proposal also involves alterations and additions to Centenary Hall and an additional teaching building, as well as development of the Concordia building to accommodate a performance theatre, multi-purpose gallery and exam centre, and new teaching spaces. The submitted Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment has not established overall noise emission criteria for these new/modified teaching and performance spaces that will form part of the proposed future Stages 2 – 6. Rather, the submitted report only seems to establish noise emission criteria for all stages for mechanical plant/equipment. Although it is acknowledged that the specific design of these spaces will be subject to detailed applications at later stages, the acoustic report for the concept plan should at least establish what the cumulative noise emission criteria are for the new school facilities/uses, so that the acoustic assessment for each detailed design stage can be done against this overarching criteria and predictions made at that time as to whether compliance can be achieved. Although some of the spaces (such as the exam centre and gallery) are unlikely to result in adverse noise emission impacts for nearby existing receivers, the teaching spaces and performance theatre (e.g. due to amplified music/voice and audience noise) could result in acoustic impacts. A cumulative criteria should be established in the Noise and Vibration for noise from use of the various proposed performance spaces, teaching spaces, function spaces, and other relevant noise generating uses that comprise Stages 1 – 6 of the concept proposal (other than those already covered by the Noise Policy for Industry criteria). Criteria should be



established at each identified sensitive noise receiver location, and compliance with the criteria should be assessed in the more detailed acoustic assessment for each detailed design stage.

- d) Page 25 of the report explains that noise from the stage 1 Sevington Courts works will be assessment against the long superseded NSW Environmental Noise Control Manual. The sentence explaining this (“These criteria are only relevant to.”) ends mid sentence and as such, clarification is sought on the assessment.

7. Stormwater and Wastewater

Concept – College Lane building (stage 3)

The stormwater strategy is acceptable in principle, subject to the following stormwater management matters being addressed:

- a) Detailed stormwater design is required for the College Lane flood / overland flow mitigation works. Confirmation of blockage factors is required for both inlet capacity and the 1% AEP pipe design of the 2 x 600 mm diameter pipes. As these works drain to a public road, the overland flow mitigation works should be covered by a restriction on title and a positive covenant for maintenance.

Note: A maintenance plan and positive covenant for all OSD tanks and WSUD devices should be secured through conditions of consent to ensure their ongoing operation and maintenance.

8. Flooding Risk

Concept – College Lane building (stage 3)

The flood assessment is generally acceptable; however, the College Lane overland flow and flooding require further detailed flood assessment before the College Lane building envelope proceed, including:

- a) The proposed College Lane pit and pipe system must be confirmed as adequate under blocked conditions. The 1% AEP flood assessment should apply a minimum 50% blockage to the kerb inlet / side-entry pit.
- b) A 50% blockage factor must also be applied to the overflow pipe system (2 x 600 mm diameter pipes).
- c) The assessment should address larger events up to the PMF.
- d) Flood gates, barriers, pits, overflow pipes and related flood mitigation assets, including the College Lane 1% AEP drainage system, require positive covenants and/or restrictions to ensure they are maintained and kept in working order.

9. Contamination and Remediation

Stage 1 - Sevington Building



Overall, the proposed investigation and remediation approach is satisfactory. While a detailed site investigation would ordinarily be preferred prior to determination, it is acknowledged that site access is constrained by the site's ongoing operation as a school.

Council requests that the following recommendations are secured by conditions of consent:

- a) Compliance with the hazardous materials survey findings and appropriate hazardous materials management.
- b) Review of the Remediation Action Plan following completion of the proposed data gap investigations, with any required addendum endorsed by the accredited Site Auditor.
- c) Submission of a Section A Site Audit Statement prior to occupation of each stage of the development.
- d) Implementation and ongoing maintenance of any long-term Environmental Management Plan required following remediation.

10. Waste Management

Stage 1 - Sevington Building

The following comments are provided regarding waste management are to be addressed:

- a) The Operational Waste Management Plan (OWMP) states that waste management is based on the size of the gymnasium, general learning area, and staff room. The NSW EPA in their 2019 "Better practice guide for resource recovery" recommends waste generation for schools be based on the number of students. As such, please ensure that the existing and proposed waste facilities are capable of accommodating the waste generation from the additional 368 students across the entire Newington College redevelopment.

11. Heritage

Stage 1 - Sevington Building

The following comments are provided regarding Heritage and Design are to be addressed:

- a) The modulation to Level 4 of the Sevington Building and the Pavillion Building is to be applied to all levels in the north, east and west elevations so as to be complementary to the modulation of the residential development located in the Kingston South HCA to the northern side of Stanmore Road. Datum lines, including parapets, string courses and window mullions must relate between the 2 buildings and respect the established lines in the streetscape. More flexibility to the detail and treatment may be applied to the southern facades that will overlook the playing field. It is also noted that the material schedule identifies the lower levels as being finished in '03 Terracotta Cladding'; however, this appears inconsistent with the materials depicted on the submitted elevations.
- b) Clarification is required regarding the demolition of the sandstone and brick fences to Stanmore Road. The Detailed Architectural Plans for Stage 1 do not indicate the



proposed demolition of the sandstone and brick fences to Stanmore Road and shows these as retained in the Typical Section drawings. The HIS states “The original sandstone walls along the northern boundary of the site carefully deconstructed and would be reconstructed on the modified alignment, retaining the existing character of the sandstone road interface.” Any proposed change to the alignment of the sandstone and brick fences to Stanmore Road must be shown in the plans.

Concept Proposal

- c) The Concept Plans should be annotated or conditioned to show the retention of the Centenary Hall building name, foundation stone and plaques to front façade and internal memorial boards as part of the works for stage 2. This must occur to retain the significance and understanding of the social significance and history of this building within the site.
- d) The Visual Impact Assessment shows the 4 storey bulk of the Concordia Building will dominate the Stanmore Road streetscape in relation to the existing 2 storey development on the northern side of the road, within the Kingston South HCA. This is also demonstrated in the South Elevation for the Stage 6 proposed envelope drawings. It is recommended that the building envelope be refined to respond to the existing building typology and character in the streetscape. Additional levels of the Concordia Building should step back from Stanmore Road and adjoining 2 storey development to reduce the overall height, bulk and scale.
- e) A Conservation Management Plan has been completed and submitted as part of the proposal. Though an individual assessment has not been prepared for Centenary Hall. The significance of this building is to be considered in part of the overall significance of the site.

12. Contributions and Public Benefit

Stage 1 - Sevington Building - Contributions

The below citation is quoted from a recently approved SSD 82714716 issued by the Department, dated 23 December 2025 (see page 6, Condition A7), Council requests that this condition is replicated if approving this application:

Prior to the commencement of construction, the Applicant must provide written evidence to the Certifier that a monetary contribution pursuant to the provisions of Inner West Local Infrastructure Contributions Plan 2023 (as amended) has been paid to Council. Council must be contacted for calculation of required contributions.

Notwithstanding, it is noted that the net increase in workers, based on the proposed GFA of 7,409sqm, is 78.8 and is to be rounded up to 79. Additionally, the stated worker contribution rate in the EIS has been based on 2021 figures. The current contribution rate (March 2026 quarter) is \$3,910 per worker.

Stage 1 - Sevington Building - Community Benefit

INNER WEST

While the proposed community access arrangements are noted, the information provided does not clearly demonstrate the extent of community use that would be facilitated by the development. In particular, the commitment that facilities will be available for hire “when not in use by the College” is open-ended and may, in practice, result in limited opportunities for community access given the extensive before-school, after-school and weekend use of the campus for sporting and co-curricular activities. Further detail is requested regarding the specific facilities available to the community, the proposed hours and frequency of access, booking arrangements, and any measures to ensure meaningful and ongoing community use of the facilities outside school hours.

Commitments to community benefit should also be included in the concept proposal.

