

APPENDIX E –ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY TABLE

1.1. ENGAGEMENT CARRIED OUT

Urbis have prepared an Engagement and Communications Outcome Report (**Appendix J**). Community and stakeholder engagement has been undertaken by the Project Team in the preparation of the SSDA. This included direct engagement and consultation with:

- The City of Sydney Council
- The Department of Planning and Environment
- Government Architect of NSW
- Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs)
- Transport for NSW
- Relevant public utility providers
- Surrounding property owners/ businesses

The Applicant engaged with all surrounding local landowners, businesses and stakeholders via a community letterbox drop.

This engagement was consistent with the community participation objectives in the Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects and complied with the community engagement requirements in the SEAR as summarised below:

- Direct consultation with agencies was undertaken in the preparation of detailed specialist studies and the EIS.
- An Engagement and Communication Outcomes Report has been prepared and accompanies the EIS.
- The EIS and supporting documentation will be placed on public exhibition once DPE has reviewed the EIS to confirm that it has satisfactorily responded to each of the issues identified in the SEARs. The key stakeholders will be provided with an additional opportunity to review the project, including the final development plans and the detailed specialist studies and assessment reports accompanying the final EIS.

In accordance with the Regulations, the EIS will be placed on formal public exhibition once DPE has reviewed the EIS and deemed it 'adequate' for this purpose. Following this exhibition period, the applicant will respond to any matters raised by notified parties.

1.2. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

The applicant and their consultants have engaged in one-on-one briefings with the relevant Government agencies throughout the design process as outlined in the table below.

Table 1 Stakeholder Engagement: Issues and Responses

Feedback	Response
<p><u>City of Sydney</u></p> <p>Briefing meeting – 7th December 2022</p> <p>This meeting with the City of Sydney was an opportunity for the Applicant to brief Council officers (including planning, urban design and engineers) on the project and to proactively seek any views on the scheme. Council’s feedback was largely supportive of the proposed use, and their feedback on the early plans provided have been taken into consideration as through the development of the concept scheme.</p> <p>Key matters discussed in the pre-lodgement meeting include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A porte-cochere is not supported in the building’s front setback to Bourke Road ▪ The provision of parking at grade and on the first and second floor is also considered excessive ▪ As the height of the building exceeds 25 metres, the SLEP 2012 requires both a Concept DA and competitive design process prior to determination of a detailed design DA. ▪ Council acknowledge that the level of detail was very preliminary and their urban design team wanted to see more analysis of the surrounding context, and a more detailed progression of the Concept at upcoming meetings. <p>As demonstrated in the design report at Appendix H this feedback has been incorporated into the design of the concept envelope and reference scheme, with the porte-cochere removed from the Bourke Road frontage, along with removal of parking at the second floor level.</p>	
<p><u>Department of Planning and Environment</u></p> <p><u>Scoping meeting – 18th January 2022</u></p> <p>Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) Megan Fu and Nathan Stringer</p>	

Feedback	Response
<p>A virtual scoping meeting was held with planning officers at DPE on 18 January 2022 to get an early indication on the key matters requiring further assessment in the EIS and to confirm the approval pathway and assessment timeframes. DPE noted the following in relation the approval pathway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A CIV report is required to accompany the scoping report to confirm that the ‘hospital’ and ‘medical centre’ uses meets the SSDA trigger in the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021</i>. This has been provided at Appendix F. ▪ A Clause 4.6 request to vary the height of building control would be required should the EIS be lodged prior the finalisation of the Southern Enterprise Area Review amendments to the SLEP 2012. This has been provided at Appendix N. 	
<p><u>Department of Planning and Environment and Planning Delivery Unit</u></p>	
<p>Briefing meeting with officers on 23 March 2022</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Planning Delivery Unit (PDU) - David Petrie, Elise Crameri, Elloise Ames ▪ Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) – Karen Harragon, David Gibson, Megan Fu 	
<p>Consultation and engagement with GANSW is recommended.</p>	<p>Preliminary discussions have occurred with Rory Toomey from GANSW. As requested, a copy of the Design Excellence Strategy has been issued to GANSW for discussion and comment. It is anticipated that further discussions with the GANSW and the City’s Design Excellence team during the assessment phase of the concept SSDA in preparing a design competition brief for the design alternatives process to occur following determination of the concept SSDA.</p>
<p>DPE (KH) Confirmed early works as part of the Concept Plan SSDA is acceptable and is common practice.</p>	<p>Early works are no longer included in the scope of this SSDA.</p>
<p>A meeting with Council’s VPA officers is recommended.</p>	<p>A meeting with City of Sydney’s VPA officer was held on 8 June 2022. The outcomes of this briefing session are provided in the table below.</p>
<p>The project team was encouraged to lodge an application to the Priority Assessment Program.</p>	<p>An application to the Priority Assessment Program was lodged 29th April 2022. On 12 May 2022, the project team were informed that the proposal</p>

Feedback	Response
	<p>does not satisfy enough of the program criteria to be eligible for the program.</p> <p>An email was received on 12 May 2022 stating that the Alexandria Health Centre project did not satisfy key criteria relating to Economic and Public benefit.</p> <p>Further information was requested from David Petrie on 26 May 2022 and 1 June 2022. The project team has not received a reply.</p>
<p><u>Government Architect NSW</u></p> <p>Preliminary discussions have occurred with Rory Toomey from GANSW. As requested, a copy of the Design Excellence Strategy has been issued to GANSW for discussion and comment. It is anticipated that further discussions with the GANSW and the City’s Design Excellence team during the assessment phase of the concept SSDA in preparing a design competition brief for the design alternatives process to occur following determination of the concept SSDA.</p> <p>The Design Excellence Strategy was sent to GANSW (Appendix L) for review and comment on 10 June 2022.</p>	
<p><u>Transport for NSW</u></p> <p>It is noted that Bourke Road is a local road and not a classified road, therefore the relevant roads authority is City of Sydney Council. The City of Sydney Council traffic engineer attended the pre-DA discussions with the project team on 5 April 2022, 30 May 2022 and 8 June 2022. The project traffic consultant has contacted Transport for NSW, requesting a meeting to discuss the project and providing them a copy of the Transport Impact Assessment for comment. It is anticipated that further discussions will occur during the assessment phase.</p>	
<p><u>City of Sydney Council</u></p> <p>Briefing meeting with Council officers on 5 April 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrew Rees – Area Planning Manager (Major Projects) ▪ Samantha Kruize - Senior Planner 	

Feedback	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greg Longmuir - Planning Agreement Team ▪ Brett Calear - Planning Agreement Team ▪ Asif Ahmed - Traffic Engineer ▪ Raj Narayan - Stormwater Engineer ▪ Jan McCredie - Urban Designer ▪ Gibran Khouri - Strategic Planner ▪ Susan Miles - Senior Public Domain Coordinator ▪ Jane Grant - Area Manager - Public Domain <p>The key issues raised by City of Sydney and the Project team responses are provided below.</p>	
<p>Council confirmed that separate meetings should be held with Council's Design Excellence team and GANSW to progress a competition brief noting the target for a competition to be held in Q4 2022.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that further discussions with the GANSW and the City's Design Excellence team during the assessment phase of the concept SSDA in preparing a design competition brief for the design alternatives process to occur following determination of the concept SSDA.</p>
<p>Council expressed their preference to limit the requirement for multiple Clause 4.6 Requests</p> <p>Council understood the timing of the draft LEP and the design of the concept envelope.</p>	<p>It is noted that the LEP amendment has been through public exhibition, has been endorsed by Council and gazettal is imminent with the LEP currently with DPE and Parliamentary Counsel. The proposal is directly aligned with the Amendment.</p> <p>A Clause 4.6 Variation Request has been prepared (Appendix N) to support the technical non-compliant building height at the time of submission. However it is noted, given the certain and imminent gazettal of the LEP amendment, it is likely the Clause 4.6 will be made redundant during the assessment of the proposal.</p>

Feedback	Response
<p>Council confirmed they do not object to early works being part of the stage 1 early works SSDA.</p>	<p>It is noted that early works are no longer included in the scope of this SSDA and approval is being sought only for the concept envelope to enable future redevelopment of the site.</p>
<p>Council confirmed that a letter of offer should be submitted with the SSD package and the VPA would be conditioned by way of the stage 1 consent.</p> <p>Council confirmed the VPA would be between Council and the applicant and would not involve DPE as the works would deliver public benefit to the City.</p>	<p>A letter of offer is provided at Appendix I. Refer to Section 6.2.11 for further discussion.</p>
<p>Council confirmed the 4 storey street wall is a central element of Council's controls and needs to be accommodated.</p> <p>Council noted that the approach to the Bourke Road frontage should consider the proportion of the street wall relative to the total building height.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Draft Sydney Development Control Plan 2012: Southern Enterprise Area Amendment, the proposal presents a four storey street wall to Bourke Road, with a 12m upper level setback, sympathetic to the surrounding streetscape.</p>
<p>Council would require a traffic impact study to justify the level of parking proposed.</p>	<p>A Traffic and Accessibility Impact Assessment has been prepared by Transport and Traffic Planning Associates and provided at Appendix M. Refer to Section 6.1.4 for further discussion on the traffic impact study and proposed parking.</p>
<p>Council noted that the flooding model should include the scenario where the laneways are provided given this would open up areas for overland flows.</p> <p>Council also suggested the Applicant considers the PMF levels and provide further justification on this.</p>	<p>Enstruct have prepared a Civil Engineering Report (Appendix T) that assesses the flooding risk of the proposal.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 6.1.8 and Appendix T, all entrance levels to the basement including the vehicle ramp, stairwells, ventilation and lifts will be designed to be protected from flooding during a PMF event. By ensuring all the entries to the basement are at the PMF level, Enstruct conclude the floor level of the basement is acceptable.</p>

Feedback	Response
<p>Council sought clarity on western boundary lane way setback.</p> <p>Council sought clarity on the vehicle route in the scenario where the laneways on the adjoining sites had been dedicated and the laneways are fully developed.</p>	<p>As shown in detail within the Urban Design report at Appendix H, A 3m setback is to be provided to the western boundary lane for levels ground to 3. A 6m setback is provided for levels 4-7.</p>
<p><u>Meeting to discuss laneway design on 30 May 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrew Rees – Area Planning Manager (Major Projects) ▪ Samantha Kruize - Senior Planner ▪ Greg Longmuir - Planning Agreement Team ▪ Gibran Khouri - Strategic Planner ▪ Susan Miles - Senior Public Domain Coordinator ▪ Jane Grant - Area Manager - Public Domain <p>An email was sent to Gibran Khouri on 1 June 2022 to outline the different laneway options and to seek Council's feedback on the preferred option. The Applicant's explanation and notes are provided below.</p>	
<p>The draft DCP future laneway envisages a wider block than just the subject site, with 2-way traffic shown along the Bourke Rd/O'Riordan St north south leg, but one way traffic east and northbound for the remainder of the laneway system.</p> <p>Given the subject site will be developed in advance of the neighbouring sites to its west, south and east, and given the full laneway will require land dedication from the neighbouring sites to complete, the subject site will not be able to rely on access via the DCP future laneway in the short to medium term (i.e. Stage 1).</p>	<p>Council officers noted that the laneway design in the draft DCP was indicative and further detailed investigation of the proposed future laneway design would need to be undertaken.</p> <p>It is noted the future laneway design will not impact on the Concept SSDA the subject of this application as the proposed vehicle arrangement provides two-way access off Bourke Road by providing a 6 m accessway (3m of which would be dedicated to Council in the future as part of a VPA).</p>

Feedback	Response
<p>At the meeting, the Applicant’s preferred option for future access once the full laneway is constructed (i.e. Stage 2) was discussed – i.e. maintaining the vehicle ingress to the site at Bourke Rd as a private driveway. The advantages of this option were discussed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the address of the health centre is maintained ▪ wayfinding is clear and legible as the private driveway into the health centre is maintained ▪ the DCP laneway intent is not compromised. 	<p>It is anticipated that further discussions will occur between the applicant and Council in the coming months in relation to the VPA letter of offer, which will detail future arrangements for laneway design and dedication.</p>
<p><u>Meeting with VPA Officer – 8 June 2022</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrew Rees – Area Planning Manager (major projects) ▪ Samantha Kruize - Senior Planner ▪ Greg Longmuir - Planning Agreement Team <p>A further discussion occurred between Council’s VPA officer and the applicant’s project team to discuss the public benefit offer. Council expressed in-principle support for the draft VPA offer to be based on the dedication of land at the Bourke Rd frontage for a pedestrian footpath (2.4 m) as well as laneways along the western and southern boundaries of the site (3 m each).</p> <p>Further discussions are anticipated between Council and the applicant’s project team in relation to the VPA based on the draft VPA letter of offer submitted along with this Concept SSDA (see Appendix I).</p>	

1.3. COMMUNITY VIEWS

At the time of writing this report, no response has been received from the public. The Applicant will continue to reach out to surrounding local landowners, businesses and stakeholders as plans progress.

1.4. ENGAGEMENT TO BE CARRIED OUT

Alexandria Property Development welcomes feedback on the proposal and will continue to keep stakeholders and the community informed of the project approval process through the exhibition and determination phases by:

- Continuing to engage with the community about the project and its impacts, as the project moves through subsequent stages of the approval process
- Enabling the community to seek clarification about the project through the two-way communication channels.

Further community and stakeholder consultation will be undertaken if the project is approved. The proposed consultation responds to the community feedback during the preparation of the EIS and the community participation objectives in the Undertaking Engagement guide.