



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-956456

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL

RE: PEMULWUY PROJECT, REDFERN

PANEL: **SOO-TEE CHEONG**
ILONA MILLAR
PETER WILLIAMS

ASSISTING PANEL: **MATTHEW TODD-JONES**

CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL: **BILL MACKAY**
MICHAEL SOO

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICE**
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **11.15 AM, TUESDAY,**
13 NOVEMBER 2018

MR S. CHEONG: Good morning. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay respect to the elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal seeking approval for a section 75W modification application to the Pemulwuy concept approval, a
5 section 4.55(1A) modification application to the Pemulwuy project approval and state significant development consent for the construction of a three to 24 storey student accommodation building, within Precinct 3 of – of the Pemulwuy Precinct.

10 My name is Soo-Tee Cheong. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the panel are my fellow commissioners, Ilona Millar and Dr Peter Williams, and planner Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC secretary, who is assisting the panel. The other attendees are from the City of Sydney Council. I'll get you to introduce yourselves in a little while.

15 In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of the information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at a preliminary stage of
20 this process and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for Commissioners to ask questions of the attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider appropriate. If you are asked a question that are not – you're 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 put up on our website. We will now begin. If I could ask you to
25 introduce yourself for the record.

MR M. SOO: Michael Soo, Area Planning Manager, City of Sydney Council.

30 MR B. MACKAY: And Bill Mackay, Manager of Planning Assessments, City of Sydney Council.

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Now, if I could ask you to take us through the issues of the project which are of concern to Council. If you would like to talk through that.

35 MR MACKAY: Okay. I will be – just find them. Okay. I – I was just locating our submissions. We don't have a proposal, presentation, but I'll just step through those, and Michael, who probably knows much more about this proposal than myself, will probably elaborate as we go. So the City of Sydney didn't object to the scheme, as
40 such, but just raised a number – excuse me – a number of matters of concern or areas for consideration. I suppose one of them, and I – you know, I suppose we can talk in more detail or you can ask questions.

45 The first and perhaps most obvious one is that the scale of the change to the residential building which is proposed to, I think, go from eight to 24 storeys. So that was identified as a concern, or at least something that clearly would need to be looked at in – in quite some detail to justify that change and, I suppose, our review at

the time, back in October 2017, was concerned that the assessment should be more than simply a matter of identifying the proximity of other towers, which I suppose – I mean, they’re on the opposite side of the railway line and I suppose the Council took the view, the context of the subject site was – was different to that. You know, it
5 recognises those towers exist but the important context is the – the western side of the railway line, as opposed to the eastern side. So I’ll just step through the various things and we can come back in – in detail.

We also touched on the deed of agreement between the City and the Aboriginal
10 Housing Corporation and the provision of the gallery space. I think, at the time, that was a potential issue because it was being relocated from the site to elsewhere, another precinct, but there weren’t any details of that. I understand we’re now relatively happy with that because the new locations are identified in one of the other applications which – which didn’t exist at the time that we made the comments in
15 relation to the precinct 3.

Some issues in relation to the development and its interface with the public domain. So that’s those sort of design issues and also that issue of the public domain being dedicated to Council. I think we made the comment to that, that I suppose the detail
20 provided at the time, sort of presenting more as a forecourt to the building as opposed to a true extension to the public domain. There are also some areas of concern or – or that perhaps need clarifying in terms of what would eventuate in that space, for example, the issue of potential wind impacts from the tower. They seem to suggest they may be able to be ameliorated by putting planting or structures or –
25 or whatever within the public domain, and I suppose those things are unknown at this point. They may be appropriate but if that public domain is to be dedicated to Council, then Council sees a role in being involved in deciding what is appropriate to go within that space.

30 Some other comments were made in relation to the amenity of the – the development, in terms of the internal amenity for the occupiers. Obviously, it’s a residential use. It’s in very close proximity to the railway line. Now, there’s clearly a noise issue. A number of apartments were identified as being noise-affected. That needs to be addressed, which can be addressed in the design of the development but,
35 at the same time, I suppose this is where the difficulty comes, addressing noise and providing adequate natural ventilation at the same time.

So, certainly, Council’s approach, in terms of residential apartments in similar types of noisy locations is that the design should incorporate the provision of acoustic –
40 acoustically attenuated vents to allow for natural ventilation when the windows need to be closed. I mean, it can be achieved by opening windows, but if that’s to a very noisy environment, then it’s not really effective. So there were some comments made in relation to – we didn’t go into detail as to how to solve the problem, but in relation to the potential amenity of those apartments, another issue in terms of
45 amenity was the number of apartments that had or didn’t have the provision of private open space within the development. So that was something that was touched on. Have I missed anything significant, Michael?

MR SOO: I just want to add, in terms of the amenity also, by ensuring the residents have the option of – you know, the choice of natural ventilation and, you know, and a quiet environment is also to do with the lifetime running costs of the building, you know. As proposed at the moment, you know, you’ve either got to choose between,
5 you know, natural ventilation or – or – or a quiet space, and the only option they really have is to turn on, you know, the mechanical systems. So just to reduce the lifetime running cost of the development. The – yes.

MR MACKAY: Okay. So that sort of touched on the issues and then if – of course,
10 you have any questions, we’ll - - -

MR CHEONG: Yes, I have - - -

MR MACKAY: We’ll go into them in more detail.
15

MR CHEONG: With the Department of Planning and Environment’s report, are you satisfied with the reduction?

MR MACKAY: I’ve had a brief review. I mean, to be honest, I only knew I was
20 coming to this meeting a very short while ago. So I – I can only say I’m aware of the recommendation. I haven’t had the opportunity to look at the – the same recommended conditions of consent to any great extent. I mean, we do have some comments in relation to how any consent may address some of our issues. For example, the – actually, one thing I didn’t mention was the provision of, what did we
25 say, 20 per cent of rooms for affordable accommodation for Aboriginal students.

Certainly, if this was a consent the city was looking at, we’d probably normally contemplate a restriction on title to try and secure that going forward. It’s one thing requiring it, you know, quite often, you know, further down the line. Perhaps it’s not
30 been complied with, or if there are issues, a restriction on title sort of makes it easier to try and deal with it rather than a condition that sort of effectively promised it would be achieved, so that’s sort of, you know, a kind of condition we’d normally contemplate, and I’m not aware of them proposing that in terms of the
35 recommendation.

MR SOO: That’s correct. Just in terms of conditions, I have had a look at the – and I do have some conditions which I’d like to make some suggestions on. I’m happy to share the – I’ve got spare copies of these. I’m happy to share them with you. The only other observation I would make with the department of Planning’s report is it
40 does not appear as though they’ve addressed the basics, particularly having regard to a recent Land Environment Court judgment. Obviously the circumstances in that case were different, but where the court held the view that a boarding house, you

know, with kitchenettes was a dwelling and obviously you've got to go through – obtain a BASIX certificate.

5 DR P. WILLIAMS: Would that be because the council's treating it as a – sorry, the department's treating it as a commercial development, so they're arguing?

10 MR MACKAY: Yes, well, no. It comes down to the basic SEPP and how it's worded, and it refers to the provisional dwellings, and we've had this issue a number of times with applicants and boarding houses, and a number of applicants accept it's the case and come along with a BASIX certificate, so it's not like they can't get them. You get them as if it was an apartment building, and we did have this court case, obviously the applicant challenged that, and it comes down to, I suppose, the nature of the boarding rooms and when they're in the form of small apartments, you know, you'd have your bedroom, living area, you'd have a small kitchenette and
15 you'd have your toilet, shower facilities, that's deemed to be a dwelling, as opposed to just a room in, say, shared accommodation, and would be caught by the basic SEPP.

20 MR SOO: We'd simply make the observation that the department does not appear to have addressed that SEPP.

DR WILLIAMS: Could I please have the judgment please? I might just make a note of it, thanks.

25 MR CHEONG: You did mention something about the amenities of the project, the internal amenities. We notice that, in their plan, they do supply common area on various floor. Would you like to see that increase to be included in every floor so that it might increase the standard of amenities provided within the buildings?

30 MR SOO: Obviously our submission did not – our response to submission from June 2018 did not explicitly say that, but obviously, given the size of development, given the nature of the surrounding context, yes, any increase in communal facilities, yes, perhaps per floor, would clearly be an improvement.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. Much appreciated.

MR CHEONG: The council obviously was concerned with the visual bulk impact. With the department's report, are you quite satisfied with the assessment with - - -

40 MR MACKAY: I mean, I suppose we have not – personally, I've not reviewed the report in great detail and not treated it as if we were assessing the application. Obviously it is a significant change. I'd probably make – and again, not looked at it in great detail, but it does talk about things like transitions. I'd note that, from the north, where you have your two-storey terraces, you're transitioning up to – I think
45 it's a nine-storey building and then a 24-storey building, so yes, some of those justifications may be, to my mind, applied a little loosely, and it's going to change the character of the area. It is a big change. I suppose that has to be weighed up against everything else, but perhaps those sort of relationships with immediately

adjoining buildings could possibly – at the street level on Eveleigh Street, I think it's three storeys and then behind that is nine storeys.

5 That looks quite close to the rear of the terraces, and I'm not quite sure if that transition is really ideal, but again, I've not, you know, I've not looked at that in a great amount of detail, as if, you know, as if the council was doing the assessment, but of course, I mean, you're transitioning up to 24 storeys and then on the south we're dropping down to a single-storey train station so, you know, I mean, it has to be recognised as a significant change and, as I say, I think council, whilst it didn't
10 object to the potential for a taller building, was a little concerned that the primary justification seemed to be that, on the other side of the railway line, there were a number of tall buildings already. I suppose the most important context would be the west of the railway line, so the position of council was that.

15 MR CHEONG: How do you see that being a response to the Central and Everleigh Urban Transformation Strategy? Are you familiar with that strategy?

MR SOO: I'm aware of it but I'm not familiar with the details of it. Having said that, I would submit that it's probably premature to rely on it in the absence of – it's
20 sort of the first step, if you know what I mean, in setting the strategy for the area. Until it's – my words – firmed up more - - -

MR MACKAY: I mean, I understand it's not a statutory document. Obviously, in its title, it's about transformation and this will certainly transform that part of the
25 area. I note, and I think I recollect just from reviewing the report, I mean, this is sort of outside of the strategy area but within the – I think they refer to it as a zone of influence, I suppose, the area and around the edges, so obviously it's about the railway line, so it's right on the edge, right on the edge of that, but you know, and a tall building within the strategy is probably – you know, it's very close to that area,
30 but certainly, I mean, you know, it's going to transform that little part of the – part of the area adjacent to the rail line.

MR CHEONG: One of the points that was raised here in the report is that council provided a recommended condition relating to public domain works should the
35 application be recommended for approval. Can you tell us a bit more of what the council recommended conditions?

MR SOO: Sorry. What page of the report is that?

40 MS I. MILLAR: 42.

MR CHEONG: 42, the last bullet point.

45 MR MACKAY: Do you know if they were included?

MR SOO: If draft conditions were provided, would have been obviously outside of the formal correspondence, would have likely have been email correspondence

between the department officer and the council officer. I could not tell you precisely what it says, but as I said earlier, I do – I have made some – I have got some comments on some conditions that the department have recommended, and they do relate to public domain matters.

5

MR CHEONG: Yes

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

10 MR SOO: And, in essence, given that council will be the future custodian of the space, you know, my recommendation would be that a lot of the conditions have council as an approval role as the future custodian, the future manager of the space. You know, the council would not be comfortable with a certifier, or the department accepting whatever the response is – the wind response, whatever it may be, and
15 council inheriting and being the custodian of those spaces.

MR CHEONG: Just for the record, the council have handed us some written comments on various issues. They will be published on the website.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Soo-Tee, while we've got this in front of us, could I ask a question?

MR CHEONG: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Sorry. Thanks, Michael, for that. Bill, you mentioned earlier about the requirement for affordable housing with some restriction on use, and that's an instrument under 88B of the conveyancing Act, to – a condition to that effect to ensure that it stays as affordable housing. Just to the contribution you've got here – sorry, the condition E4. So what you're asking for is a housing
30 contribution, but that to be waived if the Aboriginal Housing Company is registered as a community housing provider.

MR MACKAY: No, we see that as being – as I understand it, as being two separate things. So you have the affordable housing contribution, which is either a
35 contribution or provided within the development.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR MACKAY: And then, I suppose, the additional – and I suppose perhaps
40 council were looking at it in the context of a significant uplift from, whatever, nine storeys, 24 storeys, from however many beds to however many beds on the basis that this allowed the wider development to be self-funding, that that should perhaps reasonably provide for student accommodation for Aboriginal students, which is affordable.

45

MR SOO: Or at a disadvantage to our students.

MR MACKAY: Yes. So they would be seen as two separate things, but the mechanism for the affordable housing is either you get a contribution, or if you provide it onsite, then there's restrictions on title.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

MR MACKAY: So if you're proving affording student housing accommodation on site, then perhaps a similar mechanism would help to secure that, but we would see the student accommodation as being different to affordable housing.

10

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS MILLAR: So could I follow up?

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes, please do. Yes.

MR SOO: Sorry, can I just also clarify that the left column is a cut and paste from the department's conditions.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR SOO: And the right column is the City's comments.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

25

MS MILLAR: So just following up on that in terms of the mechanism for securing the restriction on use, do you see a difference in terms of the provision of affordable housing in the context of a residential use and affordable housing as opposed to student accommodation, which is treated, sort of, differently, particularly by the department, in terms of who provides that use, because it's likely to be a third-party student accommodation provider and how that mechanism is secured, or do you see the, sort of, section 88B instrument as still being applicable in the context of a student accommodation use?

30

35 MR MACKAY: Yes. Well, I think for the student accommodation, it would be applicable, because obviously you have an applicant, a student provider, who may get a concern and sell it to the next applicant come student provider, or build it and move on in the future. So that obligation to provide for student accommodation within the student buildings ultimately remains irrespective of who owns or operates into the future. You know, a commitment by a condition of consent – I'm not saying it doesn't carry weight, but it, sort of, can, over time, possibly, for want of a better word, get lost, or lose a bit of currency, because it has disappeared. At least if it's registered on title, it's there for anyone who is moving in who does their due diligence to sort of understand that there's a restriction on the development that they're coming into. So that's why we suggest that, because, again, similarly, if – as
40
45 a general rule, people pay the contribution for affordable housing, but if they are to provide it onsite – you know, I build a building. I say, "Yes, those 10 apartments are

affordable housing”, and a little further down the line, I sell the building. If it’s not on title, there’s a chance - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

5

MR MACKAY: You don’t necessarily understand you have that obligation.

DR WILLIAMS: That’s right.

10 MR MACKAY: So we would make sure that restriction went on title. So we see the student housing as being – well, it’s a different form. It’s a student housing form of affordable housing for a particular sector of the community.

15 DR WILLIAMS: So sorry. Just to clarify for myself. So council would either seek that to be done - - -

MR MACKAY: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - or a contribution - - -

20

MR MACKAY: No - - -

DR WILLIAMS: - - - for affordable housing?

25 MR MACKAY: Okay. No, Mike will be able to clarify.

MR SOO: I meant - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

30

MR MACKAY: I hope I’m not getting it wrong.

DR WILLIAMS: No, I’m sorry if I’m confusing, but - - -

35 MR MACKAY: Yes, I think - - -

MR SOO: I mean - - -

DR WILLIAMS: - - - the way that’s - - -

40

MR MACKAY: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - worded, it’s one or the other.

45 MR SOO: Well, that’s why I’ve said the department’s condition, and we didn’t raise it as an issue in our written submission - - -

MR MACKAY: Yes. So - - -

MR SOO: - - - as such.

5 MR MACKAY: Yes. So - - -

MS MILLAR: I think that condition E4 is in the - - -

10 MR SOO: It's in the Precinct 3 - - -

MS MILLAR: It's in the Precinct 3 - - -

MR SOO: - - - detailed application.

15 MS MILLAR: - - - detailed application, but is more in the context of contribution for the Precinct 1 works or the Precinct 2 - - -

MR SOO: For the accommodation in the Precinct 1, yes.

20 MS MILLAR: Yes. So - - -

MR MACKAY: Yes, I mean I think our point - - -

MR SOO: Yes.

25

MR MACKAY: - - - or the comment is just that the requirement for a portion of the student housing to be made available to Aboriginal students or other disadvantaged students be subject to a similar mechanism as the affordable housing requirement would be subject to if they were providing that on the development as a pass-through contribution.

30

DR WILLIAMS: So this is purely for Precinct 3. There's also affordable housing in Precinct 1, which is - so which is - - -

35 MR SOO: And there's a similar condition in the Precinct 1 and 2 - sorry, condition.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR SOO: But the comments are for two applications.

40

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

45 MR SOO: Precincts 1 and 2.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR SOO: And Precinct 3 - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

5 MR CHEONG: All right. So what are you saying, you would like to see the - - -

MR SOO: The restriction on title - - -

10 MR CHEONG: - - - restriction as a condition to be applied to Precinct 3 application.

MR SOO: For the 110 beds to be made available to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander students or other disadvantaged students.

15 DR WILLIAMS: And Precinct 1?

MR SOO: Precinct 1, there is conditions that we're happy with.

20 DR WILLIAMS: You're happy with that. Okay. Because I – yes, but I'm just looking at page 77 where it's pointed out, well, there's no restriction on title guaranteeing the 62 units in the Precinct 1 one being provided as affordable housing. That's on the bottom of page 77. That's the UrbanGrowth Development Corporation, but I would have thought council might have had similar concerns to ensure that affordable housing in Precinct 1 was also suitably conditioned to ensure that it stays as affordable housing. I'm sorry if I'm causing any confusion, but I just wanted to - - -

30 MS MILLAR: I think really – I think perhaps the – the issue is that we've got the – the concept approval, then we've got the project approval and then this is the state significant development approval for precinct 3.

DR WILLIAMS: Precinct 3.

35 MS MILLAR: At this stage, I don't think we have more detailed proposals for precincts 1 and 2, so the contribution is being brought up in the – the precinct 3 context. Is that the case or - - -

MR SOO: We do have a detailed application for precincts 1 and 2.

40 MS MILLAR: Sorry, apologies.

MR SOO: It is - - -

45 MS MILLAR: I – we haven't – but not before us.

MR CHEONG: I think – I think it's the other way around.

MS MILLAR: Other way round?

MR CHEONG: Yes.

5 MS MILLAR: Sorry. I'm just looking at what we have in the pack here.

DR WILLIAMS: This is all about exemptions from contributions and – and the developers – the applicant is saying, look, we want all these exemptions and – and there's these concerns, well, we haven't got enough information to ensure that - - -
10

MR SOO: So I can lead this. This is – I got that off the department website, which is a consolidated version of the precincts 1 and 2 detailed application.

MS MILLAR: Two, great, so that's what we don't have here.
15

MR SOO: And in condition E17, they do have an affordable housing contribution condition - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.
20

MR SOO: - - - which says either you pay it in cash or you have the restriction.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. That's E7?

25 MR SOO: E17.

DR WILLIAMS: Seventeen. Thanks, Michael.

MS MILLAR: And so then it's E15 in the modification – the proposed
30 modifications at the back, here, of the assessment report. Let me just check.

MR CHEONG: Matthew, can you assist us with clarifying what that condition, apply to which application?

35 MR M. TODD-JONES: Yes.

MR SOO: Sorry, can I just - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes. So I'm just looking - - -
40

MR SOO: I think the confusion may be that – so that's the consolidated version, this - - -

MS MILLAR: So what - - -
45

MR SOO: This is the modification instrument. And through some sort of renumbering, it – it's shown as E14 on the – what – on the stand alone modification recommendation, but in the consolidated version, it's shown as E17.

5 MS MILLAR: So – because this, again, looks very – looks different to what we have been - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, we've got something - - -

10 MS MILLAR: - - - given as the proposed modifications. I'm just trying to make sure that it is the right one that we're looking at but it seems to be the right reference. And here in – in our copy, it's E15.

MR CHEONG: We couldn't find the E.

15

MS MILLAR: So – so E14 is the contribution and then E15 has the registration requirements.

MR SOO: And to add a quick observation I just made was, the numbers are different - - -

20

MS MILLAR: Yes, numbers are different.

MR SOO: That's 903. That's 883.

25

MS MILLAR: No, that's – no that's – so that's – but then it – that's E15.

MR SOO: Sorry, sorry, sorry.

30 MS MILLAR: So I think that's – that's - - -

MR SOO: Sorry, sorry.

MS MILLAR: Yes, E16 is talking about the contribution for public domain works and then - - -

35

MR SOO: And then E17 is the affordable housing - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - E17 is the contribution for affordable housing and the numbers are - - -

40

MR SOO: The – through the - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - the same, yes. So I think that's – okay, that – that makes sense. So we've got this condition in the project approval for precincts 1 and 2 and then the – the mirror condition in the - - -

45

MR CHEONG: In the - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - SSD.

5 MR CHEONG: - - - SSD, yes.

MS MILLAR: But it's – the SSD is talking about the same – same contribution for the 62 dwellings in precinct 1.

10 DR WILLIAMS: I still don't think we've got it. No, that – that's not – that's not for affordable housing.

MS MILLAR: That's the next page – on the next page, yes – no, there. Sorry.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Up there?

MS MILLAR: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. We've got it as E15.

20

MR SOO: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Well, it's a mirror provision for what's in the - - -

25 MR SOO: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - but for precinct 3. It's either the contribution or the – or the provision on site by the Aboriginal housing company. Okay. So Council's happy with those types – types of conditions for - - -

30

MR SOO: Yes.

MR MACKAY: Yes, yes.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, we got there, but it was - - -

MR MACKAY: Okay.

40 DR WILLIAMS: - - - just trying to work out that we had it all properly covered, both – both affordable housing on both precincts. Okay.

45 MS MILLAR: I guess my question is, you've got the condition for affordable housing in the 62 dwellings for – for precincts 1 and 2. Does that condition also need to be in precinct 3, in respect of those 62 affordable housing units or should that better reflect the nature of the precinct 3 development, which is a student accommodation and it's a restriction on title, with respect to 110 or 111 accommodation units or however we describe them.

MR MACKAY: Well, I suppose Council's position was that the – the development, as presented would be subject to an affordable housing contribution, and the condition is contribution or provision on site. But generally, it's contribution. So the – the student housing, if approved, would go ahead and they'd pay the contribution.

5 Presumably, provision of affordable housing on the site wouldn't be an option for them because they're providing student accommodation, as opposed to regular housing. And then, the issue in relation to the 110 beds or 20 per cent, Council saw as being additional to affordable housing, because it's affordable student accommodation and, I suppose, they provided – you know, in consideration of the

10 comments, we're mindful of that request for a significant uplift in the development and the amount of student accommodation, justified, in large part, on the basis that this is what's going to make the whole development work.

It's a self-funding exercise and if you're providing a significant amount of additional student accommodation on site, then perhaps some of it should be available to

15 Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islanders or other people on an affordable basis. You know, I suppose we don't have the facts and figures, but some student accommodation costs a fair amount. The question is whether or not that is seen to – deemed to be affordable from – for students from a disadvantaged background. So

20 that – that was seen as being, you know, the development would provide a contribution for affordable housing in – you know, in the wider context, but it also provides some affordable student accommodation on site for Aboriginal Torres Strait Islanders or others from a disadvantaged background. That's – that's what the sort of – the Council comments were coming from.

25 MR CHEONG: Okay. So we understand what the Council's intentions - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Happy with that. Thanks.

30 MR CHEONG: Any other questions you may have? No?

MS MILLAR: In terms of the art gallery space changing and the – the floor area of the art gallery being now smaller than what was proposed, is Council comfortable with that being mitigated through the public domain art approach?

35 MR SOO: I think the public domain art is over and above, you know, the obligation that the proponent has with the City through our separate deed.

40 MR CHEONG: So you have no problem with the reduction of – of the gallery space?

MR SOO: It hasn't been raised in our submission, no.

45 MR CHEONG: Okay. Any other questions?

DR WILLIAMS: I mean, Council's happy with the – I'm not quite sure what the nett change final figure in terms of dedicated open space is, but Council's happy with

the – the amount of open space that’s been proposed now. There’s been a few changes.

5 MR SOO: It’s been increased.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes.

MR SOO: Yes.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. So - - -

MR SOO: Yes, yes, yes. Yes, said you have some details about Council having a sign-off role, given that we’re going to be the future custodian of the space.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes.

MR SOO: And the space to be unencumbered.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. That’s fine. Thanks.

MR CHEONG: Any other questions?

DR WILLIAMS: No, thanks, Soo-Tee. Thank you.

25 MR CHEONG: Any other issues that you – you would like to raise?

MR MACKAY: I don’t think so. I think we touched on everything that Council was – had raised.

30 MR CHEONG: No?

DR WILLIAMS: No.

35 MR CHEONG: Well, there’s no further discussion, I declare the meeting closed.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.57 am]