

APPENDIX E –ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
City of Sydney Council	<u>City of Sydney Council Briefing meeting with Council officers on 19 August 2021:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Rees – Area Planning Manager Marie Burge – Specialist Planner, Major Projects Lin Yang – Senior Public Domain Coordinator Raj Narayan – Senior Public Domain Coordinator Karen Dunne – Specialist Environmental Health Officer Emma Washington – 	Arborist report required to confirm retention of trees based on first order branches and awning height	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been prepared by Urban Arbor and is provided at Appendix DD . The AIA assesses the existing street tree on the Regent Street and recommends removal. The proposed public domain works include extensive tree planting as detailed in the Landscape Plans (Appendix X).
		Tree species to be confirmed for public domain – palms not acceptable	The proposed landscaping and planting plan includes a range of native vegetation communities and plant species. The species were selected in consultation with Indigigrow and Uncle Chicka's granddaughter Lilly Madden (Indigenous landscape designers). This has ensured the vegetation at the site was chosen for its suitability and cultural significance.
		Retention or dedication of land – retain with easement and maintenance schedule	Wee Hur to confirm
		Proposed easement for Gibbons Street to be updated to include this site.	Wee Hur to confirm
		Query splay along William Lane – strong corner and transition to church building, open up public domain and transparent base to both sides of building	The podium component, including its relationship with Margaret Street and William Lane, was subject to further detailed revisions following the meeting with Council and in response to the detailed design feedback provided by the SDRP. This

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	Landscape Architect <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erin Colgrave – Urban Designer Tom Britton – Tree Management Officer David Eckstein – Environment Advisor Christian Thomsen – Planning Assessment Officer Jane Grant – Team Leader Public Domain/ Design Manager 		<p>included relocation of the building entry and bicycle storage to further activate the William Lane frontage and an increased setback to Margaret Street to improve the relationship with and transition to the heritage listed church building.</p> <p>The proposed weaving pattern in the design was incorporated based on input from a Gadigal Elder to represent the weaving of natural materials by the Gadigal people. This weaving pattern is demonstrated across the podium. The podium will also provide an awning over the footpath, in keeping with the Redfern character and providing pedestrian amenity and protection.</p>
		Façade greening to be designed carefully with maintenance and architectural details including access, aspect, micro-climate, etc for longevity – soil depths, maintenance, drainage.	Landscape Plans have been prepared by RPS Landscape which detail the façade greening details (Appendix X).
		Retail could be better located in William Lane, potential noise and amenity.	The proposed retail space will activate the Regent Street frontage. It is considered the proposed future business will benefit from increased pedestrian traffic along Regent Street.
		Flooding issues within locality	<p>WMA Water have prepared a Flood Assessment Report (Appendix EE) which considers the flood risk and sets out the stormwater management works associated with the proposed development.</p> <p>The report concludes the site is in a flood safe area and is suitable for the proposed development subject to the adoption and implementation of the listed mitigation measures. Refer to Section 6.1.13 for further discussion.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		Awning design and potential conflict with street tree, no requirement for continuous awning.	The awning design allows for the street trees and is consistent with the awning for the approved building on the immediately adjoining property to the north (90-102 Regent Street).
		Pavement design will need to be updated to reflect City of Sydney Public Domain Manual – query whether a different approach could be pursued to make this a ‘special place’.	The pavement design is in accordance with the City of Sydney Public Domain Manual.
		Concern regarding building separation between towers and urban design principles – many different factors have informed the building separation distances including setbacks, privacy, solar, wind, etc with testing of multiple (8-10+) options	<p>The architectural drawings prepared by Antoniades Architects (Appendix G) demonstrate the way in which the building has been sited and designed to provide appropriate separation between the tower and the existing and approved buildings to the north and west the site, considering potential visual and privacy impacts and optimising the distance between the tower and the buildings to the south.</p> <p>Where separation distances are less than the recommended distances within the UDP, privacy mitigation measures are included to avoid adverse impacts on visual privacy. Antoniades Architects have designed hoods to the windows facing William Lane and 90-102 Regent Street to maximise visual privacy.</p>
		NCC 2022 consider potential implications regarding energy efficiency on final design	Vipac Engineers have prepared a suite of documents to assess the sustainability and efficiency of the proposed development (Appendix I; Appendix J; Appendix K).

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
Government Architect of NSW	<u>Government Architect of NSW</u> Four State Design Review Panel (SDRP) meetings were held on 3 March 2021, 9 June 2021, 21 July 2021 and 15 September 2021 with the following attendees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rory Toomey, Chair – GANSW ▪ Libby Gallagher, Panellist ▪ Daniele Hromek, Panellist ▪ Richard Johnson, Panellist ▪ Andrew Nimmo, Panellist ▪ Angus Bell, GANSW Design Advisor 	It is re-iterated (refer SDRP 3) that in-person consultation with community is critical. Allow sufficient time (in the context of COVID-19) to ensure outcomes from the consultation process may be implemented.	Numerous meetings were held with the Gadigal Elders, including one on site to discuss proposal and input from community. This engagement is further detailed in the Connection with Country Report prepared by WSP (Appendix GG).
		Regarding the weaving pattern at the façade: avoid cultural appropriation by ensuring the supporting narrative is approved by knowledge holders in the community seek opportunities to embed the weaving story into the project so it can be understood that the pattern comes from Aboriginal culture (e.g. via interpretation and/or installations explaining the basis of the design).	The project team engaged WSP to facilitate engagement with Gadigal Elders. A Connection with Country Report was prepared by WSP (Appendix GG) to document Connecting to Country principles, activities and engagements that have been undertaken to shape the design. Through the ongoing co-design process and engagement of Gadigal Elders, a range of design outcomes have been influenced by Indigenous culture. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gadigal weaving: Nadeena Dixon, Gadigal Elder and artist recommended the incorporation of a weaving pattern to signify the traditional custodians who used weaving day to day. The weaving pattern has been replicated in the podium façade and the external and internal floor treatments. ▪ Mundoie Footprint way-finding concept: Uncle Allan Madden Gadigal Elder recommended the incorporation of footprint patterns for users of the building the pathway to follow when moving through. ▪ Indigenous planting: further consultation with indigenous landscape architect Lilly Madden will be undertaken during detailed design. ▪ Indigenous art on building fins: The vertical fins facing Regent Street are an opportunity to display local Aboriginal

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minoshi Weerasinghe, DPIE Cameron Sargent, DPIE Peter John Cantrill, City of Sydney <p>The Design Report prepared by Antoniades Architects (Appendix H) details the issues raised by the GANSW and SDRP during the briefing meeting and design briefings and the way in which they have been responded to within the final proposal.</p> <p>The key issues from the final design briefing as identified in the correspondence</p>		art. This may be coordinated through a select invitation process targeting Gadigal artists.
		Increase consultation with Aboriginal knowledge holders on colour and material selections to ensure alignment with Connecting with Country aspirations.	The project team and WSP engaged with Gadigal Elders who provided recommendations to the proposed design (Appendix GG).
		Adopt sustainability principles that come from Country (e.g. the principle of 'do no harm'). Consider materials that have low environmental impacts and are locally sourced or recycled (as appropriate). For example, source recycled stone in lieu of quarried stone, source recycled bricks where possible.	The Connection with Country Report prepared by WSP (Appendix GG) recommends connecting the site to country through tangible and intangible outcomes. Antoniades Architects have incorporated locally sourced and robust materials to be used throughout the building and public domain.
		<p>Simplify the irregular geometries at the building perimeter of both the ground floor plane and podium to optimise the public domain and simplify the relationship between the proposal and its surroundings.</p> <p>Provide increased spatial clarity and definition for circulation, entries and building interface through simplification and rationalisation of form and shape.</p>	<p>The podium and tower have been further setback from the southern boundary to increase building separation to St Luke's Presbyterian Church and improve the public domain at the street level.</p> <p>Antoniades Architects have further developed the entries and public domain with consideration of cultural integration and place making.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	issued by the GANSW dated 9 September 2020 were responded to in Section 6.1 of the EIS.	As part of the redesign for the above, explore further setbacks to Margaret Street and decreased GFA to the ground floor (to align with the 7:1 FSR requirement).	Increased setbacks have been introduced on the Margaret Street frontage at both podium and tower levels, reducing the total GFA and enhancing the public domain outcomes.
		At Margaret Street provide street trees of a generous scale. Water gums are not supported and are applicable to more compromised locations (e.g. narrow streets and/or conflicts with powerlines or structures).	RPS to advise
		Reduce GFA to provide an FSR of 7:1 (a nominal reduction of 150m ²). GFA beyond this control is not supported.	The gross floor area has been reduced to comply with the maximum FSR of 7:1. It is noted that a maximum 7.7:1 could be achieved in accordance with the new Housing SEPP.
		Review the articulation of the southern tower form to provide a more compatible massing relationship with the podium and northern tower form.	Antoniades Architects have designed a distinctive and legible tower form with refined modulation and articulation. This form has reduced the scale and mass to the south and increases towards the northern portion of the site.
		Cross ventilation relative to traffic and noise impacts– from the limited detail provided, plenum sizes are not convincing and impacts on ceiling heights are not fully understood. Further design development is required consistent with City of Sydney guidelines.	<p>The units have been assessed via Dynamic simulation (using Design Builder software) has been used to determine the percentage of the year in which minimum performance requirements have been met for the habitable rooms provided with alternative means of ventilation due to external noise level conditions. The simulation demonstrated that the proposed ventilation design will result in the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall Energy Efficiency,

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thermal Comfort (i.e. PMV), Age of air (freshness of the air).
		Commitments to sustainability (e.g. rating systems) and integrated sustainability initiatives were not included in the presentation; it is recommended they be developed and documented for inclusion in the EIS.	<p>Vipac Engineers have prepared a suite of documents to assess the sustainability and efficiency of the proposed development (Appendix I; Appendix J; Appendix K). In summary, the key commitments to sustainability include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Load reduction through use of energy efficient devices. Optimising energy, water and material consumption through use of energy efficient devices. Use of renewable resources, including solar panels on the roof. Indoor environmental quality – achieving high levels of natural ventilation and solar access.
<u>Heritage NSW and Heritage Council</u>	Artefact Heritage emailed Heritage NSW and Heritage Council 7 January 2021.	<p>Artefact notified the following groups of the project proposal on 7 January 2021 with the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A response was received from Heritage NSW with a list of stakeholders who may have an interest in the proposed development. The Metro LALC did not respond The City of Sydney Council did not respond The National Native Tittle Tribunal replied that they had no list of stakeholders who may have an interest in the proposed development. 	<p>Heritage Impact Statement (Appendix W) has been prepared by Weir Phillips Heritage and an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report has been prepared by Artefact Heritage (Appendix V).</p> <p>Both reports have been prepared in accordance with the relevant guidelines.</p> <p>It is expected that the SSDA package will be referred to the Heritage Council and Heritage NSW during the exhibition period for formal comment.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
Sydney Water	Arcadis undertook a review of DBYD information received from Sydney Water during the preparation of the Infrastructure Report (Appendix S) which confirmed the Sydney Water network within the vicinity of the site.	<p>The existing 150DICL water main running along Regent Street has insufficient pressure to service the development.</p> <p>The sanitary drainage is to be connected into relocated sewer main running through William Lane. Provision has been made to accommodate this in the design of the sewer relocation.</p>	A Water Services Co-ordinator will be engaged to design and project manage the works including a section 73 application to Sydney Water, following lodgement of the SSDA documentation.
Sydney Metro	On 2 November 2021, Sydney Metro was provided with a preliminary plan of the building foundation layout and loads by email.	<p>Sydney Metro issued emailed correspondence dated 10 November 2021 which confirmed the plan had been reviewed and no significant issues were identified.</p> <p>The Sydney Metro response also stated that the final design, impact statement and assessment of potential impacts on Sydney Metro assets will need to be submitted once completed.</p>	The final design and associated documents will be provided to Sydney Metro as the proposal is refined during the SSDA assessment and detailed design phases.
Sydney Airport	An application to Sydney Airport Corporation Limited was made on 4 August 2021 for the intrusion of the proposed tower into airspace which is	The Conical Surface of the OLS above this site is at a height of 83 metres above the Australian Height Datum (AHD) and hence prescribed airspace above the site commences at 83 metres AHD. At a maximum height of 87.15 metres AHD, the building will penetrate the OLS by 4.15 metres.	The Proponent accepts the Sydney Airport Corporation Limited conditions.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	prescribed airspace for Sydney Airport	<p>Sydney Airport Corporation Limited approved the controlled activity for the instruction of the proposed building subject to the following conditions.</p> <p>Conditions</p> <p>The building must not exceed a maximum height of 87.15 metres AHD, including all lift over-runs, vents, chimneys, aerials, antennas, lightning rods, any roof top garden plantings, exhaust flues etc.</p> <p>Separate approval must be sought under the Regulations for any equipment (i.e. cranes) required to construct the building. Approval to operate construction equipment (i.e. cranes) be obtained prior to any commitment to construct.</p> <p>The Proponent must advise Airservices Australia at least three business days prior to the controlled activity commencing.</p> <p>On completion of construction of the building, the Proponent must provide the Sydney Airport Corporation Limited airfield design manager with a written report from a certified surveyor on the finished height of the building.</p>	
DPIE Key Sites	A request seeking a waiver for the requirement for a Biodiversity Development	A BDAR waiver was issued by the NSW DPIE on 22 June 2021 and a BDAR is not required to be prepared and submitted as part of this SSD application (refer to Appendix U).	Noted and accepted.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
	Assessment Report (BDAR) was prepared by Greentape Solutions and submitted to DPIE on 28 March 2021 (refer to Appendix U).		
Surrounding owners and occupier	Various strategies were implemented to ensure collaborative community involvement in the project. This includes telephone calls, face to face and online meetings (subject to COVID-19 requirements). This was coordinated by Elton Consulting.	Construction Impacts Three concurrent construction projects sites is a lot of activity in one block.	The potential construction impacts will be managed by the Construction Management Plan (Appendix AA).
		Occupancy Rates Impacts of COVID-19 on occupancy of the proposal and whether the proposal would have an alternative/interim use in the event of low take-up rates.	As travel restrictions ease, it is expected many international students will be returning to Australia for their studies. The Australian Government has also endorsed an International Student Arrival Plan for NSW to facilitate the safe arrivals of students back to the state. Under this plan, the Australian Government has established a pilot program to facilitate the arrival of 500 international students to NSW in December 2021, with more student arrivals expected in 2022. There is therefore expected to be a future demand for student accommodation across NSW.
		Overshadowing Concern about potential overshadowing impacts on adjacent properties.	The proposed development complies with the maximum building height controls and has been sited to provide for satisfactory separation distances between the northern and western neighbouring towers.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
			<p>The Architectural Plans (Appendix G) provide a comprehensive assessment of the potential shadow impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>The shadow diagrams show that the locality is affected by the existing and approved developments to the north and west of the site, including the approved developments at 80-88 Regent Street, 11 Gibbons Street, 13-23 Gibbons Street and 90-102 Regent Street.</p> <p>The properties further south of Margaret Street will also be impacted by additional overshadowing due to the proposed development. However, the impacts are limited to the mid-morning period, with most of the shadow impacts along the Regent Street properties absorbed by the shadow impacts of developments to the north and west of the site.</p> <p>Similarly, the proposed development will not create additional overshadowing impacts to the existing overshadowing to the properties on the western side of Regent Street, as demonstrated in the overshadowing plans.</p> <p>The proposed built form has been designed to avoid unacceptable shadow impacts to surrounding properties and the public domain. Antoniades Architects have incorporated vertical blades on the Regent Street and William Lane frontages to optimise solar access.</p>
		<p>Density</p> <p>Concerns the proposal was not consistent with the existing streetscape.</p>	<p>The locality is undergoing a transition in association with the relevant planning framework. The scale, bulk and size of the proposed development is consistent with recent approvals</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
			issued for the adjoining and surrounding properties, including 90-102 Regent Street and 13-23 Gibbons Street.
		Transition to St Luke's Church It appears the proposal would be particularly jarring in comparison to the nearest streetscape building the former Church.	<p>The final design satisfactorily responds to the detailed feedback provided by the SDRP, including significant changes to the distribution of GFA in response to contextual and urban considerations, including the former church. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased setbacks provided along the Margaret Street frontage, including at the ground level (podium) and shifting the tower form towards the northern site boundary (away from St Luke's Church). ▪ Increased setback for the southern tower component along Regent Street (southeast corner) to provide appropriate sightlines to St Luke's Presbyterian Church. <p>The podium level is broken into multiple sections by vertical fin elements, which responds to the fine grain quality of the historic Victorian and Federation era streetscape that formed the original setting of St Luke's Presbyterian Church.</p> <p>The proposed development will not block any historically significant view corridors to or from St Luke's Presbyterian Church, as the presently exposed northern wall along the Margaret Street boundary was originally obscured by neighbouring nineteenth century terraces.</p> <p>Weir Phillips Heritage conclude that the proposed development will have an acceptable impact on the ability to understand the former St Luke's Presbyterian Church as an example of a Victorian Gothic Church which makes an important contribution to the streetscape and township of Redfern.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Issues Discussed	Project Response
		Proposed Accommodation Type Concerns about an over-supply of student accommodation in the area. The proposal does not fit in with longer-term planning, does not improve the community and is not culturally attuned.	An Operational Management Plan (Appendix Z) has been prepared which outlines the proposed management of the student accommodation to avoid detrimental impacts to the amenity of the surrounding landowners, tenants and residents. The increase in the local student population will contribute to increased spending and economic growth within the locality and offer employment opportunities during its construction and operation.
		Vehicular Access Vehicle access to the proposal (i.e. for deliveries, loading and rubbish removal) given there is no residential parking.	All loading and waste collection activities will be undertaken within the adjacent student accommodation on 90-102 Regent Street accessed via William Lane. This will provide for greater activation of the William Lane frontage with increased passive surveillance. It will also provide greater site efficiencies, noting the approved loading area can accommodate the deliveries and collections expected to be required for both sites.