



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: TRINITY LIGHTHOUSE BUILD-TO-RENT, NORTH RYDE
(SSD-55844212)**

STAKEHOLDER MEETING

PANEL:	SUELLEN FITZGERALD (CHAIR) MICHAEL CHILCOTT BRONWYN EVANS
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	BRADLEY JAMES GEOFF KWOK
STAKEHOLDER:	NEV GOODYER (Stockland Neighbours Action Group)
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	10:00AM – 10:30AM TUESDAY, 17th JUNE 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD: Hello, Mr Goodyer. We've got your name up, but no visual as yet. Have we got any sound from you, Mr Goodyer?

MR NEV GOODYER: [Unintelligible 00:00:42]

MS FITZGERALD: We can just hear you. Hello, good morning. Great. We can just hear your voice.

MR GOODYER: Now, I'm using these headphones because that might stop ...

MS FITZGERALD: That's good, that's good, Mr Goodyer. That's absolutely fine, we can hear you loud and clear. Thank you for joining. We'll make intros in just a second.

But I'd like to kick off with a brief opening statement. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Wangal land here in the inner west, and I acknowledge the traditional owners and lands from which we virtually meet today, and pay our respects to their Elders.

Mr Goodyer, my name is Suellen Fitzgerald. I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel. And joining me are my fellow commissioners Mr Michael Chilcott.

MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT: Good morning.

MS FITZGERALD: And Dr Bronwyn Evans.

DR BRONWYN EVANS: Good morning.

MS FITZGERALD: We're also joined by Brad James and Geoff Kwok from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

As you're aware, due to there being only one registered speaker, yourself, the Commission has decided not to proceed with the public meeting for this Triniti Lighthouse Build-to-Rent, North Ryde State Significant Development Application (number SSD-55844212) which is currently before this Commission Panel for determination. We thought it was appropriate to meet separately and hear your views on the application, as you had expressed your interest to speak at the public meeting.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of today's information, this meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the committee's website.

We've set aside about 20 minutes today to hear your views and allow the Commission to ask any questions. So, over to you, let's begin. You have a presentation, Mr Goodyer?

MR GOODYER: Yes. Am I able to share my screen?

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, please do.

MR GOODYER: I'll share screen, okay, and I want to share ...

MS FITZGERALD: Great, that's it, we're – we've got your shared screen.

MR GOODYER: For some reason, I can't get it to start because the menu above it. I'll just put there and then ... Maybe I can do that. Yes, okay.

MS FITZGERALD: Great. That's it, that's good, thank you.

MR GOODYER: I did send a copy, but I've changed it a little bit since then. So, I do want to thank the Panel and acknowledge the process. There are a lot of Chinese residents in Ryde Gardens who are quite stunned by the consultation and the transparency of this whole process. They understand, as in China, we just have [unintelligible 00:04:22]. They're very appreciative and, yes, so I'll just rabbit on, if that's okay. I was going to – yes, and if you would just butt in and ask questions, that would be great.

MS FITZGERALD: Thank you.

MR GOODYER: The talking points here are the four steps of the Tenacity view loss. Whether or not this is a “skilled design”. Clause 6.9 which I see now has been repealed, and I'm thinking it might be replaced by 7.7. The cumulative effects of the rezoning, the TOD two towers which are just to the east of this building, so behind that shot. And the response to submissions, which – whether or not it's sufficient.

So, I'll start right there. Where this pink is larger than the original, and the blue is smaller. So, this is the amended plans from Stockland. Basically, there's an insignificant change here as far as the residents of Ryde Gardens are concerned, if that makes any sense.

The location of the camera for this is here on Level 17. You can see the wide angle there of the building. This is actually a very wide angle shot; you can see that by the horizon dipping down a bit, so there is some distortion. I'll go into that a little bit more later.

I don't know whether the video will play for you, but it's just a sunset from my window.

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, we're getting that.

MR GOODYER: Yes. With the yellow line here marking where Stockland's block will be. The two 95-metre blocks that have come in since Stockland's

application, so this is key site 12 and key 13, will roughly be over here. But they'll just only take a portion of the view, so they are fine as far as residents. So, that's view sharing, in our attitude.

5 The view that just about everybody has extends further up here to Killara, to the city, ANZAC Bridge, and right around to Gladesville Bridge.

And so, if we start with step 1, that's really the view that's going to be impacted. For me, it's sort of only a partial, I'm at the north end of the building so it's only a partial – well, it's more than 50% of my view that would be gone.

10

I did my little bit for the housing crisis a few years ago when I sold my three-bedroom home to a family with four kids. And I looked around for a place where I could view the sunrise and the moonrise and some storms and things like that. So, when I checked with the Council, they said 37 metres, 12 floors, unlikely to reach 12 floors because of the 2:1 floor ratio.

15

If we look at Tenacity step 2, all these units just have one outlook. When looked from close to the window, you've got a wide view, you know, maybe 160 degrees or so. If you're further back in the unit, you've got a very narrow view, and the proposal would block out that whole view there. Yes, it would block out the horizon.

20

The images that are taken for Stockland's view loss sheet are probably taken from these Real Estate or Domain.com ads. Whoops, sorry, I went two there. So, the units, I am actually over here, the outlines there, camera 3 which we'll see the shots from, and camera 2 in the next images.

25

The units below the red line here were always going to lose their view of the horizon. And there are 10 floors here now who will, because of clause 6.9. That's 6 units per floor, so a 60-unit block.

30

As I was saying, there's a huge variety of residents here. So, people that came to the meetings were first-home buyers, a couple of young families, there's downsizers like myself, and lots of renters.

35

Now, step 3. These are the images taken from Level 22. You can see it's taken with a normal lens. But the images taken from Level 17 are much wider angle. So, if I make the lenses equal, it means that the Stockland block almost obliterates the view from units that are in the centre there, that's camera 3, which is the lower image here. If that makes sense. So, a view loss which is almost total.

40

And the fourth step, as I understand it, would be whether or not the development is complaint. And it seems there are some issues with compliance. Clause 6.9 issues, transfer of gross floor area and parking.

45

So, the question is whether the view loss is devastating, as our town planner – so, as a group of residents, we commissioned Chapman Planning to get an

independent view because we haven't got town planning skills. And their conclusion was that the view loss is devastating. Stockland's conclusion is the view loss is moderate.

5 The other question is whether or not this design is skilled, when it actually goes out to the absolute maximum of the setbacks which are allowed. The statement in their response to submissions, that this is a "mid-distance townscape element," maybe I've got that out of context, but it doesn't appear that way to us.

10 Am I going too fast or is it ...?

MS FITZGERALD: No, that's good.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** That's fine, thank you.

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, we have had a chance to look at it beforehand, so you're taking us through it well. Thank you.

20 **MR GOODYER:** So, I've just realised that this is now, I think, clause 7.7. In amongst Stockland's plans, they seem to already be anticipating the 1 Epping Road block I think is a Goodman Building, it's the old Microsoft Building, also rising up to 20 floors.

25 So, it seems that this clause has a subjective element about it. Maybe commercial is not so subjective. I would think "commercial" would be people arriving in the morning. Because in fact the trains here are already full for many residents at peak hour, where they have to wait for another train because it's so packed from the stations further down the line. If this was "commercial", there would be lots of people coming off the train, making room for those residents to embark.

30 I know that Ryde Council asked for an Operational Management Plan, and I couldn't see one in the amended plans. And Ryde Council's point was whether this development contributed to GDP, so that ... If build-to-rent is deemed "commercial", then we've got the other clauses.

35 It appears now that in 7.7, this has been softened just a little bit in the detail [unintelligible 00:13:00] part (c) needs to be satisfied, and these are the bits which are a bit subjective. Recreation area – you'll see in later slides that Stockland is working on the original plan for a recreational area around key site 13. Can you see my mouse at all?

40 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, we can. Thank you.

45 **MR GOODYER:** And that area has now moved over to here with 0.3 hectares. So, this diagram comes from the Urban Design Network Map. So, it's smaller and it's now got to service two 95-metre blocks as well as possibly Stockland. Now, in Stockland's amended plans have got 500–600 square metres of recreational area here along – that's Rivett Road actually, but anyway. That'll be in shade for all the

winter because there's about 4 floors to the north there and about 15 floors here to the western side. But they've got nice images of it and there's a little pathway around it, but it's quite a small area.

5 The other areas that Stockland talk about, because they talk about nearly 3,000 metres of recreation area. But a lot of that is on Level 3 and Level 10, so whether or not it's public or not, if it is public, whether the public would actually know that they could use it, is another issue.

10 So, recreational area, I guess, that's for the Panel to decide whether that's sufficient.

The other condition is connectivity. And the east-west connectivity here is through the service road. I'm not sure if they plan a footpath somewhere here. The exit from the shop carpark is here. There is a waste loading area here, substation here, some wind screens here. The route would be convoluted along here [audio glitch 00:15:25] connectivity area.

I've just got a message on my screen about the sound. Is it still working for you?

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, it is.

DR EVANS: It's come back.

25 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, yes, there was a little bit of breakage, but it's good.

MR GOODYER: Fabulous. Thank you. Another point is the density of the area, which is now even higher than what was on exhibition for the TOD rezoning. The exhibition had, I think, 9 floors here and 18 over here, and there's now both over 30. So, there are an awful lot of homes here.

I'm not sure whether they're counting the existing NBH Building here of four huge blocks, and there's lots of construction over here in neighbourhood 6. So, all of this area is using the metro, the light rail, and as I say, there's already congestion there.

I've noted on here the angle of view loss using this diagram. So, the centre of block A here, I can see that the Stockland block A is blocking out, again, roughly 90 degrees.

40 So, then we got onto number 1 Epping Road. Stockland has got this diagram in their Architectural Design Report. And it appears that Goodman is – if the clause 6.9 or 7.7 is granted, then Goodman will use the same to rise their building. I think they would demolish and build again. It appears at least they've made some attempt at a skilled design here, where some of the building, Ryde Garden Building B, residents would be able to – this would be at a greater distance than this block here.

Oh yes, the main amendment that Stockland made was to their Building C to allow sunlight into this park area. Well, that park is no longer there, it's moved to this eastern side of the roundabout. So, maybe they could put some more bulk over on the western side, on the eastern side of their block, if clause 6.9 was [unintelligible 00:18:18].

Getting close to the end now. I'm not the only one who's raising these sorts of issues. If I look at the response to submissions, I see that DPHI have got most of these issues. In fact, they do not believe the proposal satisfies 6.9. They're questioning the transfer of gross floor area, and so on. Ryde Council have quite a few issues, which I'm sure you're aware of.

The Government Architect, and of course our town planner, which is Chapman Planning, their conclusion was that the amended development seeks the benefit of incentive density bonuses without providing the necessary open space and access links, as detailed within their submission. This in turn results in expansive tower footprints on the site which contribute to devastating view loss impact to surrounding properties.

So, this is sunrise from my unit. Again, this is a winter sunrise, with the sun rising down here. Summer sunrises are up here. Yes, I'm one of these people who spends a bit of time staring out the window watching the weather. And that's it from me, really.

I've created a website for the residents of the area here, so that they can try and distil some of that mass of information. So, there's a link to it there, and of which you will already have if you've got my slide. So, that's my ...

I've got a couple questions, if you are able. I understand you probably can't answer questions specific to this plan, but maybe if there is more time, I would – actually, [unintelligible 00:20:26] ...

MS FITZGERALD: If you can stop sharing. And Mr Goodyer, this really is an opportunity for us to hear from you. The Office can answer a question about what happens next or the timing or the steps and so on, but it's not appropriate to ask questions about the content of the proposal at this point.

MR GOODYER: Oh, yes. I guess, my first question would be that those clause 6.9 – would it be – now, the proposal was lodged in the days of clause 6.9, would it be judged under that clause, or would it be judged under the present?

MS FITZGERALD: Mr Goodyer, can I refer you to the Department's Assessment Report, which outlines what the appropriate town planning arrangements are for that. The Assessment Report by the Department is one of the many bits of information that we've been considering in this determination.

MR GOODYER: All right. Yes. All right. Now, this development is not in one of the key sites, so it's virtually judged on the current E2 laws. Yes. I don't think

you'll be able to answer questions. I will go and look at that other report, I have looked at it but I haven't seen the actual answers that I was looking for.

5 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, okay. Well, that's one of the key bits of information that we're relying on, along with the submissions from the Department and submissions such as the Chapman submission that you mentioned, your own, and the submissions indeed that are coming in from other residents right now.

10 I think the Commission is closing submissions on the 23rd of this month. We have your presentation and your previous submissions. If you would like to make further submissions, by all means you can until the 23rd.

15 **MR GOODYER:** Yes, I'll make a submission which is basically this PowerPoint with some additional ...

MS FITZGERALD: Great. Okay, that's good. Panel members, do you have any questions for Mr Goodyer based on the information he provided. Michael, anything from you?

20 **MR CHILCOTT:** No. I just wanted to thank Mr Chapman – sorry, Mr Goodyer, and I understand you've taken a bit of time and effort to do this, it's been helpful, it's given us some useful matters that we will need to consider, you've highlighted those, and whilst many of them would be part of what we normally do, I'm very grateful that you've taken the time to provide the input you have.

25 **MR GOODYER:** That's the beauty of being retired.

MR CHILCOTT: Say that again, I'm sorry, Mr Goodyer.

30 **MR GOODYER:** That's the beauty of being retired.

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, although not all retirees can do such great PowerPoint presentations. Bronwyn, anything for Mr Goodyer before we close up?

35 **DR EVANS:** No. I'll just echo your and Michael's comments. Thank you very much, that was very helpful just to put – the way you've put the presentation together and the way you've distilled the information. So, thank you.

40 **MR GOODYER:** This is a mass of documentation. I've got to say that the procedure is incredibly comprehensive. Stockland would have spent thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars so far, I think.

45 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, there's certainly a lot of material and process, as you say. So, thank you again. We really appreciate the effort you've put in, and taking the time to come and speak to us this morning. Thank you.

MR GOODYER: I would like to thank you, and thanks to your Panel as well, and to everybody, and the process.

MS FITZGERALD: Thank you.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

5

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you, Mr Goodyer.

MS FITZGERALD: Bye.

10

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED