

## ENGAGEMENT OUTCOMES

This section summarises the engagement outcomes, including the key themes and where relevant, the project response to this feedback.

### 1.1.1. Local Community feedback

A mix of engagement methods was used to generate maximum exposure and response. The response from the community and how this has been considered in the project is provided in the table below:

Issue type	Detail	Project response
<b>Traffic congestion – during construction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern that Cooper Street is already heavily congested and that construction traffic will worsen delays.</li> <li>- Clarence Street is narrow and not suitable for two-way traffic or large construction vehicles.</li> <li>- Concerns regarding anticipated traffic disruptions from construction vehicles, machinery and trucks</li> <li>- Concerns that access to and from the area will become more difficult during peak hours.</li> <li>- Questions from webinar participant about how traffic and safety will be managed during construction given the narrowness of Cooper Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared by a qualified traffic engineer as part of the development assessment or prior to construction.</li> <li>- The CTMP typically includes traffic control measures, temporary signage, and restrictions on heavy-vehicle access during peak periods.</li> <li>- Construction vehicle routes will be planned to minimise impacts on local streets.</li> <li>- Traffic controllers may be employed during key construction stages to maintain safe vehicle and pedestrian movement.</li> <li>- As per preliminary CTMP, it is proposed all construction vehicles will access and egress the site via Cooper Street throughout all stages of construction.</li> <li>- All loading and unloading activities are to be contained wholly within the site, where practicable.</li> </ul>
<b>Traffic impact once completed</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns that development will add significant traffic to Cooper Str, Clarence St, Parramatta Rd and Leicester Avn.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) will be prepared by a qualified consultant to assess forecast traffic volumes and intersection performance.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existing roads are viewed as Inadequate for handling increased traffic volumes.</li> <li>- Risk of longer queues, more congestion and reduced road safety (e.g. narrow road sections, potential head-on crash risks).</li> <li>- Requests for a qualified traffic engineer's assessment to be undertaken</li> <li>- Suggestions to widen roads and provide additional turning lanes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The TIA will identify required upgrades or mitigation measures, if any, and will accompany the SSDA.</li> <li>- Road widening will be dedicated to Council</li> </ul>
<b>Parking impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns that street parking availability for visitors will decrease</li> <li>- Question raised about the number of visitor parking spaces included in the proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking provision will comply with required planning controls, including minimum visitor parking requirements.</li> <li>- Internal car parking layouts are designed to accommodate resident's needs and reduce reliance on on-street parking.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise, dust and construction disruption</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worries about loud noise affecting daily life and working from home.</li> <li>- Concerns about dust, heavy machinery, early-morning work hours and general construction disturbance.</li> <li>- Anticipated reduction in quality of life during construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As per Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA), Construction noise will be limited to approved daytime hours only</li> <li>- Various noise-control methods (e.g., temporary barriers, equipment enclosures, quieter machinery) are identified in the NVIA to reduce disruption as much as possible during construction</li> <li>- Dust suppression (e.g., water spraying) and noise-reducing practices will be implemented as required.</li> </ul>
<b>Safety concerns</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safety concerns arising from increased presence of construction vehicles on narrow streets leading to reduced visibility and road blockages.</li> <li>- Concerns about pedestrian safety, especially since pedestrian pathways are narrow or absent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The final Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will include pedestrian-management and safety measures.</li> <li>- As per preliminary CTMP Class A Hoarding is proposed along the perimeter of the construction site to maintain the pedestrian thoroughfare.</li> <li>- All material, plant, and spoil bin storage are to be accommodated within the site at all times during all stages of construction.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction access points have been designed to minimise conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.</li> </ul>
<b>Shadowing / loss of natural light</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fears that the proposed development will block sunlight to adjacent buildings.</li> <li>- Concern about homes becoming darker and less liveable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shadow diagrams have been prepared to support the EIS.</li> <li>- It is noted that the majority of overshadowing impact will occur over the railway line.</li> </ul>
<b>Neighbourhood amenity &amp; quality of life</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worries about permanent increases in noise, traffic and activity levels.</li> <li>- Fears about reduced privacy</li> <li>- Perception that the character of the area will change negatively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where possible, landscaping, screening and façade treatments will be designed so as to protect privacy and improve amenity for surrounding residents.</li> </ul>
<b>Bulk waste &amp; street cleanliness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns that existing bulk dumping already a major issue in the area.</li> <li>- Concern that 200+ new units will produce more rubbish, worsening current waste management challenges.</li> <li>- Question regarding how bulk waste will be to prevent dumping.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Waste collection processes and facilities are outlined in a Waste Management Plan, prepared to accompany the EIS.</li> <li>- Waste collection and bulk waste will be collected internally within the basement, so as to prevent and minimise illegal dumping.</li> <li>- As pore the Waste Management Plan, all residents of the building will be provided with unrestricted 24-hour access to this facility. The Owners Corporation will monitor this area regularly to ensure that all materials stored within its confines are done so in a manner that will not adversely impact on the health, safety, and convenience.</li> </ul>
<b>Communal spaces</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questions from webinar participant if the communal / public space will be provided for the general public or only for building residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communal open spaces are to be provided for the common use of the building's residents or their visitors. Access to these areas will be restricted to people affiliated with the building, and not accessible to the general public.</li> </ul>

**Questions / clarifications**

- How will the project mitigate traffic congestion on Cooper Street, which is often blocked during peak hours on weekdays and weekends?

**1.1.2. Agency**

Engagement with agencies and organisations was led by the proponent and relevant technical subconsultants alongside the preparation of their technical reports and studies as part of the SSDA. Where this was not the case, Hill PDA engagement team contacted agencies directly via phone and/or email. The stakeholder engagement outcome details are provided in the table below.

Theme/ agency	Stakeholder Feedback	Project Response
<b>City of Canda Bay</b>		
<b>Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site is not eligible for the in-fill affordable housing provisions under Part 2, Division 1 of SEPP (Housing). The development should therefore comply with the height of building standards under the Canada Bay LEP 2013 (25m and 59m)</li><li>• Concern is raised with a variation to the maximum height standards under 4.6 of the LEP as this would be contrary to Part 9 of the LEP relating to incentive floor space ratio and building height for key sites.</li><li>• A mix of dwelling sizes to be provided consistent with Clause 6.11 of the Canada Bay LEP 2013.</li><li>• The EIS is to confirm whether a monetary contribution or the dedication affordable housing dwellings is proposed. Where the dedication of dwelling is proposed, the dwellings are to be of an equivalent quality to the balance of the development, and the plans must indicate the dwellings that are proposed to be dedicated.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Application is not seeking to apply the infill affordable planning framework under SEPP (Housing) or seeking the height and FSR bonus afforded through this pathway</li><li>• The concern is noted, and the assessment of any Clause 4.6 will occur through the SSD assessment and determination process.</li><li>• It is noted that Part 9 of the application does not prevent the lodgement of an application consistent with the base Zone and LEP planning controls, and seek a variation under Clause 4.6</li><li>• Noted and is being considered during the design development. Any variation from that mix would require a Clause 4.6.</li><li>• Noted and to be discussed in the EIS.</li></ul>
<b>Design quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The DPHI State Led Rezoning Team was contacted by t is requested that the proposed development be referred to a</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proponent requested a meeting with the SDRP, and this was rejected.</li></ul>

Theme/ agency	Stakeholder Feedback	Project Response
	<p>State Design Review Panel to ensure the design achieves best practice architectural quality, urban design excellence, and an appropriate response to the site and its context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the lead architects are DKO who have extensive experience in the delivery of mixed use and apartment developments exhibiting design quality and excellence.</li> </ul>
<b>Public domain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land with a frontage to Cooper Street with a depth of 3.0m is to be provided for public domain (car parking, landscaping and footpath) and dedicated to Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS will discuss the siting of the built form and the setting back of the built form and use of the land fronting Cooper Street.</li> <li>No dedication statutory requirement is contained within the LEP and the Council contributions plan references the offsetting of contributions for land dedicated to Council.</li> <li>Discussion with Council on dedication and contribution offsetting is best to be undertaken following consent.</li> </ul>
<b>Ground and Secondary building setbacks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A front setback of 6.0m and a secondary (upper level) setback of 2.0m is required</li> <li>All building setbacks are to be measured from the relocated boundary.</li> <li>The front setback area is to be clear of basements or other underground intrusions.</li> <li>The front setback must be designed so as not to be dominated by stairs, ramps, level changes, handrails and other servicing structures. Any design elements to achieve universal access must be internalised within the building form and clear of setback area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that this agency will have further opportunity to provide feedback through the Exhibition phase of the SSDA</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<b>Podium</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The podium of the building is to comprise a maximum of four (4) storeys as per Figure 17 of the Homebush Design Guide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
<b>Site Isolation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS is to address the site isolation principles outlined in Kaeavellas v Sutherland Shire Council [2004] NSWLEC 251.</li> <li>Objection is made to an alternative lot consolidation that results in a development that is inconsistent with the planning controls (public domain dedication, front setback, secondary (upper level) setbacks &amp; building separation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS will include this discussion</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

Theme/ agency	Stakeholder Feedback	Project Response
<b>Building floor plate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built form over 8 storey must be limited to a maximum 750m<sup>2</sup> GFA floorplate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Energy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIS to confirm that the development will use electricity (not gas) for all energy requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Engagement requirements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In correspondence with the project's planners, the Department advised that, because the application met the criteria for Industry-Specific SEARs, DPPI did not consult with TfNSW on the proposal. DPPI further advised that TfNSW will be required to be engaged in accordance with the SEARs engagement requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. TfNSW engaged for feedback.</li> </ul>
<b>Transport for NSW</b>		
<b>SEARs Requirements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TfNSW representative provided standard SEARs requirements, via email dated 3 November 2025, requesting the following information form part of the EIS to ensure rail protection is adequately factored into the design to assist with a streamlined assessment and compliance process through Sydney Trains: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Rail Impact Assessment (RIA) Report, endorsed by a TfNSW Asset Management Branch Technically Assured Organisation (TAO). This report must specifically address how the development will comply with the applicable rail specific TfNSW Standards and other applicable Standards, Codes and Guidelines, accompanied by associated supporting documents.</li> <li>Craneage Plans</li> <li>Detailed survey plans (by a registered surveyor) showing the proposed development in relation to the rail corridor, rail assets, TAM land/easements and relevant first and second reserve zones below and above ground.</li> <li>Cross sectional drawings (by a registered surveyor) showing the proposed development in relation to the rail</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proponent responded via email on 4 November 2025, noting that the standard SEARs requirements referenced in the TfNSW email response differed from the Project SEARs for this project.</li> <li>Nonetheless, the project team noted their willingness to work with TfNSW to ensure the development meets all expectations and design requirements.</li> </ul>

Theme/ agency	Stakeholder Feedback	Project Response
	corridor, rail assets, TAM land/easements and relevant first and second reserve zones below and above ground	
<b>Sydney Water</b>		
<b>Peg Out</b>	Water Services Coordinator (WSC) engaged Peg out received and discussions held with WSC Correspondence received advising likely suitable clearance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1258 376 1928 402">• Suitable clearance to be addressed during detailed design.</li> </ul>