



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1044368

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCIL

**RE: REQUEST FOR GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW TO AMEND THE
AUBURN LEP 2010**

PANEL:

**PETER WILLIAMS
ANNELISE TUOR**

ASSISTING PANEL:

MATTHEW TODD-JONES

COUNCIL:

**MICHAEL ROGERS
KEVINS KUO
JANE LIANG**

LOCATION:

**MEETING ROOM 2
10 VALENTINE AVENUE, PARRAMATTA**

DATE:

12.17 PM, MONDAY, 8 JULY 2019

DR WILLIAMS: I think it's good afternoon now, isn't it?

MR ROGERS: It is, yes.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin I would like to
acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my
respects to their elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the
Gateway determination review for a planning proposal seeking to amend the Auburn
Local Environmental Plan 2010 in relation to a site at 1 to 17 Grey Street and 32 to
10 48 Silverwater Road, Silverwater.

The proposal seeks to amend the LEP by rezoning the site from B6, enterprise
corridor, to B1, neighbourhood centre, which would make residential flat buildings
and shop top housing permissible uses on the site, amending the maximum height of
15 buildings, ah, control from 14 metres to 20 metres, amending the minimum lot size
map from 15,000 square metres to no minimum lot size, and including a site-specific
clause to ensure the 14,000 square metres retail component comprises 2500 square
metres of supermarket and 1500 square metres of local speciality retail and
commercial floor space. Ah, my name is, ah, Peter Williams. Ah, I'm the chair of
20 this IPC panel. Joining me on the panel is Annelise Tuor. The other attendee is
Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC Secretariat.

Ah, in the meeting with us this afternoon is Michael Rogers, ah, Kevin Kuo and Jane
Liang, ah, from Parramatta City Council. Um, in the interests of openness and
25 transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being
recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the
Commission's website. For transcription purposes, I would be grateful if you just,
ah, confirm your names when you first speak. Thank you. Um, this meeting is one
part of the Commission's process of providing advice. It is taking place at the
30 preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information
upon which the Commission will base its advice.

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify
issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're
35 not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide
any additional information in writing, which we will then, ah, put up on our website.
Ah, so we'll now begin. So, ah, Michael, Kevin and Jane, I'll – thank you.

MR ROGERS: Um, Michael Rogers. Um, I'll – I'll just kick off with a – just with
40 a brief overview of council's position in relation to the – to this planning proposal.
Um, now, this planning proposal does have a long history, um, and it was, ah,
initially lodged under the former Auburn Council. And, um – and, um, was subject
to the – to the, um, to the, ah – like, the – the, um, the inquiry that – that was – that
was subject to Auburn Council in relation to a number of planning matters, of which
45 this planning proposal was one. Throughout that – that inquiry, it was – it was
determined that there was no issues with the – with the planning proposal. But

subsequently, following the local government amalgamations in May 2016, this planning proposal then became the responsibility of the City of Parramatta.

5 Um, and the – it was reported up to the City of Parramatta – and I don't remember the date off the top of my head – I think it was in February 26 2018 that council resolved, effectively, to adopt the former Auburn Council officer recommendation in relation to this report, as opposed to what Auburn Council resolved. Um, and so – so City of Parramatta was, um, um, satisfied that the Auburn Council officer recommendation was sufficient to, um – um, to support the – the planning proposal moving forward. Subsequently, the – the proposal was, um, um, submitted for – for Gateway, and then at Gateway the – the determination was that the planning proposal not proceed based upon the – um, um, the Greater Sydney Commission's position around the review and manage of – of employment lands.

15 Um, now, our position in – in relation to that is, um – and we've outlined it in the – in the – in the submission that we've – that we've put to the, um – to the panel, is that – um, um, you know, we have a – um, an employment lands strategy, which – which does say to retain the employment lands in – in this – in this area. However, if there was to be – um, and it also noted that there was potential for a – a local centre to be provided in – in this area to support, um, the – the surrounding – the surrounding area. But, um – but it didn't specifically say that – that residential development was – was, um – um, was an element of that. However, what it – what the Auburn, ah, Employment Lands Strategy did say, that if there was to be a B1 local centre in there, then there would need to be some degree of, um, residential within there to actually support the viability of that – that – that centre.

And so – so that's the position that – that has underpinned our – our position in relation to – to this proposal, ie, that despite the fact that – that – that it's in, um, ah, like, an employment zone that currently does not permit residential, we think in this circumstance that there is some justification for a – um, for a degree of – um, of mixed-use development in here. Now, um, we acknowledge that there is the review and manage approach for – and retention of employment lands as part of the Greater Sydney Commission's position. But as it stands at the moment – and the – this – the properties subject to the site and also around it have – are still predominantly residential at this particular point in time.

So – um, and the – this area's been zoned B6 for – for quite some time under – um, it was – I think it was – again, I can't remember off the top of my head, but I think it was over 10 years ago that it was – it was zoned for B6 under former Auburn Council. And – and so they had – the – there's been no turnover in – in, um, ah, in – like, for employment generating uses for this area. So – and that's part of the proponent's argument as well, is that – is that the, um – that nothing's happened here. Therefore, in order to get a better employment outcome through a mixed-use development that can provide retail and commercial, then that provides a better outcome. And, um – and that's the position that – that City of Parramatta Council has – has adopted and is reflected in the, um – in the resolution.

Um, so, effectively, that's – that's a summary of – of our position – that the – the former Auburn Council officer recommendation that – that went to Auburn Council is – is the position that the City of Parramatta has adopted and is proposing to move forward with this planning proposal. I don't know if there's anything you want to
5 add to that, Kev or – or Jane. But I think that that's – that's a brief summation of the City of Parramatta Council position in relation to this planning proposal. So we – we are – um, agreeing with the proponent in – in – in relation to their position, from the City of Parramatta's perspective.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Kevin, Jane, did you – at this stage?

MR KUO: Yeah. Look, I might just flag, um, the issue around – there's also – so just keeping in mind, um, when council – just to provide some background in terms of what council had considered when deciding its – its position on this – on this
15 particular planning proposal. Coun – we - - -

MS TUOR: Parramatta Council?

MR KUO: Parramatta Council. Because of the – the change in local government
20 boundaries, ah, it was put to council a number of options, if you – as per the council report, as to, um, three possible ways to actually deal with this application. You either – council actually supports the – so this was following the public inquiry coming out. One option being endorse – proceed with the application as per the – the Auburn Council resolution, option two being proceed with the Auburn Council
25 officer resolution, which we thought from – from the officer point of view, we – we thought there was some rigour associated with that. There was some feasibility work that was done to - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yep, yep.
30

MR KUO: - - - to – to shape and justify that extent of residential development, in order to – to deliver, ah, what would effectively be a neighbourhood centre within the site. And, three, City of Parramatta basically does an assessment from scratch and – and, um – and proceeds with an assessment and its own analysis, um – ah, you
35 know, as a fresh application, right?

DR WILLIAMS: Yep, yep.

MR KUO: So – so when – when council, ah – and so council considered the report
40 and basically – and so resolved that they – they preferred to, given the circumstances, proceed with the Auburn Council officer recommendation.

DR WILLIAMS: Yep, yep.

MR KUO: And so the – on the basis that the Auburn Council officer
45 recommendation, um, had, ah – had more rigour around the – the specifics of the resolution. Um, also the issues around the potential land use conflicts and – um,

which – you know, given that the application applies to the whole block, could probably be dealt with as through, um, quite detailed controls in a future, site-specific DCP. Um, so that – that’s probably the only thing I’d add to what - - -

5 DR WILLIAMS: Yep.

MR KUO: - - - Michael’s already mentioned.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks, Kevin. Jane, did you want to - - -

MS LIANG: No. That’s okay. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - add anything? Okay. I might just ask one question to start the ball rolling.

15 MR ROGERS: Sure.

DR WILLIAMS: And I’ll hand it over to – um, to Annelise. Um, we – the app – we just met with the application and there is – Parramatta Council and – this is all from the department. We met this morning as well. Parramatta Council is at the stage of their Local Strategic Planning Statement.

MR ROGERS: Yep.

25 DR WILLIAMS: I think it’s going on exhibition end of October, we were told.

MR ROGERS: Yeah. We - - -

30 MR KUO: That’s the plan, yeah, around October.

MR ROGERS: Yeah. We’ve - - -

MR KUO: So we think it’s going to go to council – be reported to council in September - - -

35 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR KUO: - - - for an October exhibition.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR ROGERS: Yep.

45 DR WILLIAMS: And we put it to the applicant this morning whether they had spoken to council about how if – to what extent their parcel was being incorporated in that process. And the answer they gave us was that they were told that, ah, the

statement won't talk to this level of detail. Now, we presume they mean for the block.

MR ROGERS: Yeah.

5

DR WILLIAMS: We were wondering whether that precinct, or that corridor - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

10 DR WILLIAMS: - - - is being closely looked at. And, if it is, is this site being looked at as part of that process?

MR ROGERS: The - now - yes. We are still in the process of preparing Local Strategic Planning Statement. While we're not involved in it specifically, it is being
15 done within the land use planning unit, of which we are a part, within the City of Parramatta. So, um - but as far as the - the precinct is concerned, at this point in time - and this is also in relation to the housing strategy as well, that is a supporting document to the Local Strategic Planning Statement. So at this point in time, the - the Local Strategic Planning Statement and Housing Strategy do not factor in any
20 additional residential development in this - in this area. And that's principally based upon the fact that the planning proposal was refuse Gateway.

However, because the - this, um, planning proposal is still being prepared, um, there's still potential for that to be amended subsequent to - to the outcomes of what
25 - what occurs in - in - like, as part of this - this particular hearing. However, when we look at, um, the - the potential growth in - in residential that's occurring within City of Parramatta, um, the - the rates are very high. Um, and - um, and looking at our population projections out to - to 2036 or 2041, the - the rate of growth - and I did see a - a, um - a presentation just - just last week from our - from some of the -
30 the ID, um - the profile people who do - do a lot of the forecasting and, um - um, and, yeah, the - the average annual growth rate was - was - was particularly high over - over a long period. So in terms of - in terms of dwelling forecasts, um, City of Parramatta is - well, it's - it's exceeding any targets by - by a long, long way.

35 So we don't - we don't actually need any more residential development in - in - in the City of Parramatta in - in total, if we're focusing on the current growth that we've got, um, planned. And that is to be principally delivered through a lot of the planned precincts that are within the City of Parramatta area. So, um - so the Silverwater, ah, area is not a - a planned precinct, as such. Um, but, having said that,
40 the Local Strategic Planning Statement will also be a flexible document to - to allow, um, some change to - to occur, if there's - if there's a reasonable justification and merit to that - to that individual circumstance. So - so, yeah, the - the Local Strategic Planning Statement won't go down to an individual block level, but it will look at - at - at precincts again.

45

Having said that, I'm not the principal author of the document, so I - I can't say, you know, specifically exactly what's going to be in - in - in the document. But my

understanding is that it will be a much broader, high-level document, but it will provide a degree of guidance in particular areas as – in terms of what will be mooted for – for – for the future, in terms of – in terms of our approach to – to accommodating growth. And, like I said, the – as it stands at the moment, the focus
5 of the City of Parramatta will be to focus on the existing planned precincts and deliver our residential, um, ah, growth through those planned precincts. Um, now – but, again, there's – there's potential for – and there'll always be underlying growth that – that occurs. Um, but as it stands, this particular area is not being focused on, in terms of, um, any increases in – in – in residential, um - - -

10 MR KUO: Yes. So I will just add, the – the – the – the housing strategy that will underpin the LSPS is that councils are doing at the moment, in particular, the City – in terms of the City of Parramatta context – it's a very different housing strategy - - -

15 MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: - - - from what you would – from, say another council would need to do, in terms of identifying areas for additional, you know, increases in density in order to respond to district planned targets and that sort of thing. In Parramatta, the – the
20 housing strategy is more of – because there's so many planned precincts within the Greater Parramatta area, it was more of – of a stocktake of – of existing - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

25 MR KUO: - - - development and – and try to capture all those planning proposals, as well, which had already hit – gone past the Gateway phase - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes. Yes.

30 MR KUO: - - - in terms of going, look – the – there's already – council, you know – as Michael mentioned, we're already reaching or far exceeding those targets. It's – it's about just, sort of, reflecting that and taking a bit of a stocktake - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

35 MR KUO: - - - in terms of that. Now, if – if the Gateway had come back on this particular application that – that it was – that a – say – say, a Gateway was issued, the LS – that would have fed into our LSPSs - - -

40 MR ROGERS: Correct.

MR KUO: - - - to go, look, this - - -

45 MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: - - - you know, this is where it's at. So the strategy – the housing strategy is slightly different in the Parramatta context than, say, for other councils where it's about - - -

5 MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: - - - identifying new areas for growth.

MR ROGERS: Yes.

10

MR KUO: It was more of – of a – for want of a better word, a – a stocktake or – or an assessment of – this is what we've got going on at the moment.

MR ROGERS: Yes.

15

MR KUO: We are hitting the targets, and so if density was going to happen, it wasn't just going to be a matter of – of trying to hit targets for hitting targets because we're already hitting targets.

20 MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: Any proposals for extra residential density would have to hit other - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

25

MR KUO: - - - address other strategic merit arguments - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

30 MR KUO: - - - if that makes sense.

MR ROGERS: Yes. And – and so – so we're not – we're not ruling out additional residential development in areas outside of – of the precincts, but it just means that the justifications that – that need to be provided for that need to be pretty strong
35 because – because it's outside of a framework within which we're – we're – we're planning for the – for the longer term growth and that's effectively to be dealt with through the – through the planned precincts - - -

40 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR ROGERS: - - - but – yes. But Kevin is right. It's the – and we're not – so we're not precluding any additional development but – but locals – again, the Local Strategic Plan, certainly while it's still being drawn up, it will be fairly broad, so it's – it's not – like, there – there will be – it – it – yes. It won't be an emphatic “No” to
45 anything outside of those precincts - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Sure.

MR ROGERS: - - - in terms of – in terms of additional residential development in the future.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

5

MS TUOR: But the Local Strategic Planning framework is also doing a study of employment plans in your Local Government Area – is that correct - - -

MR ROGERS: They're – they're – well, we – we have an – an Employment Lands Strategy that was adopted by council in 2016. The Local Strategic Planning Statement will be seeking to update that, as – it's – it won't be doing a full comprehensive new study of employment lands, but it will be seeking to update the – the adopted – the council-adopted Employment Lands Strategy to have that feed into the Local Strategic Planning Statements

10
15

MS TUOR: So when you say “update”, what do you mean by that?

MR ROGERS: Again, I'm not the one who's actually undertaking the – the work, but it's – it would be looking at – effectively, looking at what we've got in the Employment Lands Strategy and seeing if – if anything has changed and then if – if – if things – circumstances have not changed, then we would be looking to maintain what's in our existing Employment Lands Strategy, however, if there has to be – if there – if there's certain things that have changed within the last three years, then that's the area that we will be focusing on, but – apologies. I'm not – I'm not the one who's undertaking that work, but that's my understanding of - of the approach that will be taken.

MS TUOR: Yes. It's just that part of the rationale or the justification for this planning proposal is that the B6 area has been around for 10 years - - -

20
25
30

MR ROGERS: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - and hasn't been developed.

MR ROGERS: Yes.

MS TUOR: So if – if that is something that has weight, then presumably that would be something that's being looked at? We're – we're just trying to understand if - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - if that is - - -

MR ROGERS: Is – yes. Is something that's going to be, sort of, focused on, in particular, for this area. That's probably something I would need to take on notice - - -

40
45

MR KUO: Yes. I think the – the only comment I would add to that is – so – so the Parramatta Employment Lands Strategy was – was finalised by council in 2016 - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

5

MR KUO: - - - so it's not – you know, in the scheme of planning documents, not - - -

MR ROGERS: Not that old.

10

MR KUO: - - - not a really old document, like, relatively recent. The Auburn – in particular, the – the recommendations around Silverwater were essentially bringing - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes, that's right.

MR KUO: - - - forward the – the Auburn Council Employment Lands Strategy findings for Silverwater into that strategy and – and so that Auburn Employment Lands Strategy was also finalised in 2016 - - -

20

MR ROGERS: Two thousand yes - - -

MR KUO: - - - so also not a very old - - -

MR ROGERS: Yes.

25

MR KUO: - - - document, which basically looked at the B6 zone in Silverwater and – and recommended that that area be retained for employment despite the fact that it's currently still mostly residential. The only difference is in – in – in that – in that analysis around that part of the - Silverwater is that it identified a need for a new neighbourhood centre in that – within that area - - -

30

MS TUOR: All right. So just I understand it, again, so there was the Auburn one that was done?

35

MR ROGERS: Yes.

MS TUOR: And then Auburn became part of Parramatta. And you did your economic - Employment Lands Strategy and, as part of that, you put into your Parramatta one what had been done previously in Auburn – is that correct – or - - -

40

MR KUO: Yes. Look - - -

MS TUOR: - - - or you reviewed all the work - - -

45

MR KUO: No, no, no – so – so - - -

MS TUOR: - - - that Auburn had done or you just - - -

MR KUO: - - - because – so – so to give – just to clarify that process because I was involved in that Employment Lands Strategy, we had – we were in the process of
5 finalising the Employment Lands Strategy for the former Parra City Council area. And so that – that report was – was basically in the midst of being finalised in 2016, and then amalgamations happened. And so, rather than finalise a – a – a – a – a – a – a strategy that only applied to the city – the – the former - - -

10 MS TUOR: LGA?

MR KUO: - - - LGA - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

15

MR KUO: - - - a decision was made at the time to go, “Look, let’s just, you know, take a few months, pool – try to pool together the” – you know, if there were some strategic technical documentation or analysis that was done for the new employment precincts that the new City of Parramatta picked up, we should reflect them in our –
20 in our – in – in the Parramatta – City of Parramatta Employment Lands Strategy and so that was done. Council did not do a – a full review of those new precincts that came – rather, it endorsed the previous – the – endorsed the technical – strategic justification for those precincts.

25 MR ROGERS: Yes, that’s correct.

MR KUO: Council did not do a separate review. And, in this particular instance, at the time, the – when council adopted the Employment Lands Strategy, with regard to Silverwater, in particular, the – the public inquiry had not been completed yet at the
30 time and so the strategy – you know, our Employment Lands Strategy just said – just, look, just retain employment as per the – you know, but – but, eventually, the – the – the findings have been – were released and then this application then has progressed to where we are now, so that’s – I hope that makes it clearer

35 MS TUOR: Yes, yes, that’s making it clearer. And, then, stepping back, which is something you might not know because it’s before your time. The Employment Lands Strategy that was done by Auburn – it was initially adopted in May 2015, and then when the planning proposal was considered in, I think, October 2015, that actually also amended the 2015 strategy to incorporate this idea of a neighbourhood
40 centre. So, in May, our understanding – and we haven’t looked at the documents, but our understanding is that in May, it didn’t have anything about a neighbourhood centre in it, but in response to the planning proposal, the neighbourhood centre concept went in but - - -

45 DR WILLIAMS: So an amended employment strategy - - -

MS TUOR: To an amended and it was meant to be subject to a master plan. So what I think we're trying to figure out is you've said there's a – sort of, a degree of rigour in that – identifying a neighbourhood centre, but do you know what the rigour was?

5

MR KUO: Okay. So I – I – so our – my understanding of the process was that the – the previous Employment Lands Strategy did – the original – sorry – the original one did talk about a neighbourhood centre there. The – the resolution – the more – the more recent amendment relating to the – to the – to the – essentially – what was essentially a council resolution which then meant that council then updated the Employment Lands Strategy to reflect the council resolution. That was for a – that was for a local centre, so it increased the status of that centre. So the – my understanding was that the previous employment – the original Employment Lands Strategy talked – talked about a neighbourhood – a local neighbourhood centre whereas the – the subsequent council resolution talked about a local centre, so an increase in – in the status of that centre at a – at a density that was much higher.

So it was – which – which basically talked about - it set – it essentially reflected the planning proposal at the time, and so that – that's – so my understanding was that the original one did refer to a neighbourhood centre. They came in, didn't actually – the neighbourhood centre issue did not flag a residential component. Subsequently, a planning proposal was lodged. Council then made – the former Auburn Council then made a - - -

25 MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: - - - resolution on the – on the – on the planning proposal that – as part of that resolution, it also made a resolution to update the Employment Lands Strategy to reflect council's decision on the matter and – and so I – there's – there's – I think there's an addendum to the Employment Lands Strategy that – that includes that the actual council resolution to reflect the planning proposal at – at the time - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

35 MR KUO: - - - is – was my understanding.

MS TUOR: And it's probably something we will have to have a look at further because I think the original planning proposal was to have it as more of a local centre and then – and that was carried through by Auburn in their resolution but the council officers' recommendation was to have it as the - - -

MR KUO: As a neighbourhood centre.

MS TUOR: - - - the neighbourhood centre. But what was actually in the employment land - - -

MR KUO: The original one - - -

MS TUOR: The original one – we don't know. We will have to have a look at that.

DR WILLIAMS: Just in relation to that, following up from Annelise's asking, the – there's all this – we've heard, this morning, about meeting community demand for a
5 need for a neighbourhood centre in that part of Silverwater and, presumably, that's one of the reasons why Auburn Council, both by resolution and then, subsequently, the Council office's recommendation and presumably why – one of the reasons why Parramatta Council has adopted it is the need, the justification for – in terms of the community need for this sort of facility so that on the one hand, we're given this
10 argument about "there's this need," but on the other hand, we're saying, "But to ensure its viability, we also have to put in residential development". Now, is that viability for the economics of the developer, or is it for the viability to ensure there's a sufficient trade area to support the shopping centre of the retail component?

15 MR KUO: There's the – the feasibility that was done was to – was for not for – to determine that amount of – so – so – so the strategy identified a certain amount of non-residential retail commercial floor space that would serve that demand, so between, I think, between three and five thousand, so we landed at 4000 square metres.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR KUO: And so the issue around the feasibility issue was really the feasibility to deliver that amount of – of – of non-residential floor space and so that's where – so it
25 was really feasibility for the developer to be able to deliver that amount which was identified in the strategy which said that the area could – that there was a need for this area to have, you know, between three and five thousand, 4000 square metres of non-resi or local.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS TUOR: But that was, presumably, an existing need generated by the catchment for the existing residential and the existing industrial.

35 MR ROGERS: Employment area, that's right.

MS TUOR: Yes. So there's already a demand for – that the nearest shopping centre was in Newington, or something like that, and there's a demand for a shopping centre here by the existing population. So, I suppose - - -

40

MR KUO: Are you – are you alluding to the fact that if you're now resi here, then, presumably, that should be increased to - - -

MS TUOR: Well, we just don't understand why it needs to be subsidised by
45 additional residential development if there's already a need.

MR KUO: I see.

MS TUOR: If there's already a demand by existing residential development and industrial land that - - -

MR KUO: They probably need that.

5

MS TUOR: - - - they need to go and buy a sandwich and there's nowhere to buy a sandwich - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah, it doesn't need an extra - - -

10

MS TUOR: - - - why does it need to be subsidised by more residential?

MR KUO: Yes, I understand.

15

MS TUOR: And whether that was explained somewhere but - - -

MR KUO: No. Look, the only thing I can point to is the fact that the Auburn former Council had, in response – the offices, in response to the proposal at the time, engaged an economic consultant to do some feasibility work which determined that instead of four to one, 2.5 – 2.7 to one could be feasible and it should be capped at that.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

25

MR ROGERS: Yeah, it was more from a development perspective as opposed to a need perspective.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Yeah. Because the other aspect of all this too is the applicant considers that 4000 square metres retail is excessive, particularly the 2500 square metres of supermarket and obviously, the way the planning proposal is drafted at the moment, that will be part – if that goes through there will be an amendment to the other two.

30

MR KUO: Yes, that's right.

35

DR WILLIAMS: And so you've got this going through but the developer clearly – well, not – that's not their favoured position so we're just concerned if this goes through they get – they've asked for 4000 square metres but they don't want to provide 4000 square metres. What do we do then?

40

MR ROGERS: I mean - - -

DR WILLIAMS: And sorry – and if we said, “Well, all this could be provided,” does that undermine what you're trying to achieve with having the neighbourhood centre there?

45

MR KUO: Well, I guess, that assessment would need to be carried out anyway.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR KUO: So say, for example, if the – I think, if the gateway was issued with 4000
with that structure of 2,500, you know, supermarket and 1500 specialty shops and
5 that sort of thing, and the applicant and said, “Look, this is not working for us, we –
look,” and we would have to reassess it at the time. So we would have to go, “Look,
then what is the – what is the demand now based on?”. You know, it was – you
know, the previous work indicated that that amount was – did have a demand for it
and if they’re saying, “No, it doesn’t,” then, I mean, it’s part of the process that we
10 would have to go through to just say, “Look, you know” - - -

MR ROGERS: It would need to be assessed.

MR KUO: It would need to the relevant economic assessment and we would
15 have to determine whether or not we thought we agreed or not without the numbers
or we – I guess, what Council can go on is the strategic work that was carried out
previously and so – so, yeah.

MS TUOR: So you didn’t see it as being a mandatory requirement?
20

MR KUO: No, we didn’t want to lock them down with any – with the proposal
proceeding, it was always the intent to lock down a minimum provision of non-resi
to ensure that the intention of delivering a neighbourhood centre here was actually
being delivered and - - -
25

MR ROGERS: Yeah. And – and employment.

MR KUO: And employment was not - - -

MR ROGERS: Yeah.
30

MR KUO: Was being delivered and not just a – a – otherwise we would just be
going let’s do an RFB here.

MR ROGERS: Yeah.
35

MR KUO: It’s – yeah, not – I guess it wasn’t the intention of the - - -

MR ROGERS: No. That wasn’t the intention. Right. Yep.
40

MR KUO: Yeah.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Michael, something else you wanted to - - -

MR ROGERS: No, no. I was, um – I think Kev – Kev just – basically just – just
covered off I think – I think – because the thing is we – we would probably need to
reassess the quantum of residential that would – that could be supported in this – in
45

5 this precinct if we were to be significantly reducing the – the amount of, um,
commercial development in – in relation to that, um, because, um – I mean – and we
– we do note in our submission that the, um, um – in terms of the – the access to
public transport is – there’s buses but it’s quite a distance from a – from a – like, a
heavy rail or anything like that so – so what – if – if we were to be, um, reducing the
– like, the quantum of employment generating within the site, then we would – we
would – we would need to do a – a reassessment of the - - -

10 MR KUO: Of the resi.

MR ROGERS: Of the resi as well.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah. Okay. One of the ideas that we put to the applicant was
rather than straight rezoning, B1 – B6 to B1, was just adding new permissible uses
on the site. Had council thought of that option at all?

MR KUO: Look, I mean, ultimately there’s a – I mean, you – you could potentially
deliver what – what they’re wanting through that mechanism.

20 MR ROGERS: Yep.

25 MR KUO: And so – look, we didn’t give that much thought. I mean, that’s one
way that you can do it and I guess we wouldn’t have an objection. I mean, it would
still reach – deliver the outcomes I’m assuming - - -

MR ROGERS: Yep.

30 MR KUO: - - - around basically saying – but it’s just making sure that the right
quantum of – of – of employment use or non-residential uses is – is delivered in – in
the – with the objective of providing a neighbourhood centre is delivered. The issue
around the additional permitted – additional permitted use or having a local provision
in the LEP that talks about certain amount of neighbourhood floor space and – and
resi, is that what you’re – what you’re envisaging potentially?

35 DR WILLIAMS: I was looking at – I think shop top housing and – well, it’s two
uses – two residential uses that are permitted in your – to add to the – to the – to the –
they’re in the B1 zone but weren’t in the – were not in the B6.

40 MR KUO: Yeah.

DR WILLIAMS: So - - -

MS TUOR: I think they were just talking about adding shop top housing - - -

45 DR WILLIAMS: Housing.

MS TUOR: - - - to the – to the B6.

DR WILLIAMS: So it's - - -

MS TUOR: So it's an issue rather than it being a rezoning.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR KUO: The issue for us would be if that – if that was the stance, then potentially, to satisfy that shop top housing requirement, they could theoretically just do – provide quite a nominal - - -

10

MR ROGERS: Yep.

MR KUO: - - - shop – ground floor commercial component.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR KUO: And primarily stack it with residential and – and so council - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

20

MR KUO: So my initial view of that would be that would be an issue.

MR ROGERS: Yeah. We would not be - - -

25 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR KUO: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: On face value, that – that wouldn't be something that we would be - - -

30

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR ROGERS: - - - that happy with.

35

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR ROGERS: I mean – and sometimes, like, if you additional permitted uses, then if they effectively present as a different zone then we should be zoning the land to reflect what – you know, what is effectively being permitted in there. So – but again we come back to the objective of the – of the – the employment zone and that is to provide a level of employment. So to – to just have shop top housing, yeah, we could potentially be faced with a situation where we do get a, um – just a nominal amount of – of convenience retail on the ground floor in a corner of a development and the rest of it is – is effectively residential above. So that wouldn't be in keeping with the intention of – of – of what the council resolution is in relation to this matter.

45

DR WILLIAMS: In relation to the retail component?

MR ROGERS: Yes. Well – and the provision of employment as part of this because, um – because I guess we are mindful of the Greater Sydney Commission’s approach to – to the – to the review and manage of – of employment generating lands. And so to go down that path I think would be quite contrary to that, whereas – whereas – whereas the path that we’ve got here at least provides a degree of – of employment generating use on – on – on this – on this site and in this area.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: And so that’s – we – we want to be able to see – see those objectives still being met and – and to reduce the quantum of a commercial and retail space. Yep. I mean, we could have a look at it but we wouldn’t want to – to reduce it down to the fact that it just permits shop top housing because then that – that allows a – a much bigger disconnect – sorry. A much bigger difference between – between your – your retail or commercial component compared to your residential component above. So if – if it were to include a – a site specific vision, we would still want to maintain a – a minimum quantum of commercial space as part of that site specific provision.

DR WILLIAMS: We thought that that – the advantage of that, it would still permit a range – far greater range of B6 uses which the B1 zone wouldn’t – wouldn’t - - -

25 MR ROGERS: Yeah. And – and that’s something that – that, you know, we would be open to as – but, again, we would need to – we would need to put this analysis back through – through to get council to adopt a position on it.

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

30 MR ROGERS: Because, I mean, we’re just talking of officer level here at this point in time.

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

35 MS TUOR: Sure.

MR ROGERS: So we would need to – to re-report a change like that to – to council as the principal planning authority for the – for the proposal.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: So yeah.

45 MS TUOR: And also, if that was added as a permissible use for the B6 zone, presumably it would apply across the basic zone, not just to this piece of land, unless you did, you know - - -

MR KUO: A key – identify it as a key

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes.

5 MR KUO: Identify zone

MR ROGERS: Yep. Yep.

MS TUOR: Yeah. But it gets a bit messy.

10

MR KUO: Yeah.

MS TUOR: Also, just in terms of the structure of the LEP, at the moment it – there's a definition of neighbourhood centre - - -

15

MR KUO: Sure. Leave it to me. Yep.

MS TUOR: And there's a definition of neighbourhood shop and neighbourhood supermarket and those definitions all talk about meeting just the needs of the, um, local community . And in particular the supermarket definition or floor space for that envisages a size of being 1000 square metres, whereas what's proposed is - - -

20

MR ROGERS: I think – was the supermarket two and half thousand?

25 MR KUO: Two and a half - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah. Yep.

MR ROGERS: Two and a half thousand square metres for the supermarket. Yeah.

30

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: And that's, like – I mean, the nature of – of supermarket, um – like, um – like – what - - -

35

MS TUOR: It just wouldn't be a neighbourhood supermarket.

MR ROGERS: Well – because generally you allow that two and a half thousand for a full line supermarket. That's – that's a small level. But the nature of the retailing is changing and so you – you could potentially meet the needs of the local community with a – with a smaller footprint potentially but, again, we haven't undertaken that analysis as part of this proposal.

40

MS TUOR: All right.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Any other questions, Annelise?

MS TUOR: So, uh, the actual planning report that went up to Parramatta Council
- - -

MR ROGERS: Yep.

5

MS TUOR: - - - we can get a copy – is that – is that on your - - -

MR ROGERS: That – that should still be on the City of Parramatta website but we
can - - -

10

MS TUOR: You can forward it - - -

MR ROGERS: - - - send it through to you if – if you like to make it easy, so you
don't have to trawl through the – the council business papers on our website. We can
send through that report and the minutes for you if you like.

15

MS TUOR: Yeah. That would be good, thank you. And also, in terms of the
different versions of the Auburn Local Employment Strategy, would you have the
May one and the October one and - - -

20

MR ROGERS: Um - - -

MS TUOR: That presumably has gone into the Parramatta one now?

25

MR KUO: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: Yep.

MR KUO: So – so there was a transfer. Theoretically all the stuff should be over.

30

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR KUO: The – we can – let's see what we can find but – but I – at the time we
were – there was lots of toing and froing with the former Auburn Council to – to get
a – um, a detailed understanding in terms of where things were at. So look, we can –
we can – we can try to get that. So essentially, division 1 and then the – essentially,
the one that has been amended is the one that's currently on the Auburn Council
website so that's already – you've already got. It's just the – the – the Employment
Lands Strategy in its original form.

40

MS TUOR: Original form.

MR ROGERS: Yeah.

45

MS TUOR: Or at least maybe the report that went up - - -

MR KUO: Sure.

MR ROGERS: Yeah.

MS TUOR: - - - that supported it - - -

5 MR KUO: Okay. We can - - -

MS TUOR: - - - being changed.

MR KUO: Yeah.

10

MR ROGERS: Yep. Because I'm – I'm a former Holroyd Council employee who then became a Cumberland Council employee with the amalgamation so – and obviously that brought together Holroyd and a bit of Parramatta and Auburn so I – I still know a lot of people at Auburn so if we need to – to – to track something back
15 through which is not in our records, I can – I can seek to – to – to get that from – from Cumberland Council if - - -

MS TUOR: That would be good.

20 MR ROGERS: Yep.

MS TUOR: Because I suppose it's just trying to work out the strategic evidence or rationale behind - - -

25 MR ROGERS: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - identifying this area as the neighbourhood centre.

MR KUO: Sure.

30

MS TUOR: Yep.

DR WILLIAMS: Matt, would you be able to follow that - - -

35 MR M. TODD-JONES: Yeah. Absolutely. Yep.

DR WILLIAMS: I saw you take notes so I presumed that.

MR ROGERS: Yeah.

40

DR WILLIAMS: Yep. Thank you.

MR ROGERS: Yeah. We can get that stuff through to you. I don't think it's going to take us too long to be able to get that through to you.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Yep. Yeah. Yeah. I understand – I appreciate the difficulties you've had with trying to piece together the history. We've got more difficulties.

MR ROGERS: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: So we're – just trying to get our heads around the history of this whole - - -

5

MR ROGERS: It – it does have a long history, this planning proposal, so it's – because, I mean, I've only been working at City of Parramatta just over 12 months so, um – so I don't have the full – the full context to it. But – and then – then, I mean, Kev only sort of inherited it when the – when the, um – when the
10 amalgamation occurred so there's – there's, like, you know, at least three or four steps in – in the process of this that goes back to, you know, like – you know, like, four or five years now. So it's, um – yeah. It is – it can be a challenge to trace back the – the process that the proposal went to to get to this point but, um – but I guess as far as – as far as the City of Parramatta is concerned, the – we've got the adopted
15 position of council and that's – and that's in our submissions so that's – that's the City of Parramatta position in relation to the proposal.

MS TUOR: Good.

AW Turn 15 Time 12:59:14

20

DR WILLIAMS: Annelise?

MS TUOR: No, I think that's all.

25 DR WILLIAMS: And Matt?

MR TODD-JONES: No.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. I think that's everything. So thanks, Michael, Kevin, Jane
30 for coming today. I appreciate the time you've given to us.

MS TUOR: Just one question. All of the work that was done for the planning proposal was all done before the Parramatta Road - - -

35 MR KUO: Strategy?

MS TUOR: - - - Strategy, which identifies also a neighbourhood centre.

MR ROGERS: Yes.
40

MS TUOR: So what's your opinion about having two neighbourhood centres?

MR ROGERS: Ah, that's a good question. Um, I mean, the – the – with the amount of growth that – that is – could potentially occur as part of the – the Parramatta Road
45 Corridor Strategy, there'd be – um, you know, there's potentially a significant, um, amount of – of, ah, increase in – in – in population in this area, but we haven't – we haven't done an analysis of that that I'm aware of, Kev, but there would be – I guess,

when – when you look at the – the – the catchments for – for these areas, um, there’s some significant barriers to – to – to the north being the M4 and Parramatta Road.

5 Um, so if – if you look at, um, how, um, like, the local set of catchments would be – would be distributed, um, you’d generally – like, barriers such as that are generally sort of, you know – um, you can – you can – you can have some – a couple of centres within relatively close proximity to each other if – if the – um, if those – those barriers are such that – that – that people wouldn’t generally go from one side to the other to go to the other local centre if the – if the same services are being
10 provided, but we haven’t done a detailed analysis of that, but I would, um, ah, hazard a guess that given the amount of growth that is proposed as part of the Parramatta Road Corridor Strategy, um, there would be, um, you know, quite a fair bit of demand for some additional local centre space as part of the incoming population, but – um, but like I said, we haven’t done a – a – a detailed analysis of that.

15 MR KUO: We wouldn’t of, because that component would have been - - -

MR ROGERS: That’s right.

20 MR KUO: That’s – that’s - - -

MR ROGERS: Yep.

25 MR KUO: - - - the Auburn Council - - -

MR ROGERS: That’s right.

MR KUO: - - - part of the Parramatta Road Strategy.

30 MR ROGERS: That’s – that’s right.

MR KUO: Yeah. Yep. Yeah.

35 MR ROGERS: Yeah, of course.

MR KUO: Yeah.

40 MR ROGERS: Yeah. Sorry, I was – I was – I was reverting back to – to Cumberland when I was looking at that.

MS LIANG: Yes, that’s right.

MS TUOR: That was the “we” you were talking about.

45 MR ROGERS: Yeah. Yes. Sorry, yes.

MS LIANG: That was the – that’s right.

MR ROGERS: I – I apologise about that. I - - -

MS TUOR: That's all right.

5 DR WILLIAMS: No, that was good. Thanks for picking that up. Look, I think we will leave it at that. So thanks, once again, for coming today. I appreciate the time you've given us.

MR KUO: No problem.

10

MR ROGERS: No problem at all, and if there's anything else you need, just – um, we can – we can provide that, but we'll – we'll – we'll get through that – that information to you as soon as we – as soon as we can.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Michael.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you.

MR KUO: So can I just ask, in terms of next steps for - - -

20

MR ROGERS: Yes.

MR KUO: For the deter – for the determination of this and – and I'm assuming there's a few steps that you – it sounds like you've already had the briefings with the department - - -

25

DR WILLIAMS: The department, the applicant - - -

MR KUO: - - - the applicant and now us.

30

DR WILLIAMS: Us. And we'll have a look at the site this afternoon. Um, what this is about is just a recommendation.

MR KUO: I see.

35

DR WILLIAMS: So we're reviewing it.

MR KUO: Yep.

40 DR WILLIAMS: The – the Gateway determination. So – and we come back with a recommendation. Should it – should it stand, should it – or it's purely a recommendation so that the department doesn't have to accept our recommendation.

MR KUO: I see.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Though – but the recommendation is basically should it stand, should it be amended, should it – should it proceed to Gateway.

MR KUO: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Um - - -

5 MR KUO: Do you have a timeframe as to when you need to provide that recommendation

DR WILLIAMS: We get a timeframe - - -

10 MS TUOR: Last week, I think.

DR WILLIAMS: We get a timeframe – we get a timeframe on our correspondence, but everyone is extraordinarily busy at the moment - - -

15 MR KUO: Are they?

DR WILLIAMS: - - - including the department, and including us.

MR KUO:

20

DR WILLIAMS: So – and as you - - -

MR ROGERS: Yeah, I understand.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Yeah, and – yeah, and so we – you know, we've organised this meeting as quickly as we could.

MR KUO: Yep.

30 DR WILLIAMS: - - - um, to get everyone together, and, um – so, look, normally, a matter like this might then take another two or three weeks to - - -

MR KUO: Sure.

35 DR WILLIAMS: To write up - - -

MR KUO: Yep.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - the report and - - -

40

MR KUO: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: And also, we have to give time for additional information - - -

45 MR KUO: I understand, yeah.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - and things like that, so – say, seven days or something like that. So we wouldn't start finalising the report till after that has happened.

MR ROGERS: Yes, but I mean, ultimately - - -

5

DR WILLIAMS: Our recommendation, yes.

MR ROGERS: Yeah, ultimately, we're at the behest of the department, though, because, I mean, as far as the City of Parramatta, we've done what we can to this point and - - -

10

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

MR ROGERS: So if – if it does require, um, ah, like – or if there is to be – if the department does, you know, recommend that the planning proposal proceed, then, obviously, then we will – we will – we will – you know, we'll be invo – involved in that.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

20

MR ROGERS: But, either way, I guess we'll – we'll just be needing to advise our councillors of the outcome of - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

25

MR ROGERS: Of the – of the proceedings here. So – and that's – that's no problem. So - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yep. Yep. Good. Good. Thanks, Michael. Thanks very much.

30

MR ROGERS: Thank you very much.

MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

35

DR WILLIAMS: You've been very helpful this morning. Very helpful.

MS TUOR: All right.

DR WILLIAMS: This afternoon, sorry. Thank you. Thanks.

40

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[1.04 pm]