



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

## **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1439436

### **INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW – 355 AND 375 CHURCH STREET,  
PARRAMATTA**

### **MEETING WITH THE PROPONENT**

**COMMISSION:**           **CHRIS WILSON (CHAIR)**

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:**   **JANE ANDERSON (SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER)**

**PROPOONENT:**       **MELODY POTTER (STOCKLAND)**  
**ALISON MCDONAGH (STOCKLAND)**  
**ALISON BROWN (STOCKLAND)**  
**JOSH BANNISTER (MCDONALDS)**  
**PAUL ROBILLIARD (ETHOS URBAN)**  
**JOSH MILSTON (JMT CONSULTING)**

### **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

**4.00 PM, MONDAY, 12 APRIL 2021**

MR C. WILSON: Good afternoon and welcome, everybody. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we variously meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Gateway determination review of 355 and 375 Church Street, Parramatta. My name is Chris Wilson and I'm the chair of this Commission panel. We're also joined by Jane Anderson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It is important for me to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put on our website. To ensure the accuracy of the transcript I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for everyone to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. We will now begin. So, I understand you have a presentation today, is that correct?

MS M. POTTER: Oh, hi, Chris. Yes. We've got a presentation ready to go.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS POTTER: So I – my name's Melody Potter. I'm from Stockland. So if everyone's happy we can jump straight into that.

MR WILSON: I'll just – I'll just raise two things before we start. Firstly, on the – on the agenda is – and I know it's in your presentation – is the condition about isolated site. You know we have additional advice from the Department they're not concerned about that condition any more, so we note that. So I wouldn't focus too much on that condition. I know it's at the end of your – your presentation. The other issue is that the Department's forwarded us a – a further additional letter from Transport in relation to their position on the parking rate which we have before us, which I presume you're aware of and you have? Is that correct?

MS POTTER: Yes. That's right.

MR WILSON: Okay. So, in the course of – the course of this process we'll be formally asking the Department for their views on that letter in terms of the review. So we'll – we will send that off tonight or tomorrow and hopefully get a response from them very quickly. So – so we'll just start off then – we'll go through the presentation. I've just quickly looked at the presentation. Are you able to – you don't mind if I ask questions during that presentation, do you - - -

MS POTTER: Oh, no. Not at all.

MR WILSON: - - - rather than at the end, because I'll probably forget it.

5 MS POTTER: No. That's – no. That's fine.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. Thank you very much, Melody.

10 MS POTTER: Excellent. I'll just share the screen. I think Josh is on. Can you hear us, Josh? All – all good. Okay. Can everyone see that?

MR WILSON: Yes.

15 MS POTTER: Excellent. So I'll just start with just an overview of how we're going to break up the presentation today. So we'll – we'll just do a quick project overview and site context then move on to planning history, and that will be presented by Ethos Urban and McDonald's, and then there'll be a bit of a detailed section on traffic and parking presented by Josh Milston. There are some notes on the isolated site, but that's just on the last slide. So in terms of project location, as you all know  
20 it's at 355 and 375 Church Street. So that's just the red shaded area on this map, and it's about a kilometre north of the Parramatta Train Station, Parramatta Square, Westfield and – and that location there.

25 McDonald's is currently the landowner and will continue to be the landowner post development and Stockland currently have a development agreement with McDonald's that we entered into in 2017 to develop the site. So that's just the zoom in of the location, Prince Alfred Square there, and an aerial image on the right showing what's currently on site, being the McDonald's restaurant, and there are also some disused former retail and commercial buildings on the site as well. So Victoria  
30 Road and Church Street. In terms of the proposal, so we're looking at a mixed use development comprising of a new McDonald's restaurant on the – and some ground floor retail and 360 – approximately 360 apartments across two residential towers.

35 So these are just some images of the potential scheme. As you can see on the right there, the McDonald's restaurant will be located on the corner of Victoria Road and Church Street, so it will be a two level – likely to be a two level restaurant with undercover drive-through towards the back and – and this is just a scheme showing the two residential towers which will be set back just to ensure there's no  
40 overshadowing on the southern – southern end of Prince Alfred Square.

MR WILSON: Just – just in terms of the ingress there, that's generally where the ingress is now – is that correct?

45 MS POTTER: Off – off Victoria Road. Yes. That's right.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS POTTER: I will just hand it over to Josh Bannister from McDonald's to talk a bit about the – the planning history and McDonald's history on the site.

MR J. BANNISTER: Thanks, Melody, and thanks, Chris, and your team for the  
5 Commission's time this afternoon. We've been occupying this site for 42 years now,  
have owned it since 1978 and have actually increased the size of this site over that  
time to what you know today. We understand how critical this site is for Parramatta  
and for the city, for that matter. It's – it's a gateway site. We recognise that. Over a  
10 long period of time even preceding my eight years in development we were looking  
at a redevelopment of this site, but to be transparent, it's always got to be the right  
place for McDonald's and our customers. So, exiting the site has never been an  
option.

We operate under existing use rights. We can continue to operate under those rights,  
15 but we believe we're missing an opportunity by not redeveloping the site and we  
think we can achieve the ambitions of not just McDonald's but also of Parramatta  
Council in terms of bringing this to being the significant site that it holds the position  
within the LGA. We've had a bit of a, you know – a long journey, you would say,  
with this site. Over five years ago we took it through planning and we were told at  
20 that time that we were underdeveloping the site, which doesn't often get said, but we  
took that feedback on that were underdeveloping the site and the Ethos guys will take  
you through some of that detail.

And we went out and we found who we believe were Australia's most reputable  
25 developer. We're not residential developers. Stockland are and Stockland are  
brilliant at what they do. So we've grabbed Stockland and we're bringing you the  
proposal in its current form, but even over the last five years we've had to make a  
number of adjustments and I think McDonald's as the landowner have been very  
reasonable. We've listened to Council. We've listened to government throughout  
30 that process and we've made concessions, but we've also got to do something that's  
commercially feasible and, you know, where we're at now in the process, this last  
push is really about ensuring that we've listened to all the feedback, addressed that  
feedback, which I'm really confident that we have done and I – I hope that the  
Commission gets to that position today.

35 And through that willingness to work with all appropriate government authorities and  
referral authorities I think we've got a really, really strong proposal. But  
unfortunately it's a proposal that does need to be balanced and concessions on car  
parking that we've made, the position that we've got today is really the floor of  
40 where we can go as a business, but I think it's a really good balance for what is  
looking to be achieved here and what's desired from Council, from Transport, and  
the feedback coming into today's meeting matches off with that, so we're hopeful  
that you'll get to that same position as well.

45 Again, just let me reiterate before I hand over to Ethos is, you know, we are  
committed to redeveloping this site as long as we can get the right outcome for our  
customers ultimately, which is what we're aiming to do, but the – the proposal that

we put in front of you today brings one of the best looking McDonald's restaurants in the world to Parramatta. It achieves the goal of fully developing the site with Stockland, bringing residential benefit and amenity, and also capitalises on the gateway site opportunity that exists.

5

MR WILSON: So, Josh, I've just – just in terms of viability – because we – we asked this question of Council the other day. I guess what are the fundamentals of the – I mean, I just – because I guess what we're asking for is Council's, I guess, taken it on face value but we haven't been close to the process, obviously. Council's taken it on face value that to reduce the number of car parks even further undermines the viability. They've taken that message from you and they've agreed to it, but can you just explain to me why the reduction in parking does undermine viability of the development site?

10

15

MR BANNISTER: Yes. Sure. So the way our business works is we're a convenience based business and we know that whilst there is a pedestrian element being within, you know, the CBD or the fringe of the CBD within Parramatta, this restaurant itself fills what is quite a significant gap for the surrounding trade area population. So there'll be a large number of people who do travel to the site by car, and then the convenience of them being able to have onsite parking is really critical to us being able to achieve the sales that we desire. That, alongside with the drive-through which has been the other key contention as we've gone through and had this discussion with Council and with Transport, those two elements really provide that convenience model that assists us in achieving the top line sales to invest the significant amount of money that we are doing to redevelop the site.

20

25

MR WILSON: Okay. And having – having one which is several kilometres up the road doesn't offset that need to, you – you know, so obviously they could drive there, but it's because of – is it because of the position on Victoria Road or is it the position in relation to the CBD that - - -

30

MR BANNISTER: It's because of its position in relation to other McDonald's restaurants and then - - -

35

MR WILSON: Right.

MR BANNISTER: - - - the difficulty of being able to penetrate the CBD more generally and that's why the land is so valuable to us a business and why we've, you know – if we get to the point – and I really hope we don't because we're very passionate about achieving our vision that we're presenting to you today. If we get to the point we will just continue to operate it as a 43 year old restaurant and put coats of paint on it and modernise it to ensure that it's as relevant as possible to our customers, but that's not the best outcome for them nor the city.

40

45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR BANNISTER: All right. I think I'm handing over to Ethos at this point, Melody, unless there's any other questions.

MS POTTER: Thank you. No, to Paul – hand it over to Paul, I think.

5

MR P. ROBILLIARD: Thanks, Josh, and – and thanks, Chris, and the IPC. So Paul Robilliard from Ethos Urban. Just going to – as others have said – take you through briefly what's quite a long history in terms of the development and the – or development applications and the planning proposal that we're currently considering. So as Josh alluded to, in 2015 there was a DA that was lodged for – on site for the restaurant with residential development in association with it. At that stage, that – that application was reviewed by RMS and by the JRPP and, as Josh said, the feedback at that point was that the – the proposal – while it was a – a redevelopment and a – an upscaling of development on the site – didn't really fulfil the full potential of the site given its – its significant location and its gateway location coming in to – to – to Parramatta CBD.

So I might just jump to the next slide, Melody, I think, if you're controlling – but, again, as Josh said, that feedback was taken on board really seriously by McDonald's. McDonald's have went away and thought, you know, very seriously about what they could do on the site and – and what they could do to realise that potential. And I guess that's what's got us to the point now with the planning proposal and the – the partnership with Stockland that came about in 2017. So that partnership led to a – a new development proposal or development scheme that underpinned the planning proposal for the site. That's – that proposal was subject to a lot of negotiation with Council and working through the issues, including some of the issues that we're talking about today around the traffic and parking, and – and then led to the submission to the Department of Planning and the gateway determination in 2020.

30

So that's where we've got to the point we're at now, I guess, in terms of the – the two gateway conditions, but, as we've said, the one in particular around the parking provision and the – the rates that are appropriate to the development. So what we're looking at now is – is the proposal reducing the current car parking from around 60 spaces to around 30 spaces which is generally compliant with the – the current controls that are in place under the Parramatta LEP. And as Josh said, it's something that enables McDonald's to continue to operate with its business model while allowing for the – the renewal of the site as well.

So the – the parking rate, I suppose, that – that's been struck and – and Council is now comfortable with and we understand now Transport for New South Wales is also comfortable with, based on their latest correspondence, is one that we think reflects the fact that this site is unique. It's – it's a very different site because of its – of its – of its history of use and its location relative to other types of development that, I guess, have been contemplated through the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal. So as Josh said, a site that's been in operation as a McDonald's restaurant

45

since 1978, there's nothing that – that compares to this in terms of the location and the use in and around the Parramatta CBD.

5 So the concern around, I suppose, the – this parking rate that – that was proposed in  
planning proposal creating a precedent for other development in and around the  
Parramatta CBD to – to question the controls that Council is proposing to include in  
the – the CBD planning controls we don't think is relevant. And as we understand,  
Council is – has – has satisfied itself that this development and this proposal because  
10 of its unique circumstances won't create a situation that generally calls into question  
the planning controls or the parking controls that it's proposing to include in the  
LEP.

15 So really the – we're – we're comfortable that the – the parking rate that we're  
looking to include in the planning proposal is – is consistent with the site and its use  
and its context and – and will allow – allow the – the site to be redeveloped in  
accordance with the vision for the Parramatta CBD and the – the potential of the site.  
But it's one that also allows McDonald's to continue its – its occupation and use of  
the site that's been ongoing since 1978. I think I've – I might now be handing over  
20 to Josh Milston to talk through the traffic and parking assessment - - -

MR J. MILSTON: Thanks, Paul.

MR ROBILLIARD: - - - unless you've got any questions, Chris.

25 MR MILSTON: Yes.

MR ROBILLIARD: Sorry.

30 MR WILSON: Oh, no. I don't have any questions on that. I mean, the Council rate  
was 37, wasn't it, under the LEP, is that correct?

MR ROBILLIARD: That's - - -

35 MS POTTER: Yes.

MR ROBILLIARD: That's right. Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40 MR ROBILLIARD: Yes.

MR WILSON: So – so it was 60, down to 37, now down to 30, is it, that bespoke  
rate?

45 MR ROBILLIARD: That's right.

MR MILSTON: Yes.

MR WILSON: But under the – under the – under the CBD Planning Proposal it would be three, yes, because they adopt the City of Sydney rate.

MR ROBILLIARD: It comes down to three, yes.

5

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR ROBILLIARD: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: Thanks. Okay. Thank you very much.

MR MILSTON: Hi, Chris. My name's Josh Milston. I'm a transport planner at JMT Consulting. I've been assisting Stockland and McDonald's on – on this particular issue or item around the parking, so I'll just run you through today some of the more technical elements around the transport component for the site and particularly supporting the proposed car parking provision. The slides that you'll see now – the five or six slides you'll see now essentially are identical to what we presented to Transport for New South Wales a week and a half ago or so which then led to their updated advice that – that you would have now seen. So – so nothing's changed with that respect.

15  
20

MR WILSON: Sorry. So this is the information that Transport based its new advice on, yes?

25 MR MILSTON: Yes, yes. Exactly.

MR WILSON: The information that they referred to in their letter.

MR MILSTON: Yes.

30

MR WILSON: Because that was one of my questions. Okay. Thank you.

MR MILSTON: Yes, yes. And this is almost word for word - - -

35 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: - - - the same presentation, so I've had a crack at it once at least so I'll hopefully get it right the second time as well. So for – so before – before I get into the – the more technical details, I guess there's four key principles that – that we're looking at here to – as part of the development and particularly the parking rate. Firstly, and probably most importantly, it's about – was about striking the right balance between providing car parking that met the – met the needs of McDonald's and their customers and to be a viable business, but also an – an amount of car parking that didn't impact the operation of the road network, and I'll – I'll go into that in more detail shortly.

40  
45

Secondly, given the site's location on the fringe of the CBD, near a light rail stop, supporting a road shift away from private vehicle use compared to current conditions, but while also recognising those specific travel needs and requirements of customers. Thirdly, we're aware of the Parramatta Integrated Transport Plan or  
5 strategy, including the mesoscopic modelling that Council are doing, so not undermining the recommendations of or findings of that, and also the previous strategic transport study as well. And lastly – and which goes to Paul's point before – not setting a – a – a precedent that would negatively impact the operation of the road network for other sites within the Parramatta CBD.

10

So on that first point around traffic impacts and road network operation, the – the – the rate of parking was almost tweaked or calibrated to ensure that the traffic generated from this planning proposal when you include the McDonald's and you include the residential component of the site did not increase from the current  
15 conditions. Because we're halving – essentially halving the number of car parking spaces from McDonald's from 60 down to 30 we're putting in residential, but residential land use given its location on the fringe of the CBD and near public transport doesn't generate a huge amount of traffic in itself, we actually see a slight – a very slight reduction in traffic generation during the AM peak hour and a – and a sizeable decrease in traffic generation during - - -

20

MR WILSON: So - - -

MR MILSTON: - - - the PM peak hour.

25

MR WILSON: - - - just on this, this is raising a point. Are – so are you saying that it actually decreases traffic movements or decreases an increase so it reduces an increase in traffic movements?

30

MR MILSTON: It – no. It – it - - -

MR WILSON: Surely if you put the residential on top of McDonald's then you're going to have an increase in traffic by that - - -

35

MR MILSTON: You do have – you – you do have an increase in traffic from the residential but with the McDonald's – with the rate of traffic generation from the existing McDonald's site halving, that significantly outweighs the amount of traffic generated from the residential. Now, the – the – the traffic modelling and analysis that was done for the project didn't assume just a 50 per cent reduction in traffic  
40 because we've got a 50 per cent reduction in car parking. Some of that traffic that was parking previously was assumed to go to drive-through so the traffic reduction actually was about 30 per cent.

45

So even though you might say, "Well, a 50 per cent reduction in parking might be a 50 per cent reduction in traffic", it was actually done at – at – probably a conservative assessment or scenario whereby a 30 per cent reduction was applied for the traffic movement or generation from the McDonald's which then significantly

outweighs the – the movements from the residential component. Being at the fringe of the CBD near – near a light rail stop, most of the future route – and this has been proven through surveys of other similar residential sites. Residents there when they travel to work – because we’re talking – we’re not talking Saturday afternoon here,  
5 mind you.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

MR MILSTON: We’re talking the morning peak and the afternoon peak. They’re  
10 walking to work. They’re using public transport to get there. Yes. In terms of the parking rate itself, you can see that the proposed rate – the 30 spaces is significantly below more than – more than half of the parking rate of any other guidelines that – that exist for fast food takeaway outlets. So as per the current – the Parramatta – the existing Parramatta DCP, one space – sorry – 10 spaces would be required for every  
15 100 square metres of floor space. That would be about 90 spaces if you applied the current DCP parking rate.

Other Transport for New South Wales guidelines – whether it be the – the 2002 RMS  
20 guide or the surveys that were done by Transport in 2016 – again you’d be looking at more than double the number of parking spaces. Applying neighbouring Council DCPs again you’d be looking at three times the number of spaces. So the rate that’s been proposed is significantly lower than any other comparable planning control in the - - -

25 MR WILSON: Isn’t there – isn’t there a reason for that? Isn’t the reason for that the fact that it’s going to be a second – Sydney’s second CBD?

MR MILSTON: Well, exactly, and that – we - - -

30 MR WILSON: And none – none of these – none of these are comparable, but these are comparable to the CBD locations, aren’t they?

MR MILSTON: Well, that’s - - -

35 MR WILSON: It’s just a question, because - - -

MR MILSTON: Yes, yes. No, no. I agree - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

40

MR MILSTON: - - - and I’m – I’m not – I’m not - - -

MR WILSON: If you were to do – if you were to compare apples with apples  
45 wouldn’t you be looking at, sort of, like, fringe areas in Sydney’s CBD or places like that – retail shopping - - -

MR MILSTON: No. Oh, no. What – what we’re trying to demonstrate – what we’re trying to demonstrate here is we are recognising that this site presents an opportunity on the fringe - - -

5 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR MILSTON: - - - of the CBD, hence we’ve produced a – a much lower parking rate.

10 MR WILSON: Sure.

MR MILSTON: Yes. Rather than – rather than saying we should be at 10 we’re saying we’re – we’ve reduced to be in line with its location – strategic location.

15 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR MILSTON: And then just in terms of the consistency with the CBD Planning Proposal and – and the integrated transport plan, it’s – it’s a bit hard to read potentially from your screen but in the draft LEP provisions there’s – there’s a couple of tables in there which – which note the parking rates for different land uses. And they go through, you know, whether it be commercial, residential, child care, etcetera, and – and there’s a rate for retail which is what has been applied – was – which is the rate that I believe that Council initially applied or the Department initially applied, but there’s no actual rate for takeaway, fast food and retail outlets and you can see there’s a note that’s – that’s been highlighted in red and expanded out which says:

*...for any land use not specified in that table a separate report must be prepared to justify the – the – the proposed rate –*

30

effectively. And fast food and takeaway outlets – Melody, if you move to the – to the next slide – are a bespoke land use that have bespoke traffic and parking requirements, as – as you’re probably aware, similar to other land uses such as, you know, seniors living, child care, residential, commercial, etcetera. Transport for New South Wales recognised that. That’s why they’ve done specific surveys of fast food takeaway outlets. They haven’t just lumped it in with retail or lumped it in with commercial. They realise that specific rates are required and, therefore, specific parking rates should be developed for those uses rather than just lumping it in with another – with a retail or commercial or another land use there.

40

MR WILSON: This is despite the move away from retail – fast food takeaway outlets having their own retail rate. My understanding - - -

MR MILSTON: Sorry. Say that again, Chris. I just missed that.

45

MR WILSON: Well – well, my understanding was that the – that – so they weren’t lumping them all in with them but the – the government was adopting a generic rate

for commercial development and that there was no separate fast food takeaway outlet rates proposed to the LEP, is that correct or not correct?

5 MR MILSTON: Not – no. It depends – depends on – depends on the LGA but from a – from government wide – say from Transport for New South Wales, they don't – they don't apply parking rates. It's up to Councils ultimately to do that, as you know, but they provide guidance as to what the traffic requirements would be and the parking requirements would be for different land uses.

10 MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

MR MILSTON: They've got a – a report for retail and they've got separate reports for fast food takeaway, so they recognise there's a difference there.

15 MS A. BROWN: Could I just jump in and make a comment on that. Can everyone hear me?

MR WILSON: Yes. Sure.

20 MS BROWN: Thank you. Alison Brown here. I'm a New South Wales planning manager at Stockland. Just in relation to that point about the categorisation of – of uses for car parking, I guess my observation would be that I guess not many Councils have the rates in LEPs. It tends to be limited to those, you know, CBD type locations. Typically, they – the rates would be in DCPs. So because Parramatta  
25 Council proposes just to basically adopt the City of Sydney CBD parking rates they've just brought them over holus-bolus and, of course, in the Sydney CBD you're not going to be finding takeaway food and drink premises so that's why they haven't gone down to that further level of detail under the Parramatta proposed CBD LEP.

30 But because of the land use definitions it does end up with us being treated in the retail premise land use category which has that very low parking rate of just – of just three spaces. So, you know, we're certainly not saying that Parramatta Council should introduce a rate of – a much higher parking rate for all food and drink  
35 premises – takeaway premises in Parramatta CBD. We're just saying that it – it deserves a consideration of a site-specific rate in this location for the reasons that we've – we've discussed.

40 MR MILSTON: Yes. It deserves a bespoke rate that – that reflects its location but also reflects the fact that it doesn't impact the operation of the road network itself

---

MS BROWN: Yes, yes.

45 MR MILSTON: --- which is the other key point ---

MS BROWN: Thank you, Josh.

MR MILSTON: - - - I think that Transport for New South Wales also made. Yes.

MS BROWN: Yes.

5 MR MILSTON: Thanks, Alison. Yes. That leads to the next one, which is good.  
Parramatta – so Parramatta light rail – that was another point that was made. This is  
more in response to the initial Transport for New South Wales letter that was  
received and – and then we had the meeting subsequent to that. So as I, sort of,  
mentioned already that the site – we note that the site’s already got good accessibility  
10 to the future PLR stop at Prince Alfred Square and that the reduced parking rate for  
the McDonald’s and – and the – the residential also component of the site reflects  
that strong accessibility, hence a halving of the spaces. But as Josh for McDonald’s  
already noted, there’s still going to be a – a level of car reliance to the site, primarily  
because of that trade catchment and primarily because McDonald’s rely – and I’m  
15 moving to the third dot point to start with.

They rely on – on a high reliance of – of passing trade traffic. People already in a  
car, travelling to – whether it be their weekend sport, Bunnings, whatever it might  
be, on the way or on the way home and stopping in at McDonald’s or stopping in at a  
20 fast food restaurant, that accounts for about 50 per cent of – of traffic and that’s  
based on surveys that’s been done from Transport for New South Wales. So people  
are already in the car when they’re – when they’re on their way to McDonald’s.  
They don’t make a specific trip, meaning that it’s – it’s not really feasible for them to  
just – to plan a trip on the light rail in that – in that instance. They’re going – they’re  
25 already on the road network.

Victoria Road is a major – major thoroughfare, a major regional road. It connects up  
to O’Connell Street which has also – with the Church Street closed – become a major  
regional route as well, and people drop in to McDonald’s on the – on the way there  
30 or on the way home. Because of this it actually doesn’t generate more trips on the  
road network. These cars are already on the road. They’re just stopping by to – to  
get their food and drink and then leave and – and – and move on to their next  
destination. A couple of other points to make on this. They – people typically visit  
McDonald’s on the evenings or over the weekends when public transport isn’t as  
35 readily available as it would be at 8 o’clock on a Thursday morning when people are  
travelling to work.

And – and lastly, moving to the first dot point, it’s a family restaurant. You get  
families – you – you get a lot of families that – that – that come here and you don’t –  
40 that 400 metre or 800 metre walking catchment that you typically apply for a public  
transport stop, be a heavy – heavy rail station or a bus stop – that doesn’t apply when  
you’ve got two or three kids and you’re pushing a pram. You need it – you know,  
people rely on cars to get to these types – types of places. So in – in that  
circumstance, PLR will be of some benefit but we can’t rely upon it to meet the  
45 travel needs of customers. It will only be a relatively small benefit for visitors to the  
site.

And then just in summary, this is the last on my slides, effectively we've got a site and – and a park – a bespoke parking rate that's been supported by Council as per their July '20 count – 2020 resolution and also by Transport for New South Wales following our meeting with them on the 30<sup>th</sup> of March and their subsequent letter to the Department on the 1<sup>st</sup> of April there who are both supportive of the parking rate.

5 We're halving the parking – we're halving the number of parking spaces which means traffic from the McDonald's itself is going down by 30 per cent but with no net increase in traffic as a result of the planning proposal, reflecting its strategic location.

10 We've got a significantly reduced parking rate compared to existing planning controls which then doesn't undermine the – the Parramatta ITP or the CBD Planning Proposal given those things that I've talked about. It doesn't increase traffic on the road network. There's no specific rate that has been identified for drive-in food and takeaway premises. The future development proposals would have to then – similar to what we have done – undertake their own bespoke parking assessment to demonstrate the acceptability of their parking – of their parking numbers. We have a demonstrated acceptability because of the – the bespoke traffic modelling and assessment that's been done based on the 30 spaces.

15 They would then have to do the same thing. So it wouldn't undermine or – or set a – set a precedent that would impact the operation of the road network and, as has been mentioned a few times before, there's, you know – this is a unique – a unique site with unique circumstances. It doesn't question the validity of – of Council's controls for other future development sites. And then just lastly on the – on the last point around PLR or light rail, yes, it will improve accessibility but there is a level of car reliance to this site meaning we need a minimum of 30 spaces. That was it from my end. I'm more than happy to take any further questions, Chris.

20 MR WILSON: Oh, okay. No. That's – so there was the – there was the Colston Budd Rogers – that's under Stockland, was it, that report.

25 MR MILSTON: Yes. So I've – I've been supporting Tim Rogers of Colston Budd  
- - -

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

35 MR MILSTON: - - - with this assessment. Yes.

40 MR WILSON: Right. No. I – look, I – I'm still – yes. Look, I understand all that. I'm – I'm just – I just – just want to come back. Can I just come back to the point about the – the – the – the net decrease in traffic generated from the site. So what you're basically saying is that notwithstanding that, yes, there'll be a decrease in traffic generated by McDonald's because there's going to be a 50 per cent drop in –

45 in parking – yes – or - - -

MR MILSTON: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - a 50 – 50 per cent – sorry. So there’s 60 now. There’s going to be 30. But you’re saying that there’ll still be a decrease, notwithstanding that the residential will generate its own – it – it – its own traffic. But because of the use of the PLR and other – because of the mass transit public transport in the locality that they’ll be generally catching those – the mass transit - - -

MR MILSTON: Well, not - - -

MR WILSON: - - - public transport - - -

MR MILSTON: And – and – and the fact that the – that - - -

MR WILSON: - - - or walking – or walking to work.

MR MILSTON: Or – yes. More importantly, you’ve got, you know, Sydney’s second biggest employment centre on their doorstep, yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. Yes. All right. So that – that’s – that’s basically why you can hold your hand on your heart and say, “This is not going to increase traffic”.

MR MILSTON: Yes.

MR WILSON: The – the planning proposal as a whole will not increase traffic generated from the site.

MR MILSTON: Correct. Which is very important with respect to the mesoscopic modelling that’s been undertaken to support the CBD Planning Proposal. So that’s not undermining it in one way at all.

MR WILSON: Okay. No. That’s fine. Is that the end of the presentation?

MS BROWN: Oh, I think we’ve – we’ve just got the - - -

MS POTTER: The isolated - - -

MS BROWN: The slide on isolated sites. If you - - -

MR WILSON: Oh, you may as well talk about it. I – I can’t deny you your opportunity, so - - -

MS BROWN: Oh, thank you.

MR WILSON: - - - you might want to have – you might want to talk about it briefly.

MS BROWN: Chris, Alison Brown again.

MR WILSON: Thanks, Alison.

MS BROWN: Look, we – we don't need to talk about this. We just had the slide in case you had any questions. We were obviously pleased to see that the Department  
5 had agreed with the representations that we had made in the – the gateway review request and that Council had also supported that it was not necessary or desirable to include this site in our site specific planning proposal. The key reason being is that the isolated site will get its uplift anyway through the CBD - - -

10 MR WILSON: Yes.

MS BROWN: - - - Planning Proposal and to include it in ours just captures it in a requirement to do a VPA with that landowner, which is never going to happen because they're going to get their uplift anyway. So it – it – it just seems more  
15 reasonable to – to remove it. We have been required by Council's resolution to include an option where that site is part of the development site in our site specific DCP. So there will be a scenario where we could consolidate with – with that isolated site, but we won't be forced to do so, effectively, through this - - -

20 MR WILSON: Sure.

MS BROWN: Through the – through the site specific planning proposal.

MR WILSON: Okay.  
25

MS BROWN: So we're happy to answer any more questions about that otherwise we'll just - - -

MR WILSON: No, no. We – we acknowledge - - -  
30

MS BROWN: - - - take it as read.

MR WILSON: - - - the department's position on that, so - - -

35 MS BROWN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR WILSON: - - - I'm – I'm not quite sure we need to take the - - -

MS BROWN: Thank you.  
40

MR WILSON: So that's it basically, is it? You – there's nothing else to add?

MS POTTER: That's it for our presentation, yes. Unless there's any questions – I'm happy to take those.  
45

MR WILSON: Jane, do you have anything to add?

MS J. ANDERSON: No. I think – I guess just for our information, if you could clarify – I understand there are 360 apartments proposed. How many associated residential car parking spaces are there in the development?

5 MR WILSON: Oh, well, yes. Could someone – can someone answer that for us? The rates are in the – the rates - - -

MS POTTER: So we've adopted the category A City of Sydney Council rates, which I think is 0.3 for a one bedder, 0.7 - - -

10

MR WILSON: Yes. That's it.

MS POTTER: - - - for a two and one for a three bedroom.

15 MR WILSON: It – it resulted in about two hundred and - - -

MS POTTER: About 263 cars.

MS ANDERSON: Yes. Okay.

20

MR WILSON: Okay. But that's – that's – is that in the AM and PM peak, is that right?

MR MILSTON: No, no. So that's 260 car spaces – physical car spaces.

25

MR WILSON: Right. I'm sorry. Yes, yes. So - - -

MR MILSTON: That - - -

30 MR WILSON: But they won't be – what – what you're saying is that they won't be using those to travel to work necessarily.

MR MILSTON: Yes. What you – yes. What you see typically for residential developments with good access to public transport is people don't – people – people  
35 want car spaces to drive to Bunnings or sports on the weekend but on the weekdays they're generally left on the site because they're walking to work or they're using public transport. They more use it on a discretionary basis, yes, outside - - -

MR WILSON: Okay. So - - -  
40

MR MILSTON: - - - those peak periods.

MR WILSON: - - - what you're saying is that less than 30 of those cars will leave the – leave those spaces in the – in – during - - -

45

MR MILSTON: No.

MR WILSON: - - - the day, is that right? No.

MR MILSTON: No. So – so I can – I can run you through the detailed numbers, Chris. So - - -

5

MR WILSON: I'm just trying to understand the – the fact that the – by reducing the McDonald's parking by - - -

MR MILSTON: Yes.

10

MR WILSON: - - - 30 spots means you're going to have an overall decrease in the traffic generated by the site - - -

MR MILSTON: Because McDonald's - - -

15

MR WILSON: - - - when there's 264 spots and 30 spots - - -

MR MILSTON: Yes. So those 30 – those 30 spots from – at – at the moment, McDonald's generates – oh, I'll just focus on the morning.

20

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: I'm happy to do the afternoon if you want, but - - -

25

MR WILSON: No.

MR MILSTON: - - - in – in the morning McDonald's – the 60 car spaces generates 240 car movements. Right.

30

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: So that's basically one person on average staying every – for 30 minutes on the site.

35

MR WILSON: So they park for 30 minutes. Yes.

MR MILSTON: They park for 30 – they enter the site, they park for 30 minutes and then leave.

40

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: So one – one car space generates four car movements. Yes. With the - - -

45

MR WILSON: I understand.

MR MILSTON: With the 50 per cent reduction in car parking for McDonald's - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: - - - that number reduces by 72 car movements.

5 MR WILSON: So - - -

MR MILSTON: As I said, there's the 30 per cent reduction.

10 MR WILSON: - - - it comes down to about 168 then.

MR MILSTON: Something like that, yes. Exactly. So – but they – they go down by 72. The residential component, there are - - -

15 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: - - - 358 or 360 units. Based on generic Transport for New South Wales surveys – I'd – I'd – I'd suggest this is a conservative assessment, but the survey suggests units' traffic – that the traffic generation of residential units is 0.19 car trips per unit. .19 times 358 gets you 68 car movements from the residential component. So you're adding 68 car movements from the residential component, but the McDonald's component is reducing by 72 - - -

20

MR WILSON: Yes.

25 MR MILSTON: - - - so you get a – a slight net reduction.

MR WILSON: There you go.

30 MR MILSTON: It's more pronounced in the PM peak.

MR WILSON: Four – okay. Excellent. All right.

MR MILSTON: The – that – that – we're more than happy to share that - - -

35 MR WILSON: No. That's okay.

MR MILSTON: - - - assessment with you if you need.

40 MR WILSON: No.

MR MILSTON: That's been – that's been peer reviewed by Transport for New South Wales as well who hasn't - - -

45 MR WILSON: Right. No. I accept that.

MR MILSTON: - - - raised objections for that.

MR WILSON: All right. Thank you. I was just trying to get my mind around it. That's all.

MR MILSTON: Yes, yes.

5

MR WILSON: All right.

MR MILSTON: No. You've got to – yes. The distinction is between car spaces and car movements, so – yes.

10

MR WILSON: Yes. That's right. I – but I guess those – the peak's how long?

MR MILSTON: The one hour peak.

15 MR WILSON: Right. So you only get one movement out of the residence, but one hour peak is – you'll – what you're saying is you'll get four movements, is that right?

MR MILSTON: Well, yes. Well, let's – let's assume you – let's assume there's one car for every unit – which there isn't, but let's assume there is.

20

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: If there was you'd only get one car movement for every five car parking spaces or 0.2, effectively.

25

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MILSTON: From the McDonald's it's the other way around. It's about four car movements from every car space.

30

MR WILSON: Okay. All right.

MR MILSTON: So it's – it's, like, 20 times more because of the – the – the frequent nature of people coming in and out.

35

MR WILSON: Of the frequency of it, yes.

MR MILSTON: Yes.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. Look, I don't have anything else. That's it. So, look, thank you very much for that. It's been – it's been very useful. So thank you for the presentation because it – it – all the questions that I wanted to ask were in there anyway, so that was good. Jane, is that it? So - - -

45 MS ANDERSON: Yes. Nothing else from me, Chris.

MR WILSON: - - - we – we will – we will – we will formally write to the Department and ask for their views on the – on the additional letter from Transport, but that’s not going to slow us down too long, I hope.

5 MS ANDERSON: Chris, I – I guess just to note to the Proponent that we did just receive that additional advice today so - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MS ANDERSON: - - - that’s why we’re only seeking comment from the Department now.

MR WILSON: Yes. So we’ll – we can get that done this afternoon. That’s fine. So how long would we have them, Jane? We don’t have to give them long, do we?  
15 Seven days – is that too long?

MS ANDERSON: I’ll have a chat to – to them but - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.  
20

MS ANDERSON: Yes. I think that should be okay.

MR WILSON: All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

25 MS POTTER: Great. Thanks. Thanks, Chris, and thanks, Jane. Thanks for your time this afternoon.

MS ANDERSON: Thank you.

30 MS POTTER: Thanks, everyone.

MR BANNISTER: Thank you.

MR MILSTON: Thanks, everyone.  
35

MR WILSON: Thank you.

MR ROBILLIARD: Thanks, Jane.

40 MS BROWN: Thanks very much.

MR WILSON: Bye.

MS BROWN: Thanks for the opportunity. Bye.  
45

MS ANDERSON: Thank you, Auscript.

MR WILSON: Thank you. Okay.

**MEETING CONCLUDED**

**[4.44 pm]**