

MR MACKAY: Well, good morning, and welcome and before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet virtually and I would also like to pay my respects to the elders, past and present. Welcome to the teleconference today to discuss the Cabramatta Town Centre East Gateway
5 determination review which was requested by Fairfield City Council. My name is Richard Mackay and I am the chair of this Independent Planning Commission panel, and joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Dr Peter Williams. Peter, would you mind just waving?

10 MR WILLIAMS: Morning.

MR MACKAY: We're also joined by Casey Joshua and Callum Firth from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's teleconference is
15 being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. The 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 upon which the Commission will base its advice and in that regard, I should say that
20 we have reviewed the documents that form part of the review and we have inspected the site and we met earlier this morning with representatives from the proponent.

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate so if you're asked a question and are not
25 in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and to provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. To ensure the accuracy of the transcript, I request that all members today introduce themselves in a moment and then each time before speaking and for members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, please. So if we may, we'll
30 now begin and could I invite the council of representatives each to introduce yourselves, please.

MR MOONEY: Andrew Mooney, I'm the acting manager of strategic planning at council.
35

MR SHINN: Chris Shinn, coordinator of strategic planning at Fairfield Council.

MR FOSTER: Greg Foster, consultant planner on behalf of council.

40 MR MACKAY: Thank you all. Well, I think we've pre-circulated an agenda and on the 4th of May the Commission wrote to council providing early advice of the questions that the Commission has. So very happy if, through the course of the meeting, there are other things to cover but I'd suggest we perhaps begin by working through the agenda and therefore I'd invite council to provide a brief overview, if
45 you would like, of the council's request for the Gateway determination review, please.

MR FOSTER: Okay. Greg Foster. Half a second.

MR MOONEY: Yes, that will all need to be done by – Greg’s actually speaking on behalf of the council body. As officers, we have a conflict because we recommended
5 support but we’re happy to answer any, you know, questions of fact or about – in general, that we have. So I’ll hand over to Greg.

MR FOSTER: Yes, in regard to this matter, my report on page 6 actually set out what it was but on the 14th of August of 2017, a planning proposal was lodged with
10 Fairfield City Council to – as we were aware, to change the controls on that site to allow for the proposed development. There was a briefing on the 10th of October 2017. On the 28th of March at 2018, an independent planning and urban design panel were asked to actually review the planning proposal.

15 From there, that result came – went back to council for their consideration and then from there, a report was prepared by the staff, council staff, that was then considered by council and then forwarded through to the Fairfield Local Planning Panel on the 30th of August of 2018. From that, on the 25th of September 2018, again council considered – or outcomes committee of council considered the report and proposed
20 that the heights – this was the councillors and wasn’t supportive of the council officers’ report and proposed – which supported the planning proposal.

The council has proposed to reduce the height to 15 storeys over the site and that that matter was forwarded to the department and from there it actually came back to
25 council with a recommendation from the department that prior to exhibition, that it – the original planning proposal, the height, floor space and such, be adopted and placed out before – for exhibition on the 6th of August of 2019.

A report was put back to council and council considered the council officers’ report which again advised of that outcome – or the advice from the department, and council resolved that. They restricted development to 16 storeys. That’s where the review and that’s where I was commissioned to review the matter and then make a recommendation in regard to it. What I’ve done is my report is being placed before the department. The department prepared a response to that matter and from that, as
30 part of that response, the proponent was actually asked or suggested that they can put a further response to it which only we became aware of, and I don’t know if the council has become aware of it as well, just last week when it was raised, that on the 9th of December of last year, GLN Planning presented to council and that’s then determined the matter for the questions that are now coming from the Independent
35 Planning Commission. So that’s a very short overview of it. Any questions?
40

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry, Richard, you’re on mute.

MR MACKAY: Thank you. Peter, do you have any questions at this stage?
45

MR WILLIAMS: Just one if I may. It’s Peter Williams here. Greg, you mention that council only became aware of a report last week.

MR FOSTER: Yes, that's right.

MR WILLIAMS: Could you – is that correct? Could you elaborate?

5 MR FOSTER: Yes. The 9th of December submission from the proponent
addressing my report I only became aware of last week when I was actually asked or
invited to attend this meeting. Took me through the documents. I was found that
this response has been lodged with the department but, one, I was never – I was
never provided with a copy or asked to comment on it and I gather council hadn't
10 been advised of it. I know that's when I raised the matter could I have a look at the
documents from there, and this is when – this is when this matter's now become
aware of the changes or the submission has been put tomorrow and that's where I've
been asked those – to answer three questions.

15 MR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR MOONEY: Sorry, Greg. Do you know if that was in response to a request
from the department that they provided that additional information?

20 MR FOSTER: I'm not – I'm not a hundred per cent sure – I believe it was. I had to
go back to.

MR MOONEY:

25 MR FOSTER: Yes. I believe it was – well, the opportunity was given by the
department to the proponent to make a submission, a further submission, in response
to our request, or my request on behalf of council, for the review.

MR MOONEY: So that's the visual impact assessment document you - - -

30 MR MACKAY: Sorry, Andrew, can I just remind you to say your name before you
- - -

MR MOONEY: Sorry. Okay.

35 MR MACKAY: Thank you.

MR MOONEY: Yes. Andrew. So I guess we're talk about the visual impact
assessment document which is quite an extensive document. So that's been provided
40 to the Commission, has it?

MR MACKAY: Yes, it has. The Commission also only received that document last
week.

45 MR MOONEY: Okay.

MR MACKAY: And that document is about to be placed up on the Commission's website and document which the Commission takes into consideration in relation to this matter now.

5 MR MOONEY: Okay. So guess it's part of the – sounds like it's a part of the internal process that the department in their process in reporting to you – but it probably seems fair that Greg Foster has an opportunity to – or if council was dealing with the matter, on behalf of council, that – that Greg have an opportunity to comment on it.

10

MR MACKAY: Thank you, Richard. Thank you, Andrew, yes. I think that it's entirely appropriate. So, Greg, are you in a position to comment on the visual assessment report today?

15 MR FOSTER: It's Greg Foster here. What I – Casey was kind enough to provide all the documentation. I've had a review of the documents. One of the questions that's actually been raised, which is the fourth question about the applicant's modelling for both height options. As I have not had the opportunity to really thoroughly examine it but also I haven't actually had the opportunity to go back to
20 council and say will they wish that to be done in light of it and then there would be a fairly substantial fee to go through that process to examine it.

Now, I have had a look or a review of the information using what was provided initially, the initial shadow diagrams and then the later shadow diagrams. So I could
25 provide a comment today on it but depending on – I would like to possibly take it on notice and have a further discussion with council how far they wish to take this matter.

MR MACKAY: Thank you, Greg. This is Richard. I think it would be very helpful
30 if you would comment insofar as you can in the context of the meeting today and I think we have a – we have a time frame within which the Commission is required to make its decision. So I think we'd welcome hearing from you today and later today we might come back to you, I presume through council, and nominate a time frame that would be feasible within the total time frame for our response to this matter by
35 which we'd need to hear back and then I guess it would be very helpful to hear back from you or council about whether that further analysis and review is going to take place or not.

MR MOONEY: It's Andrew here. So just to comment. I'll touch base with our
40 group manager but I don't think there is going to be any great benefit or insights gained by us reporting back to council because at this stage council's reasons for their position has been pretty black and white. They haven't given us any reasons as to why there's a reduction, whether it's visual or the shadow issues. So just speaking off the top, I don't think there'd be any great – we're going to get much more back
45 from council, put it that way. They're just totally black and white, their resolution other issues associated with it.

MR MACKAY: Thank you. It's Richard - - -

MR MOONEY: I'll confirm that.

5 MR MACKAY: Yes. Richard. Thank you, Andrew. That's helpful. I think what we'll do is try to make sure that by close of business today we are all on the same page in terms of an opportunity if council, through its consultant, wants to put any - - -

10 MR MOONEY: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - further response in play and the time frame by which that would need to be done for us to meet our time frame, please. So, look, Greg, with that long preamble, I think, are very happy to hear from you in relation to the - - -
15

MR FOSTER: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - more substantive matter.

20 MR FOSTER: Okay. Do we want to start with the questions?

MR MACKAY: Yes, please.

MR FOSTER: Okay. Well, question one in regard to the accuracy, and I think that
25 relates back to item 4, comments provided by the – on the 9th of December, yes, I acknowledge, on the last page, Mr Lawrence raises the issue that the urban design review undertaken on the 18th of March in 2018, didn't use the word unacceptable. That was my word. So I came to that conclusion given that the advice within that report didn't actually – it clearly indicate that he accepted it so I've taken the word
30 it's unacceptable, even though they didn't mention it. That's a, you know, a bit of licence used in regard to that so I want to acknowledge that, yes, the words weren't used and that's an important thing because Mr Lawrence raised, you know – bases some of his assumptions and some of his
35 facts on that matter.

Further that the – I actually looked at the matters in regard to it and I acknowledge that – I actually spoke to the council in regard to it so further to the response and Mr Lawrence's report on page 9, he raises that there were no written reasons advanced by council and that's correct, that all they've actually – council staff provided or,
40 sorry, the council has provided is their resolutions. Now, as we'd all be aware, quite often council has a lot of to-ing and fro-ing or discussion that isn't recorded and I actually raised the issue whether these meetings were recorded and the advice was they weren't aware of any recording of that. So the basis of it is is we've only got what council has in front of them and what their own mind is.

45 I have tried to, in preparing my report, tried to understand what council wanted to actually achieve, possibly, and if I was assessing the application, sitting as a

councillor, the basis of most applications, whether they be now as a planning proposal is to look also and was reinforced in the report by – excuse me for going out of the photo – TPG, the initial one back in March of 2018, that there is some – what would I say – impact to the south of the site, as we’re aware but on 126 and 144
5 Cabramatta Road East, now, always the basis of any application is usually to try and minimise those impacts externally and maximum them internally. I understand the basis of what the proponent is trying to do with this site is make it a very useable market place area in the centre of the site so what they’ve done is they’ve placed the substantial buildings that will create shadow to the south and therefore open up their
10 northern aspect to allow adequate sunlight in.

Very simply, going through the matter of the documents that have been provided and comparing the shadow diagrams, I still come to the same conclusion that if we could reduce the height on the southern part from the 19 down to 16 will reduce that impact
15 somewhat, especially to the building to the south, 144, even though they have shown – the plan has shown in their shadow diagrams for the CCC option for the site, that – and they’ve assumed a two storey building will be some time in the future even though the controls at this stage are unsure, can achieve what they or they allege they can achieve those results to meet the ADG requirements for shadowing. However,
20 shadowing, again, is down on to 126.

So in a – in a very simplistic way, I still come to the same conclusion that I believe that that corner could be reduced. Also, if I was presenting – if I was the proponent and consenting, I would have actually commissioned to have shadow diagrams that
25 showed the difference between what council sought, which is the 16 – you know, 16 storeys, and the 19 and do a comparison. So justify my case that there really isn’t a situation where Mr Lawrence, in his letter on page 9, as indicated, council hasn’t undertaken any of that shadow – shadow analysis and that’s correct but normally, to place the onus back on the council versus council’s an issue, if I was in that
30 situation, I would have presented that information to justify my case. So at this conclusion, I believe that there is still going to be too greater impact on to that area and three storeys could be taken down. So in a sense that, I think, answers question 1 and 4.

35 MR MACKAY: Greg, thank you. Could I just – this is Richard Mackay speaking.

MR FOSTER: Yes.

40 MR MACKAY: Could I just press you a little bit on that last statement. When you say taking down the three storeys would provide a better outcome and accepting your comment that, okay, it’s not for council to have to do work that the proponent might do. Perhaps rather than making reference to specific diagrams or calculations, in lay terms, what do you see the beneficial effect of reducing those three storeys, please?

45 MR FOSTER: Well, as I’ve noted – as I’ve noted in my report and having done – prepared shadow diagrams as part of my – as a planner over a number of years when I was actually working for councils, and also doing it for my own business a – on a

flat site scenario or a plan proposal, a rule of thumb is normally in the winter time, for every metre of reduction in height, usually it's a three metre reduction in shadowing, reduce shadowing. So you're talking – if you're dropping down about three storeys, you're talking about a reasonable amount of reduction in
5 overshadowing and that's where I – my conclusion.

I haven't drawn – because, if you – when you go to the shadow diagrams, it actually, the new shadow diagrams presented as part of the 9th of December documentation, notes that they are not to scale. Now – but if you have a look again at the shadows
10 that were produced as part of the original proposal, planning proposal, they seem to be identical, in a sense, same scale and such, so visually you can do a comparison and that's where I – I'm sort of – sat beside one to the other and tried to, what I would say is move it around or look at it and do some basic measurements, per se, and finding that there would be what I would call a reduction in the overshadowing.
15 Excuse me, I've got a frog in my throat. I don't have the coronavirus. I just have a frog in my throat. So, yes, I still come to the same conclusion here that corner building could come down and that's just again – that just again reinforces the March 18, 2018 report from TPG.

20 MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Thank you, Greg. Can I again just ask a supplementary. So in making that conclusion, what assumptions are you, and I guess they're general, making about the island block, I think that's 144, and the block across the other side of Cabramatta Road East, I think that's 126.

25 MR FOSTER: Yes.

MR MACKAY: Are you assuming that they are used for residential purposes, and what kind of heights, please.

30 MR FOSTER: It's Greg. Now, in regard to it, I assume their basis is for residential, both 144 being the island site, and then down to the south again for residential. I've just looked at it on a flat site. I haven't looked at development options for those sites. But however, the applicant or the proponent has been kind enough to provide what they feel could be a development on that site for the island site.

35 I've just – my basis assumption has been that they're assuming that this will be developed what I've looked as saying, well, if it isn't developed, I've looked at those impacts on the existing built form that was there and it could be 20 years away before we develop in that. So what would be the impacts or the quality of life within
40 these units from this development, if it goes ahead, because if you have a look at the staging of this, stage – or the second stage, stage B, is the very tall building. So in regard the last building to be developed is the smallest on the northern boundary and that may never occur.

45 So we're just not quite sure. So what I've done is I've looked at the southern side of the building, assumed that what's there now is staying there now for the next X amount of years and therefore looked at the quality or the quality internal and I feel

that the location of the higher building where it is, at 19 storeys, you'd be able to pull some of the shadowing back, especially for the existing residential flat buildings and therefore allow a better sunlight within. That's working on a flat site. So they, if you go through – if you have a look in the elevational side, maybe, and I've got to
5 accept the fact, maybe the lower portions of those buildings are already affected or would be affected by shadowing so it could only be the top units. That I haven't done the analysis of.

10 MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Thank you for that, Greg. Peter Williams, do you have any related question or comment?

MR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Richard. Peter Williams here, Greg. Just one related question. You've mentioned – you've discussed mainly, to-date, the higher – the highest tower on stage – which is located on stage B. Have you got any thoughts or
15 comments on the height of the tower on stage C because potentially stage C is going to have impacts, identical impacts, irrespective of the height, whether it's council's approved height or the amended height. There appears to be very little difference in overall height or number of storeys proposed in the two alternatives for site, stage C. So the overshadowing impacts possibly will be the same no matter what the height is
20 eventually derived at for the stage C site in terms of the impacts to the residential units to the south-east of the site.

MR FOSTER: Greg. Yes, I acknowledge that. But the height on that C is not going to vary under this proposal. The fundamental part is the south area and that's
25 where that south tall building and that's where the impacts – well, from that – the council resolution, proposes that that won't – in regard to the C, yes. It wasn't within my brief to say whether that should be reduced. I would – if, in theory, if it was to go to look at a whole proposal, you would be moving those buildings on the southern up to the northern boundary and doing a mirror reverse or a flip around and therefore
30 this shadowing will be fundamentally within – contained within the site but the outcome of that will be that you have a market place, which is one of the driving forces, the way I understand it, in shadowing - - -

35 MR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR FOSTER: - - - at all times. So therefore when you actually go through all the documentation that I've had a look at, one of the fundamental design philosophies or design points was to create a good area within the middle of the site at – for the – for the occupiers of the unit to go downstairs and utilise that area which I think's a very
40 good option. But what it does do in this design is pushing that part of the impact externally and not maintain them internally and that's the balance that, yes, is a problem with this – when you have a north south facing site, you know. That's why – but I only just focused on the primary spot, bringing that one down on that corner and that's the one that would be being required fundamentally by council to reduce
45 in height.

MR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks, Greg. Thank you very much. Thanks, Richard.

MS JOSHUA: You're on mute, Richard.

MR MACKAY: Sorry about that. Thank you. Thank you, Peter, it's Richard. So it seems to me that that does cover items 1 and 4 from the Commission's letter of 4th
5 of May. So, Greg, could I please take – I think I'm going to Greg, take you to item 2 and invite any other evidence – I mean, I know you've covered some of this but anything else to support the council resolutions from September 2018 and August 2019, please?

10 MR FOSTER: Greg. No, I'm not aware of any written evidence. I became involved in this process or was invited to become involved in this process and commissioned after the – well, as part of the request in August of last year so I wasn't – I hadn't attended either of the meetings where those decisions were made. So I have no idea of the decision-making process that council went through and I
15 don't have any evidence that I can provide to substantiate why council's resolutions were of that nature and I think Andrew has expressed that already as well.

MR MACKAY: Yes. Thank you, Andrew. Would you like to comment, Andrew?

20 MR MOONEY: Yes, Andrew. Yes. Just – on my understanding, I can double-check, but there was no council – no discussion about those merit issues about overshadowing or anything like that. It was just really there was – the motion was put and carried unanimously so there's no evidence of any discussion about or information about the reasons offered by council. It was a fairly straightforward
25 process.

MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Thank you. Could I then just again invite a comment, and you don't have to comment if there's nothing further to say, that the Commission has noted that the council's view on the heights, but the council request
30 makes no reference to FSR and so with the FSR unchanged, if the heights are reduced as per the council position, that it would obviously have implications for the resulting bulk scale form of the buildings and presumably amenity issues of the kind that Greg just mentioned with respect to the internal open space market area. So has there been any consideration of the nexus between the height control and the FSR,
35 please? And I think I'm directing this perhaps firstly to Greg but inviting Chris and Andrew to comment if you would like to.

MR FOSTER: Greg. I'm – I am unaware of any nexus or review or examination of what would occur in regard to FSR and yes, I acknowledge that that will change the
40 form of scale, streetscape, massing, and that's acknowledged in Mr Lawrence's letter, his response, 9th of December, in regard to that matter. So very simply, there isn't any – there hasn't been any work undertaken, I believe.

MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Thank you, thank you, Greg. Chris or Andrew,
45 would you like to comment?

MR SHINN: Yes. Chris here. Thank you. Yes, there wasn't any consideration from our understanding from the council as to reducing the FSR. But from a factual perspective, if you reduce the height of building without reducing the floor space ratio, you're more likely to get fatter, more squattier buildings and then probably
5 reduce much more of a shadow so that would be something that we'd have to definitely consider reviewing an FSR if the height did come down.

MR MACKAY: Yes. And the Commission has also noted that step 65 would of course apply so - - -
10

MR SHINN: Correct.

MR MACKAY: There will be a range of factors that would dictate resulting built form. Peter Williams, could I just ask whether you've got any other related
15 questions or comments at this point, please?

MR WILLIAMS: Righto, Richard. Peter Williams here, just unmuting. No, not on - not on these points. Thanks Richard. Thank you.

MR MACKAY: And I'm also just checking is there anything else - I mean, I think where we're at is that Greg has provided responses to the matters in the letter that are within his purview. Anything else from the IPC staff?
20

MS JOSHUA: I'd like to ask Greg a question, if I may. Just to clarify, going back to question 1 in the letter, I think that we wanted to get a bit of a sense that of in your review and acknowledging that you haven't had a huge amount of time to review the documents, but in your review of what has been provided by the proponent in terms of the concepts on those southern sites and the potential shadowing impact, is there anything that you can see that's materially wrong? The proponent has showed to us that a concept - a building can be provided on those southern sites that will comply with the sole access requirements. So is there anything that you have seen that is
25 contrary to that conclusion?
30

MR FOSTER: Greg. Given the short period of time, I've reviewed the matter and I haven't been able to - I don't disagree with what the proponent has placed. There isn't any - any factual evidence to indicate that what they're visually indicating isn't correct. So - excuse me. From that viewpoint I would have to say it appears to be accurate in regard to what they've presented.
35

MS JOSHUA: Okay. Thank you.
40

MR MACKAY: All right. It's Richard. Thank you, Greg. I think that brings us, in terms of the pre-circulated agenda, to item 4 and my understanding is that this is a matter for the council officers to perhaps provide a little bit of clarity about the negotiations between - well, with council in relation to the VPA. So Andrew or
45 Chris, could I ask - invite you to comment on that, please?

MR SHINN: It's Chris here. So we've received – council's received an offer, written offer, from Moon Investments regarding the voluntary planning agreement. In that agreement it discusses a number of material benefits, including an overpass bridge from the development site to the station, station concourse level. Some public domain works as well as improvements in the public art within that proposed publicly accessible square.

At this point council officers and the proponent haven't progressed the voluntary planning agreement any further because my understanding that the applicant or the proponent has given me – given council that the VPA will change depending on the scale of development that's achieved from this planning proposal. It's on a smaller development. They've indicated me will impact the VPA benefits that have been proposed. But that's where we sit at the moment. We've formally received a written offer with a recommended public benefits being proposed but at this stage no further work has occurred with the uncertainty regarding this scale of the proposal.

MR MOONEY: It's Andrew here. So we're happy to make that available if the Commission hasn't got it - - -

MR MACKAY: Yes.

MR MOONEY: - - - the document. Seeing that's been formally submitted to council, we can make that available if that – I presume you don't have that document.

MR MACKAY: It's Richard. I don't recall seeing it in the bundle of documents. If it is submitted to us, it would be published on the Commission's website and there may be – there may be consultation with the proponent.

MR MOONEY: Okay. I'll take that on board. I'll track that offer.

MR MACKAY: Look, it's Richard again. It seems to me that what's – the reason we've raised this is that reference was made to these discussions and my understanding is there is an offer. It's a qualified offer. It depends on the outcome of the Gateway review. It's got no status other than that at the moment and it's something that would be dealt with between the outcome of the review and any downstream development application and that, from the proponent's point of view, it would depend on, I guess, the amount of development available that results from this process.

MR MOONEY: Yes.

MR MACKAY: I'm seeing lots of nodding on screens. I think it would be best for us to note that advice and I'm looking to Peter Williams but I see no reason for us to seek that document. I think that just adds an issue that's not really in play at this point.

MR WILLIAMS: It's Peter Williams here. Yes. Look, I agree entirely with what Richard's saying. The main reason we raised it; it was just that the VPA was mentioned in the documentation we'd received so we're just trying to get confirmation of that.

5

MR MOONEY: Okay.

MR WILLIAMS: It's, in that sense, it's not a strictly irrelevant consideration for us but we just want an acknowledgement of the whole context. And Richard's right. If we did get a copy it would have to go on the web page and it's really not essential for our – for our purposes. So, but, yes, it was just merely just to get confirmation of that pointer that's all. Thanks, Richard.

10

MR MACKAY: All right. Richard. Thank you, Peter. It seems to me that covers off item 4 on our agenda. And item 5 was included just to provide council with an opportunity to inform the Commission about its view on the contemporary strategic context of the site, particularly in relation to the local strategic planning statement. I presume that's something that would – well, to anyone, but to the council officers.

15

MR MOONEY: Yes. Andrew here. I was going to mention that, that since the lodgement and the Gateway review request, that council has adopted its Local Strategic Planning Statement. It came into force on the 30th of March and is available on the training portal. But I can make that – can email that directly to the Commission today, if you like. But at this stage in terms of Cabramatta, the document's still fairly higher level and issues awaiting to finer – finer grain detail for Cabramatta is being considered under an urban design study that's substantially completed but hasn't been reported to council. We can still give you some background on that, just in general principles.

20

But the LSPS, flags Cabramatta town centre as one of the main centres for future – accommodating future growth for the city and it refers specifically to Cabramatta East as being the main catchment where that growth would take place. So I understand you've been to the site so you'd probably appreciate with Cabramatta, it's fairly split centre and this proposal will help bridge that a bit but the issues of having the western side of Cabramatta, and that's based on previous traffic studies, is that the surrounding road network and car parking can't accommodate higher levels of densities on the western side. There's only probably one remaining large site, which is the Woolworths site that has some potential. But the remaining town centre, it's fairly finer grain and it's fairly heavily strataed. So there's obstacles in terms of being able to increase the densities there. There were a lot of amalgamations but as I said, the road network itself, the T map study that we did about eight years ago revealed that it's fairly constraining trying to get high densities on the western side.

25

So the LSPS acknowledges that fact in stating that the eastern side is the target area for future increasing residential growth in the – in Cabramatta Town Centre. But the

30

35

40

45

urban design study, when that's finalised, will be reported to council, that that will kind of explore that in a bit minor – that will reveal that in, I guess, finer detail.

5 MR MACKAY: Thank you. I think – I think it would actually be helpful for the Commission to receive formally the adopted statements and again, because we've received it formally, would then also appear on our website. Peter Williams, do you have any questions arising from that statement from the council?

10 MR WILLIAMS: No. Sorry, just – Peter here. Just an observation. That would be very helpful to refer to the local strategic planning study now that it's a been completed, and to reference it, and the information that you've just given us then would be very helpful as well in terms of the background and the intention, council's intention for Cabramatta East. So that's – so that's all really useful. So, yes, just to reiterate what Richard's saying, having access to the statement would be very
15 helpful.

MR MOONEY: Sure. We'll get that sent out.

20 MR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thank you.

MR MACKAY: Okay, it's Richard - - -

25 MR MOONEY: Sorry, just Andrew again. Just to add that before the – with the further progression of the Gateway – of the planning proposal, the planning proposal would have to be updated before it got submitted to the department in light of the LSPS. That's one of the requirements of the directions that apply to planning proposals. That would need to be factored in, whether it was done by council or the proponent, that would happen before it got submitted to the department in
30 finalisation.

MR MACKAY: Thank you. It's Richard. That's a helpful point. Thank you, Andrew. Greg, any comment from you on that, I guess, particularly in light of the council's very recent adoption of that statement.

35 MR FOSTER: Greg here. No I'd need to review it in light of what was said. But I think that the matter's really to be determined whether the heights are going to apply or not and then, from there, if it's not, well then I could review the matter. But as it stands at the moment, I'd need to really review all that information again which most likely won't meet the time line what – and I don't think it will have that tremendous
40 or impact or decision on whether the corner area with the removal of the basically three levels is going to be such importance to this at this moment.

45 MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Thank you, Greg. I'm about to just summarise what I understand will be the next steps but before I do that, can I firstly check with Peter whether there are any other questions you would like to ask during the meeting, please?

MR WILLIAMS: Look, it's just a question that I asked to the proponent but there is – it's to do with the exact boundaries of the site. There is some council land involved in the planning proposal, at least laneways or – Andrew or Chris?

5 MR SHINN: Yes. It's Chris speaking. Yes. The laneway coming off the southern portion of the site, Cabramatta Road East - - -

MR WILLIAMS: Yes.

10 MR SHINN: - - - that would be not formally part of a voluntary planning agreement. They would have to negotiate with the council's property branch as any other landowner, to negotiate the acquisition of that.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15 MR SHINN: But I do understand that it would need to be staged given the fact that that laneway services a number of other properties at the moment, so the proponent is still looking to acquire some of those properties. So, yes, I understand that it would have to be a private – and negotiations between the council property assets branch
20 and between the private owner.

MR WILLIAMS: No, that's fine. It's just – thanks, Chris. It's just getting clarification of exactly what's in and not in the – the site itself. Thanks for that.

25 MR SHINN: Thank you.

MR WILLIAMS: Thanks Richard.

30 MR MACKAY: It's Richard. Can I just check with the Commission officers, Casey and Callum, if there's anything from you?

35 MS JOSHUA: Could I please ask Chris or Andrew, in the local strategic planning statement, is there any – excuse me – any identification of commercial floor spaces or number of dwellings in the Cabramatta Town Centre East?

40 MR MOONEY: No, not specifically. There's an overall statement, though, I'll highlight the sections for you in terms of the themes that we use in the LSPS. It does mention our overall joint target for city for 2036 and that's the total growth of 19 per cent growth and that's where it's linked to – at a higher level – mentions that where the – tendered growth would be accommodated and it's based around the heavy rail centres of Fairfield and Cabramatta Town Centre and Villawood on the main centre. So as part of the LSPS, we're still doing more detailed studies in our residential strategy and also the urban design studies all feed into each other in terms of
45 identifying more specifically what the all in target will apply or what potential yield would be out of those town centres. But I think it's a matter of, like, we'll look at what the urban design studies say can be accommodated in the town centres and that will help inform the overall eventual yield for each centre.

MR MACKAY: Okay. Thank you. Anything further from the Commission – it's Richard. Anything further from the Commission officers?

MR FIRTH: No, thanks, Richard.

5

MS JOSHUA: No, thank you.

MR MACKAY: Anything further from you, Greg?

10 MR FOSTER: Greg here. No, Richard.

MR MACKAY: Chris and Andrew?

MR MOONEY: That's all, thanks.

15

MR SHINN: Nothing further.

MR MACKAY: Can I just summarise what I understand is the next steps? The Commission is, as I indicated in the opening, in the process of understanding the relevant information and forming a view. We are yet to meet with the department and obviously we are yet to turn our minds to the matter coming out of the consultation with the proponent and yourselves.

20

Arising out of this meeting I think that the Local Strategic Planning Statement council officers will kindly forward it the Commission. We will have regard to that. We will put it on our website and then we will request the Commission Secretariat through Casey or Callum to come back to you, Greg, perhaps through council, just with a time frame, if there's anything further that you wish to add with respect to the visual impact assessment or any of the other proponent documents that are in play.

25

30

As I mentioned, the Commission has quite a tight time frame for making its findings and recommendation about the Gateway review so that time frame is likely to be towards the end of this week. It's not going to be weeks, but that opportunity is available. So that's, as I understand it, the actions from here. Is there anything – just look generally at the screen, is there anything further – if there's anything else that needs to be said, would someone wave?

35

MR MOONEY: Not from me, thanks, Commissioner.

MR MACKAY: There being no waving, can I thank you all. It's a slightly awkward format for such a meeting but thank you very much for your patience, from the contributions that you've made and, in due course, the Commission's decision will be published on our website and communicated to council. So just thank you very much all again for your attendance and participation.

45

MR MOONEY: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Commissioner, appreciate that.

MR MACKAY: Thank you very much. Thank you.

5

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.49 am]