



**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-1434350

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

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

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND  
ENVIRONMENT**

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

**OFFICE OF IPC:**               **JANE ANDERSON**

**DEPARTMENT OF**               **CHRISTINE GOUGH**  
**PETER PHAM**

**LOCATION:**                      **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

**DATE:**                         **2.00 PM, TUESDAY, 13 APRIL 2021**

MR C. WILSON: No, all good. We'll just kick straight off, yes? Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we variously meet today and pay my respects to their elders past and present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Gateway Determination Review of 355  
5 and 375 Church Street, Parramatta.

My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this Commission panel. We are also joined by Jane Anderson, from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of  
10 information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its  
15 advice. It is important for me to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate.

If you are asked questions and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information by you which we will then put on  
20 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 speak over the top of each other.

25 We will now begin.

Just before we start, I think we'll put on record that we note there's some additional information that's come in from Transport to the Department and we have a copy of that advice provided to us yesterday and we've formally sought your comment on  
30 that as of this morning. Have you received that request?

MS C. GOUGH: Yes, we have.

MR WILSON: Okay. So, look, it's my view today that probably – look, it's up to  
35 you. I don't want to put you – I guess – in a position where you necessarily form an opinion on that advice yet, so we're happy to wait if that's the case. If you don't want to discuss it today and want more time to consider it, we accept that. Is that okay?

40 MS GOUGH: Yes. No problem.

MR WILSON: All right. So, look, the agenda's pretty straightforward. The other thing I would just like to mention before we start, I don't think we really need to talk

about condition 1(d). I think everyone's of a mind to accept that. I think the Department's now accepted that 1(d) can be approved, is that correct?

MS GOUGH: Yes, that's right.

5

MR WILSON: Okay. So, look, I don't think we should spend too much time [indistinct] So, Christine, I'll just hand over to you.

MS GOUGH: Sorry, the audio's dropping out. Are you saying condition 1(d) in relation to the isolated site – we don't need to talk about today?

10

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS GOUGH: Yes, that's fine.

15

MR WILSON: Okay. So – now, I hand it over to you, Christine. Just to run past and give us a brief overview of the [indistinct] today.

MS GOUGH: Sure. So Peter Pham is with me as well. So he's the [indistinct]

20

MR WILSON: Yes. Hi, Peter.

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR P. PHAM: So the planning proposal seeks to amend development controls to facilitate a mixed use development at 355 and 375 Church Street, Parramatta.

25

Stockland have requested a review of the conditions for 1(c), which is to remove the proposed car parking rates for the take away food and drink premises with an associated sunset clause.

30

So as part of the – the Gateway review request, we've done some analysis and we believe that the clause should not be removed, purely because, you know, in the context of the Parramatta CBD and the adjacent Parramatta Light Rail stop, we believe that there's potential for a mode shift in the future for public and active transport when it becomes operational in 2023.

35

MS GOUGH: Yes. So – so, we've been holding a consistent policy position on all planning proposals in the CBD since 2016. So when – when these site-specific planning proposals started coming through – Transport and RMS at the time raised some concerns around parking rates and the – and basically not having that underlying analysis and evidence base in terms of, you know, impact on – of the development on the road network. So in 2016 the policy position was taken to implement some fairly stringent parking controls across the CBD which really was there to enable site-specific planning proposals to progress in advance of the CBD planning proposal. That came in in 2016 and we've been upholding that policy position since that time in terms of site-specific planning proposals.

45

So what's happened with this planning proposal is we've had some – a request for an alternative rate and we didn't support that alternative rate – as Peter said – because we'd been upholding that policy position since 2016.

5 So that's where we're at with that. And we're also concerned about the precedent issue and we're also very cognisant of the fact that – as Peter said – that this site is adjacent to the Light Rail – it's adjacent to a new light rail stop – it's on the intersection of two main roads and we believe the policy position should be upheld until such time that maybe the CBD planning proposal has progressed, and we're  
10 getting towards the end of that planning proposal at the time.

And I know that you're asking questions about the Integrated Transport Plan, and the mesoscopic study that's been done to support the CBD PP, and that is required to be submitted to us for finalisation – at finalisation stage of the CBD PP. So, we haven't  
15 had oversight of that at this point in time.

MR WILSON: Okay. That's okay. Just on the precedent issue, Christine, Council was quite adamant that they don't think there's a precedent. Obviously [indistinct] so what's – it's not – is it just a question about a parking rate and the policy position or is it a precedent about a broader precinct – a broader precedent issue than that?  
20

MS GOUGH: It's – it's a precedent in terms of amending the existing policy position prior to the evidence base on the CBD PP coming through. But it's also a more site-specific analysis on the precedent in terms of, well, Council is saying  
25 McDonald's is the only, you know, take away and food premise in the CBD with this kind of issue in terms of having existing parking rates. But we think there's a broader policy issue that we just need to uphold until such time as the CBD PP is progressed.

30 MR WILSON: Right. And the – so in other words the adoption of the City of Sydney CBD rate – is the – sorry, Parramatta CBD proposal adopts the same parking rate for retail or commercial [indistinct] that [indistinct] CBD does, is that right?

MS GOUGH: That's – that's correct, and that - - -  
35

MR WILSON: It's quite low.

MS GOUGH: That's right. And our position was taken to enable the site-specific planning proposal to progress in advance of the CBD planning proposal because at  
40 the time, the evidence base - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

MS GOUGH: - - - in terms of the proposed transport plan and the mesoscopic  
45 model had not been completed.

MR WILSON: Right. Okay.

MS GOUGH: And that – the original advice we got from Transport, when we talked about this rezoning review, was that they were happy to support our position because they knew that evidence base and that work is being finalised at the moment to support the CBD PP.

5

MR WILSON: Okay. Another issue that was raised yesterday, was it yesterday – yes, yesterday, was the view, and it's the Applicant's view and I think it's – it's the Applicant's view that notwithstanding the Light Rail, which is coming right next door to McDonald's, it's unlikely that will generate increased – increased  
10 movements for McDonald's in the short and immediate term. Is that something you subscribe to or - - -

MS GOUGH: No, I don't think so. Because what we're trying to do here is grow the second city.

15

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS GOUGH: We're trying to deliver the second city, an essential city – of the city, the Central City. You know, Light Rail has been heavily invested in. It's going to  
20 connect Westmead up with the CBD and Carlingford. There's a very defined vision for Parramatta and the CBD and that's what we're trying to deliver.

25

MR WILSON: Okay. On that note, as you're aware, there was an original [indistinct] panel - - -

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - the under the utilisation of the site.

30

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: So where we sort of – I'm in a sort of juxtaposition where we've got one site, now, which could be realised but may not be realised because of not applicability of the [indistinct] - - -

35

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: Do you see what I'm saying? Is there sort of – are we sort of stuck in this sort of balancing one against the other now?

40

MS GOUGH: Correct.

MR WILSON: The Applicant – the Applicant's sort of saying, well, if we can't maintain some traffic through – through that site, then we will just continue and we'll  
45 just continue. Whether it's – you know, whether it occurs - - -

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - or not, but they'll just continue that – to run a 40-year-old McDonald's on the site.

MS GOUGH: Yes.

5

MR WILSON: Is that the sort of [indistinct] where we're trying to balance – trying to balance – you know, get in, utilise the site in the CBD as opposed to maintaining, sort of, McDonald's – a 40-year-old McDonald's on the site?

10 MS GOUGH: Well, I certainly think there's a – there's a vision to realise development on the site in terms of – particularly under the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

15

MS GOUGH: - - - [indistinct] there. I think the policy position and the tension that we have at the moment is that site-specific versus broader - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

20

MS GOUGH: - - - you know, planning outcomes, and that's always been a bit of a tension in terms of how to – how to manage those outcomes. Look - - -

MR WILSON: Christine, I think - - -

25

MS GOUGH: - - - I think that's why we're here today, because, yes, yes.

MR WILSON: Yes. I understand it. So, but – Christine, the incentives that are applied to that site, they're reasonably generous in terms of uplift, aren't they?

30

MS GOUGH: Absolutely, yes.

MR WILSON: So, you know, I guess something else we've got to consider is, you know, Stockland sort of – some agreement with McDonald's [indistinct] might be but McDonalds is the – the landowner, would be the subsequent beneficiary of that [indistinct] - - -

35

MS GOUGH: Yes, absolutely. And – that's right. Yes.

40 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS GOUGH: So – but we – we're not privy to their financial - - -

MR WILSON: I understand that.

45

MS GOUGH: - - - or economic appraisals so we – based on a policy – planning policy position.

MR WILSON: Yes. Yes. But we did ask the question because Council accepted McDonalds' argument that it wouldn't be viable at 20 or at three in terms of the parking rate. Yet 30 is acceptable and I guess we're just trying to understand what that feasibility issue really is.

5

MS GOUGH: Yes, and I mean – can't answer that, I'm sorry.

MR WILSON: Yes. No. I appreciate that [indistinct] we did ask the question the other day. Okay. So, look, so there's that – so in terms of – I understand the policy position, but in terms of the Integrated Transport Plan.

10

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: There were concerns, I think, in your justification report, you said that that was one of the reasons it shouldn't – shouldn't proceed. Is that more about – is that more about a vision of – or sort of influencing [indistinct]?

15

MS GOUGH: It's – it's more to do – we haven't seen the Integrated Transport Plan.

MR WILSON: Okay.

20

MS GOUGH: We haven't – it hasn't been – it hasn't – it's a condition on the CBD planning proposal that it's submitted to us at finalisation stage. So Council's working on that at the moment and we'll be able to see that at finalisation and they've been working very closely with Transport on it, as I understand it - - -

25

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS GOUGH: - - - in that – the traffic – the traffic team, so it is coming together but we haven't seen it yet.

30

MR WILSON: What is the status of the CBD planning proposal?

MS GOUGH: Council's working through the submissions they received during the exhibition process, and we have recently received a Gateway alteration request that statements that they are looking to report the CBD – CBD PP to Council in May with submission to us - - -

35

MR WILSON: Okay.

40

MS GOUGH: - - - by June.

MR WILSON: Okay. All right. And what would happen if – so if this wasn't [indistinct] this – this planning proposal, the site would include all those provisions that are in this planning proposal in the CBD planning proposal - - -

45

MS GOUGH: That's correct.

MR WILSON: - - - except for – except for [indistinct]

MS GOUGH: Correct.

5 MR WILSON: Parking [indistinct] okay. All right. [indistinct] that's why it's proceeding to run before them - - -

MS GOUGH: Yes. Yes, that's right.

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

MS J. ANDERSON: I don't think so, Chris. I think the Department's position is clear and, yes, it would be great to just receive that formal response to our request. But other than that, I don't think I have any further questions today.

15

MS GOUGH: Okay. So, we'll – we'll get a formal response to you on that letter. Just from our perspective, we weren't involved in that meeting that was held, so we're not – we have to get – to do a bit more background and find out when - - -

20 MR WILSON: And we appreciate that.

MS GOUGH: Yes.

25 MR WILSON: And come back [indistinct] given it may have some indication for [indistinct]

MS GOUGH: Yes. But I mean – yes. Okay. We'll get back to you.

30 MR WILSON: Yes. Yes. But don't – I understand – I understand what your policy position is and that you're maintaining that policy position and we'll – obviously we'll consider that. But apart from that, I'm not quite sure that there's a lot we can actually talk about more – talk about today in relation to [indistinct] - - -

35 MS GOUGH: Well, we're happy to reconvene at a later day if that's required. That's fine.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. Look, I mean, a lot of the – a lot of the arguments for the parking rate is the – is that there will be a lesser impact on the road – sorry, a reduced impact on the road network from fully developed planning proposal – in other words, I'm just trying to get my head around this, is that if you decrease the parking by at least 50 per cent, which is what they're proposing, obviously the proposal will increase it much more, but if you decrease it by 50 per cent, but you still end up with a – a significant reduction – maybe not significant – but a reduction in overall traffic generation from the site.

45

MS GOUGH: Yes.

MR WILSON: So this is what I'm trying to get my head around. So you've got a 40-year-old McDonald's on the site that's generating X, Y, Z.

MS GOUGH: Yes.

5

MR WILSON: And then you've got a proposal that's going to have 350 units with 260 spaces, might generate – you know, each might generate – peak hour movement, and the way it was explained to us is that you've got a McDonald's which even with 30 parking spaces, is going to be generating two or three movements per hour, is that right, Jane?

10

MS ANDERSON: Yes. I think it's – it's currently 63 parking spaces and if it goes down to 30 - - -

15 MR WILSON: Yes.

MS ANDERSON: - - - that's obviously a huge reduction and – yes, every space, I think it was four movements per hour.

20 MR WILSON: I understand that's site-specific [indistinct] technical assessment. It's not necessarily [indistinct] representative policy position but - - -

MS GOUGH: Yes. And I – I think we also need to go back to what we're trying to – to achieve in terms of the vision for the Central City and while McDonald's are saying that they need this car parking, I think, you know, Parramatta CBD is evolving and once those car parking spaces are there, they'll be there forever and, you know, there's not many – we did a bit of research – I don't think there's many McDonald's in CBD locations throughout Sydney that have 30 car parking spaces in central city or Chatswood or any of the big CBDs.

25  
30

MR WILSON: In one of your reports, Christine, it was mentioned that, you know, you can leave the parking open for the developers to utilise as a – as they see fit. What – what was the thinking behind that?

35 MS GOUGH: Well, there's a total cap of car parking - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS GOUGH: - - - [indistinct] CBD, and the CBD rates, so whatever the total cap is. They can allocate that parking however they choose, so they can take some residential car parking away and put it into the McDonald's. We're agnostic to that. It's just we believe that the cap should be maintained until we, you know – well, the original position of Transport was at least until the CBD PP has progressed - - -

45 MR WILSON: Sure.

MS GOUGH: - - - and we have a better understanding of the Integrated Transport Plan and mesoscopic study.

5 MR WILSON: Okay. I mean, and that sort of – I mean, they argue also that, I guess, that residential component – that no one – very few people would be using the cars, on the residential - - -

MS GOUGH: Very – very few people will be using cars?

10 MR WILSON: During week days, yes. Weekends will be different. Anyway - - -

MS GOUGH: Okay.

15 MR WILSON: That's what was stated - - -

MS GOUGH: Yes. Okay. That's fine.

20 MR WILSON: Yes. But that – but that – I guess that would – that tends to add weight to what you're saying is that, you know, if there – if the residential components are going to be under-utilised in terms of parking movements, you know, you might be able to allocate [indistinct]

MS GOUGH: That's right. Yes.

25 MR WILSON: Anyway. I mean, that's something we will consider. All right. I don't think there's anything else – look, I appreciate your time and, maybe you're right, maybe we need to reconvene, depending on what's provided from your information - - -

30 MS GOUGH: Okay.

MR WILSON: Is that all right?

35 MS GOUGH: Yes. Sounds great.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS GOUGH: Thanks Chris. Thanks.

40 MR WILSON: Thank you, I appreciate it.

MS ANDERSON: Thank you both.

45 MS GOUGH: Okay. Bye. Thanks.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[2.20 pm]**