



17 July 2025

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Online submission at:

<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/draftplans/exhibition/proposed-changes-community-participation-plan>

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: SSROC Submission to the proposed changes to the Community Participation Plan for State Significant Development

1. Introduction

The Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (SSROC) appreciates the opportunity to make a submission about the exhibition of the *Proposed changes to the Community Participation Plan* of the Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure (the Department). The consultation focus is the public exhibition timeframes for certain residential State Significant Development (SSD) applications.

SSROC acknowledges the opportunity provided by NSW Government's recent legislative amendments to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act to enable greater flexibility to change the minimum mandatory exhibition period for certain residential SSD applications with the aim of supporting reasonable measures to help accelerate housing delivery.

SSROC is an association of twelve local councils in the area south of Sydney Harbour, covering central, inner west, eastern and southern Sydney. SSROC acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land on which we work and live, the peoples of the Darug, Dharawal and Eora Nations. SSROC provides a forum for the exchange of ideas between our member councils, and an interface between governments, other councils and key bodies on issues of common interest. Together, our member councils cover a population of about 1.9 million, one third of the population of Sydney, including Australia's most densely populated suburbs. SSROC seeks to advocate for the needs of our member councils and bring a regional perspective to the issues raised.

SSROC acknowledges the Government's commitment to help local councils to contribute to housing supply reforms and targets under the National Housing Accord to increase the number of homes built to address supply and affordability issues across the state. SSROC and its member councils have a strong interest in the supply and ongoing provision of market and non-market housing in their communities and welcomes the opportunity to provide input into the proposed arrangements.

2. Our understanding of the proposed changes

A consultation document [Proposed changes to the Community Participation Plan | Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#) outlines proposed amendments to the Department's Community Participation Plan to change the minimum public exhibition period for certain

residential SSD applications. The proposed amendments follow the assent of the Environment Planning and Assessment Amendment Bill on 22 May 2025.

The proposed changes shorten the minimum public exhibition period to 14 days for relevant residential SSD applications, including:

- Development declared SSD under section 4.36(3) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* that includes residential accommodation.
- Housing developments listed under schedule 1 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021:
 - Housing development carried out by certain public authorities
 - In-fill affordable housing
 - Build-to-rent housing
 - Seniors housing.
- Developments that include residential accommodation within accelerated Transport Oriented Development precincts as specified in schedule 2 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021.

A 28-day minimum exhibition period will continue to apply to all other SSD applications.

Legislative Requirements

All planning authorities, such as councils and the Department, are required to prepare and publish a Community Participation Plan on the NSW Planning Portal. The Community Participation Plan explains how the planning authority will undertake community consultation. When preparing a Community Participation Plan, planning authorities must have regard to the principles set out in Section 2.23(2) of the Act.

Public exhibition requirements

During a public exhibition, the community and other stakeholders are invited to make submissions to share their views on a policy, plan, or project.

Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Act sets out the mandatory requirements for community participation for planning authorities in carrying out their planning functions.

Under Schedule 1, Section 9 of the Act, the minimum public exhibition period for SSD applications is currently 28 days; or for certain residential SSD applications, the period can be set out in the Department's Community Participation Plan.

Rationale for changes to exhibition timeframes for certain residential SSD applications

Responding to the housing challenge and achieving the targets set under the National Housing Accord is an important priority for the NSW Government.

The Consultation Paper states that changes aim to retain meaningful opportunities for community input during the public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), while helping to accelerate the delivery of essential housing projects.

Previously, all SSD applications were required to be publicly exhibited for a minimum of 28 days. Recent legislative amendments to the Act now provide flexibility to change the minimum mandatory exhibition period for certain residential SSD applications. The aim is to assist in streamlining the assessment of housing projects.

The Department is proposing to amend its Community Participation Plan to change the minimum public exhibition period for certain residential SSD applications from 28 days to 14 days.

Schedule 1, Section 9 of the amended EP&A Act provides that the Department's Community Participation Plan, as prepared by the Planning Secretary, can specify shorter or longer exhibition periods for certain residential SSD applications. However, the minimum exhibition time is 14 days.

The Consultation Paper notes that the Department will retain the ability to extend the 14-day period on a case-by-case basis, if appropriate. This flexibility seeks to ensure the level of public consultation reflects the potential impacts of each project. Longer exhibition periods will be retained for more complex applications that in the opinion of the Department may require more detailed input or advice.

The Paper also notes that the proposed changes to the Department's Community Participation Plan are to adopt the 14 days minimum period with the aim to bring the exhibition period for these residential SSD applications, in line with what the Paper asserts would typically apply for residential development applications progressing as local development.

Excerpt of proposed changes to the Community Participation Plan

The Table below provides an excerpt of the proposed change to the mandatory requirements set out in Table 1 of the Department's Community Participation Plan.

Assessments	
Planning function	Exhibition timeframe
Application for development consent for certain residential SSD applications including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing development carried out by certain public authorities (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 26) • In-fill affordable housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 26A) • Build-to-rent housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 27) • Seniors housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 28) • Development in accelerated Transport Oriented Development precincts (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 2, Section 19) • Development declared SSD under Section 4.36(3) of the Act that includes residential accommodation 	14 days*

*Minimum exhibition timeframes can be extended on a case-by-case basis.

3. Key Issues

A number of interrelated key issues need to be taken into account when considering the appropriate exhibition period for residential SSD projects.

3.1 Scale of residential SSD projects

Most residential SSD projects in Greater Sydney are over \$75 million in capital investment value (CIV), and as a rule, are large and complex. Typically, their multi-storey building configurations will impact on whole neighbourhoods, the local environment and traffic movement in significant and

interconnected ways. A majority now appear to involve greater complexity with a concurrent rezoning.

There is a wide span of residential SSD project sizes, with varying complexity and diverse urban contexts being recommended by the Housing Delivery Authority (HDA)¹. For example, 40 dwellings in Ulladulla² to 1,500 dwellings registered in Brookvale³ and 1,554 dwellings in Leppington⁴. A singular minimum threshold exhibition period for all contexts does not suit these very different project scales, planning contexts and the nature of the risks applied. A singular minimum threshold is inappropriate and unhelpful for stakeholders. On the other hand, gaining individual tailored exhibition time frame approvals from senior management in the Department for the particular exhibition period may well exceed the difference between 14 days and 28 exhibition periods under consideration negating any potential time saving. A more streamlined administrative approach is therefore recommended.

The public and councils need a longer exhibition period for them than for simpler, smaller residential projects. This allows stakeholders to properly assess the proposals, their implications and provide feedback and if determined lodge objections to parts of the proposal or the proposal as a whole. Mitigations to any design problems with the projects identified during the exhibition period will enable the assessment and conditioning of the approval to add value, contribute to achieving 'density done well' and help promote the social licence of the planning system.

The series of recent legislative changes to the types and scales of residential SSD projects now requires a more tailored approach than a single mandatory exhibition timeframe. These changes need exhibition periods proportionate to the types of projects and their complexity, related to community's engagement needs and expectations while still achieving an appropriate streamlined assessment process.

The level of public scrutiny should be proportionate with the degree of anticipation of such projects in the adopted planning for an area. Where there is a departure from the established strategic planning, the risks of negative impacts increase and so does the need for more public scrutiny.

3.2 Department Proposed Exhibition Timeframes

The proposed minimum mandatory exhibition time of 14 days is too short for effective public consultations on larger State Significant Developments.

Community participation through more extended exhibition timelines has a proven track record of adding lasting value to major housing and other developments. Governments have long publicly acknowledged the importance of public engagement particularly for larger residential and mixed developments like many of the SSD projects with concurrent rezonings. This underlines the need for adopting a more nuanced, proportionate and calibrated approach to community engagement recommended by this submission. See Attachment 1 for a summary of some notable larger projects in NSW that have been recognised as having value added to place based outcomes instigated through a good public consultation process where exhibition periods were longer than 14 days.

Even in those instances where community feedback did not contribute to adding value to the nature of a development, this outcome is not predictable and is countered by those occasions

¹ <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/policy-and-legislation/housing/housing-delivery-authority/published-records>

² HDA Record 23 June 2025 No. 12

³ HDA Record 7 March 2025 No. 17

⁴ HDA Record 7 March 2025 No. 27

when it does.

However councils' input to SSD is reliably valuable - providing planning information and technical studies that add useful insights that facilitate intelligent trade-offs. 14 days for larger housing projects is not adequate for councils to perform this role.

Accordingly, this proposed change to the Community Participation Plan is, in our view, is counterproductive and not fit for purpose. As noted in the Consultation Paper public input on development applications should help to make sure all relevant issues are identified during assessments and lead to improved and lasting outcomes for local communities. In complex contexts involving developments, it is important to understand the net community benefit of a development such as weighing the marginal benefits of additional housing supply as well as negative impacts to the local community and environment.

There is also potential to add to community distrust in the planning process while not significantly reducing overall assessment times. 14 days is too short to allow people to make a well-considered submission and this is likely to default to just an objection without adding value by articulating the specific problems.

A shorter time frame is likely to be counterproductive as it may well encourage some local campaigns enlisting objections to the SSD proposal to quickly reach 50 objections to try to trigger what may be perceived as a fairer hearing from Independent Planning Commission.^{5 6 7}

While the Government in 2024 elected to largely exempt in-fill affordable housing residential SSD proposals from IPC involvement, the Minister for Planning may be called on to use his or her discretion to make a referral when the matter becomes contentious. Critically, this change in IPC involvement that removed powers of objection from local councils occurred on the understanding of a 28 day public exhibition period staying in place⁸.

3.3 Corresponding Council Exhibition Timeframes

The consultation paper notes that the intention of the proposed changes is that the exhibition period for these residential SSD applications will be in line with what would typically apply for residential development applications progressing as local development in the Department's Community Participation Plan.⁹

⁵ "The IPC works together with the greater NSW community to ensure a mutually beneficial future. We deliver a high level of independence, expertise and transparency across the assessment and determination of SSD applications in NSW."

⁶ Infill Affordable Housing projects that are deemed highly contentious and those with a declared political donation will still be referred to the IPC and other existing thresholds still apply. <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/news/more-affordable-homes-be-delivered-faster#:~:text=The%20Infill%20Affordable%20Housing%20Bonus%20scheme%20was,affordable%20housing%20for%20at%20least%2015%20years.&text=Infill%20Affordable%20Housing%20projects%20that%20are%20deemed,IPC%20and%20other%20existing%20thresholds%20still%20apply>.

⁷ The only exception to this is for in-fill affordable housing SSD applications (Schedule 1 section 26A of the Planning Systems SEPP). For these applications the only automatic trigger for IPC referral is where the applicant has made a reportable political donation. <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/development-and-assessment/state-significant-development>

⁸ "Following the changes, projects will still be placed on public exhibition, communities and councils will have their say and they will be thoroughly assessed through a merit-based process". Ibid

⁹ DPHI Consultation Document, *Proposed Changes to Community Participation Plan*, Page 5



Overwhelmingly local councils in SSROC have exhibition periods of 28 days (20 working days) for large residential projects with a \$75 million threshold for capital investment value.

No evidence was provided of examples of such large residential projects having 14 days exhibition periods. This assumption is not correct. There needs to be parity in exhibition times to keep the planning system fair and functional.

Some examples illustrate this point.

City of Sydney

- The City of Sydney would apply a 28-day exhibition period for development applications of over \$50 million CIV.¹⁰

Randwick City Council

- The Randwick City Council would apply a 28-day exhibition period for applications for development consent for designated development, for integrated development or for State significant development.¹¹ (In Kensington and Kingsford areas, most large applications need to be referred to Office of Water because of the groundwater issues associated with basements, and are therefore Integrated Development with an exhibition period of 28 days).

City of Canada Bay Council

- The City of Canada Bay would apply a 28-day exhibition period for applications for development consent for designated development, for integrated development and for planning proposals.¹² Development applications would be 21 days.

Generally, our councils do not consider 14 days to be sufficient time for effective public consultation on applications of this scale and complexity¹³. A desk top review of development exhibition times across Australia and internationally suggests that this proposed shorter period is not best practice and highly likely to be problematic.

There may be situations, especially during school and public holidays when people are away and do not see notifications in time. This is likely to create frustrations and mistrust in the system. Extending the exhibition timeframes to take account of these periods would be prudent and consistent with council participation plans.

Therefore, the singular threshold with a shorter exhibition period as currently described should **not** apply for certain residential SSD applications and is not recommended to be included in the Department's Community Participation Plan. If there is a case for the proposed rule, a case has not been provided in the Consultation Paper.

3.4 Residential SSD projects with concurrent rezoning

The EP&A Act did not envisage SSD projects with concurrent rezonings led by private proponents. Schedule 1 therefore does not set out a mandatory minimum exhibition period for this type of complex application, that adequately responds to the specific probity and engagement risks attached to this context and type of application.

¹⁰ Community Engagement Strategy and Community Participation Plan 2025-2029 Appendix D <https://www.bing.com/search?q=city+of+sydney+Community+Engagement+strategy+2025-2029&form=APMCS1&PC=APMC>

¹¹ www.randwick.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/25918/Community-Engagement-Strategy.pdf

¹² <https://www.canadabay.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-03/CanadaBay-CPP-20240321-FA.pdf>

¹³ Approximately 100 dwelling units for a CIV of \$75 million.

Concurrent rezonings

SSDs with concurrent rezonings have greatly added complexity. It is inappropriate that the 14 day minimum mandatory exhibition period apply to these SSD proposals. A separate, distinct minimum exhibition period is now required and should form a separate element of the Department's Community Participation Plan.

These proposals are seeking two major concurrent planning decisions that are inherently more complex and interconnected. They require deeper and longer consideration by the public, the local council and the NSW Government led assessment. A spot rezoning generated by a singular private proponent by its nature disrupts the well-considered existing strategic planning that has gained collective stakeholder support and acceptance as current law. It has wider geographic social and economic implications for communities as well as infrastructure needs and demands. They also have wider implications for neighbouring sites, existing land use plans and unseen council planning that may be underway for a precinct. By the HDA's definition the rezonings are significant - greater than 20% increase beyond existing controls¹⁴.

The proposed changes will create inconsistencies with current Departmental good practice. The SSD Rezoning Policy (Sept 2024)¹⁵ notes that SSD rezoning proposals should be publicly exhibited. The minimum exhibition period is indicated as 20 working days in the Policy.

As at 24 June 2025, of 147 residential SSD projects recommended by the HDA in 2025, 101 (69%) proposed concurrent rezonings.

Where there is a concurrent rezoning with SSD the exhibition periods could also be concurrent to accelerate the overall assessment process. However, this would transfer added project approval risks to the proponent.

3.5 Probity Risks in Proponent-led SSD and Concurrent Rezonings

While the EP&A Act has now enabled flexibility for setting mandatory public exhibition timeframes to match circumstances, these timeframes should be codified by the Department's Community Participation Plan to avoid probity risks and protect the public good and benefit in proponent-led SSD applications and especially with SSD applications with a concurrent rezoning.

Because of the special nature of SSD proposals with concurrent rezonings there are special inherent probity and corruption risks with proponent led rezonings. In this context, there is always the latent risk of corruption because of the special permission granted to the singular proponent to nominate the size of upzoning benefit they could receive. More specifically there is the risk of causing injustice through advantaging one party, the proponent, at the expense of others: the community; council; and other developers looking to develop on adjacent sites.¹⁶

Furthermore, the length of the minimum consultation period may influence proponents' decisions about the type of housing proposal and therefore the approval pathway that is made and configured to avoid the chance of added scrutiny and the potential involvement of the IPC in adjudicating a development. It is very important to avoid a situation where a minor or less

¹⁴ Significant changes to development standards or prohibited development will require a suitable concurrent rezoning proposal. For a proposal that exceeds applicable development standards (such as height or FSR controls) by more than 20% or is prohibited by an EPI, will need to be lodged in conjunction with a rezoning proposal.
<https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-12/housing-delivery-authority-ssd-criteria.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-09/state-significant-rezoning-policy.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.icac.nsw.gov.au/about-corruption/why-exposing-and-preventing-corruption-is-important>

significant part of planning regulation controls or influences more important major planning outcomes. This perception needs to be avoided by the NSW Government keen to maintain the highest probity standards.

Avoidance of broader public scrutiny was clearly not the rationale for the infill affordable housing bonus' exclusion from the IPC responsibilities, as other local planning controls and merit tests still apply. Rather, it was chosen as a way of minimising unhelpful minor objections to affordable housing and added height and floorspace. It was not presented by the NSW Government as a means of avoiding deeper public oversight of controversial complex proposals. There is a present risk that a housing proposal does not have any council and community support. This could be because these stakeholders consider that the proposal lacks merit and would deliver density poorly, and therefore would advantage only the proponent as the financial beneficiary.

Clearly shorter time frames confer special financial and other benefits on proponents, as is both explicit and implicitly noted in the Consultation Paper. This is proposed as it assists with producing more much needed housing supply. This is the main rationale and driver for the proposed reduction of the minimum exhibition and consultation period from 28 days to 14 days.

Added time creates a monetary cost for proponents in terms of their holding and interest charges for development sites. However, a shorter exhibition time also reduces the risks of the public consultation (and council consultation) identifying impediments to the development proposal in its current form obtaining approval. An approved DA with rezoning adds considerable monetary value (usually millions of dollars) to the landowner and/or developer with these development options over the subject site.

Fit for purpose planning controls and process should seek to balance the public benefit of growth for future residents and businesses with the needs and protection of existing communities' amenity, while acknowledging the need for proponents to enter into developments that will return a profit to shareholders.

The underlying purpose of the public exhibition is not to elicit objections and slow the building process, but rather to identify serious infrastructure constraints and lasting community disbenefits generated by the development as well as opportunities to bring about improvements: better planning assessment and approval decision-making results by harnessing community participation and diverse perspectives beyond professional planners.

For probity reasons it is important that minimum timeframes for SSD projects in practice do not unfairly advantage one group of proponents using the SSD pathway over another group of proponents using another development pathway. As noted, the local development pathway administered by councils generally requires a 28-day exhibition period for this size of residential development. The case for this position is even stronger for SSD proposals with concurrent rezonings. With rezonings, the risks are both higher and more likely and require more time for the community, councils and other stakeholders to adequately consider, seek technical advice and assess and then formulate a submission.

3.6 Delivering Certainty and Transparency

It is important that the decision-making process for determining the exhibition period be transparent and provide confidence that strong probity measures are being consistently implemented by the Department. A more detailed set of thresholds will provide a clear and early signal to applicants and limit the need for exceptional circumstances to be considered on a discretionary basis.

Clarity and certainty for projects under the SSD pathway will be enabled by a clearly defined process that includes new minimum exhibition periods for concurrent rezonings, provides applicants an understanding of reasonable time frame expectations, and governance procedures to vary these.

This more detailed approach in the Community Participation Plan will still provide flexibility for longer exhibition time frames as and if required.

As a consequence, a more detailed codified approach to exhibition times reflective of residential SSD project size and complexity will help:

- accelerate the delivery of more land for homes and jobs in NSW by gaining more public support for what is constructed;
- increase investor confidence in a clear, predictable and timely NSW assessment process; and
- support the sustained delivery of NSW Government's commitments under the Housing Accord, both in the short and over the longer term.

3.7 Notification Process

Another important issue to consider is the notification process itself, beyond publishing on the Portal. Whatever the notification period applicable, it will be important to modernise how notifications are delivered to improve timeliness, fairness and service. This will be especially critical for shorter timeframes given that Australia Post has shifted to delivering mail every second day.

The use of online platforms like Service NSW, for example, to electronically notify residents and businesses based on their address, and providing councils with advance notice when proposals are being considered by the HDA are two options that should be further considered.

Even with real time notifications, the proposed reduction in the exhibition period will impact the ability of the community to engage experts to advise on DAs – to interpret technical documents, plans and legislation. A 14 day window is insufficient to engage such professionals, given their availability and time required for a thorough review and site visit. The general community will need adequate time to read, understand and respond to large and complex proposals.

3.7 Recommendations

SSROC recommends that:

1. The Community Participation Plan use the flexibility created in the EP&A Act for mandatory public exhibition timeframes to match those that typically apply to residential development applications progressing as local development.
2. The new Community Participation Plan codify a set of minimum residential SSD exhibition periods proportionate to project complexity: considering the development's value, size, scale and impact.

This is to achieve consistency, transparency and fairness, with extended periods beyond a minimum mandatory exhibition period linked to objective criteria to satisfy probity objectives and give developers greater certainty.

The recommended set of exhibition times are set out in a revised Table 1. Key changes include:

- Minimum 28 days exhibition period for residential SSDs that meet the \$75 million threshold for capital investment value.
- Minimum 28 days exhibition period for residential SSDs applications with concurrent rezonings.
- Minimum 42 days exhibition period for residential SSDs applications with concurrent rezonings that meet a \$200 million threshold for capital investment value. (This reflects the 42 days exhibition provided for the Accelerated TOD precincts by the Department).

Proposed Revised Table 1

Assessments	
Planning function	Exhibition timeframes
Application for development consent for certain residential SSD applications including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing development carried out by certain public authorities (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 26) • In-fill affordable housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 26A) • Build-to-rent housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 27) • Seniors housing (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 1, Section 28) • Development in accelerated Transport Oriented Development precincts (Planning Systems SEPP Schedule 2, Section 19) • Development declared SSD under Section 4.36(3) of the Act that includes residential accommodation 	14 days for projects with a CIV under \$75M without a concurrent rezoning 28 days for projects with a CIV of \$75M and over 28 days for projects with a concurrent rezoning 42 days for projects with a CIV of \$200M concurrent rezoning

3. The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure adopt a secure, real time electronic notification system to alert residents affected by an SSD proposal. This would complement and support the existing exhibition notification processes.

4 Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the *Proposed changes to the Community Participation Plan* document of the Department of Planning Housing and Infrastructure and the public exhibition timeframes for certain residential SSD applications.

This submission welcomes this consultation as it is SSROC’s first opportunity to comment on the proposed exhibition and notification times for certain residential SSD developments.

SSROC does not support a reduction in the minimum notification times for residential State Significant Developments from 28 days to a singular 14 days period. A reduction in exhibition timeframes sit very uncomfortably with the rest of NSW planning system which emphasises transparency, accountability and public participation.



Accordingly, SSROC makes a suite of recommendations to better codify the flexibility provided in the amended legislation through applications of the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's Community Participation Plan based on project complexity. These recommendations should, strengthen community confidence in the process as exhibition periods will be proportionate to project complexity and give developers greater certainty and clarity of the exhibition time frames and more effectively mitigate risks to probity under the ICAC Act.

In order to make this submission within the prescribed timeframe, it has not been possible for it to be reviewed by councils or to be endorsed by a formal meeting of SSROC Delegates. I will contact you further if any issues arise as it is reviewed. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me or Mark Nutting, SSROC Strategic Planning Manager on 8396 3800, or ssroc@ssroc.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H Sloan".

Helen Sloan
Chief Executive Officer
Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils



Residential or mixed-use developments where community consultation led to positive project changes

NSW Examples

1. The Orchards Norwest (Hills Shire)

- Project: A large master planned residential community within the Norwest Business Park precinct.
 - Community Feedback Impact:
Residents raised concerns about traffic, infrastructure strain, and building heights.
 - Modifications made included:
Reduced building heights in some stages.
 - Greater emphasis on public domain improvements and green corridors.
 - Staged delivery of infrastructure upgrades.
- Government Recognition:
 - The Hills Shire Council highlighted community feedback in its DAs and planning panel decisions, ensuring a more balanced density and amenity outcome.

2. Gosford Waterfront Redevelopment (Central Coast Council)

- Project: Mixed-use developments incorporating residential apartments along Gosford waterfront.
- Community consultation led to:
 - Stronger foreshore access guarantees.
 - Inclusion of public space and cultural facilities alongside private residential.
 - Height reductions in some proposals to protect views and character.
- Government Recognition:
 - The NSW Government's Central Coast Regional Plan and Council strategic statements noted that consultation helped align private development with community expectations for public benefit.

3. Newcastle CBD and Honeysuckle Precinct

- Project: Urban renewal incorporating high-density residential, commercial, and public space.
- Advocacy from local residents led to:
 - Increased public waterfront access.

- Integration of public art and heritage preservation.
- Better pedestrian connectivity across former industrial sites.
- Government Recognition:
 - The Hunter and Central Coast Development Corporation (HCCDC) credited community engagement with guiding improvements to the master plan, especially in ensuring the Honeysuckle waterfront remained accessible.

4. South Eveleigh (Formerly Australian Technology Park)

- Project: Mixed-use redevelopment with a residential component, including affordable housing.
- Community Feedback Impact:
 - Local concerns over gentrification, heritage, and public space led to:
 - A higher proportion of affordable housing.
 - Heritage buildings protected and adaptively reused.
 - New open space and cycling infrastructure.
- Government Recognition:
 - NSW Government, through Mirvac's partnership with UrbanGrowth NSW, referenced community consultation as instrumental in shaping the development's social outcomes.

5. Macquarie Park Urban Renewal (Ryde LGA)

- Project: High-density residential developments integrated with commercial and university precincts.
- Community engagement led to:
 - Adjustments in building heights and setbacks.
 - Improved public transport planning, including new Metro connections.
 - Greater green space provision amid concerns about overdevelopment.
- Government Recognition:
 - The City of Ryde acknowledged consultation as helping to re-balance density with liveability in the precinct planning process.

6. Parramatta CBD and Riverbank Precinct

- Project: High-density residential, mixed-use, and cultural precinct developments.
- Community Feedback Impact:
 - Changes were made to:
 - Improve pedestrian connectivity across the Parramatta River.
 - Ensure cultural spaces (like the Powerhouse Parramatta) included community programming.

- Adjust urban design guidelines for better residential amenity.
- Government Recognition:
 - Parramatta City Council and NSW Government's Greater Cities Commission cited community feedback in shaping Parramatta as a more human-scaled, mixed-use city centre, despite its density.

7. Sydney Metro West (NSW)

- Consultation: Extensive public and stakeholder consultation on station locations and design features.
- Community Feedback Impact:
 - Changes to station access, heritage protections, and noise mitigation.
 - Additional entrances added and urban design improved in some areas.
- Government Recognition: NSW Government cited community input as crucial in shaping final station designs and achieving better local outcomes.

8. Barangaroo Development (NSW)

- Consultation: Several rounds of consultation since inception, including on the Headland Park and waterfront precinct.
- Community Feedback Impact:
 - Headland Park redesigned to reflect more naturalistic forms instead of the originally proposed built-up foreshore.
 - Increased public space and foreshore access.
- Government recognition:
 - Both the NSW Government and City of Sydney lauded the final public space outcomes as a "world-class" precinct shaped significantly by community advocacy.

9. Green Square Town Centre (NSW)

- Project: Major residential and mixed-use precinct development in Sydney's inner south.
- Community feedback led to:
 - Increased public amenities such as a library, aquatic centre, and community facilities.
 - Adjustments to pedestrian pathways and public domain to improve accessibility.
 - Ensuring a more diverse housing mix.
- Government recognition:
 - The City of Sydney emphasised community engagement as critical in shaping the precinct to balance density with liveability.

10. Central Park Sydney (NSW)



- Project: Major mixed-use urban renewal on the former Carlton & United Brewery site in Chippendale, including thousands of new apartments. (2,200 apartments)
- Community Feedback Impact:
 - The developer (Frasers Property) engaged extensively with the City of Sydney and local residents.
 - Feedback led to:
 - Increased green space (notably the award-winning Central Park with vertical gardens).
 - Improved pedestrian connectivity through the precinct.
 - Design innovations to reduce urban heat.
- Government Recognition:
 - The City of Sydney praised the project for setting a new standard in urban living and sustainability, often citing the collaborative planning with the community.