



APPENDIX D – ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
City of Sydney Council	Meeting between City of Sydney Council, Goodman and Ubris Planning on 4 August 2022 (11am-12pm).	<p>Item #1 – Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD)</p> <p>Question from CoS on how the project is addressing ESD.</p>	<p>Goodman is addressing ESD via the following:</p> <p>5-star green star rating for office and 5.5-star NABERS</p> <p>Modified façade cladding sun-shading on eastern & northern facades (already on west)</p> <p>Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) - bioswales (Burrows & Canal & centre of ramps) - additional water filtration from ramps / rooftop gardens</p> <p>2,000 kW PVs- fully offset building in peak during the day. Won't be net offset. Tenants will portion.</p> <p>Materiality - recyclability, investigated different options of metals & concrete (green-concrete), recycle % of steel. Implications on cladding used and framed required to support cladding.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
			<p>Originally galvanised now aluminium (less framing required)</p> <p>5% EV charging points for all carparks upfront - consider incorporating earlier in design (20% for future proofing)</p> <p>LED lighting - 60-80% reduction in lighting usage</p> <p>Rainwater harvesting (re-use for landscape irrigation & flushing etc)</p> <p>Net 0 embodied carbon - manufacturing, procurement & construction. Offset at completion of project (when as-builts done)</p> <p>Social - community bookings at GF plane, allowing in local community to space (local teachings etc linked to CWC)</p> <p>Daylight harvesting to mitigate light fitting use.</p> <p>Surfmist colour roof sheeting - mitigating heat island</p>
		<p>Item #3 – End of trip facilities (EOTF) and bike parking</p>	<p>The facility is 5-start green star targeted</p> <p>Goodman is considering benchmarking the provision of EOTF</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		Question from CoS about <u>EOTF and bike parking provisions</u>	and bike parking off DCP rates (for bike parking & EOTF).
		<p>Item #4 – Traffic Generation</p> <p>CoS queried the traffic generation and approach</p>	<p>Goodman and Traffic Consultant (Ason) is meeting with TfNSW to agree adoption of reduced generation rate in line with generation rates adopted for comparable developments.</p> <p>Modelling will be micro-simulation and extent of modelling agreed subject to 1 additional intersection.</p>
		<p>Item #5 – Noise</p> <p>CoS questioned noise with aircraft noise and vehicle ramp noise mitigation for office / occupants needs to be considered</p>	<p>Goodman will consider noise with aircraft noise and vehicle ramp noise mitigation for office / occupants.</p>
		<p>Item #6 – Public Art</p> <p>CoS mentioned public art considerations are very positive – manage with costings</p> <p>CoS questioned if it was to fall through, what are alternative treatments – further conversations needed at the time.</p>	<p>Public art component to include light fitting and will therefore likely exceed 1% benchmark for CoS.</p> <p>Goodman is considering ongoing piece of art strategy - moving into future for CoS events etc.</p>
		<p>Item #7 – Contamination</p> <p>CoS notes contamination needs to be considered</p>	<p>Phase 1 & 2 completed - phase 2 still relevant. SAS B & RAP will form part of application. Given the depth of excavation proposed (i.e. to RL 2-</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>CoS commented that trigger for designated development if hitting water table (excavation). Site Auditor review will be required.</p>	<p>2.3m), the works are unlikely to hit the watertable (at RL -1.8-0.8m). If interaction with the water table occurs, a management plan will be prepared within the existing RAP to address any concern.</p> <p>Capping method proposed involving importation of fill following cut and fill earthworks.</p>
		<p>Item #8 – Green roof</p> <p>CoS commented Nicola Reeve will be the relevant contact moving forward for ‘major projects’ given upcoming restructure.</p>	<p>Noted by Goodman</p>
		<p>Item #10 – Model</p> <p>CoS comment, include:</p> <p>Digital model is key</p> <p>Timing for physical model TBC with DPE / CoS</p>	<p>Noted by Goodman</p>
<p>Bayside Council</p>	<p>Email from Guy Smith of Goodman to Bayside Council on 26 July 2022, outlining the project proposal, providing draft plans,</p>	<p>Item #1 – Proximity to Bayside Council</p> <p>Although located in the City of Sydney LGA, the subject site is nearby the border of the Bayside Council LGA to the south. Development of the site could, therefore, have tangible cross-border implications for the Bayside LGA, including any current</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
	offering a meeting, and inviting comment on the proposal.	or proposed strategies, plans or interests of Council in the vicinity of the site.	
		<p>Item #2 – Use of office space</p> <p>Council notes that the multi-tenancy agreements within the proposed multi-level warehouse must exclude office usage outside of ancillary offices, pursuant to section 6.3.19 of Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 (SDCP 2012).</p>	<p>The proposed office component will be ancillary to, and in support of the primary purpose of the facility for ‘warehouse and distribution’ use.</p> <p>No standalone office use will be accommodated within the facility.</p>
		<p>Item #3 – Contribution to current and future role of Mascot</p> <p>Council notes that the proposed development positively contributes to the current and future role of Mascot. The industrial and business precinct around Mascot is a critical component of the International Trade Gateway, and is key employment land within the Eastern City District. The employment opportunities associated with the proposed development are consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan, Eastern City District Plan, and Future Transport 2056.</p>	Noted and agreed.
		<p>Item #4 – Planning context</p> <p>Under the SLEP 2012, the subject site is located in the IN1 General Industrial zone. The proposed Warehouse and Distribution Centre is permitted with consent under this zoning. The use is also broadly consistent with objectives for the IN1 General Industrial zone:</p>	Noted

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>To provide a wide range of industrial and warehouse land uses.</p> <p>To encourage employment opportunities.</p> <p>To minimise any adverse effect of industry on other land uses.</p> <p>To support and protect industrial land for industrial uses.</p> <p>To ensure uses support the viability of nearby centres.</p> <p>Furthermore, Bayside Council notes site-specific provisions for the site have been incorporated into the SLEP 2012 and SDCP 2012. These clauses are:</p> <p>Clause 6.57 of SLEP 2012; and</p> <p>Section 6.3.19 of SDCP 2012.</p>	
		<p>Item #5 – Visual impact of ramp</p> <p>The visual impacts of the proposed vehicular ramps are of concern. The proposal include two x 25m high circular ramps on the northern and southern elevations, occupying 37% and 30% of the frontages, respectively, at that elevation. The visual appearance of the open vehicular ramps will appear unsightly to people who are driving south-east along Canal Road just before entering the Bayside LGA. Council recommends the retention of existing trees along the</p>	<p>Noted. A significant majority of the trees within the public domain will be retained (Refer Appendix A - Arborist Report). These trees will provide good visual screening and softening of the built form from the public domain.</p> <p>An additional 6m landscape setback will be provided along the site boundary along Canal and Burrows Rd, from the current nil setback.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>Canal Road and Burrows Road perimeters to minimise visual impact from the public domain</p>	<p>Several species capable of growing approx. 30m high will be included within the landscape setback, including endemic trees and plants which will provide significant screening and softening to the built form once mature.</p> <p>The landscape strategy includes approx. 15% of the site as canopy coverage and deep soil planting.</p>
		<p>Item #6 – Visual Impact of Burrows Road Façade.</p> <p>the 30 metre-high unbroken south-eastern façade to Burrows Road will appear bulky, despite the landscape setback. The building may also appear visually bulky when viewed from places within the Bayside Council LGA. Council officers wish to recommend that the façade should be broken up to counteract the potential bulky appearance. Council also recommends that existing trees around the perimeter of the site should be retained.</p>	<p>It is noted that the proposal was subject to a City of Sydney Architectural Design Competition, with the winning scheme awarded to Welsh and Major in April 2022. The winning scheme was selected by the Jury Panel, which included 1 x Govt Architect representative, 2 x City of Sydney and 2 x proponent (Goodman) representatives.</p> <p>The Competition process requires the ultimate SSD architectural scheme to be consistent with the competition winning scheme. This limits the scope for any redesign of the winning scheme, including for example ‘breaking up’ the façade as proposed by Bayside Council.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
			<p>It should be noted the 'Design Integrity Panel' reviewed and endorsed the SSD architectural scheme on 18 August 2022 as being consistent with the competition scheme (Refer to Appendix B - Design Integrity Panel Endorsement).</p> <p>The proposed façade design is iconic in design and visually attractive. It will include horizontally expressive facade components and strong cornice-like fascia to accentuate the length and sweep of the building along Burrows Road and create visual interest and articulation.</p> <p>The articulation of the facade is provided both in geometry and materials, with a vertical break-up of the façade through utilising three (3) materials along equal third bands to help reduce perception of bulk and scale.</p> <p>The building facade contributes strongly to the placemaking and contribution to the public domain - providing a canvas for a programmable light art, to be curated</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p data-bbox="938 405 1576 472">Item #7 – Potential heavy vehicle traffic impact on local roads</p> <p data-bbox="938 504 1576 979">The proposed development site is located adjacent to the St Peters Interchange of West Connex. Council officers advise that a designated route for freight access should be clearly, and purposely, focused on Campbell Road to the north, and away from Ricketty and Bourke Streets, Mascot. Bayside Council and Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) are planning Mascot to support ‘Place’ characteristics, following the completion of the Sydney Gateway in 2025. This involves removing freight from the town centre and returning the street-side environment to prioritise local access, pedestrian, bicycle, and public transport amenity.</p> <p data-bbox="938 1018 1576 1085">Item # 8 – Potential impact on Mascot Town Centre</p> <p data-bbox="938 1117 1576 1404">The Mascot Town Centre has the potential to be negatively impacted in regard to noise and pedestrian safety if a designated freight route is not determined as part of this project. Bayside Council requests additional detail on how this project will ensure that ingress and egress at this site will connect directly with the motorway network, and with minimal interaction with local roads and town centres.</p>	<p data-bbox="1617 304 2058 371">to reflect the concepts of change and movement.</p> <p data-bbox="1617 405 2069 735">The proposal is speculative, with future tenants not yet known. The required freight routes are also therefore not yet known. However, as the site is zoned ‘IN1-General Industrial’ to support ‘warehouse and distribution’ use, access flexibility is required to ensure the facility operates effectively.</p> <p data-bbox="1617 769 2069 979">Proposed trade routes will utilise the existing approved routes for 20m articulated vehicles from Port Botany, Sydney Airport, Mascot Industrial Precinct on Coward Street and local roads</p> <p data-bbox="1617 1018 2069 1123">Future tenant access requirements are yet unknown and access flexibility is required.</p> <p data-bbox="1617 1157 2069 1294">Goodman will continue to consult and provide progress updates to Bayside Council and offer the opportunity to comment / provide feedback on plans.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>Item #9 – Proximity to active transport infrastructure</p> <p>The proximity of the proposed development to local cycleways appears to have been accounted for, with designated parking and accessible active transport provision. The State Government’s Sydney Gateway Active Transport Strategy is expected to include details of a number of proposed cycleways in the region, and potentially a cycleway on Burrows Road adjacent this project. The Sydney Gateway Active Transport Strategy is open for public comment in September.</p>	Noted.
		<p>Item #10 – Integration with active transport infrastructure</p> <p>Council officers recommend consideration for recognition of the surrounding cycleways, specifically the required signage and road crossing design when the public domain plan is developed for this project.</p>	Noted. This has been considered with the proposal.
		<p>Item #11 – Potential flooding impact</p> <p>In relation to flooding impact on the development or impact from the development on flooding, it is noted that the modelled 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood extent does not encroach on the subject property. Hence, there is no adverse impact to existing flood conditions, or surrounding developments associated with the proposed development. Council</p>	Noted.

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>does not have any objections to this proposal based on flood risk management.</p> <p>Item #12 – Feedback</p> <p>We trust that Goodman will carefully consider this feedback on the SEARs when preparing the EIS for this proposal.</p>	<p>Goodman has reviewed and responded to the SEARS in the preparation of the EIS.</p>
Inner West Council	<p>Email from Guy Smith of Goodman to Inner West Council on 26 July 2022, outlining the project proposal, providing draft plans, offering a meeting, and inviting comment on the proposal.</p>	<p>No formal response was received from Inner West Council.</p>	<p>Goodman will continue to consult and provide progress updates with the NSW Department of Environment, Energy and Science (Biodiversity and Conservation) and offer the opportunity to comment / provide feedback on plans.</p>
<p>Department of Planning and Environment, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning and Assessment Team 	<p>Email from Guy Smith of Goodman to Pamela Morales of the Department of Planning and Environment (Planning and Assessment team) on 26 July 2022, outlining the project proposal, providing draft plans, offering a meeting, and</p>	<p>No formal response was received from DPE.</p> <p>DPE participated in the Design Integrity Panel presentation.</p>	<p>Goodman will continue to consult and provide progress updates with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (Planning and Assessment team) and offer the opportunity to comment / provide feedback on plans.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
	inviting comment on the proposal.		
Transport for NSW	Email from Guy Smith of Goodman to Transport for NSW on 26 July 2022, outlining the project proposal, providing draft plans, offering a meeting, and inviting comment on the proposal.	<p>Provide a transport and accessibility impact assessment, which includes:</p> <p>Details of all traffic types and volumes likely to be generated during construction and operation, including a description of key access and haul routes</p> <p>An assessment of the predicted impacts of this traffic on road safety and the capacity of the road network, including consideration of cumulative traffic impacts at key intersections (using industry standard modelling).</p>	<p>The proposed development is expected to generate a total of 164 net vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and a total of 155 net vehicle trips in the PM peak hour during operation. Access to the Site by light and heavy (commercial) vehicles will be from Burrows Road, and entry access by Fire Brigade will be from Canal Road. Construction traffic volumes are subject to the development of a detailed construction staging plan upon the appointment of a contractor.</p> <p>SIDRA intersection modelling has been conducted, demonstrating that under the development scenario, nearby intersections continue to operate similar to future base conditions or operate at acceptable degrees of saturation and delays. Accordingly, the Proposal will not be required to deliver any additional upgrades to the surrounding road network and will operate satisfactorily through existing infrastructure</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
		<p>Plans demonstrating how all vehicles likely to be generated during construction and operation and awaiting loading, unloading or servicing can be accommodated on the site to avoid queuing in the street network.</p>	<p>Swept path assessment has been prepared demonstrating vehicles will be wholly contained within the Site during operations. Furthermore, the proposed vehicular access strategy and internal site layout can accommodate up to 20m Articulated Vehicle (AV) for side loading. During construction, it will be the responsibility of the contractor to ensure that vehicles do not queue onto the street network</p>
		<p>Details and plans of any proposed internal road network, loading dock provision and servicing, on-site parking provisions, and sufficient pedestrian and cyclist facilities, in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards.</p>	<p>A design review has been conducted of the plans with reference to AS2890.1:2004, AS2890.2:2018, AS2890.3:2015, and AS2890.6:2009.</p>
		<p>Swept path analysis for the largest vehicle requiring access to the development.</p>	<p>Swept path assessment has been prepared (refer to Appendix B) demonstrating suitability of access for the largest design vehicle, 20m Articulated Vehicle.</p>
		<p>Details of road upgrades, infrastructure works, or new roads or access points required for the development if necessary</p>	<p>The Proposal will not trigger any road upgrade or new road implementation. The traffic modelling undertaken within this TMAP suggests that the proposed development traffic will be satisfactorily accommodated through</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
			<p>existing road network and will not worsen the future base assessment for the course of next 10 years hence it is supportable on traffic modelling grounds .Access to the Site by light and heavy (commercial) vehicles will be from Burrows Road, and entry access by Fire Brigade will be from Canal Road.</p>
		<p>Provide a Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing predicted construction vehicle movements, routes, access and parking arrangements, coordination with other construction occurring in the area, and how impacts on existing traffic, pedestrian and bicycle networks would be managed and mitigated.</p>	<p>A Preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been provided detailing general principles and likely traffic impacts during the construction period. The contractor, upon engagement, will prepare a detailed CTMP, referring specifically to the proposed construction details and programme.</p>
Water NSW	<p>Email from Goodman to Water NSW on 26 July 2022, outlining the project proposal, providing draft plans, offering a meeting, and inviting comment on the proposal.</p>	<p>Reply from Justine Clarke of Water NSW stated that the proposal is not located near any WaterNSW land, assets or infrastructure, therefore we have no particular comments or requirements regarding the proposal.</p>	<p>Goodman will continue to consult with WaterNSW throughout the assessment of the EIS, Goodman will also respond accordingly to any future enquires received post lodgement.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback	Project Response
NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA)	Email from Goodman to EPA on 8 August 2022.	Stuart Clark of EPA stated they provided comment through council during an earlier stage in the process. They reiterated the advice that an air quality assessment should be prepared with a methodology that is appropriate to the project context and will include a regulatory worst-case emissions modelling scenario.	As a requirement of the SSDA, the project has completed a complying Air Impact Assessment. Goodman provided EPA with a copy of this assessment.
<p>Industrial neighbours, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2A, 4, 6 and 8-10 Burrows Road - Tenants of existing Goodman property at 9 Canal Road. 	A community newsletter was sent on 3 February 2022 to 122 and business located nearby the proposed site. The newsletter outlined key features of the project and invited feedback. It included details of the project email and phone number managed by Urbis Engagement to answer questions and collect feedback.	At the time of writing this report, no enquiry emails or phone calls have been received from a near neighbour following the letterbox drop.	Goodman will respond accordingly to any future enquires received post lodgement. Goodman will continue to consult with neighbouring businesses as plans progress.