



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-1024959

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: SOCIAL HOUSING 11 GIBBONS STREET, REDFERN

PANEL: **STEVE O'CONNOR**
WENDY LEWIN
OLIVIA HIRST

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID WAY**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** **DAVID McNAMARA**
ANDY NIXEY

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

DATE: **9.30 AM, MONDAY, 13 MAY 2019**

MR S. O'CONNOR: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting. St George Community Housing Sustainability Limited – the applicant – is seeking approval for the construction and operation of an 18-storey social and affordable housing development at 11 Gibbons Street, Redfern.

My name is Steve O'Connor. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner Wendy Lewin as well as Olivia Hirst, and David Way from the Secretariat on my left. In the interests of openness and 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. The meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its final decision. It's important for commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues where we consider it appropriate.

If you are asked a question and are 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 on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So that's the formalities out of the way. We have an agenda and we've done the quick introductions – done the opening statement. We might go to the project summary and is that over to you, David, for that.

MR D. McNAMARA: Yes, Steve. Thank you. David McNamara, director, key sites assessment. If it's okay with you, I could talk to a project summary and a summary of the agency advice during exhibition and then once I've done that, I will hand on to Andy to talk about some of those key assessment issues. He will give you an overview of those. Whilst doing that today, there's a couple of images we've got in a pack which I will let you look on to and I will refer to. We can send through a copy of these if you want to then attach that to the record of the meeting or put it on the website. I will leave that up to you. There's five or six images I will refer to, images that are in the report.

So 11 Gibbons Street, Redfern – it's a proposed development for an 18-storey, 160-apartment social and affordable housing development in the suburb of Redfern. The proposal also includes some ancillary ground floor retail office and commercial type uses. The first image before you just locates the site. It's a former City of Sydney Council depot – I think it was previously South Sydney Council before the amalgamation. The site was sold to St George Community Housing with a specific restriction: that the site be developed for social and affordable housing. And this

site forms part of the wider Redfern Town Centre located on the corner of Gibbons Street and Marian Street.

5 The immediate area has been subject to significant redevelopment across the past decade. There are several completed developments to the north nearby this site and this is one of several sites with current development applications under assessment by the department and student and affordable housing is increasingly becoming the preferred land use within this precinct, a number of completed developments to the north providing student housing. I move now to the second image in the pack which
10 helps show the relationship of the adjoining development sites. The subject site is shown in red. Immediately to the north of that block, a site has been developed with an 18-storey residential student accommodation housing.

15 MR O'CONNOR: How new is that, David, do you know?

MR McNAMARA: Not exact numbers – it would be similar numbers to or more than the number of apartments in here, but we can confirm that to you, the exact details of the approval.

20 MR O'CONNOR: So is it just student accommodation

MS W. LEWIN: Is it this one or this one?

25 MR McNAMARA: So – yes. So the site 60 – 78 Regent Street is student accommodation developed by Iglu and then you have residential development to the blocks to the west, the 157 to 159.

30 MR A. NIXEY: So Andy Nixey, principal planner of the department. Sorry; the tag has just gone a little bit off to the side there. So that's 79 Gibbons there.

MR McNAMARA: So that's development to the north. We've also – there have been previous approvals issued on 80 – 88 Regent Street, some approvals issued by the Commission, but we also have an application on that same site to change the approval from residential to student housing and that's currently under assessment.
35 And you will see another site to the south of the subject site – 13 – 23 Gibbons Street – an application currently being considered for student housing, and then the green site on the diagram, 90 – 102 Redfern Street, we've issued Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements and will be expecting an application to be lodged in the coming months for redevelopment potentially again for student housing
40 but obviously not formally lodged yet.

45 So there's a lot going on in this little precinct. We move across to the third image in the pack – image 3 – it illustrates the site in relation to the surrounding set height controls. You will see some block height control shown here and then the site shown in red. Continuing to move on, the next two images, images 4 and 5, are illustrations of the proposed design. The proposed design has evolved through extensive participation in the state design review panel process involving four meetings

between May and August 2018 and then a further meeting in December 2018. That's referenced through page 23 in our report in more detail. The panel's involvement has resulted in a number of refinements to the design.

5 The panel supports the design and on the basis of their support and our own assessment, the department considers this development would exhibit design excellence. Some of the key features of the development, as you will notice, is the three-storey brick podium to both street frontages, a three-tower modulation to the upper levels with varying setbacks and materials, some landscaping and communal spaces both on the roof podium as well as on the top at level 17. There's no car parking proposed. There's no basement proposed. There are bicycle parking at ground level accessible from William Lane. Because it is a proposal for social and affordable housing, it's eligible for a 20 per cent floor space bonus under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP and that's discussed on page 29 of our report. That increases the potential permissible FSR from a base of seven to one to 8.4 to one and that would extrapolate out to a total maximum GFA of just over 13,000 metres squared.

20 Moving through to image 6 in the pack, it shows the relationship of the height controls that apply to the site. There's a three-storey height control for the podium suggesting a four-metre setback for then a four-metre setback to the tower area above. The proposed tower, in this case, extends with that four-metre setback zone and a SEPP 1 objection was submitted for that variation and our report goes into that issue in some detail and we can talk to that later in the presentation. The application was publicly exhibited. We received seven public submissions which were all objections. The key concerns in those submissions related to matters such as height, overshadowing, wind impacts and also the cumulative impact of development in the wider area.

30 The government architect the New South Wales office supported the proposed design, noting its refinement through the state design review panel process. The City of Sydney Council objected to the proposed development. The city's key concerns could be summarised as the erosion of the four-metre tower setback to Gibbons Street, building separation and privacy impacts, wind impact, noise and ventilation issues particularly along Gibbons Street and development contributions. And the concerns of the city raised both initially and in response to the response to submissions are detailed on pages 19 and 21 of our assessment report.

40 The proponent – their response to submissions introduced a number of changes that could be summarised as follows: they increase the podium setback out to six metres from the centre of William Lane. They increase the Marian Street setback to three metres from the curb line. They made a range of revisions to apartment layouts to the fenestration of balconies, etcetera, predominantly to address privacy concerns. They made a number of changes in accordance with the recommendations of their technical wind report and they also provided increased bicycle parking.

That's a snapshot of the changes that they introduced and then allowed us to then conduct and finalise our assessment. That brought out a number of key issues which we would like to briefly talk about today and I will hand on to Andy to talk about those key issues being setbacks and building separation, noise and ventilation, wind and contributions as well as anything else after that that you would like us to talk about in more detail. So - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Just before we go to Andy, you did mention the 20 per cent bonus that's available because it's affordable and social housing. Is there any criteria to be able to achieve that 20 per cent bonus, or is it merely the fact that that's what you're proposing gets you the bonus?

MR McNAMARA: Yes. There's no - - -

MR O'CONNOR: CAD design excellence or anything like that?

MR McNAMARA: Well, design excellence is a requirement anyway because of – the LEP provisions require design excellence to be called up. There's no additional provisions for the 20 per cent - - -

MR NIXEY: Not under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP.

MR McNAMARA: So it still just needs to be an assessment under the heads of consideration under the Act. Design excellence is requirements of the LEP, regardless of whether the 20 per cent is applied or not.

MR NIXEY: Yes. Sorry. Just to clarify, it's the State Significant Precinct SEPP which sets the design excellence requirements here. It just requires us to consider design excellence in the assessment. Okay. So the issue to talk about is the setbacks in the building separation. So we have the 18-storey height control which we talked about earlier which the developer has complied with. As mentioned, the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP provides a bonus for this form of affordable housing development. So we've got over additional – an additional 2000 square metres of permissible floor space which will result in larger floor plates and that in turn results in reduced setbacks to each side of the proposed tower.

If I can go to the next – sorry, you're already on that image. So this shows the variations in relation to the set tower – the setback controls. So that's the four-metre setback control from Gibbons Street and from Marian Street above the podium. So as you can see, there's – because we've got this tower modulation design which was developed through the design panel; – the state design review panel, we've got variations which come down to 400 mil here, and obviously the greater setbacks up to seven metres between the towers there and that wraps around with similar form of variations on the Marian Street side as well. It's - - -

MR O'CONNOR: So before we leave that, Andy, there are no variations to any development standards in terms of setbacks to the other boundaries?

MR NIXEY: Not to William Lane. The SEPP only has the controls wrapping around Marian and Gibbons. So the – also the other issue to talk about with setbacks is the ADG which is the next one here.

5 MR O'CONNOR: ADG.

MR NIXEY: So we don't have any residential development on the other side. That's the Gibbons Street Reserve. So taking you to the centre line of Marian Street for the – for the setbacks there. We've got setbacks of 8.2 metres down to 6.4 metres
10 to, if I remember rightly, that's 13 to 23 to the south, and then we've got a six metre control there, and it's 4.6 metres to 7.5 metres. So that's generating the 12 metre separation, the six metres on each side, and it's similar to William Lane. We've got nine metres above the podium coming down to 4.9 metres at its closest point there. I
15 guess that important thing to consider here, and I will just take you to the last image that we have in the booklet here, is if you take the ADG controls which – well, I say controls. They're not controls. They're recommendations.

And add them on with the podium setback controls as well, they're actually very small developable area and I don't think that was the intent of the ADG obviously to
20 have these hard and fast controls here. It's more about how you consider issues of privacy and building separation, and it's similar on the – to the – for the set controls as well. They've been varied for other sites in the town centre.

So what – so rather than focusing slavishly on the setback – the numerical setback
25 controls, we've looked at the impacts from those issues. So in terms of the visual impacts, so the chemistry setback is high because there's the four metre control, but it's considered there the various setbacks would not result in adverse visual impact and the State Design Review Panel agrees – no concerns with the variation, given the desirable design outcomes.

30 We've referred to that in page 23 of our report. You can see the design is consistent is consistent with the emerging high density character of the town centre, and, of course, if you did push the tower further back in terms of the tower setbacks, say, from Gibbons Street, you're reducing the setbacks to William Lane, for example, or
35 you're simply reducing the four plate area which I think would prevent the redevelopment on the site, certainly for social and affordable housing.

I mean, obviously, it receives the benefit on the affordable rental housing steps are meant to take it away because of trying to comply fully with these numerical controls
40 rather than the impacts. We've looked at those impacts instead. Overshadowing – page 31 of the report talks of overshadowing. We've got minor slivers of additional overshadowing from these non-compliances. Views – again, minimal impact on view corridors in comparison with a compliant development.

45 And we say privacy obviously being an important factor in the assessment. And, again, noting that they're not strict development standards, and certainly on the block to the north in Redfern town centre, there has been a predominant 12 metre

separation between the towers that has been adopted, and the design has been refined to incorporate various design treatments to ensure we've got privacy, particularly to the future development at 90 to 102 Regent Street and also the future development at 13 to 23 as well, so there we're talking of high level windows, obscure glazing,
5 balcony screening and making sure the window placements are appropriate with regard to neighbouring developments as well. Just moving on from building separation. So - - -

10 MS LEWIN: Sorry – I don't mean to interrupt. You mention that to the north there's predominately a 12 metre separation between the existing developments. Is that the case?

MR NIXEY: Yes.

15 MS LEWIN: And they're mostly residential or residential or a mix of commercial?

MR NIXEY: No, they're residential and student accommodation.

20 MS LEWIN: The ones you're – these – okay. So you're referring to the redevelopments which are student. Do you envisage – it's a question we can talk about a little later, but it would seem to me that what's being proposed and in relation to what has recently been built, the student accommodation, there might be a future consideration of urban design – specific urban design controls for this precinct if it's going to be developed as student, social or affordable housing? Because each
25 development so far has been considered in relation to, not a compromise, but an adjournment or a relaxation of certain guidelines and - - -

MR McNAMARA: Yes, I guess when you're looking at student accommodation there isn't a specific set of guidelines and we have to rely on the scheme that applies
30 to the site, the ADG, and take an approach of applying that as best you can. There isn't a specific set of design guidelines, fortunately or unfortunately. Maybe student accommodation would be easier to assess if we had a set of criteria specifically for it. We've already got in this precinct with the images we showed earlier a lot of development already approved or under assessment, and I think we are required to
35 just use the most applicable guideline being ADG and the controls and the scheme that has been – is in place for the site that sites the zoning, sets the setbacks and so forth, and just undertake a merit-based assessment. I'm not sure we will have the luxury of getting a specific set of guidelines in this precinct.

40 MS LEWIN: So we're still working on site specific issues rather than a precinct consideration.

MR McNAMARA: Yes. Well, I guess there's - - -

45 MS LEWIN: As they build up - - -

MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - you're going to be facing the same sort of concerns and discussions each time.

5 MR McNAMARA: Indeed, we do. Yes. Yes. And, I guess, what we've to have a view on this side and the other side is to look at those key relationships - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes.

10 MR McNAMARA: - - - to understand what the potential impact from a development could be to a joining development going ahead in the future. So here we paid a lot of attention to the Gibbons Street and the eastern elevation where the development will interact with future development. Gibbons Street, having that park to the west gives you a little bit more breathing space and we know that won't get developed, so that has helped shaped our assessment of issues and impacts. Just that
15 context, and – because we do have a number of other live applications and matters before us, we've got a pretty good understanding of what the future built form will likely look like on those adjoining sites which helps as well.

20 MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR NIXEY: Just moving on to noise and ventilation. This was one of council's key concerns. So what's proposed is a hybrid ventilation system comprising solar powered fans on the roof. These will provide fresh air to apartments via a ducted system. We talked of this on page 45 of the report. So the system is environmentally
25 neutral and will allow residents – obviously given we're in a high noise area on Gibbons Street here, so will allow residents to keep the windows closed if they desire and they will still receive airflow ventilation. So I know council's concerns revolved around the use of mechanical ventilation in any form and referred to the ADG, but – so our view of the – actually satisfies the intent of the ADG because the ADG itself
30 acknowledges that it's not – it may not be possible to satisfy natural cross ventilation recommendations in noisy environments. And certainly as referred to in the report, there has been other similar alternative methods of natural ventilation on either sites, even 80 to 88 regent Street which was approved by the commission – a different form of ventilation proposed there.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Wendy, did you have questions about the ventilation system?

MS LEWIN: Yes. It's about the draw. Has the applicant given you more information than we have in your very good report, about how the – when the solar
40 passage mechanics kick in, there has to be a draw. Is it the – is the system pushing air down or pulling it up, and if it's either way, there has either got to be an ability for the air to be released so that there is the convection or the passage of air, or in reverse, whereas the intake, to be able to be drawn out. It doesn't appear to be on any documents that we have in front of us, and I just wondered whether that could be
45 further explained. Also, if they're going to close doors and windows to mitigate the noise issue, is there sufficient draw or, not so much leakage, but a passage of air that can be for release and not pressurising?

MR NIXEY: I think there has been quite a lot of information submitted about this ventilation system, and it has evolved during the application process as they've responded to the State Design Review Panel's comments and obviously just worked through how it would work themselves. So it's – as I understand it, it would pull the air down. There are trickle vents and different methods that the air can, you know, permeate out of the apartments as well, but it's – so it's – I think it is fairly complicated. It might be - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Good question for the undertaking.

MR NIXEY: Good question to – I think Northrop have provided quite a lot of - - -

MS LEWIN: It shouldn't be complicated. It's a very simple principle. Yes.

MR NIXEY: Not only the principle, but I think – and I know the applicants have spent a lot of time working with Northrop to get this system working and obviously how the solar power will relate to it, so a good question for them, I think.

MS LEWIN: We will ask. That's good.

MR McNAMARA: Yes, I think where – how we've looked at this is it should give people a choice. It is a noisy environment. Some people may choose to want to have their window closed to deal with the noise environment. There's a choice then to not have to rely on mechanical ventilation solely. Other people may have – and this hybrid system, to call it hybrid ventilation system, does give people a choice to close it off or open it up. And then similarly if they – they may choose to accept the noise. So what would be really focused on here is it does give people more options than just a straight situation of opening or closing a window.

MR O'CONNOR: Got to open the window. Yes.

MR McNAMARA: There's an alternate option there, but probably best we do – yes, speak to the applicant about the specifics so we don't mislead you about how it works.

MS LEWIN: Good. Thank you.

MR NIXEY: The next issue is wind. So the RTS amendments include extending the awning around and across the full Marian Street frontage chamfering the south western podium corner, and provision of various windscreens and vegetation on the level 3 open space. So the RTS wind report confirms that the trafficable areas within and around the development will be suitable for their intended use and satisfy the required controls to wind impacts. And obviously wind will impact. It's an 18 storey development. So it's how you obviously mitigate those impacts, and given the technical information provided were satisfied that they will be suitably ameliorated. Can move on to the final issue I was going to talk about which was contributions. So council – excuse me – considered the Redfern Waterloo Authority Contributions

Plan 2006 and the Affordable Housing Contributions Plan 2006 should be applied to the development.

5 Urban Growth New South Wales administer these plans and they've recommended that any monetary contribution payments be waived on the basis that the costs of the proposed public domain works exceeding the required contribution amount, and the fact that the proposed development is for social and affordable housing. The department – council have raised concerns and they wish for the contributions to be paid. We don't consider the council's position to be justified effectively because as explained by Urban Growth New South Wales the estimated costs of the public domains works is around 136,000. I imagine that has actually gone up because the setback to William Lane has increased since that time. And that exceeds the required contribution of just over \$47,000.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Can you point out where those public domain works are taking place.

MR NIXEY: Yes, I don't have ground floor plan. You might have a better plan here.

20 MS LEWIN: Yes, we have.

MR NIXEY: Yes. Really, it's – it's just the setbacks to William Lane predominately. We've gone to quite a sizeable setback of over three metres there. So, you know, this is a very narrow footpath at the moment. So with a 3.2 metre setback there. Also I think it's just under a metre – the increased setback to Marian Street.

MR O'CONNOR: Right.

30 MR NIXEY: But obviously the works will – we will need to tie the whole footpath in accordance with council's recommendation conditions for the public domain. There's no real increased setback onto Gibbons Street but there are street tree planting - - -

35 MR O'CONNOR: And this remains private property.

MR NIXEY: Yes.

40 MR O'CONNOR: Is there going to be any easement for public access? It's going to be an open area that people can just walk through. Do you know - - -

MR NIXEY: No, that's going to be gated.

45 MR O'CONNOR: It is.

MR NIXEY: So, yes, that's just their private driveway for servicing arrangements. The plan is – I say plan, our understanding is that with the development of 13 to 23, William Lane will be extended through to Margaret Street. And so we will have a – not a through side link but obviously an extra – an additional length through between the sites as well. So, yes, the final reason was obviously the development is for social and affordable housing, so we don't consider it to be reasonable to charge an affordable housing contribution.

MR O'CONNOR: But wasn't council's counterargument that a component of it is retail and commercial café and maybe the charges should apply to that component?

MR NIXEY: They're a very small component of the development. I think the fact we're have 160 social and affordable housing units provided in perpetuity I think would offset the relatively small amount of contributions required for those areas. And to say Urban Growth New South Wales are the administrators of the plan and they've suggested they be waived subject to conditions and we've incorporated those conditions in our

MR McNAMARA: Yes, I guess given that the plan does allow this scenario of works in kind to be provided in lieu of a contribution and the administrator of the planned urban growth have given their agreement to that approach, we do have to give a lot of weight to what the plan allows and the administrator's comments, and just noting the retail commercial and café areas are approximately 250 or so square metres out of a development site around 13,000.

MR NIXEY: I think there was over thirteen - - -

MR McNAMARA: So as a proportion it's very small.

MR NIXEY: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: And the value of the social and affordable housing can't be discounted and it might be worth asking the city how they waive contributions or where they waive contributions for social and affordable housing in other parts of the city such as maybe Green Square or others and what their approach is there. We're comfortable that we're administering – applying the plan appropriately. Urban Growth as the administrator of the plan have got the ability to allow this situation to occur. We don't think it's an unreasonable outcome in this case.

MS LEWIN: David, does this stay in perpetuity a community – sorry. Yes.

MR NIXEY: Sorry; the office component?

MS LEWIN: The community hub, yes.

MR NIXEY: Yes. Yes. I mean, their - - -

MS LEWIN: That also goes with the in perpetuity use of the site.

MR NIXEY: Yes, SGCH Office will service this development and some of their other developments within the city as well and they will form, yes, part of the overall
5

MR O'CONNOR: Just while we're on that particular issue, can you take me to the condition that requires that in perpetuity aspect?

10 MR NIXEY: I think it's E4. It's E4(b) restriction on the

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. That's good.

MR NIXEY: Okay. Well, just conclude, following our detailed assessment, the
15 department supports the proposed development subject to conditions and presents the application to the commission for approval.

MR O'CONNOR: Great. Thank you very much for that presentation. Both Wendy and I, we were impressed with the report. We thought it was very well done, so - - -
20

MR NIXEY: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Pass that on to Anthea too given that she didn't make it today.

25 MR NIXEY: Yes, I will. Yes.

MS LEWIN: No, it was good. It's very well organised.

MR O'CONNOR: I might start off with a couple of questions.
30

MS LEWIN: Go for it, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Thanks, Wendy. Just one of two questions about the power that the IPC has. So I think that takes us to page 15 of your report, section 4.1. You talk
35 about this being a State Significant Development project. And you referenced both the State and Regional Development SEPPs and the Minister's delegation dated 14 September 2011 and both of these are pointing towards the IPC, being the consent authority. But you make a point in relation to the first State and Regional
40 Development SEPP that council objected outside the mandatory period for community participation. Was there an implication there that therefore that trigger doesn't apply? In other words, IPC might not be the consent authority in relation to SRD SEPP?

MR McNAMARA: I think our letter of referral clarified that it was on the basis of
45 the Minister's delegate that the IPC would be determining this matter, not as the consent authority. It is the timing of the – of council's submission if it – as you probably know, Steve, it occurs during the formal exhibition period of the trigger of

consent authority power because it came outside the formal exhibition that triggers your power as a delegate of the Minister. But I think our referral letter should have clarified that, but I'm more than happy to follow up if we need to, to just absolutely clarify without doubt our understanding is that your power - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. So - - -

MR McNAMARA: - - - rests as a delegate of the Minister.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Is in relation to the Minister's delegation.

MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Yes. That's fine. Just in, again, statutory-wise, I noted
15 further on in that chapter – see if I can find that – maybe it was another chapter. There's reference to the RMS concurrence being required under the Roads Act and also Sydney Train's concurrence being required in the infrastructure SEPP and clause 102. So is that the case, that we require concurrence from both those
20 authorities powers to exercise by determining approval.

MR NIXEY: So what page are you referring to?

MR O'CONNOR: I just find – it will be the – where those particular SEPPS are assessed in your report which, I think, between chapter 6.

25 MR NIXEY: There's, like, not normally a concurrence required with SSD.

MR O'CONNOR: That's what I wanted to be clear on. I will have a look through.
We - - -

30 MR NIXEY: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - will come back to that.

35 MR McNAMARA: Because there is a reference on page 77 that, in accordance with the infrastructure SEPP, we made referrals to RMS and Transport for New South Wales, but if you can point us to it – another passage in the report - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Sure.

40 MR McNAMARA: - - - we can take that on notice.

MR O'CONNOR: We will come back to you on that.

45 MS LEWIN: We will come back, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. The – can you take me to the conditions that referred to the consolidation of the lots. This is also a – it's a subdivision application, as well as a development application. Looking through, I was just finding it hard to see where those conditions requiring consolidation and the timing of that land all happening.

5

MR NIXEY: Yes. I'm looking at it now. Looks like the part G hasn't come across. It's not here either. So there – yes. There is those conditions, but – so I will have to forward them to you. Sorry about that.

10

MR O'CONNOR: So we haven't – there's another - - -

MR NIXEY: There - - -

MS LEWIN: G.

15

MR O'CONNOR: After F is G.

MR NIXEY: Because it – because – yes, because it was just a small additional section for the subdivision that has gone away.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Good. Okay.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

25

MR O'CONNOR: I was wondering where it was. I thought it was buried somewhere else. Good. Well, you will provide that to us. Right. And just on the issue of bicycle parking, I note that they've had, in the response to submissions report, they did increase the bicycle parking in part – in the response to council's concerns being raised, but they're only proposing 80 spaces for the 160 dwellings.

30

Council's code requires that 160 spaces for 160 dwellings.

There's talk in the report about the applicant wanting to encourage bicycle use and looking at instituting some sort of share scheme to help encourage bicycle use, and it just seemed that given there's no car parking on site, this is the only form of vehicle parking, that that might be a bit on the low side. Did you have an opinion about whether the 80 spaces for the dwellings – I accept the number of spaces for the other uses on site. It's the ones with the dwellings that seemed to ring a bell.

35

MR NIXEY: Yes. So, obviously, there's no basement with this development.

40

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR NIXEY: So all bicycle parking has to be provided on the ground floor. So the applicant's contention is that the – because I think, under the council's Development Control Plan that require 160 resident spaces, their argument is that that rate is not tailored to the specific needs to social and affordable housing, and their evidence was that 80 to 90 per cent of their residences, I've seen in other developments that they

45

have, don't have bicycles. So their concern, obviously, would be providing a huge amount of bicycle spacing for residents that do not have bicycles. So their analysis was they expect up to 40 tenants to own and use a bicycle. So providing 80 spaces and encouraging bicycle use through their bicycle share scheme would be an
5 appropriate balance between that and mostly utilising quite a large amount of their ground floor for bike parking which their – so their analysis of their other space is that it wouldn't be utilised.

10 MR O'CONNOR: So the bicycle share scheme would still require the bikes to be parked onsite, I take it?

MR NIXEY: Yes. Yes.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Yes. Okay.

MR McNAMARA: Yes, it could be an allocation or part allocation of the spaces they've got - - -

20 MR O'CONNOR: Of the 80 spaces.

MR McNAMARA: - - - toward a share scheme which, in effect, gives you - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Exactly.

25 MR McNAMARA: - - - a lot more accessibility for their residents. It would be good to maybe explore that with them as to what that share scheme might look like and any experience they've got on their other sites.

30 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. Okay. You have any questions - - -

MS LEWIN: No further to what I've already asked - - -

MR O'CONNOR: All right.

35 MS LEWIN: - - - at this stage.

MR O'CONNOR: What about David and Olivia? Anything you want to raise or ask?

40 MR D. WAY: No.

MS HIRST: No.

45 MR O'CONNOR: No? Okay. So subject to us coming back to you, we're just clarifying about that concurrence issue, but I think the only thing that you were going to do is get back to us in relation to - - -

MR McNAMARA: Part G of consent.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, part G of consent, of course.

5 MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: The missing part.

10 MR McNAMARA: Apologies about that, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Great. Okay.

MR McNAMARA: Okay.

15 MR O'CONNOR: That's the case, then. Thanks very much, Caitlin. We might end the transcript now. Thanks.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.11 am]