

MR MACKAY: I should say good morning. My name is Richard Mackay. I'm about to do a welcome opening statement. I think we've got Jim; we've got Peter and we've got Rido, who's looking black but presumably you've got your video off, have you, Rido?

5

MR PIN: I don't have a video here, unfortunately. So I'm just with audio.

MR MACKAY: Okay. But you can obviously hear us.

10 MR PIN: Yes, definitely.

MR MACKAY: So we will – we will get formally underway because I think all attendees are present. So good morning and welcome.

15 MR PIN: Good morning

MR MACKAY: And before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, and I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the teleconference today to discuss the Cabramatta Town Centre East Gateway determination review which was requested by Fairfield City Council. My name is Richard Mackay and I'm the chair of this Independent Planning Commission panel and joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Dr Peter Williams, who you might just wave. Thank you. But also Casey Joshua, Callum Firth and not – Stephen Barry, the other officer involved in this matter from the IPC Secretariat are also in attendance.

20

25

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's teleconference is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This teleconference is one part of the Commission's consideration of the Gateway determination review request. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its advice and I should point out that the commissioners have read the relevant documentation, so you may assume that, and we have also inspected the site in the company of the staff from the IPC Secretariat.

30

35

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate and 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 up on our website. And to ensure the accuracy of the transcript, I request that all members today introduce themselves each time before speaking so if you could say who you are every time you speak, please, and for members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. We will now begin but could I please invite the representatives of the proponent to introduce each of yourselves and your roles, please.

40

45

MR LAWRENCE: I'll start. I'm Peter Lawrence from GLN Planning so I've been the planning consultant putting together the planning proposal over the last two years.

5 MR MACKAY: Thank you, Peter.

MR CASTAGNET: Good morning, everyone. Jim Castagnet, I'm director of Moon Investments and the developer for the project.

10 MR PIN: Good morning, everyone. My name is Rido Pin. I'm a director at Plus Architecture and I've been working with the team over the last couple of years to develop this scheme.

15 MR MACKAY: Thank you all. So could I now perhaps invite the representatives from the proponent, I presume that's you, Peter, is it, to provide an overview of the planning proposal.

MR LAWRENCE: Yes. I'll kick off. So, Peter Lawrence, from GLN Planning. Look, I'll start by just saying the planning proposal looks to apply transit-oriented
20 development principles, place making the location of this site adjacent to the station with a high-density development. Consistent with this theme, the urban design principles that heights will transition down from – or transition away from a rail hub or centre. We look to apply – we look to recognise that but also I recognise within the site itself, that we wanted to provide a difference in heights because that provides
25 the greatest opportunity for solar access and outlook for the dwellings or the tenants that will live in those dwellings in the future.

If you've been out there, you would have seen the shops are fragmented. They're relatively tired and certainly this side of Cabramatta, Cabramatta East, lacks the
30 vitality of the western side of Cabramatta. Core parts of the planning proposal is to include a plaza in the centre of the development. an attraction to the site, and a new connection linking this site with Cabramatta station concourse and therefore the western side of Cabramatta via a pedestrian bridge over Broomfield Street and that's something that council's flagged since well before we were involved with the site.

35 We approached Fairfield council to start talking about the rezoning of the site in 2016. It's been a long time. And at that stage we were looking at a 22-storey maximum building to place mark the centre and at that stage also we included the Fisher Road car park which was – which council subsequently said they didn't want
40 included in the site.

Just a little bit of background to that. The Fisher Road car park is a council car park but it was funded by federal government money. We were simply going to replace the existing number of car parking spaces in the development and build over the top
45 and to the side of that. But council said they didn't want to be involved and that was fine. So that was subsequently withdrawn from the site.

We also knew, back in 2016, that council had looked at Cabramatta as part of its earlier residential development strategy where it looked to upzone parts of the commercial centre on both sides of Cabramatta, Cabramatta East and West, for high density development as well as the surrounding residential areas. However, council
5 had some traffic studies done to look at the viability of that and we were – we reviewed the traffic studies and we were told by council, through their discussions with RMS, that the western side impact of the upzoning was too great and would cause a lot of intersections to fail but the eastern side was relatively unconstrained which – which gave us a bit of optimism because we could look at not only the
10 redevelopment of this site but our traffic modelling also included the opportunity for council to implement the rest of the residential development strategy on the eastern side of Cabramatta.

So we undertook that work and that actually showed that – the results of that study
15 showed that there was little impact on the intersections. We also – I'll just – I'll just find my notes in a little closer order, if I may. So the proposal then went through a series of investigations. 2016 was a long time ago but we went through various steps which, from council's point of view and our point of view, kind of informed the heights of where we are now.

20 The first one was the traffic study. As I said, the summary out of the study was all intersections continue to operate at an acceptable level of service with your average delays and capacity. So that's taking into account not only our site but the residential strategy that council hadn't implemented on the eastern side. So from a
25 traffic modelling point of view, it showed the densities and heights that we're looking at on the development site could be accommodated.

We also consulted directly with Airservices Australia because we knew we were in relative proximity to Bankstown Airport and we got advice back from Airservices
30 Australia that our proposal wouldn't breach the obstacle limitation surfaces or PANS-OPS and I just might add that the proposal the Airservices Australia reviewed was a maximum height of 87.3 metres. So that was the actual reference in their letter. Obviously we're some distance, some 20 metres below that.

35 We also – we also – I was going to say sat and waited, but we also waited for council to complete a broader study of their commercial centres in Fairfield local government area where they just wanted to place – they wanted to do some studies just to place make – place mark Cabramatta in relation to other centres with the view that Fairfield – Fairfield centre should be – you know, have the strongest and highest
40 densities and then subservient centres should be below that. So we weren't involved in that study. We waited for the outcomes of it and by that stage we got down to a 19-storey building as the maximum height of the building on this site and council confirmed that their study showed that that would be an appropriate height to put in a
45 planning proposal on.

The council then had the planning proposal independently reviewed by TPG, town planning urban designers, and as noted in my Gateway determination review

submission of the 9th of December, the report recommends further work and re-consideration of massing just to ensure the commercial properties to the south of our site, that's at 144 to 158 Cabramatta Road East, can be redeveloped. Now, we call that the island site because it's actually bounded by Broomfield Street, Cabramatta
5 Road East and the flyover. It's not a very large site. It's actually under 1300 square metres. The depth is under 30 metres. There's no basement parking at the moment and the planning controls at the moment kind of limit any redevelopment on that site to a maximum of 15 storeys and that the scope to which it would redevelop based on those terms is unknown.

10 But where we also, as I get to it a bit later, had a look at if those controls were cast aside for a moment and council wanted to implement a residential development and again putting in something appropriate and more consistent with their previous residential development, could that redevelop. So we'll touch on that a bit later.

15 And the other thing or the other component that the TPG town planning report asked us to look at was 126 to 142 Cabramatta Road East which are an irregular shaped vacant parcel on the southern side of the Cabramatta Road East flyover so – and so that kind of informed the last part of the work we did. So I'll jump to, now, the
20 questions that were asked of us, if that's all right, or would you like any further clarification or comment?

MR MACKAY: Thank you, Peter. Look, no, I don't have any further questions at this stage. I mean, it would be good if you would address the GM Planning Services
25 response but before we do that - - -

MR LAWRENCE: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - Peter, do you have any questions at this point?
30

MR WILLIAMS: No, not at this point. Thanks, Richard.

MR MACKAY: Casey or Callum? No. I think, Peter, moving to the GM Planning Services response would be very helpful.
35

MR LAWRENCE: I'll try to keep this high level but - - -

MR MACKAY: No, that was so thank you.

40 MR LAWRENCE: And certainly Jim and Rido can jump in whenever they want and if they want. So, look, my take out of the GM Planning Report, there's two things. The first is there was some negative comment about us changing the planning proposal to restage the development and I just wanted to touch on that to give background to that.

45 So we have a big site and what we want to do is encourage a range of developments and from a planning point of view there's various ways we can do that. We can rely

on the LEP solely, we can actually set up triggers in the DCP and certainly our first round of discussions with council was to have a very broad approach, when I say broad, we were to apply a single set of planning controls at GFA and a maximum height across large parts of the site, and combined they would say, well, you can't
5 develop it across the whole site at this because the GFA doesn't allow it so you have to drop down and the DCP was intended to provide additional advice on that.

Council were a little bit concerned about that, partly because the role of DCPs have changed and evolved recently. They, in council's eyes, tend to have less weight than
10 they previously did and they also wanted, from an administrative point of view, when we lodged a particular stage, to be able to just assess that stage against the controls that were in place for that stage.

So at the suggestion of council, we were happy to amend the plans and to break it
15 into the stages which now form the planning proposals and set heights and GFA for each of those stages. It certainly reduces the flexibility that we wanted from a delivery point of view but we also appreciate council's comments in respect of that. So I just wanted to clarify that because there was a comment in the GM Planning Report that a change had been made.

20 Then the second part of it and the key part of it, I think, is what impact do you have on the properties to the south. The GM Planning Report says – says that the independent review said that that was an unacceptable impact. I didn't find those words in the report and in fact when I read the report and certainly when we met with
25 council after the report was completed, they said the GM Planning Report in our views says you have to have a look at those sites to the south and satisfy us that that island site to the south in the commercial zone, could redevelop and meet ADG solar access requirements and, secondly, that the development on the other side of the site – I'm sorry, the other side of Cabramatta Road East, which is vacant, could also
30 redevelop.

So what we did and what's in the submission is some additional work done on the shadow diagrams which show the 19-storey building and the buildings along that southern edge of our site. It also shows the – that we've assumed a 10-storey
35 development for the island site. Now, we also tested this at six storeys but at 10 storeys, obviously when we produce the shadow diagrams, that in itself has an impact on the vacant sites on the other side of Cabramatta Road East and it would be up to, I guess, a planning authority to moderate the final height of that – that development – redevelopment, should it be rezoned and should it occur immediately south of our
40 site to, in turn, protect solar access on the southern side of Cabramatta Road East.

I hope I haven't confused things with that. Okay. So that was the second part of it. So the first part of it and the results that are in the submission show that with a six and a 10-storey building, it is capable of achieving solar compliance with the ADG
45 and Rido did that work so he can talk to that if you have specific questions about that.

And the second part of it was, looking at the triangular site on the southern side of Cabramatta Road East and we satisfied ourselves that it would achieve suitable solar access. It would be a development – it's actually a land locked development, aside from Cabramatta Road East. So Cabramatta Road East would be its driveway
5 access. It's a regular shaped site so part of the site couldn't be developed. It's really the triangular part of that. But the shadow diagrams show that the sun would primarily fall within the setback that you would assume for that particular flat building should it occur in the future and I might point out that to a large extent, some of the overshadowing that occurred was from the assumed 10-storey building
10 on the island site which is of course closer than our site. And relatively – in the morning, relatively little from the 19-storey building that's proposed on our site. So that could achieve solar compliance with ADG if redeveloped in the future. So I think that they're the main criticisms that I took out of the GM Planning Report.
15 It had substance in respect to determining the heights of this development.

MR MACKAY: Peter, thank you. I think before we ask Rido, can I just check, Peter Williams, do you have some questions at this point?

20 MR WILLIAMS: Just to – Peter Williams here. Just one question I should have asked earlier, Peter, I apologise for that. When you were explaining the initial history of the site and the original inclusion of the Fisher Road car park area, when we went on the site inspection last week, we were just a little bit uncertain about the
25 precise boundaries of the property now, particularly what side of one or two of the access laneways around about the back of stage C, for example, whether it included the laneway or not. There seemed to be a bit little bit of variation in some of the diagrams. It's just confirmation of the precise boundaries and also is there any – what I'm getting at is is there also any council owned land in the project as it stands
30 now?

MR LAWRENCE: Okay. Thanks Peter. Peter Lawrence talking again. Yes, the proposal does include the public laneway so from early on we've been talking to council about the closure of that lane and – and closure of the lane and the – the
35 proponent purchasing that laneway. We have a public lane road closure application ready to be lodged. We've just had it surveyed and services located within the laneway so we understand what we're dealing with. That all looks fine and that should be lodged within the next week or so.

40 So in answer to your question, yes, it does include the public lane. Basically that entry off Cabramatta Road East will continue to service the main entry into the site. It will actually be widened because the northern most shop premises adjacent to that laneway will actually – is part of the development site but that will actually be demolished to widen the driveway into that site because that's the main driveway that goes – will ultimately go down into the basement in stage 1.
45

MR WILLIAMS: Right. So that would be the western most site – the western most property in stage C.

MR LAWRENCE: Yes.

MR WILLIAMS: Sorry, it would be actually the eastern most.

5 MR LAWRENCE: Sorry, yes, yes.

MR WILLIAMS: All right. It's the eastern side. Yes, don't worry. I'm just looking at the map as you're talking. I think the eastern most one. Yes, that's fine, thanks.

10 MR LAWRENCE: That's right, isn't it, Jim?

MR PIN: That's correct.

15 MR CASTAGNET: the driveway on CRE. Jim Castagnet speaking. On Cabramatta Road East, is that what you're talking about?

MR LAWRENCE: Yes.

20 MR CASTAGNET: It's on the south side.

MR LAWRENCE: No, we're talking about - - -

MS JOSHUA: The main road on the south side.

25 MR LAWRENCE: east west, so we're talking about the eastern most shop - - -

MR CASTAGNET: I see, yes.

30 MR LAWRENCE: - - - on the laneway.

MR CASTAGNET: Yes.

MR LAWRENCE: In our site.

35 MR CASTAGNET: Yes. Which will be demolished, correct.

MR LAWRENCE: Yes.

40 MR WILLIAMS: Okay. That's it. That's it. Now, thank you very much for clarifying that, thank you.

MS JOSHUA: In the laneway from Broomfield Road, is that a public laneway or is that on private land?

45 MR LAWRENCE: No, that's private land. It's owned by the – they call it the Stardust Hotel.

MS JOSHUA: Okay. Thank you.

MR MACKAY: Thank you, Casey. Okay. Peter Williams, do you have any further questions at this point?

5

MR WILLIAMS: There is a question about that – the visual impact assessment report we got the other day on the heights but I don't – if we want to deal with that now or wait a bit later on.

10 MR MACKAY: We might come back to that.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15 MR MACKAY: I might touch just to nail the overshadowing and I'll leave it to the proponent, as to whether it's Peter or Rido who answers. I mean, thank you for that overview. So can I just be very clear, noting that suitable solar access can be provided, Rido, could I ask you to perhaps be a little bit more specific about that in terms of the actual compliance with the standard and – and to be clear for us that Peter mentioned some assumptions about the setback, particularly on the RMS site to
20 the south of Cabramatta Road East and also the effect of a 10-storey building. Now, when we were on-site it was very helpful to be on-site because it's clear that the RMS site is a little south-east, hence it - - -

25 MR PIN: Correct.

MR MACKAY: - - - the morning sun is going to clearly not be affected by the site that is subject to this review. But I'd be very interested in just having some more standard space commentary that is – that is specific about exactly why - - -

30

MR PIN: Sure.

MR MACKAY: - - - suitable solar access would be available, please.

35 MR PIN: Yeah, sure. Rido Pin from Plus Architecture. I think – I think to start off with just a few quick comments on the project. It's obviously quite a substantial site which will provide something quite unique, right next to the train station. The way we've always approached this, this site, is to create a very strong and something that's very permeable that really allows the community to come through this and
40 filter through this entire project towards the train station and therefore I think some of the principles that have used which includes unifying the basements and the entry points and making sure that everything is activated is obviously very important, and I think similar with the actual hierarchy of built form. It's always been very much the aim to ensure that, you know, we can achieve good solar access on the plaza that we
45 create and to ensure that every building eventually will be able to achieve solar access within our own development but also understanding what's happening south of us.

So the – there's a range of SunEye views that we've produced which effectively indicates the view of the sun and the fact that you've got the sun not able to touch on the particular hours and obviously solar access being assessed between 9 and 3 o'clock in the interim when the sun is lowest and the orientation of the site generally is slightly tilting towards the east meaning that buildings that would be sitting along Broomfield would naturally be in a good position to get sun in the afternoon. So if you're looking for two hours of sun, and that what we've been aiming for, you know, from 1 o'clock until 3 o'clock it would be a really strong window to assess.

10 So looking at the site, we effectively took on this exercise to, to, you know, let's say we had to develop something on the site which most likely want to develop and how it orientates this site. Look, I would say it's not a – it's not an easy site in the sense that it's obviously captured by, by, by road, so from a noise perspective it would be challenging, I guess, but the position of the site and its orientation means that it will be a good solar access coming into the afternoon to the site.

The width of the site allows us to put something quite sensible in place from the energy perspective, reproduces a typical floor plan of about seven apartments with a variety of twos and ones and three bedroom units and naturally what you would do regardless is try and obviously meet solar access so place as many of the apartments facing west in our case.

So we've been able to achieve three apartments facing west towards Broomfield and that means that those apartments, as you might have seen in the diagrams, will get pretty good sun from, you know, around, I think it's around – I think it's around 12 o'clock, 1 o'clock. So essentially those apartments are complying from 1 o'clock until 3 o'clock. But there was also a decent gap between our built form along the north which also brings some light in in the middle hours of the days from 11 to 1. So there is – there is, overall, a sensible diagram there for us to develop if it was to happen.

And it's also very important that the built form would also naturally align with the adjacent proposed built form so from an urban design perspective, you would want to make this building part of the overall composition of proposing. So in that sense a 10-storey building with, in our minds, would be a sensible development because also if you would go a lot higher, it would start to overshadow on properties further south, and incidentally, if you look at the diagrams, let's say, at about 11 and 12 o'clock, it effectively aligns with the roads that sits out, you know, so Cabramatta Road East and would therefore be a sensible height.

That's also largely the reason why we feel that, you know, the 9th storey and the 10th storey would make a lot of sense because at that point it wouldn't overshadow beyond the edge of the road setting south of us. So there's some good sensibility in all that I would say that also obviously we are assessing the solar access between 1 and 3 but the sun will keep on streaming in after 3 o'clock as well and obviously that's not allowed within the calculations but it is in our reality, you know, that this sun will get really good solar access and in fact it will probably require some solar

device to stop the sun from coming in, I guess, facing west. That's probably a quick response, I guess on the way we have approached this particular science.

5 MR MACKAY: Rido, thank you. Are you able to be a little bit more specific with respect to the standards? I think perhaps dealing with the site, the RMS site that is south of Cabramatta Road East, and trying to be specific, if there is no change to the development on the island site, what I'm inviting you to explain to us is why the proposed height and built form on the site that's subject to the Gateway determination would provide suitable and compliance solar access.

10 MR PIN: Sure. So, yes. Rido Pin Plus Architecture. So the sites would get really good sun in the morning so from 9 o'clock until 11 o'clock it effectively has no impact on the south – on that side south of Cabramatta East therefore already complying with the sun so a reasonable development would be able to be achieved, receiving solar access. In fact from 9 until 12 o'clock it gets very good solar access and following that point, there will be impact on the site but it already has received its window of solar access within the time frame that's required from solar access perspective.

20 MR MACKAY: Thank you. That's really helpful. Okay. Peter or Casey or Callum, have you any other questions about the solar access shadowing questions?

MS JOSHUA: Not from me.

25 MR MACKAY: Okay. Well, look, I think that, to my knowledge, there's at least two other matters that we would like to raise. Peter Williams, could we come to your question about the recently received visual assessment, please.

30 MR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Richard. Peter Williams here again. Look, thank you very much. We received the visual impact assessment last week that had been prepared and I was just – just some explanation in terms of possible inconsistencies, we're just not sure. But figure 6 in that visual impact assessment on stage D, the site for stage D, appears to show an eight storey building, yet the planning proposal, both the original one and the approved one, show – consistently show a 48 metre height and there's talk of that translates to a 12 or 13 to up to 15 storeys building on that stage D site as demonstrated in table 2 of the Gateway determination report. So, Peter or Rido, just some – or Jim – just some clarification of the height, the actual height level of stage.

40 MR LAWRENCE: Peter Lawrence from GLN Planning. I'll kick off on that one, Peter, but happy to have Jim or Rido jump in or give further clarification if needed. So the visual impact assessment report was something that had been requested by the department to have a look at what the visual impact of the proposal would be and certainly the
45 8th storey reference to Broomfield Street is – talks to the number of – number of storeys you can count by looking at the facade of the building. But in practice we've got a church at the bottom which there's an existing church on that corner of the site

now. We're trying to incorporate it into the development so it's got a much higher normal floor to ceiling. And the top most apartments are in fact mezzanine apartments but read to Broomfield Street as a single storey, yet they're two.

5 So that – rightly or wrongly, that was the intended effect of saying you will see eight storeys to Broomfield Street. In reality it's closer to 10 storeys. Now, previously we'd submitted to council, with our very first scheme, a 12-storey development that went to about 45.9 metres, I think I calculated. It's always hard to set these heights in planning proposals. They're set as maximum heights of buildings and that
10 maximum height of building can vary depending on what you have on the roof. If you choose to have a common room or access to a roof top garden, then you need to provide a lift with an overrun on top of that which then adds to the thing – adds to the height again.

15 The other thing which is always difficult to work out is what's going to happen at ground level. We have a fairly flat site so we're fortunate. We don't have a lot of differentiation between levels, but we did subsequently receive a report from the council where they'd identified a little bit of overland flow of one per cent flooding and we're still in discussions with them about whether or not we need to incorporate
20 a freeboard. So that's the other thing that you can tweak up a development.

But it's fair to say that, I guess, the primary change that you can see in that visual impact assessment between what was first proposed, which was a 12-storey, to now, has been just us – we've had two years to sit and twiddle our thumbs on this and test
25 different design scenarios. And one of the things which I guess we've been trying to focus on in that intervening period is just to ensure that that market, the plaza, the public plaza in the centre of the development, receives really good solar access.

30 So that's been the other driver in just reducing the height on that Broomfield part of the development. We have set ourselves a standard which we've talked to council about, about that plaza receiving – 50 per cent of that plaza gets solar access for at least two hours each day and so that required some adjustment to those sites. So that's the reason why the height's been reduced in the visual impact assessment.

35 MR WILLIAMS: Thanks very much, Peter. That's great. Thank you.

MR MACKAY: Yes. Thank you. That's very helpful. Peter Williams, any other questions from you?

40 MR WILLIAMS: No, no, thanks, Richard. Thank you very much.

MR MACKAY: Right. Look, I just had one, I guess, overarching question which is to invite the proponent to comment. Council's endorsed heights is look at a sort of blanket 48 metre height control and yet the Commission has observed that council
45 has made no request for changes to the floor space ratio controls. So I'd invite you to comment on that particularly what it might mean for the proponent if that were to – if it were to turn out as per council's request, what that would mean in terms of the

built form configuration, I guess having regard to the very comments you were just making about issues of design and amenities. I think that's probably one for you, Peter Lawrence.

5 MR LAWRENCE: I was about to say I'll kick that off. Peter Lawrence from GLN Planning. Yes, look, it's an interesting one. Council's resolution did talk about reducing the height. It didn't talk about reducing the FSR and when we spoke to council, we said please don't reduce the FSR because we might be able to still use that extra GFA in trying to clawback something of the development.

10 Now, it may mean – and remember when I was talking at the outset that we had this broad-brush approach where we would set a maximum height and use GFA to control things. Well, it might mean that we can do a couple of things. One might be to just fatten the buildings. Don't necessarily want to fatten the buildings because
15 that generally just means larger units. It's not in a part of Sydney where larger units particularly attract a premium.

But the other thing, too, is that we might be able to incorporate or pick up that GFA in other parts of the development, maybe the shops or maybe in the gap between the
20 buildings in stage – the Cabramatta Road frontage ones. But again that may have implications on overshadowing and things like that so it's not something to be lightly or think it's necessarily easy to achieve.

MR MACKAY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

25

MR LAWRENCE: Rido, did you have anything to add to that?

MR PIN: Yes, look, I think it's – this site, it's very much tailor-made in terms of, you know, providing a sensible outcome for the plan. So it would be a – it
30 wouldn't – it wouldn't mean, in our mind, the best urban design outcome, you know. From our perspective it makes a lot of sense. It creates a sense of hierarchy within this overall composition of built form and to ensure that there is a strong marker sitting right next to the train station and I think, like Peter just mentioned, fattening of buildings doesn't work that well. I mean, you can bury more area into the
35 podium. There's a lot of space there. You can reduce the plaza. You can create more retail area if you wanted to, I guess.

But that doesn't necessarily help, I think, the financial equation of this project. There's a lot of give back to the public at the moment and I think the more slender and the more elegant is would look, the more beneficial for the overall project
40 outcome.

MR MACKAY: Rido, thank you. So could I just again, finally, invite either Peter Williams or Casey or Callum, if you've got any other questions or comments?

45 MS JOSHUA: No, thank you.

MR WILLIAMS: No, thank you.

MR FIRTH: No, thank you.

MR MACKAY: Well, I think we're all done. That's been a very helpful session for us. It's extremely useful to have the opportunity hear from the proponent and to
5 clarify some of the things that we have observed during our review of the documents and our visit on-site. So that is assisting the Commission in making a well-informed recommendation on this review.

Where we are at, we're in the middle of assessment process in that we've looked at
10 documents, we've visited the site. Today we will meet not only with yourselves but also with the department and with representatives from council. The transcripts from those meetings will also be published on our website so you would have the opportunity to access them. It's normally a few days before those transcripts become available and then when the Commission makes its decision, I think I'm right, I'm
15 looking towards Casey, that that decision will be published on the website. It will be advised – and advised to the parties including yourselves.

MR CASTAGNET: Richard, Jim Castagnet, Moon Investments. May I have a few words, please?

20 MR MACKAY: Certainly, Jim.

MR CASTAGNET: Look, we haven't really touched on the financials or the economic liability of the project and the impact that the decision may have on that.
25 So if I may, I might just say a couple of words about that very quickly.

MR MACKAY: Yes.

MR CASTAGNET: We are talking about some 30-odd apartments, those three
30 upper levels, and in financial terms this is about 28 – \$22.8 million or so gross, and in net terms if you take land value and construction cost, the amount is probably most of value of about 7 to \$8 million and without land, which of course we're going to have to pay for anyway, regardless of whether – what the height limit happens to be, we're still
35 talking about some \$11 million in value being lost.

So for a development of that calibre in Cabramatta, that's a substantial revenue loss and one of course that we will try to avoid. But I think also more importantly, in designing the – what we're calling the icon tower, the considerations, apart from, I
40 would say the obvious urban design benefits of having one tall tower as opposed to four or five towers, perhaps, of the same size, if that is even contemplated, the idea is to have a landmark in Cabramatta to give it a sense of arrival for tourists and make it attractive, a place to come and visit, et cetera. But it is meant to not only be financially viable but also to mark a
45 development and mark Cabramatta, if you like, put Cabramatta on the map.

So that, combined with the fact that we considered – as you may know, we put in a draft VPA with the planning proposal and of course that was based on having the icon tower and the value that’s been derived from that. So it’s all very much interlinked, as well as, you know, making sure that the community point of view, the
5 give back with – it almost subsidises, if you like, the market place because this loss of if you like, and we’ve made that up by having the tower at the height that it is and it’s all very well interlinked, including the bridge and – the overhead bridge, et cetera. So I thought I’d mention so perhaps if you can take that into consideration as well that would be tremendous. I think you’re on mute.

10 MR MACKAY: On mute. Thank you. And that’s taken on board and I am remiss in not having offered you a final opportunity for any further comment or last words. So you may do that now. And so is there anything else from the proponent side that you would like to say before the meeting concludes?

15 MR PIN: No, thank you.

MR LAWRENCE: Thank you very much.

20 MR PIN: And I think that’s Thanks.

MR MACKAY: Well, look, it just remains for me to thank you all again for your time this morning, for sharing those perspectives and that information and the Commission will act as expeditiously as it can in these rather strange circumstances,
25 to provide its recommendation about this request. Thank you.

MR LAWRENCE: Thank you very much.

30 MS JOSHUA: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you

35

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.18 am]