



Appendix E – Engagement Summary Table

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
Government authorities			
<p>NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure</p> <p>Planning and assessment team</p> <p>Government Architect NSW</p>	<p>Urban Planners from Urbis have been in ongoing consultation with the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) throughout preparation of the proposal.</p> <p>This included informal Scoping Meetings in December 2024 and January 2025 to present the proposed uplift scheme and seek feedback.</p>	<p>DPHI and the Government Architect NSW provided feedback on the built form options that were presented and supported the progression of an ‘alternative built form option’ as a comparison to a straight 30% uplift scheme.</p> <p>DPHI provided feedback and direction on the process to convert the design competition scheme to the Bridging Design Excellence Strategy, which supported the ‘continuation of the design competition.’</p>	<p>Urbis will remain available to meet and discuss the proposal with DPHI as the application progresses.</p>
<p>Design Integrity Panel</p> <p>City of Sydney Representative</p> <p>Government Architect of NSW Representative</p>	<p>The Design Integrity Panel (DIP) has been consulted on various occasions throughout the development of the proposal. This includes:</p> <p>DIP meeting #1: 30 April 2025</p> <p>Email correspondence: 2 June 2025</p>	<p>At the conclusion of the DIP engagement the panel was confident that the site is well positioned to accommodate the proposed additional density whilst remaining in alignment with the design intent established during the Design Competition. Overall, the DIP agreed that the design provided design</p>	<p>The design team has provided the DIP with a number of materials to satisfy the comments raised during the panel meetings. This includes:</p> <p>Massing and design options analysis</p> <p>Detailed architectural plans</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
	<p>Informal meeting: 11 June 2025</p> <p>DIP meeting #2: 23 July 2025</p>	<p>excellence in accordance with the winning scheme.</p> <p>During the DIP process the panel requested further consideration on the amenity impacts to surrounding areas as a result of the built form. The DIP wanted to understand the other massing options considered and how these amenity impacts compared.</p> <p>Further, the DIP made comment on the public domain and ground plane including equitable access opportunities and how safe movement across the site can occur at both day and night.</p> <p>Additional comments included materiality and architectural outcome, affordable housing distribution, architectural plan sets, affordable housing solar access and thermal performance.</p>	<p>Written letter from community housing provider</p> <p>Further presentation on revised design such as explanation on equitable access and CPTED design.</p> <p>Following the DIP process, the panel provided written confirmation that the design could progress to EIS stage, this demonstrates that several of the matters raised by the DIP have been satisfied.</p>
<p>City of Sydney Council</p> <p>Planning and assessment team</p>	<p>On 1 August 2024 and 2 September 2024, the Applicant and the project team met with Council's planning team and technical experts to discuss the sites forthcoming detailed design application following the concept DA approval.</p>	<p>The project team presented the Design Competition Winning Scheme to Council, outlining how the architect intends to address the Panel's recommendations for design refinement. Council provided initial feedback on level transitions, public</p>	<p>The project team has refined the design since the pre-DA including uplifting the site to accommodate the 30% uplift in accordance with the housing SEPP infill affordable housing pathway. This uplift has considered potential impacts to the site and surrounding neighbours</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
	<p>As the development transitioned from a Council DA to State Significant DA the City of Sydney have remained a key stakeholder. As such, the City of Sydney attended a session with the Government Architect, at which the GA briefed the City on the Bridging DES process, with the City attending the first Design Integrity Panel session as an observer.</p> <p>The DIP is made up of Design Competition Panel members.</p>	<p>domain accessibility, and alignment with the approved concept envelope.</p> <p>Council outlined considerations for a future application, including the technical reporting required, further assessment of view impacts, vehicle access, rooftop design, and clarification around proposed building heights that deviate from the concept envelope.</p> <p>In addition to the above, during the DIP process no verbal or formal written feedback was provided by Council.</p>	<p>including view sharing and overshadowing.</p> <p>The design, whilst increasing in density, continues to provide a design that aligns with the final competition scheme and is considered to achieve design excellence.</p>
<p>Lord Mayor and Councillors</p> <p>Clover Moore AO (Lord Mayor)</p> <p>Cr Olly Arkins</p> <p>Cr Sylvie Ellsmore</p> <p>Cr Lyndon Gannon</p> <p>Cr Robert Kok</p> <p>Cr Zann Maxwell</p> <p>Cr Jess Miller</p> <p>Cr Matthew Thompson</p> <p>Cr Yvonne Weldon AM</p>	<p>On 10 July 2025, Urbis Engagement contacted the City of Sydney's Mayor and Councillors to introduce them to the proposal and invite them to a briefing to discuss the proposal further.</p> <p>A copy of the community newsletter was attached to this email.</p>	<p>On 17 July 2025, Lord Mayor Clover Moore's office responded advising that the email had been forwarded on to the City's Chief Executive Officer's office and City staff for response.</p> <p>No response was received from other Councillors, the CEO's office or Council staff.</p>	<p>Urbis will remain available to provide further information on the proposal should a response be received.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
Cr Adam Worling			
Elected officials			
Alexander Greenwich MP (Independent) – State Member for Sydney	On 11 July 2025, Urbis Engagement contacted Alexander Greenwich to inform him about the SSDA and provide a copy of the community newsletter.	<p>On 16 July 2025, an Electorate Officer from Mr Greenwich’s office responded advising Mr Greenwich was on leave and requested his registration for the community webinar which he or a member of his office may join.</p> <p>No representatives from Mr Greenwich’s office attended the webinar.</p> <hr/> <p>On 19 August 2025, representatives from the project team met with Mr Greenwich and a member of his team to provide an overview of the proposal and led a question and answer session. During the meeting, Mr Greenwich and his team provided the following feedback:</p> <p>Affordable housing:</p> <p>Affordable housing was a key focus. Mr Greenwich recognised ongoing challenges with the loss of affordable housing in infill developments and raised the issue of key workers often being ineligible for affordable housing despite</p>	<p>Urbis will remain available to provide further information on the proposal should Mr Greenwich or his office request further information about the proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>Affordable housing:</p> <p>William Street Nominee has been in discussions with a certified Community Housing Provider to understand best practice ongoing management measures. This will be conducted in line with current legislation and requirements for affordable housing.</p> <p>In line with these discussions, the affordable homes include 1-to-2-bedroom apartments. Market homes range from 1 to 3-bedroom apartments.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
		<p>affordability pressures. He encouraged William Street Residential to consider incentives to support essential worker housing on the site.</p> <p>Mr Greenwich requested clarification about the allocation and typology of apartments for affordable homes and market homes. He also urged WSR to monitor any amendments and recommendations to the Affordable Housing requirements.</p>	
		<p>Precinct activation & open space:</p> <p>Mr Greenwich and his office showed support for the inclusion of new public open space, noting the importance of its management, activation, and sunlight access. Mr Greenwich emphasised that any green space is welcomed, provided it remains well-maintained and active.</p> <p>Mr Greenwich queried who would manage the open space and recommended that William Street Residential contact the Kirketon</p>	<p>Precinct activation & open space:</p> <p>William Street Residential will retain ownership and ongoing management of the ground floor retail and public open space to ensure it is a contributory factor to precinct activation.</p> <p>A Plan of Management will be prepared to ensure the open space is secure and safe for all members of the community.</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
		<p>Road Centre to support ongoing safety measures.</p> <p>Support was also shown for the ground floor retail as a driver to help activate the precinct. He also highlighted the need to design the park in ways that encourage positive activity, such as fitness and recreation, while acknowledging potential challenges around anti-social behaviour.</p>	
		<p>Height distribution:</p> <p>Mr Greenwich and his team queried whether the option of reducing the open space to accommodate built form at lower heights was considered.</p>	<p>Height distribution:</p> <p>The inclusion of public open space was considered a welcome addition to the design scheme during the Design Integrity process. Therefore, preservation of this space alongside the proposed height was the preferred option.</p>
		<p>View impacts:</p> <p>Mr Greenwich sought to understand how views and solar access would be considered.</p>	<p>View impacts:</p> <p>A key component of William Street Residential's SSDA is to ensure additional impacts, beyond the approved concept scheme, are minimised. As part of the proposal, William Street Residential has commissioned studies to determine</p>

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
			<p>whether this has been achieved in the proposed design scheme.</p> <p>The consultation approach included a several briefings with strata committees of surrounding buildings who were likely to be impacted or interested in views and solar access. Attendance at these briefings is captured in Section 3.</p>
		<p>Traffic, parking and access:</p> <p>The parking provision was also queried, noting 331 spaces was high in comparison to the number of apartments being provided. The importance of EV charging capacity was also discussed,</p> <p>Questions were also asked about vehicle access points and traffic impacts in comparison to the site's current use.</p>	<p>Traffic, parking and access:</p> <p>The proposed parking is in line with local and State Government requirements for in-fill affordable housing proposals. EV charging will be included in the development.</p> <p>Access points, for both residents, visitors and servicing is via Forbes Street. This is consistent with the approved concept scheme.</p>
Allegra Spender MP (Independent) – Federal Member for Wentworth.	On 18 July 2025, Urbis Engagement contacted Allegra Spender MP to inform her about the SSDA and provide a copy of the community newsletter.	To date no feedback has been received from Ms Spender.	Urbis will remain available to provide further information on the proposal should Ms Spender or her office request further information about the proposal.
Transport for NSW	On 30 July 2025, the appointed traffic consultants contacted Transport for NSW's (TfNSW)	On 19 August 2025, TfNSW responded advising it has reviewed the submitted information and	The appointed traffic consultants will proceed with the methodology outlined in its correspondence with

Stakeholder	How this group was consulted	Feedback received	Project response
	<p>Development Sydney team to provide an overview of the proposal relevant to traffic. The consultants explained that car parking would comply with relevant planning controls and that traffic generation is expected to decrease during weekday peak periods, though a modest increase is anticipated on weekends.</p> <p>They noted that, due to the limited overall traffic impact (in comparison to the site's current use as a car hire company), no new traffic surveys or modelling are proposed. Instead, their assessment will focus on the net change in traffic and include a Green Travel Plan to highlight opportunities for alternative transport modes. Feedback from Transport for NSW was invited ahead of finalising the application documentation.</p>	<p>confirmed no traffic modelling is required for TfNSW assessment purposes as the development is unlikely to significantly impact the classified road network.</p> <p>TfNSW will provide further comments during the EIS exhibition stage when the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) is available for review.</p>	<p>TfNSW to inform its Traffic Impact Assessment</p>