



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-1271546

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: DONNISON STREET GOSFORD

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON**
 WENDY LEWIN

ASSISTING PANEL: **HEATHER WARTON**
 STEPHEN BARRY

APPLICANT: **JOSEPH "JOE" BELL**
 ADAN COBURN
 MICHAEL HAY
 PATRICK HALL

LOCATION: **SYDNEY**

DATE: **10.05 AM, THURSDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 2020**

MR C. WILSON: Good morning. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet, and pay my respects to their elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today. This is the meeting with the applicant. The Lederer Group Proprietary Limited is proposing a concept application for a podium and building envelopes for five towers for residential and retail and commercial uses, a concept landscape plan, design guidelines, and design excellence strategy for the site at 136 to 146 and 148 Donnison Street, Gosford. Stage 1 development for demolition of the existing buildings, removal of vegetation, extinguishment of easements and stormwater and sewer works is also proposed.

This is State Significant Development application 9813 known as Gosford Alive. My name is Chris Wilson. I am the chair of this panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner, Wendy Lewin, and Heather Warton and Stephen Barry from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. I understand representing the applicant today are Adam Coburn, town planner from Mecone, Joe Bell, town planner from Mecone, Patrick Hall, development manager on behalf of the landowner, Lederer Group, and Michael Hay, architect from the Buchan Group. Is that correct?

MR J. BELL: That's correct.

MR WILSON: 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. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process, and is being conducted via electronic means in line with current COVID-19 rules around social distancing and public gatherings. It is taking place at a preliminary stage of this determination process, and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of meeting attendees to clarify issues as we consider appropriate.

If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer straightaway, please free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I would ask that all participants state their name before speaking each time, and please be mindful not to talk over the top of one another, so that we can ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now work through the agenda. So our agenda items are obviously – our first agenda items are presentation by the applicant, so I will hand over to – who am I handing over to?

MR BELL: You'll hand over to me.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR BELL: It's Joe – Joe Bell here, so I'll support

MR WILSON: Okay. Away you go, Joe.

MS H. WARTON: I'll make you the host, Joe, so you can share the screen.

MR BELL: Thank you. Technical difficulty. To share I have to quit and rejoin, I apologise.

5

MS WARTON: Really?

MR BELL: Yes. It's a system preference. I just will be right back on. It's – it's on our end, not yours. I'll leave now.

10

MS WARTON: Do you want to email it to me instead, or - - -

MR BELL: It's quite big. If we can just quit and rejoin.

15

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR BELL: Thanks.

MR WILSON: Okay.

20

MS WARTON: Then maybe I have to take my host back, otherwise you might - - -

MR BELL: I'll assign it to you. Thanks.

25

MS WARTON: Okay. Thank you. I did that smoothly, didn't I? Okay. They're coming back in again. Making you the host again. No. Okay. You're the host again.

MR BELL: Excellent. Thanks. So that's visible for everyone?

30

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS W. LEWIN: Yes.

35

MR BELL: Great. So, yes, Joe – Joe Bell here from Mecone, and I'll be running through sort of the first half of this presentation, and talking to some of the – the planning aspects, and then – and – and background, and halfway through I'll hand over to – to Michael from Buchan to – to talk more to the design.

40

MR WILSON: Thank you.

45

MR BELL: So we'll talk – I'll talk generally to the planning history, the and its controls, the vision and concept proposal, and the process we've been through in general. Just reconfirming from earlier, so myself, Joseph Bell, joined by Adam Coburn, director from – from Mecone looking at planning, Patrick from – from Lederer, and Michael here from – from Buchan, lead architect. I'll quickly let

Patrick speak for a couple of minutes just about Lederer's position in – in Gosford, and commitment to the development in general.

5 MR P. HALL: Thanks. Thanks, Joe. It's Patrick Hall speaking. I guess I just want to give you a quick overview of the Lederer Group. The Lederer Group is a family business headed up by Paul Lederer. Paul Lederer is 75; he still runs the business on a daily business, comes into work every day, very passionate about – about Australia and – and things. He's not – you know, he's not in this to make money. It's – it's – it's really a passion – everything is a passion for him now. Paul and his uncle have
10 been part of Gosford for over 40 or 50 years. They had a number of businesses up there through butcher shops, smaller dairy things to large abattoirs. You know, they purchased the Imperial Shopping Centre. Going from it being a butcher in the shopping centre, they bought the shopping centre about 25 years ago. They've managed that shopping centre every day since then.

15 In the last five years, they've renovated it. They've put over \$20 million into that shopping centre so, you know, Gosford is a passion for them. It's the – they – they are part of the community up there. This subject site, again, they bought about five or six years ago, and every day they've been trying to get a – a DA for that site to –
20 to really see Gosford to grow and revitalise. I think they've been there for 40 years and they haven't seen anything happen so, again, very passionate about the area. They're not a – they're not a, sort of, a traditional buy-and-sell developer. They're part of that community, and everyone knows them up there. Yes. So I guess I just wanted to give you a bit of that – bit of background on who they – who they are, who
25 the family is. Thanks, Joe.

MR BELL: Thanks, Patrick. So starting with the general background of – of this site and the development in general, touching on what Patrick alluded to there, you know, as a – as a group, and as a team led by Lederer, really renewal of this site has
30 been pursued for a very long time, for almost five years now, officially. So at the end of 2015, the then Gosford City Council was proposing changes to its own LEP, the Gosford LEP, to stimulate development and to increase development feasibility, I suppose, within the Gosford CBD. So in general, what that planning proposal included was a broad pool of GFA, 150,000 square metres of GFA that any
35 development site if it met certain criteria could absorb above their base controls, and alongside that, the removal of site-specific FSRs and height of building controls that any development that utilised this new provision, other than setting a blanket cap of RL99.

40 In response to this, to the planning – the draft planning proposal that council was leading, the Lederer Group lodged a concept DA in the middle of 2016, which incorporated not only the subject site we're talking about today, but the Imperial Shopping Centre as well. So this was a – a large scale concept proposal for many towers with ground floor activation, etcetera, which was socialised and well accepted
45 by council. It even went through community consultation and was progressing relatively well. However, the changes to the LEP were ultimately abandoned by council, and the application was withdrawn in March 2018. So March 2018 is not –

not that long ago, and I think – in the grand scheme of things, so I think – this is just to highlight that, like Patrick said, we – we’ve been looking at this site for a long time, and we – we’ve been committed to its – to its redevelopment and renewal. So more recently, not long after the – you know, the withdrawal of that DA itself, our
5 project team recommenced planning for the site, following the gazettal of the Gosford SEPP.

MR WILSON: Joe, can I just interrupt there. Chris Wilson.

10 MR BELL: Sure.

MR WILSON: Why was it withdrawn? Was it withdrawn because the SEPP was being prepared?

15 MR BELL: So the DA was contingent upon the council planning proposal - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR BELL: - - - which was only a draft at the time, and as – as it – as council
20 withdrew or didn’t continue with the planning proposal - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR BELL: - - - the DA needed to – to be withdrawn.

25 MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR HALL: Chris, it’s Patrick Hall. Chris, council – at the time, council went into
30 administration to merge with Wyong Council, and at that time, the administrator said, “All bets are off, all draft planning controls are now – are now, sort of, you know, are ceased – cease to exist.” So we were forced to withdraw that DA.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MR BELL: So touching on the – the Gosford SEPP, so as I’m sure you – you are aware, it is really about facilitating and driving renewal and revitalisation in Gosford City Centre through new controls which, in a sense, requires redevelopment but also really aim to ensure design excellence outcomes, protecting key – key landmarks that – that make Gosford what it is. Strategically, the introduction of this SEPP more
40 broadly responds to the Central Coast Regional Plan, which had come out a couple of years earlier, and the aims of that plan or what it talked about was promoting Gosford as the capital of the Central Coast, increasing housing density within walking distance of the City Centre, improving the public domain and attracting more commercial development as well, within Gosford.

45 An action out of that strategy was to do more master detailed precinct planning in Gosford, which culminated in the urban design framework which the Government

Architect led. So that's some background; then we will move on to – to – to where we are today and the site, in particular, and this slide here is quite – or this image here, I should say, is quite compelling in terms of what's going on in Gosford, and how the – the market is responding to renewed interest and increased feasibility in the new – new SEPP. So there are a range of products shown on – on this map, most of which are approved, if not complete or under construction, and they really show that the scale of development in Gosford is really changing and increasing, compared to what we saw when we were on site yesterday.

10 So we'll get into the specifics of our proposal in a minute, but we're touching on a maximum RL of around about 100, and that is comparable if not lower than some of the other approvals or items under construction at the moment in Gosford, the highest of which SEARs have recently been issued for the Central Coast Leagues Club at a site north – in the northern area on Watt Street, close to, sort of, 135RL.

15 And you might have noticed the Mann Street site, 108-118 Mann Street, which is in the – the image is in the bottom left of the – this – this page. That's under construction at the moment, so that's where there's a change in – change in context, and it's part of what the design intent and the – how – how we've responded and built up our design. This is now a key sort of consideration for us.

20 And then we go to our site itself, so yesterday as I'm sure was evident to – to yourselves walking around, this site is screaming out for renewal. It's a – a huge opportunity site in what is essentially the centre of – the centre of the Gosford CBD and a key location, prime location adjacent to the park, walking distance to the train station, shopping centre, etcetera, but really has become this, sort of, under-loved eyesore, frankly, that needs – that needs renewal. Previously, in a – in a – in a former life, it was a shopping centre, but what it's currently used for is the – is – is really that free public car parking or free – the car parking provision. Key planning provisions, so obviously the SEPP, the Gosford SEPP applies, and this is in every control, but these are the – the main ones that are relevant, I – I think, so zoning would be for mixed use; height of building and FSR control, these are to be determined by the consent authority where the provisions of clause 8.4 are met, but the – the underlying mapped heights are from 15 to 48 metres, and mapped FSRs were 2.5 to 4.75 to 1.

35 The design excellence clause, so this clause applies to all development in Gosford, but – sorry, applies to all development in Gosford, and provides a list of matters for consideration that all development needs to be considered against. The exceptions to height and FSR clause 8.4 provides a pathway to exceed height and FSR to an amount determined by the consent authority, again, where certain criteria or conditions are met. Solar access – for us, really, the relevant solar access provision is the protection of sunlight to Kibble Park, and vistas and view corridors, which talks about the protection and enhancement of clear view corridors, so for us, sort of, it defers to the DCP really, and that's the view rights through to Rumbalara Reserve from different vantage points.

45

So I won't run through every control what – that's on this slide, but these are extracts from – from the DCP, so where – sorry, the DCP and the urban design framework, so in the DCP we're identified as key site 4, and within the urban design framework within the civic heart, there's a – there's a, I suppose, a scheme or a concept for – for
5 renewal of our site in the broader context of what's happening around Kibble Park. And the key takeaways that are spoken to in these two documents are, again, around focusing development around Kibble Park in increasing the green canopy and green links, protecting those sightlines through either side of the site and, importantly, going through a master planning process to – to really determine the most
10 appropriate outcomes.

I'll let Michael talk to the vision when I pass over to him in a couple of minutes but, essentially, this is what our end outcome that we're aiming for is, so a mixed use redevelopment, ground floor activation, you know, a really exciting, lively place that
15 people within Gosford want to be and want to – to go to, with – with the residential towers on top, through-site links, great – great public realm outcomes. In terms of what our actual proposal is that we're seeking approval for today, it's the – it's the first step of, I suppose, the concept proposal, concept approval for the envelopes, and the uses, so setbacks, heights and the main uses of each – of each – of each building,
20 sorry. So, Chris, you've read through the development in general, so I'll skip over these quite quickly. We've got five buildings or podiums. Key features other than the buildings and the uses themselves are that north-south through-site link, 18 metres in width, and the east-west connection of – I think it's 14 metres in width.

Stage 1 works are also sought for demolition and stormwater realignment, and to ensure that the outcomes are of this approval are tied to what we're envisaging in our reference scheme. We've also prepared design guidelines and a design excellence statement, to – to ensure that we get there through – through future development. I won't labour over every item here in this timeline, but just to tell you how we –
25 we've gotten to where we are today in September of 2020. So we – we really started engaging with the Department of Planning in October of 2018, so really two years ago now. The back end of 2018 involved lodgement of the SEARs, and as we moved into 2019, we received the SEARs and then went through a pretty rigorous process with the Design Advisory Panel to – and the Design Reference Group, which
30 is an offshoot of that panel, to refine our design, to take their suggestions on board, to – to – to make changes as – as they required and as they – as they raised issues as they – they came along.

And this was a – this was a truly legitimate and collaborative process. We were in front of them several times. There were legitimate changes made to the design each
40 time, which we can run through again in – in a few minutes, but, yes, this was – this was a key part of our – our design processes, and getting through to a – a lodgement of an EIS. By the middle of 2019, we were doing community consultations. There was newspaper advertisements, community sessions held in the Imperial Centre, and agency consultation. Moving into the sort of back end of 2019, we lodged our
45 Environmental Impact Statement in September. We again met with the Design Advisory Panel post-lodgement on the – on the EIS scheme in October, and by

December we had received – or at the end of December, we received the request for information which, again, requested some design refinement and changes, and the provision of design – design guidelines.

5 We really took those on board. I think we – it’s fair to say we responded openly and positively to what was – what was asked for, and we resubmitted our scheme after working through it in 2020. We resubmitted in April 2020. So the final couple of things from me is just to touch on the height and floor space provisions and design excellence. So the height and floor space provisions really are vital to and a – and a key component of the Gosford SEPP. They encourage and attract investment whilst ensuring design quality outcomes. I think it’s important to acknowledge and to – to – to understand that these are – clause 8.4 isn’t a typical variation clause in the traditional sense, like clause 4.6 or the – the – the now outdated SEPP 1. It’s a series of processes and criteria to meet in order to be activated in general, so site criteria, 10 the design panel review, a provision of commercial floor space, and meeting or exceeding minimum sustainability standards. 15

In this, the design review panel requirement is really that critical factor, because it essentially provides the – the rigour to that design excellence clause which otherwise 20 applies to every other development in Gosford. So that panel becomes a key sort of informer and part of the design process, with respect to how that maximum height and density can be established in the absence of formal height and – height and density controls, and how the development can then ensure design excellence. And how that panel works and operates, well, as I said, every development technically 25 must demonstrate design excellence under clause 8.3, but it’s only the development that utilises clause 8.4 for the exceptions to height and FSR that actually goes through a panel – a Design Advisory Panel process. Their role and objective is pretty clearly identified within the guide for proponents and stakeholders, so:

30 *That formed to ensure design excellence and quality design outcomes for Gosford City Centre.*

And they are there to:

35 *...support proponents and decision-makers to achieve a high degree of design excellence, by promoting a design-led approach to development.*

The panel also needs to consider a design excellence statement, which talks to the urban design framework, planning controls and really is a statement or a process of 40 how we intend to ensure design excellence in the final built outcome, and that’s really important for a concept DA, how we’re going to get to the reference scheme. And the sessions we attended were attended by the acting government architect and the New South Wales Chief Planner. So that’s it from me in terms of background and process, so I’ll – I’ll hand over to Michael from – from Buchan now, if there’s 45 no questions now.

MR HAY: Thanks, Joe. So from our perspective, having joined the – the project after withdrawal of the first DA, what we were really seeking to do is to bring meaning to the title of the project and to the title of the precinct within which it sits, and that's the Gosford Alive project within the civic heart of Gosford. So those two things take some doing from the current scenario that you can see on site, but we're – we're passionate believers that that's eminently possible and that this project will have a really good push in that direction. So – next slide, Joe – so there's – as Joe has mentioned, there's quite a history to this. We've worked really openly and collaboratively with all the stakeholders along the way as best we can, even attending some of the public meetings ourselves to hear from the community. So there - - -

MR BELL: Sorry.

MR HAY: So, yes, we started – now, originally actually our pre-DA had a much larger podium that was going to be a lot more, sort of, retail, entertainment-led kind of thing, but the impact of that podium onto the park was really significant, and there was some other overshadowing and other things caused with that, and as you can see, the clumping of the towers towards the back blocked the view through to the ridge, which we thought was important. So after that initial discussion, we went away, put a revised scheme to the DAP, which reduced the bulk and scale of the podium significantly, slimmed the towers out so you got the gap between them through to the ridge, and started to introduce some different topologies and – and more richness into the podium, and starting looking at a – at the provision of a through-site link and trying to work out how to do that on grade. Next slide.

So at each point, you can see we're getting feedback from the various panels, the Design Advisory Panel, Reference Group, taking all of those comments on board, including the feedback from the Government Architect, who really had a red hot go at the application, and really trying to – we haven't been doing the traditional developer thing, and pushing back on a lot of the feedback; we've been pretty much accepting of all the feedback as we've gone along. So we improved the connection visually and physically through to Kibble Park. We really started to focus on the quality of those public domain spaces, and the panel spent quite a bit of time with us working out what that through street should look like, whether it should be a public street that should – we actually initially didn't have any parking in it, and they've requested and we've added just a little bit of "hero" parking to sort of try and activate arriving at those entries, and to draw the traffic through a little bit.

It's also part of being able to balance the load for the traffic on the various intersections, and – and really cut up that very long block, and we think that's a really excellent outcome now, that – that physical cut through the building, and you can see when we were on site as well, the physical cut through the podium is actually quite important from the perspective from the park. So we got to lodgement. You can see there's a whole variety of architectural kind of images as well there. We are cognisant that we're not actually designing the buildings per se as part of this application but, nonetheless, we have actually done that, and we – the envelopes

have come out of a design for a project and for a real building that we think is a really good outcome for that site, and then we've crafted the envelopes around that.

5 So started to work out how we could articulate the towers, step the towers better, reduce the dominance of the car park levels onto Donnison, so we've gone around each of the streets, and there has been specific discussions with the panels on each of the streets, and I'll come to that in a minute. And then even in the RtS, the response to submissions, we've been doing just finer and finer grain development on the – the design of the – the project, making sure that we've activated all of the streets all the way through, and – and part of that RtS, we tightened the envelopes and reduced them, after feedback – I forget who it was from – but after feedback, we were asked to consider tightening the envelopes around the building a bit tighter.

15 MR BELL: I think it was a joint – from the Panel and the Department.

MR HALL: Yes.

20 MR HAY: Yes, Panel and Department, and we've – so we've done that. We've left them a little bit looser on the front two towers, because we think the design of the DAs on those two buildings needs to have a little bit more wriggle room to actually really hit a fantastic design later. They've got a bit more challenge on the front than the towers at the rear, and so the – the envelopes are much tighter on the towers to the rear and more controlled.

25 MR WILSON: It's Chris Wilson. Can I just interrupt. What was the reason for asking for the tighter envelopes?

30 MR HAY: It's a good question, but as I understand it, there was – they felt there was too much wriggle room for us, in particular on the – on the front areas of the building, and that if we occupied right out into that proposed envelope, we would potentially have shadow impacts onto Kibble Park that the reference scheme didn't have, for example. So there were some impacts like that that were avoided by pulling those envelopes in a bit.

35 MR WILSON: So the envelopes were reduced from the – in the response to submissions, yes?

MR HAY: That's right.

40 MR BELL: Yes, that's correct.

MR WILSON: Right. Thank you.

45 MR HAY: So I'll go through some of this stuff fairly quickly, but just to note in that urban design framework that, really, the Imperial Centre and this Gosford Alive project really do form the guts of that Civic Heart precinct. You can see it there in that image that's on the left. These are really critical projects to get that Civic Heart

actually working and actually functioning. The broad urban approach, as you see it, key fundamentals for us: providing new connections and new streets; creation of really good quality stepped landscape; and really sensible graduation of the built form up the hill. So these key kind of ideas were part of our scheme from the very beginning, and we've just iterated and worked on them and worked on them and worked on them as we've gone through, and I think that's part – that process, is – is what's pushing us towards an excellent outcome.

10 So these two main cuts through the buildings – a 18-metre wide public street and a 14-metre wide public pedestrian access way, one on grade, one with the left, these are really good quality, solid, clear, straight public facilities, right, so they're not sort of – they're not quasi-internal, and I think that's really important. Street activation – we've done a hell of a lot of work on that, so just leave all of the car parking which took some doing, but is – but is now done, and we've got over 500 metres of active street front that we've managed to create with – and a very small amount of inactive as an overall proportion of all of that. So that's a really excellent outcome, I think, and would make a radical improvement to Donnison and some of the other streets there.

20 And the quality of that is really good, so the street activation where we first stood down on Henry Parry Drive, this is just lifting up that little courtyard like we talked about on site there, a 10-metre high podium and then a setback tower. That setback does vary. Just where that section is cut, it's nine metres, but that – that varies depending on where you are in the tower, but a setback tower. So you get this really nice kind of existing character two-storey, three-storey kind of size, and then the setback feature character, and there's a really – it's cut away – the angle of the podium is cut away there so that you get sun right down into that – into that courtyard there, and that's – that's an important component as the sun moves around the development, to pick up sun in good quality public spaces there.

30 So the through-site link as well; the dwellings that front on to there, the little SOHOs, they've got their own little private courtyards that just add to that – the section of width as well. They're not – although their built form is to 18 metres, there's actually an indent beyond that in most cases. So that's – that's a full-street width, with footpaths, planting zones and a carriageway each way for the vehicles, a good quality space. The landscape concept, which I won't really speak to – it's probably relatively self-evident in the landscape drawings – is this series of landscape and stepped podiums with really solid opportunities, and you can see the four pieces that this large site has been cut into, so that it – it breaks down that – that significant scale quite well. So you get a really nice open and transformative kind of frontage to Kibble Park, and – and really that's – it's actually really important, we think, and important to Lederer Group that that is part of what these two developments – this one and – and any rework of Imperial – can do for that Kibble Park. It really will radically improve that Civic Heart.

45 So new connections through – that view right through to the bush behind is only enabled by cutting that podium up and orienting those towers in the way that they

are, so that their slender profile presents itself to the predominant visual interaction with the public. We've also done a fair bit of work trying to work through the understanding of the stepping of the towers, both individually as well as collectively, and there's a big sweep of the tower heights and the tapers – subtle taper down at the back as well; quite a variety of heights from 61 up to 88 metres, so quite a variety in heights, but also big steps in the top of the towers. The DCP calls for a two-storey step. In most cases, we're significantly more than that, aside from tower 3, which is a very small plate. So you get a much stronger kind of a step, and that also provides opportunities for common area landscaping up there, which would have a beautiful aspect down to the water.

And then providing opportunities and some guidance into the design guidelines about what the future DAs might be able to achieve in terms of making sure that we're defining podium and tower, vertical splits to be able to get the vertical proportion, and the one we talked about, those really solid steps at the top of the building. So this slide was just to illustrate this is kind of where we've come to with the reference scheme, and a lot of work was done on the reference scheme, although it's not a big part of the presentation today, to make sure that the solar access works, the cross vent works, that the – even the orientations of the dwellings – this is Gosford; it's not Surry Hills, and so you don't want them sort of looking out at one another, and so a lot of effort was – was made to try and make sure that those dwellings oriented away from each other in – in a sensible kind of a way, and – and made the best use of their surroundings.

So you can see here aerial view. So much of that is – is overall landscaped area now – some deep soil, some on podiums, some in towers, but a huge proportion of the overall site will receive landscaping, and that's – that's a great outcome. Overshadowing over the park was very carefully controlled. We have the top row there, the shadow diagrams for mid-winter, so very small shadow, disappearing by 10 am in the morning, and we've taken the shadows even for the other two times of year, and very small shadow despite our close proximity to Kibble Park, and we think that's an excellent outcome. All shadow is gone by 9.30, 10 o'clock in the morning.

So the master plan, as you know, that's actually kind of what we're seeking, obviously, in the end; not the pink shapes, just the other shapes but, nonetheless, you can see there that the front two towers, in order to do their articulation, just need a little bit more wriggle room, it's our opinion, in the envelopes, and then as you go back towards the rear of the site, because they tuck in tighter to the boundaries, it's appropriate to control those envelopes much more tightly. So you can see the stepped heights that we're actually controlling in the envelopes there as well, so the individual steps in the towers are also controlled within those envelopes. We can just roll through. So you'll also see that we've put on those the – the reference heights in orange there, from the original control, and so there's a ready comparison between the uplift that we're looking for and where that occurs.

We've also done a fair bit of work, in part coming out of the feedback from the community, they were very keen on the development happening, actually. It was one of the most positive interactions I've had in a community consultation. But one of the things that they were asking about was the parking. They're very sensitive to the parking, so we did some work during the staging to make sure that there was up to 170 cars – car spaces available on site during construction; progressively less, obviously, as the construction continues, but doing our best to kind of keep that public benefit going as long as we reasonably can do. So I won't dwell on the numbers too much, other than to alert you to – and you can have a look at this later on in more detail – but in the top right there, there's a volumetric fill number and a percentage, and it ranges from 81 per cent for one of the towers up to 96 per cent for one of the towers at the rear. So quite a different percentage range, and that reflects how we're – how tight or otherwise we've set those envelopes in relation to the towers.

15 MS WARTON: Can I just a question here. It's Heather. That 81 per cent for tower 1, is that the podium fill or the tower fill, or the average of both?

MR HAY: That's the average of both, and it's the relationship of the GFA – of the volumetric fill to the overall envelope.

MS WARTON: And do you have – these are – maybe are questions for later on, but do you have just the tower fill and just the podium fill information separately?

25 MR HAY: I would have to take that on notice.

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR HAY: So that's it from me, architecturally. I'll hand back to Joe.

30 MR BELL: Great, thanks. Thanks for that, Michael. So one final thing and we'll get on to the questions which I'm sure you're looking to move on to – is just to touch on public benefit of – of our proposal. So we think that inherently within the development itself, there are a number of tangible public benefits. So this includes the provision of those new through-site links; 24/7 accessibility; breaking up what is currently a large impenetrable city block; great public realm improvements and outcomes, including streetscape planting and high quality architectural outcomes and requirements moving forward; new retail and commercial opportunities; redevelopment of, essentially, one of the largest opportunity sites in Gosford, stimulating broader renewal of the CBD in line with the strategic intent; creation of 267 jobs in operation and close to \$56 million per annum on an ongoing basis, which is – we've taken from the Economic Impact Assessment.

45 So these are tangible within the development itself, but then, you know, what – what the development will spur is around about up – depending on the final CIV, around \$10 million in local and state contributions over time. It's a significant contribution towards new and upgraded infrastructure, and we also note the conditions that the

Department have put on around the provision of a child care centre and community facility to be included within the future development. So a great public benefit outcome there, which we're not – we're not contesting as part of our – but we will get to that. And that's it from us. Thank you for – for listening. Do I need to –
5 Chris, I think if you're speaking, you're on – on mute at the moment.

MR WILSON: Thank you. Heather, Wendy, do you have any questions in relation to the presentation, before we move on to the next item on the agenda? Okay.

10 MS WARTON: No. I mean, I've got various questions, but we'll work through it.

MR WILSON: All right. Wendy?

15 MS LEWIN: Can you – no, well, let's just keep going, I think, Chris.

MR WILSON: Okay. So – Chris Wilson – just the first – the next item, I guess, is we're just trying to understand a bit better the rationale for the building – the building envelope or the height, and I understand there was – from some of the schematics earlier there were – there was – there was a scheme for four towers, and
20 now there's five towers. I guess we're trying to understand – and – and in particular, the rationale behind those five – five envelopes and their heights, particularly in relation to council's – council's or, sorry, not council's but the DCP, which looked for a gradation of – of building heights.

25 MR BELL: So I think starting, maybe, from a planning perspective, we think it was – well, going back to the start of our design process, we thought it was important to look contextually around what's happening both within Gosford in terms of development, as setting some sort of benchmark or upper limit, and that's what we spoke to a bit earlier, where we are seeing approvals and, indeed, things now under
30 construction or completed, sort of pushing up into that 80, 100 and even above in terms of RLs in terms of built form. So that's setting some sort of built form context which can be used as a – as one reference point or a guide to begin our process of setting an – an absolute upper limit for height.

35 Separately to that, we also know having, you know, worked closely with council in the original DA several years ago, that there's – there's this importance of the book ends, if you will, of Rumbalara Reserve and Presidents Hill on either side of the Gosford CBD valley. So the maximum heights of those – of those ridge lines are somewhere in the order of 120 to 130 RL, higher in some specific places. So then
40 we're getting, let's say, a natural upper limit from the surrounding scenery, from the surrounding landscape, telling us what we need to stay – stay under. So using those two reference points, the built form approvals and the changing context from a built form perspective, as well as the static ridge lines and landscape, we know or we – we thought it was appropriate to sort of stay in that 100 give or take RL height. As we
45 worked through the design process, originally it went in a little bit higher, and – and we – we starting bringing that down.

MR WILSON: Yes. Tower – tower 5 was reduced, wasn't it, but that's – that's correct?

5 MR BELL: That's correct. It went in at approximately 110 RL, and it came down to 101.

MR WILSON: That was your decision, though; it wasn't guided by the DAP?

10 MR BELL: They – they had suggested that more refinement was needed in the – in – in that edge, in that eastern edge.

MR HAY: Yes. They were after a – a sweep over of the heights, so they wanted the highest portion in the centre of the site, and not up on Albany, and I might also note, just in – in relation to your question there, Chris, that the – the leading edge that you see at the front because of these big steps in the fronts of the towers, the two leading edges are 50 and 60 metres, and then the – the highest points of the towers are sort of 80 and 85, so there is a fair gradient in the heights of the towers as we go along, depending on where you're – where you're looking. So for us, it's also about providing density into that CBD. There's a – there's a real desire to actually make a CBD. I mean, if it's going to be the Central, you know, Central Coast capital or what have you, I forget the terminology, then the Civic Heart has to have some good solid quality density in it - - -

15
20

25 MR BELL: Yes.

MR HAY: - - - you know, to live.

MR BELL: I think that's a really important point. So it's about providing that critical mass in, like Michael says, the – the centre of the CBD, so we thought this was a landmark site to really achieve – achieve high density outcomes, support that revitalisation, support what's being proposed in the ground floor as well as – as well as the surrounding CBD.

30

MR HAY: Yes. And then really carve away at those envelopes where there were impacts, and – and to create better spaces. So that's what we've been doing throughout this whole process, is progressively carving away and carving away - - -

35

MR WILSON: Okay.

40 MR HAY: - - - to where

MR WILSON: So just on that, in relation to the DCP control relating to slender towers, you know, and the maximum floor plate or length of a building of 45 metres, can you discuss that a bit?

45

MR HAY: Yes, sure. So let me just turn to the

MR WILSON: Just, again, in terms of the rationale for – for – I mean, there is an overall desire, on my understanding, is for – for slender towers, and I guess we would like to hear from you why you think that these are slender towers.

5 MR HAY: Okay. So the – the bog standard kind of, you know, candy bar, if you will, that comes out of a lot of the architectural design guide is a 40 by 25-odd-metre tower form. So we – we are seeking here, for example, the – the leading edge tower there, tower 1 – that’s probably a reasonable exemplar – has a maximum length of
10 48 metres and a maximum width of 23. So – so it is – and it is orienting its narrow end to the – to the park where the bulk of the tower - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

15 MR HAY: - - - is mostly seen from, and that extra length that goes beyond the 45-metre guide is – you can see it there in the envelope, to do with the reference scheme having a bit more capacity to articulate. So we could trim that off and come back to, you know, a – a more standardised size and, similarly, in tower 2, where we’ve L-shaped it, right, to get a slightly different proportion there, and to get a better
20 outcome for the dwellings, but we think also for the overall articulation. We’ve got five towers. If they’re all the standard candy bar shape, there’s not enough architectural variation and articulation in that. So we’ve left some room in there in the envelopes. It’s not to say that the internal floor space or the – the end product needs to be anything more or less than it needs to be.

25 MR WILSON: Okay. Wendy?

MS LEWIN: No. Look, I think they’re – they’re particular points of view from the architects in the way that they see the towers being developed. I – I think we’re
30 interested in understanding why the proposal doesn’t respond – perhaps you might think more literally, but it’s important for us to understand why the proposal doesn’t respond to the real incline or not just that the tops of buildings, but the incline and – of – of height from Kibble Park to the east, that’s supported in the DCP and the SEPP. Could you – could you talk us through why this isn’t more responsive to that
35 intent?

MR BELL: Can you clarify - - -

MS LEWIN: Your – the DCP shows an outline and in your sectional drawings or the envelope drawings, it indicates in the orange – yes – a very significant intent of
40 the stepped profile of the buildings throughout the site, from the west to the east. The towers that you’re proposing don’t have that articulation at all. Towers 3 and 5 are the same height and are perceived as the same height, whereas the intent in the DCP is – is entirely different. Can you talk us through why this wasn’t, I suppose, respected in the way that the tower profiles have been developed? And I don’t mean
45 respected in a judgmental sense; I mean in terms of your decision-making, design decision-making.

MR HAY: Yes. We – we did originally have a direct sweep from front to back, and actually, I mean, you can see it to a certain extent in the dotted profile behind, but there was a – feedback from the panel that it was to do with how the development on Albany would happen later on, that they didn't actually want a – a sweep up there.
5 They made us, for example, increase the podium height there, but also to taper the building down at the top, so that it becomes more of a hill rather than a sweep, and that was to do with the fact that they didn't think that there would be quite as much density on Albany Street down the track, to build up to, and so I guess that's kind of where we've come from, and it – it has transformed as it has gone along, from more
10 of a sweep into a – a hill-shaped kind of outcome.

MR WILSON: Okay. We will move on to – thank you very much for that. We will move on now to item 2, otherwise I'm conscious of time.

15 MS WARTON: Yes.

MR WILSON: Heather, do you want to talk to this?

MS WARTON: Yes. Sure. Thanks, Chris. I just have a few, I guess, informational
20 issues or things, sort of, we would like clarified in the – the actual concept envelope. So the actual dimensions on the – on the plans, so on your drawing DA02, the plan view of the concept, you've got maximum dimensions and minimum dimensions.

MR HAY: Yes.
25

MS WARTON: Would we be able to have a drawing showing the actual dimensions, because the actual dimensions is what's going to be approved, not – yes. We just want to see the actual dimensions.

MR HAY: Yes. I can take the maximum and minimum off. I guess, we had that on there to provide flexibility to reduce from there, so the – the DA doesn't have the sense that it should be a certain length of building. So, for example, if you're looking at tower 1, we've written maximum 48 metres. If the DA comes in and it's less than that, then that's a good – you know, that – that's absolutely fine. So I'm
35 happy to take the language off if it's confusing

MS WARTON: But your envelope is a fixed area. The building doesn't have to go right to the edge of the envelope. It's understood that the building will be somewhere in that envelope, the future building.
40

MR HAY: Yes. That's fine. We'll take the language off.

MS WARTON: And there's just a discrepancy also because on the – when you look at the dimension maximum – minimum 24 between tower 3 and tower 4 – I don't
45 know if you want to bring up the plan view on the presentation; we could see a little bit better – and then you look at the same dimension between tower 1 and tower 2, it

– it's quite different. The dimension on tower 1 and tower 2, minimum 24, is a much wider dimension than the dimension between 3 and 4.

5 MR HAY: Yes. I will put the actual dimensions on.

MS WARTON: Yes. That would be useful.

10 MS LEWIN: Sorry, it's Wendy here. I think we need also for the graphic to be accurate.

MR HAY: What do you mean by that?

15 MS LEWIN: Where you have the markers for the 24 metres, one is narrower than the other.

MR HAY: Yes. That's what I'm saying. I will take off the minimum numbers, and I'll put the actual dimension there.

20 MS LEWIN: Well, yes, but make sure the – the graphics are correct.

MR HAY: Yes.

25 MS WARTON: And could you have the RLs of the podium – other podiums as well and the through-site links?

MR HAY: Yes. The podium RLs are on there in green.

MS WARTON: And the through-site links?

30 MR HAY: That's complicated because it's a lot of different RLs.

MS WARTON: Is there? Well, perhaps just a few key points, so we get a feeling, like, at the entrances – like, at the intersections.

35 MR HAY: Sure.

MS WARTON: Just so we get an understanding, like, at the – at the Henry Parry Drive side of the east-west link and the other intersection with the north-south link.

40 MR HAY: Yes.

MS WARTON: Maybe just the intersections with the other streets and with the two streets with each other.

45 MR HAY: Okay. Yes.

MS WARTON: Also can you tell us – it doesn't have to be on this diagram, but in a separate diagram – the heights in metres above the ground level existing? I mean, I know the – the heights will change across the site, but at key – at key points on each tower, what is the, I guess, the maximum height from the natural ground level below.

5

MR HAY: Yes.

MS WARTON: And the – yes, they're the main things. Also the – a compliant scheme, – to see what a – what the same development at the – with FSRs as per the – the base controls, as it were, the clause 4.4 and – or 3 – 4.3 and 4.4 in the SEPP, compared to these – compared – the base – like, the compliance scheme showing compliant FSR and compliant height. Would that be possible?

10

MR A. COBURN: Yes. It's Adam here. We did show that on – the compliant heights on the elevation, so you can see the orange dotted line there shows the height.

15

MS WARTON: And what FSR does that represent? Has that been worked out?

MR COBURN: We would have to come back to you on that. I think we've got some numbers, but we would have to just check them.

20

MS WARTON: Yes. I mean, and probably not on the same diagram; probably on – because that will just get a bit too complicated. This is just, like, extra information for the panel to consider in the – just the – what a compliant building height - - -

25

MR COBURN: Okay. We will

MS WARTON: "Compliant" building height and compliant FSR would look like. I've got a few other questions about the floor plate and the fill, but I don't know if Wendy or Chris want to ask some other questions.

30

MR WILSON: No. Go – just keep going, Heather, and I'll - - -

MS WARTON: Keep going? Okay. So there's – there's the – the FEAR in the – the draft FEAR in the Department's consent about this 85 per cent fill, and you had a table that you presented regarding the fill.

35

MR HAY: Yes.

MS WARTON: So as I – as I mentioned earlier, it's really difficult to work out how that was calculated for the information that we have. Can you provide the actual reference scheme – the full yield table for the reference scheme, showing every floor?

40

MR HAY: Are you after the volumetric fill number or the GFA number?

45

MS WARTON: Well, the – the – yes, the GFA. So, like, a complete yield table for the reference scheme. So we've got the drawings, but we don't have a – and we have a summary table that shows building by building what the GFA is of each building, but we don't have a table showing the, like, every level what the GFA is, and what
5 the use is. I guess, the – the – where you've got your summary table that I think you showed - - -

MR HAY: Yes. There was one - - -

10 MS WARTON: - - - on one of the slides, if we could have that broken down so we can see every level, what the GFA is on every level.

MR HAY: Yes.

15 MS WARTON: And then the calculation of how you worked out the fill.

MR HAY: So the fill is effectively the – when you look at the DA02, it is the pink shape, right, so it's like a – if you bubble-wrapped the – the entire building, that's – that's how we understand that you would perhaps like it measured. If you – if you
20 have a definition that you could send us, that would be helpful, but we haven't run across this volumetric fill calculation before, so we're making our best guess about how to measure that.

MR WILSON: Okay.
25

MS WARTON: So we're – I think we understand from the Department, although we'll be clarifying that later, that they just mean the amount of building that the – that these occupy within the envelope. I don't think it's related to GFA.

30 MR HAY: So gross - - -

MS WARTON: Is that – is that how you worked it out?

MR HAY: So gross building area, GBA?
35

MS WARTON: Yes. I think so.

MR HAY: that outcome?

40 MS WARTON: I think so. Is that what your 81 per cent, for example, for - - -

MR HAY: Yes. That's right.

MS WARTON: - - - building 1 represents?
45

MR HAY: That's right.

MS WARTON: And then the – so, yes. So an expansion of this table showing more detail floor by floor.

MR HAY: Okay.

5

MS WARTON: Or I guess the original table that this one came from, that this summary arrived – arrived at. And also, separately, the – the fill from – separating the fill from the podium and the fill from the tower.

10 MR BELL: So just to touch on this as well, I think it's worth just noting that this table has the building by building volumetric fills, and as an average across the development, it comes out at about 89 per cent. So the – the Department's draft condition is – is slightly problematic, although there is some flexibility in it, but just thought we should draw attention to that here now.

15

MR HAY: I think one of the interesting implications is that it would reduce the mass on each floor plate of the rear towers, and potentially increase it on the front towers, and I'm not sure that's the intention of that condition.

20 MR BELL: Yes. Our – our interpretation of the condition is that it's to introduce further sort of insurance that the reference scheme, which is really the – the ultimate intended outcome, trying to condition that – that something along those lines will – will be achieved. So we don't think the current condition in its – in its current form actually – actually does that because there's a slight discrepancy between those –
25 those numbers.

MS WARTON: So – so, yes. I think you're right where it says the eighty – where you have 81 per cent, that means potentially you could have more GFA in tower 1.

30 MR HAY: That's right.

MS WARTON: Is that how you would interpret it?

MR HAY: That's what - - -

35

MS WARTON: But you were limited by GFA, so the effect is unclear.

MR HAY: Yes. And so we would in general that that condition would be applied on a whole-of-site average across each of the developments, but it's not quite
40 clear from the condition as it's currently drafted.

MS WARTON: Right. I don't think they mean it as an average, but we'll clarify that with the Department.

45 MR BELL: Yeah.

MS WARTON: So, similarly for tower 5, the 94 per cent, that means you would have to shrink that; is that how you interpret it, that you would have to have – shrink the building within the envelope?

5 MR HAY: That's right.

MR BELL: That's right, and which we don't believe was the – you'll be able to clarify with them, I suppose – but we don't believe that that was their intent, that each for the buildings, therefore, it needs to be further defined. We understood –
10 reading their report, we understand it to be essentially trying to control it at the outcome is along the lines of the reference – reference.

MR HAY: Yeah, for example, tower 5 is a 42 metre by 22 metre walkway. I'm not sure anyone's really intending on that.

15 MR COBURN: Yeah, I think it is, as Michael said earlier, it's really driving really hard on the reference scheme out of as well.

MS WARTON: And did you get feedback – did you see the draft conditions
20 provided – or did the Department provide the draft conditions to you, and did you give them feedback on that proposed FEAR?

MR BELL: No. So we did see them, but to be transferred by There was some misinterpretation, I think, because there had been some discussion with the
25 Department about, you know, what's the efficiency, and they provided some figures, yeah, but I think in – since then, and before this meeting, we've realised, looking into that further, and based on recent developments, we've sort of understood that condition more since.

30 MR WILSON: Okay, we'd better move on.

MS WARTON: Okay, sorry, yep, yep.

MR WILSON: Yeah. So, look – Chris Wilson – just – we – just in terms of solar
35 access, we've – we appreciate the efforts you've gone to avoiding Kibble Park and we note the shadow diagrams, and it's just a very small portion of Kibble Park that's affected in mid-winter. Well, we are interested in terms of the shadow – the solar access in terms of the ABC site and the TAFE site, which, in mid-winter, are fairly affected. Do you want to just to that a bit? We've been through your shadow
40 diagrams, but you might want to just give us some bit of rationale behind or the implications for those properties.

MR HAY: Yeah. I guess – so we looked at each of those properties as we were doing it and putting the scheme together. Oh, yes. We looked, in particular, at the
45 front of the courthouse, because, as you saw that today, that's kind of one of the few spaces along that street there that are currently being actually used, and so we were

cognisant of that, and we've maintained, you know, a pretty reasonable level of solar access to that courtyard.

5 There is a difficulty, obviously – any development at our site, because of its orientation, is going to cast a shadow across Donnison. We went and had a look at each of the spaces along the Donnison Avenue there and they are, largely, on unoccupied spaces at present. We've made sure that any of the residential properties that do exist further along there are totally unaffected, but there are sweeping shadows that run across those properties further up the street, and what we're trying
10 to do is just make sure that those divisions between the towers can provide some passing sunlight into that space.

15 But it's difficult. I mean there – the concentration of the usable floor space in the TAFE is much further up the hill and well away from shadows have been

MR WILSON: Is the site – what's the site zoned? Do you understand what the zone - - -

20 MR BELL:

MR WILSON: Sorry? It's capable of being – of uplift as well, yeah?

MR BELL: In theory, yes, it is.

25 MR WILSON: Yeah. Okay. Heather, you - - -

MS WARTON: I don't know – did we want to talk about the sustainability measures? So one of the – I understand one of the clause – or it's clause 8.4 – you have to provide or reach targets for sustainability – the targets for sustainability. Can
30 you just summarise your sustainability measures that are proposed?

MR HAY: Yeah. So, for a development of this character that's still trying to hit an affordable kind of price point, we have to be cautious. We'll make sure that we meet or exceed any of the benchmarks and so we would note that they are being ratcheted
35 up continually and that we're at about – I think it's about 50 per cent reductions now in energy and water use that we have to hit as a mandatory kind of benchmark, so we'll make sure that we meet or exceed those.

40 I note there's a condition in the approval to when you get to the detailed design work, to examine options for further pushing into that space and to improve the potential environmental performance of the buildings, but it's very hard at this master plan stage to be too dictatorial about that. From my perspective, that would be something that the DAs themselves would have to push yeah.

45 MR BELL: Yeah, and the conditions do also talk to a green star rating on each development, which is a four star green rating, I believe, which is the best practice.

It's a five minimum standard, or it's accepted practice, so that's a really great outcome, in terms of sustainability, moving forward, as well.

5 MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you. Just in terms of the extent of commercial floorspace, there's – I mean there's – I think it's about seven and a-half per cent, isn't it, that's the owner provided?

MR HAY: It's about 5,000 square metres plus the SOHOs.

10 MR WILSON: Yeah, so that's – I think it's about seven and a-half per cent, but, anyway. So, just quickly, in terms of clause 8.4, you're satisfied that this is sufficient to justify that with?

15 MR BELL: I would say yes; yes, we are. I mean, the clause is quite interesting in that it doesn't set a minimum, so, essentially, every site has to do its own studies and analysis to understand how much commercial floorspace is feasible and appropriate. So we've got 5,000 square metres of commercial floorspace and that's before additional non-residential floorspace like the childcare centre. That's in the conditions going in as well.

20 Originally, when we went in, we – at the original lodgement at EIS, we had around about three and a-half thousand – this was increased by about 50 per cent following some feedback from the department.

25 Even with the development is, this isn't really sort of a high, significant foot traffic area, particularly once you've passed that sort of opening area at Kibble Park, so we kind of think that location is pretty appropriate. We did have a commercial means assessment done by to support the development, and it identified a fair amount of vacant commercial floorspace in Gosford, and around 13,000 additional –
30 sorry – 13,000 square metres of additional floorspace in the pipeline, so the future demand, including this development and everything else that's come they had deemed to be appropriately catered for with what's already in Gosford or what's in the pipeline.

35 MR HALL: Chris, it's Patrick Hall speaking. We're the owner of the Imperial shopping centre.

MR WILSON: Yep.

40 MR HALL: At the moment, we've probably got about 13 vacant commercial shops in that shopping centre, including Aldi supermarket, which is over 2,000 square metres, so Aldi has left the market, left the centre, and there's a number of, you know, specialty shops, you know, as I said, you know, 10 to 15 specialty shops that are still vacant. So the to the market at the end for commercial floorspace is not
45 there at the moment.

MR WILSON: Retail or commercial? Just – or both?

MR HALL: I guess, when I say commercial, I am catching everything, but in that example, certainly, retail. We own two other buildings adjacent to the Imperial Centre – the Sewing Centre and Weir Court – they’re both commercial buildings that are like vacant. So it – as Joe alluded to, the market demand at the moment is not
5 there for large – well, large areas of commercial. Hopefully, as you bring people in with the intensification of Gosford, that will change, and these things can be massaged and sort of grown – and organically grown as the market grows.

10 MR WILSON: Okay. All right. Heather?

MS WARTON: Maybe the parking; what – so, can you just tell us about the parking you’re providing, in terms of the parking for the residential? Is it between ADG minimum and the council’s DC or the DCP? As I understand it, the council is seeking more carparking rather than less, and, separately, what’s the carparking
15 proposed for the commercial?

MR BELL: Yeah, so that’s correct. The rates, as a total, is somewhere – sits somewhere between the ADG minimum and the council minimum, which is really quite high compared to other major urban centres. I think the Department kind of
20 recognised the need for site by site for this to be considered, and for a traffic or parking needs assessment to be done, so we’ve had that done before this initial concept, yeah, and that will continue to be referred to or refined under future DAs.

But, really, I suppose the – from a planning perspective, I think you’d say general
25 planning policy and strategic policies to reduce car dependency, which is where the ADG minimum is perhaps more appropriate as a target to achieve or to look towards, but Gosford, of course, is it’s own market and its – the needs of the future need to be considered as well. So that’s where we’ve kind of landed, halfway in between.

30 The SEPP itself does have parking rates for commercial premises – the exact number escapes me now – but, as a SEPP control, we’ve been able to achieve that, yeah.

MR HAY: And so I think we’re not being silly about the residential parking. There’s one per dwelling at the very least, but there is an opportunity to sort of break
35 that mindset at Gosford about “I have to drive everywhere” and you’re literally across the road from a shopping centre and a two minute walk from the train station, and so we think there is an opportunity to pull back from Gosford City guidelines. And that’s actually appropriate to do so, otherwise you’re just continuing the carparking nightmare, I think.

40 MS WARTON: So you’re not proposing any variation to the SEPP minimum, which I think is one per 75 or one per 50 – one per 40 for retail?

MR BELL: That’s correct, yeah. That’s correct in terms of we’re not proposing any
45 variations to that.

MR WILSON: Okay. I'm just conscious of time because we have another meeting in 10 minutes. So, just in order of importance, I guess, really, just in your perspective, can you just – in summary – I know you've given us a fairly comprehensive summary of the – I guess, of the process to date and what you've
5 been through to get to this stage – but, you know, from the consent authority's perspective, we're left with the decision to determine whether this has design excellence, so just – so, in your overall summing up, what – why do you think that this proposal demonstrates design excellence?

10 MR HAY: I think, for us, it comes down to a series of things. It's a really good quality public street and link. It's a fully activated street over 500 metres. It's no shadows to Kibble Park. It's slender towers to the main public aspect. It's maintaining things like public parking during construction. It's meeting or exceeding every request from the design reference group, the DAP, the Department,
15 everybody that we've come across the whole way through this process, all of whom, by the way, now consider the master plans have design excellence.

And I think if – when they were envisaging the clause about intensifying the centre of Gosford and trying to create a civic heart, I think this is the kind of thing that they
20 had in mind, you know. So, for us, the community feedback was very positive; they're all very keen to have this happen. And, when you put all of those things together, for us, those master plans are – would be an excellent outcome, yeah.

MR WILSON: Okay. Wendy, do you have any further questions? Wendy?
25

MS LEWIN: Yes. Sorry We're at this point where many, many cooks are being involved in the development of this proposal. I'm just wondering whether there is something that you believe has been not realised, that you considered previously was very important to the intent of your work; that's a question to the
30 Buchan group.

MR HAY: Good question.

MS LEWIN: Yes.
35

MR HAY: I don't know. I mean I think, from my personal perspective, we'd be fairly itching to get into the actual architecture, and I think it's kind of a slow torture to continually work on envelopes and do the prep schemes and pre-concepts without actually being able to get in and do things like work through the sustainability
40 questions or the street xx questions in proper detail.

So it's not quite an answer to your question, I suppose, but I guess that's – we think there are lots of opportunities to make this better before it hits the ground and I guess we're very keen to get out of this process and into that, so we can actually get to the
45 real rigour of it and into the real architecture of it instead of kind of the stuff.

MR WILSON: Just on that – so is it a statutory step to do the master planning process first or is that a decision made by the applicant that they'd prefer to do that, get some certainty before getting into the detailed DAs?

5 MR COBURN: Yeah, no – it's Adam here – no, it's not a statutory requirement; it's – given the scale, we wanted to

MR WILSON: Oh, yeah.

10 MR COBURN: ...

MR WILSON: No, that's fair enough.

MR COBURN: Go through the stages.

15

MR HAY: And then design your DA with confidence, because otherwise, you iterate on it too many times as it goes through the planning steps.

MR WILSON: Yep. Fair enough.

20

MS LEWIN: So, to the staging, is it envisaged that there's the five separate stages or one and two is stage 1 with the podium and the through-site links? How are the through-site links going to be – when are the through-site links being proposed, both of them?

25

MR HAY: So the intent is to develop stage 1 first and that delivers that through-site link right at the beginning.

MS LEWIN: Both through-site links?

30

MR HAY: Both through-site links right at the beginning.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

35 MR HALL: It's important – it's Patrick – it's important for It's under – he's been driving it. He wants to do something on the sites, so doing that podium at the start – and he wanted the towers certain subjects marketed, but certainly building the through the site is building that podium. In doing something on that site is an important driver, so the podium will come in the straight away.

40

MR HAY: Yeah, get rid of the eyesore of the

MR HALL: Yeah.

45 MR WILSON: Yep.

MS LEWIN: Right.

MR WILSON: Okay. Have any of you anything - - -

MS WARTON: And we sort of touched on it a moment ago, the DAP could require a design competition for the future stages. What's the Lederer's group – do you
5 mind having a design competition?

MR BELL: I don't – if I could speak for the Lederer group there – we don't believe that's the case. So, early on in the process, the initial stages of the DAP engagement included the rationale or the decision as to whether design competitions would be
10 required down the track, and they decided that it would not. However, to strengthen up the sort of design quality and architectural intent and variation, this was of a series of sort of the rationale behind requiring a design guidelines to be presented and design excellence – the design excellence statement to be prepared, which talks
15 through, you know, the calibre of architectural firm that's leading the design and other bits and pieces. We don't believe that there's any – like, we believe they've made the decision that there's not going to be a design competition. There's no need for a design competition.

MR HAY: But I do note there's a condition that says that each of the stages needs
20 to go back to the DAP - - -

MR BELL: Yes.

MR HAY: - - - for review, and that one of the key things that they will be
25 considering is the for variation - - -

MR BELL: Yeah.

MR HAY: - - - across the development hits the right benchmark.
30

MR BELL: Yeah, correct.

MR WILSON: Okay. I think that probably sums us up, actually. I think that's – Wendy, Heather, is there anything more?
35

MS WARTON: No. I might put some of my typical questions in writing, in terms of the actual further information – the, you know, the detail that I said in the meeting – I might put those – that in writing to the

MR WILSON: Yeah. How long would it take to respond to those? I mean I don't
40 think they're - - -

MR HAY: Yes. From what I've heard so far, that will be fairly quick; it'd be a day or two to respond - - -
45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR HAY: - - - to those questions.

MR WILSON: So, today being the 3rd, so we'll probably – shall we say next Tuesday or Wednesday? How – does that fit within our schedule?

5

MS WARTON: Yeah.

MR WILSON: Okay. Let's say next Tuesday, then – Tuesday COB. It'd be appreciated if you have that information. And we'll get that letter to you – Heather, today?

10

MS WARTON: Possibly today, but probably tomorrow morning.

MR WILSON: Okay.

15

MR BELL: Yeah, the sooner we have that, the sooner we can come back to you with the information.

MR WILSON: Excellent. Okay. Well, look, we thank you very much for that and your participation and that was very informative. And thank you for yesterday's site visit, as well. We've got a meeting with the Department in five minutes, so we'd better get moving. But thank you very much.

20

MR BELL: Thank you.

25

MR HAY: Thank you, Chris. Thank you, Wendy.

MS WARTON: Thank you very much.

30

MR WILSON: Bye.

MS WARTON: Bye.

35

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.25 am]