



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: 50 BOTANY STREET, BONDI JUNCTION (PP 2024-104) –
GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW**

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: JULIET GRANT (CHAIR)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRADLEY JAMES
CALLUM FIRTH

**WAVERLEY COUNCIL
REPRESENTATIVES:** FLETCHER RAYNER
TIM SNEESBY
PATRICK HAY

HillPDA: CATHERINE HUYNH

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 2:00PM – 2:45PM
MONDAY, 30th JUNE 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS CATHERINE HUYNH: Good afternoon.

MR BRADLEY JAMES: Hi.

MS JULIET GRANT: Can you hear us in the Council room, can you hear us?

[All say “we can”]

MS GRANT: Excellent. Hello.

MR PATRICK HAY: You can hear us?

MS GRANT: Perfect.

MR HAY: Excellent.

MS GRANT: Are you expecting your councillors to join you in that room, Fletcher, or are they ...?

MR FLETCHER RAYNER: No, the joining room only.

MS GRANT: Okay.

MR RAYNER: I guess, if they haven’t joined us within a reasonable period, it would be fine to proceed.

MS GRANT: Okay. Well, I can start the introductory statement and then if they jump in midway. Okay.

Well, good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands from which we virtually meet today, and I pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the gateway review request for the planning proposal PP 2024-104 at 50 Botany Street, Bondi Junction currently before the Commission for advice. The planning proposal seeks to rezone part of 50 Botany Street, Bondi Junction from SP2 Infrastructure (Telecommunications) to R3 Medium Density Residential, introduce a minimum lot size control of 232 square metres, remove a redundant local heritage listing, and commit the collection of affordable housing contributions.

My name is Juliet Grant and I’m the Chair of this single-member Commission Panel. I am also joined by Brad James and Callum Firth from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's 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 part one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice.

I may need to ask questions to clarify issues. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which will then be put on our website.

I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript.

We will now begin. If I could just ask each member joining from Council to please introduce yourself and, if applicable, provide any verbal declaration or actual or potential personal interests that you may have in this project. Thank you.

MR RAYNER: Thanks, Juliet, I'll kick off. I'm Fletcher Rayner, Director of Planning, Sustainability and Compliance, and I have no conflict.

MR TIM SNEESBY: Hi Juliet. Tim Sneesby, Manager of Strategic Planning, and I have no conflicts of interest.

MR HAY: Patrick Hay, Senior Strategic Planner, no conflicts of interest.

MS GRANT: Thank you. And your HillPDA colleagues?

MS HUYNH: Catherine Huynh, Senior Consultant with the HillPDA, and I also have no conflict. Thank you.

MS GRANT: Terrific. Thank you. You guys have got a presentation, I believe. Thank you for sending that through. Did you want to share that or just talk me through – I've got a printed copy, so whatever suits you.

MR HAY: Yes, I will share, I think that will be preferable, and we'll just run through. There's only a handful of slides, but we thought that'd be useful just to inform the discussion points you put on the agenda. I will just share my screen, just bear with me. You can see the PowerPoint?

MS GRANT: Yes.

MR HAY: Okay. I too would like to acknowledge the traditional owners, the Bidiagal, Birrabirragal and Gadigal people, and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

As I mentioned, we've just put together a few slides just to recap and provide an overview on the key points raised in the agenda for today's meeting. Specifically with

regard to the policy settings around the affordable housing contribution obligations, the feasibility study that was undertaken as part of the planning proposal, the statutory side of things in relation to the affordable housing contributions, and Council's role throughout the planning proposal process and as our previously delegated plan making authority.

So, the Waverley Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme, which we call the AHCS, was instigated quite a number of years ago. Initially it was actually first exhibited in 2020, but the final current version with us now was adopted in 2023. This scheme establishes the need for the provision of affordable housing the Waverley LGA and sets the policy settings for ways in which Council can obtain contributions in order to increase the stock of affordable housing.

This policy document was implemented in a planning sense by the Waverley AHCS Implementation Planning Proposal and that was initiated originally in 2021. It took a number of years working with the Department to finalise that planning proposal. And that implemented two different aspects of the scheme. The first was a 1% broad based affordable housing contribution for certain development types in the Waverley LGA, so that includes development paths such as residential flat buildings, multi-unit dwellings, seniors housing, and shop-top housing.

The planning proposal also proposed to introduce a clause and a schedule which would implement the aspect of the policy regarding to capturing contribution for planning proposals that received uplift. And the proposed clause and schedule was deferred in the final making of the plan, by the Department of Planning, only on the basis that we didn't at the time have any relevant planning proposal sites to lift, and they didn't like putting in blank schedules into LEP. So, that was deferred until a suitable planning proposal was basically ready to implement that part of the planning proposal.

The policy document, the AHCS itself, sets a case-by-case approach to planning proposal sites that receive uplift. So, that's where we would go in and have a look at what a feasible amount is for that site. And with a general target and a maximum of a 10% contribution on that site as well.

In the context of our assessment of this planning proposal when it was lodged by the Proponent, in terms of the policy setting and the strategic merit aspect, we believe that the various objectives and planning priorities and actions throughout the different strategic documents both at a state level and at a council/local government level, that providing an appropriate contribution towards affordable housing in line with Council's AHCS, was a key aspect of demonstrating strategic merit for this planning proposal. And we have discussed that in the planning proposal itself and also in the submission we previously provided before the meeting.

In terms of the feasibility process which I briefly mentioned on the last slide, in the first instance, we believe the site is receiving a value uplift by the potential rezoning. Whilst there isn't a proposal to change the development standards, the current zoning of the site being that special infrastructure zoning is a low value use, particularly with the types of uses that can occur there. And if it were to be rezoned to a residential

zoning, that there would be a value uplift created. So, as a result of that, we believe that an affordable housing contribution in line with our AHCS is appropriate.

5 When the planning proposal was submitted by the Proponent, a contribution towards affordable housing was mentioned as one of the objectives of the proposal. No suggested amount was provided, and no feasibility study accompanied the submission of the proposal. So, following discussions with the Proponent in the early stages, we proceeded to undertake a request for quotations for suitable consultants, and that's where HillPDA was selected based on the criteria that was set to undertake that
10 feasibility study.

As part of the assessment and HillPDA having done these sorts of things before, the approach to undertaking the feasibility study was undertaken in line with the relevant state guidelines around how these sorts of studies occur. In order to get a better
15 detailed idea around costings in the first instance, Council also employed a subcontractor quantity surveyor to undertake more detailed analysis, which fed into the feasibility study that HillPDA undertook.

20 As you probably saw in our submission, with the detailing around dates and the different activities that occurred, we've been very transparent, open and honest with the Proponent throughout the process, giving them many opportunities to input into the study, review the outputs of the study, and we met with them on several occasions. So, Council, from our aspect, we believe we've acted in good faith throughout the process.

25 To the contrary, one of our, I suppose, points is that the Proponent has perhaps been a little bit inconsistent throughout, particularly with regards to providing unjustified offers for monetary amounts with regards to a contribution that they would prefer, or a contribution they'd prefer to pay. And that was detailed in our submission, in the first instance, the \$100,000 without an adequate justification of costings. There was also a
30 sort of one-time offer that occurred in a meeting of \$500,000 that was a take-it-or-leave-it, which was subsequently withdrawn. And then you probably see now later in the piece, they're suggesting that it's not feasible to pay a contribution at all.

35 So, there have been a lot of contradictions from the Proponent's side. Another aspect to that point is their costings around demolition and construction. One of the key aspects was the Proponent suggested that they pay to remove the existing large telecommunications tower on the site. We've asked them on multiple occasions to provide evidence to that effect, and they've not been willing to do. So, there's been a present unwillingness from their end to be open and transparent as Council has tried to
40 be throughout the feasibility study process and the planning process itself.

45 In terms of the statutory side of affordable housing contributions or being able to apply a contribution for this planning proposal, because this is one of the points that the Proponent questioned in their request for a gateway review. Section 7.32 of the EP&A Act allows for contributions to be levied where a state environmental policy identified the need for affordable housing, and that identified through the Housing SEPP and our LGA is encapsulated as part of that, and I believe actually all of New South Wales is, there's a need for affordable housing. And generally, those are implemented through

an LEP clause. As I suggested before or I discussed before, that planning proposal in the first instance implemented the 1% broad-based contribution for all development paths across the LGA, and the planning proposal aspect.

5 So, from an ability to be able to apply a contribution on this planning proposal, we have proposed to activate that deferred clause and therefore list the subject site as part of that new schedule, which was an approach that was supported by the Department in that planning proposal, but simply deferred as I previously mentioned.

10 But this way of applying it in the LEP is completely consistent with how this has been done in other LEPs, and the City of Sydney is a good example of that, where they have a very similar clause relating to planning proposal sites and an existing schedule with a number of different sites on there already. So, I suppose it's not a new thing; we're not reinventing the wheel, and we're consistent with previous approaches throughout
15 Greater Sydney at least.

There was a point on the agenda with regards to the relationship between the DA and the planning proposal stage. Our AHCS specified that the Proponent, they were subject to a higher rate as part of a planning proposal, would not be also subject to the 1%
20 broad-based rate. So, whatever the contribution percentage that potentially would be lifted on this site, if the plan was made out as we suggested, is what they would pay, and the 1% would not be applied on top of that. That would be listed in the LEP, it'd be assessed as part of a future development application, as it would with any other clause in the LEP, and then it wouldn't be applied as a condition of consent.

25 And the Applicant could either pay by financial contribution, or they could provide an in-kind physical contribution in terms of dedicated stock to Council in perpetuity. And the fulfilment of that only to occur at Occupation Certificate stage. So, there's no, I suppose impetus early in the development process for the developer.

30 In terms of our role, there was some points made by the Proponent in their submission that Council's mischaracterised the planning proposal by proposing the site-specific contribution in the LEP, and that we've altered it in some way compared to how that was lodged.

35 It's standard practice for councils to take carriage of a planning proposal, is just in the LEP making guidelines, that the types of things that the planning proposal authority can do, and so we have taken their high-level commentary or objective around affordable housing contribution and, as I mentioned, as part of our assessment,
40 suggested that the appropriate way to apply that in the planning proposal is via that site-specific deferred clause that we've mentioned. So, we're not doing anything unordinary here, it's common practice for planning proposals to take a different shape as they move forward upon the initial submission.

45 As we mentioned in our submission, and also a bit of a strange circumstance where the Department initially didn't grant the gateway review to proceed but then have consequently gone back and changed that decision. We've already fulfilled all the

steps that we would have undertaken – or should have undertaken had this gateway review not gone ahead.

5 So, if the gateway determination stands as is, the Council's ready to work with the Parliamentary Counsel to finalise the plan and finalise the planning proposal in itself. So, yes, we're certainly, from our end, acting in good faith to progress the planning proposal as best as possible throughout.

10 Just in terms of some concluding points. I think it's quite clear that we've established the need throughout the preparation and implementation of our AHCS that there is a genuine need for affordable housing in the Waverley LGA. As I said, a key aspect of our assessment from the strategic merit aspect, is providing a contribution in line with our affordable housing contribution scheme. We've been as transparent as possible with the Proponent and worked as collaboratively as we could.

15 Obviously, we've read the Department's assessment of this gateway review and noting they previously supported our AHCS planning proposal, that we agree with their assessment and think the planning proposal should proceed as what's submitted and the gateway was originally initiated.

20 And as a final point, the gravity of whatever the decision is around this is quite important in the context of our AHCS and other councils seeking to apply these sorts of policies in being able to undertake a rigorous process and apply a contribution in a way that facilitates contributions moving forward in the LEP, which is a really good strong way of doing it.

25 And that's all we have in terms of our presentation, so, yes, we're happy to take any questions.

30 **MS GRANT:** Fabulous, thank you. I've got a few questions from the material that I've read. So, just, I guess working backwards. So, are you saying that the next step for you now would be to engage with Parliamentary Counsel's Office – you're at that pointy end of the plan making process now?

35 **MR HAY:** Yes, that's correct. So, we exhibited the planning proposal late last year and Council resolved in March to finalise the plan. That was very shortly before the Department advised that they were going to extend the – or progress the request to the gateway review with the Commission, yes.

40 **MS GRANT:** Okay. And the planning proposal what was deferred that originally introduced the provision into the LEP, how long ago did you say that was?

MR HAY: In terms of when that was finalised?

45 **MS GRANT:** When the decision to defer that inserting the provision.

MR HAY: That was in June 2024.

MS GRANT: Okay. And Council hasn't had anymore planning proposals since June in the last 12 months that triggered an uplift that would have engaged those provisions?

5 **MR HAY:** Yes, this is the only one.

MS GRANT: Okay, all right. A question – I understand the statutory context and understand the mechanism, the thing, the issue that I would like – perhaps Catherine could help me understand a little bit clearer, was the question of the feasibility. And in
10 the HillPDA report, I read the August 2024 version, talked in your conclusions at the end, talked about that 9.27 – you ended up getting to 9.27, but 10% was not feasible, 6.75% was your tipping point, and then there was discussion about other potentially being 3 or 4% if other costs were involved.

15 Can you just explain to me why this is progressing at the 9.27 versus the 6.75?

MS HUYNH: Okay. So, the 6.7, I think it's 6.27% that you're quoting, that was based on my feasibility using my own feasibility NSA revenue. Construction costs have been peer reviewed. And the 9.27% was based on that amount, which was about 1.6 million
20 divided by the gazetted Council rate of 21k. So, I adopted about the 28k, 28,000, as potential revenue on the average per square metre of net sellable area.

But Council had published a rate of, I think, 21,000. But from my understanding, that 21,000 was based on a broad average apartment rate, which would be different from
25 townhouses. And it's different because the land in that area would be very expensive, so the distribution of the rate on a per-dwelling or per-apartment basis for townhouses is a lot more higher. The portion of the value of the townhouse is a lot higher than apartments where it's distributed over a larger number of units.

30 So, yes, I believe that a higher rate should be adopted. So, that was based on the 6.75% - my apologies – 6.75%. Yes, using a higher rate. But if use Council's published rate, it would be the 9.27.

MS GRANT: And with the significant changes to labour costs and construction costs and input costs that's occurred in recent times, is that number likely to have shifted
35 since you did those calculations?

MS HUYNH: Construction costs escalation have been, I've been told, is more subdued. I can't say for the next year, but as of now, it has been more subdued. Interest
40 rates, I know they've loosened it a bit but we're still adopting the more conservative 8.5 at the moment.

And construction costs, I just want to highlight that the construction costs is quite high on a per-square-metre basis, it's about 9,000 – I did calculate it – about 9,000 or so a
45 square metre. That's quite high. For example, we're looking at Cross Street in Double Bay and we're adopting, for apartments which technically should be higher because they're building higher with deeper basements, we're adopting a rate of 7,500.

And the reason I just wanted to flag that is because the assumptions in the revenue should reflect the cost of construction as well. Because you're making sort of assumptions about the quality of the finishes. So, we did factor in what I believe to be all industry standards. As Patrick mentioned earlier, we do a lot of affordable housing studies on an LGA basis as well as site-specific basis. And prior to this, I also did a lot of construction funding valuation, so I do look at specific sites and analyse sites on a specific basis using industry standards as well. Yes, yes.

MS GRANT: Thank you. So, Patrick, is there a way in Council's methodology that takes into account – so if you've got published rates at 21,000 which are a bit more fixed or static, how does the Council's methodology take into account that changing costs? Because if that's what's driving the difference between applying a 6 or a 9%, how does that work?

MR HAY: On page 6 of our submission, we showed the two together. Essentially, it's just a translation. Like, we have a rate – and Tim might be better placed to explain this than I, but we have a rate that's published. But obviously for a planning proposal, we get given a concept scheme that's part of the proposal. And we have to do the feasibility based on that. So, we assume that the developer will proceed with that and then the tipping point or the appropriate amount in this instance is 1,652,738, which translates to 6.7% contribution of the concept scheme.

But then when that's translated as against our benchmark rates which are a lower published rate, that's where you get the higher percentage. So, there's no change in – they're not two different rates in the context of the feasibility around the concept scheme that's been submitted, a hypothetical development scenario that could occur. It's just that we have a flat rate in our affordable housing contribution scheme that we have, but translate that to ... Is there anything you want to add, Tim?

MR SNEESBY: Yes, Tim Sneesby, I might just add to that. I suppose our rates, they're suburb based. We aim to update those every 12 months or so. And because they are suburb based, they probably are relatively conservative. So, for example, as you would be aware, you could have two properties one block away from each other and they could have significantly different sales prices. One could be on a busy road, one could be across the road from a park, for example.

Similarly, what we see in Bondi Junction is we get floors that are on the upper levels which have views of the harbour and the city and of Centennial Park. Similarly, we've got floors on the sort of first or second floor which have no views and are generally just looking at other buildings. So, these are variants in the quality type, and I suppose that's what we try to capture with those suburb-based rates. So, they are suburb-based rates, they are conservative for that reason.

And so when you get sites which are more favourable, you've got finishes that are a higher level of finishes, that's, I suppose, in those circumstances, you do get a higher sale price result for that. So, as Patrick alluded to, we charge the percentage contribution based on what's reflected in our published AHCS at the time. And so if

it's in Bondi Junction, it's 21,000 a square metre. If it's in Bondi Beach, it might be \$24,000 a square metre, for example.

We can only charge that rate that's in our AHCS. So, when HillPDA has found that a viable contribution is \$1.6 million, the only way that we can talk about that in percentage terms is to divide it by the rate that's outlined in our AHCS. And that's the only way to get a consistent ... So, that our LEP clause is consistent with our published AHCS.

MS GRANT: And if the development was to change, and currently it's seven townhouses but something was to change and it was to be six townhouses, for example, that would then trigger ... Because it's not being done at DA stage and you don't know the exact output, you're having to assume a development outcome. I know that in the HillPDA report, there was a reference to a 100% efficiency rate, which is pretty unusual from what I understand. So, is there a way of correlating that, you know, what's the theoretical output versus what ends up being the actual?

MR SNEESBY: So, maybe I'll speak to this first and then Catherine, if you've got anything to add, happy for you to jump in.

So, the way that AHCS schemes are developed, or whether they're done on a site basis or a precinct basis or even an LGA basis, is they always assume the highest and best use of a site, so they always assume that sites are going to be built at their highest and best use.

So, we – and it is a point in time feasibility snapshot. The reason why the Department's adopted those guidelines is that it's a superior way to do it where everything is clear and upfront in terms of the assumptions. You know what the sales prices are, you know what the land is, and you know what construction costs are. You've set those upfront, and then industry has certain so they know how much they can pay for the land in the end.

So, that's the way that it's done. Feasibility, of course, can change over time. It can go down, it can go up. What we've seen obviously in recent years is post-COVID it's gone down because construction costs have gone up at a higher or faster rate than prices have done so. We obviously did this feasibility last year, probably at a point at which construction costs have stabilised.

So, arguably, it's probably at the worst possible time for viability. I would also argue that going forward in the future, I think we're going to the upswing of the cycle and interest rates are coming down, construction costs have stabilised, and we probably expect to see prices to increase as well. But obviously Catherine's the expert on that, so happy for Catherine to jump in and approach anything I've said.

MS HUYNH: So, definitely, if a developer is looking at a site, they will be looking at its highest and best use. So, I agree with that. In terms of with it's ... We've always had to capture the feasibility as of that time, which usually gets, from what I understand – I'm not a planner – usually gets negotiated at the onset in order for them

to proceed. So, the developer knows what the cost implications are at the start as well as if they decide to sell it off, then any new buyer would know what are the cost implications associated with that development site.

5 In terms of the efficiencies, we've only adopted that because it's a townhouse and we've assumed that there's really no shared areas. So, that's why we've made that assumption. But yes, on a site-by-site basis, we can only capture the highest and best use at the time, because it does change, and we do sometimes get developers come back to us and reassess it. But that's outside the scope of this work, yes.

10 **MS GRANT:** And is there an opportunity when you're looking at that highest and best use, given that this has got heritage listed properties either side, it's in a conservation area, what's the highest and best use on this site in this context versus more generically. Is that subtlety able to be captured?

15 **MS HUYNH:** Heritage listing might ... Usually what I've made allowances for heritage listed or heritage conservation areas is maybe a slightly higher proportion of professional fees should be accounted for. Because it might take a slightly longer lead-in period. But I did allow for two years as a lead-in, as well as a bit more for some pre-sales. So, I adopted assumptions that I thought were reasonable at the time, yes.

MS GRANT: Okay.

MS HUYNH: Yes, yes.

25 **MR HAY:** Just to add in the context of, I suppose, highest and best use and appropriateness. The concept scheme that was submitted was something that was relatively compatible with the conservation area, that sort of pitched roof, townhouse-y type. Our Urban Design and Heritage Team reviewed it as part of that. So, obviously it's more drawn out when it gets to the DA stage. But they haven't come in with something that isn't potentially compatible in that aspect as well too, so, for the concept scheme at least.

30 **MS GRANT:** Okay, thank you. And in terms of the concept of uplift, have you had any other experience of – you made the comment, Patrick, that it was an SP zone, Special Use Zone, this was considered, that a Resi Zone was a higher value zone, notwithstanding the fact that its development standards are not technically changing.

35 Have you had other case study examples where it's been an SP zone? Because I guess there's no height or FSR control on an SP zone, so you could, for argument's sake, put it that actually this is being restricted, not uplift, because it's gone from having no controls to having some controls. I'm just playing devil's advocate. But because it's not your traditional going from R2 to R3 or 4, you're going from a Special Use, is that an uplift question?

40 **MS HUYNH:** Can I jump in? Is that okay? From a valuer's point of view, because there's such a limited use, it's just telecommunications, and Telstra's really seeing it as

a redundant site. I think if it was, you know, even when it was offered to the market, if another telecommunications saw it as an opportunity, they would have jumped onto it.

But looking at the costs of land in Bondi Junction and Waverley and so on, it just makes sense that it would be for residential use. So, there definitely would be an uplift. Because a Special Use Zone would only have a very shallow market interest. So, from a valuer's point of view, there would be definitely an uplift in its proposed residential use.

MS GRANT: And how would you then, without removing the heritage listing, I appreciate Waverley's got clause 5.10, you can open up the range of land uses that would be permitted in there. How would you balance – that might be a question for the planners, Catherine, sorry.

MS HUYNH: It's okay.

MR SNEESBY: I'm happy to answer that question. So, the way that we applied clause 5.10 – yes, I suppose it's only been in very limited circumstances, particularly just around heritage listed properties that are developable in that zone. So, for example, a heritage listed house, for example, in that zone, in a residential zone as opposed to being a use that's not permissible in that zone at all. So, they're the contexts in which we've used clause 5.10.

I mean, the other thing to add to is that SP2 zone does have existing height and FSR controls, they aren't being changed. What it didn't have was a minimum lot size control, and so that is being introduced as well.

MR HAY: And just to add, I suppose, and to round off – potentially round off the uplift question. I think it was in our submission, but it's definitely discussed in the planning proposal around what is considered uplift, in some of those strategic documents.

And our argument that this site's receiving uplift aligned with how those, what the definition of uplift was described, if I recall, it's in the Region Plan and the State Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme Guidelines specifically. That'll be in the documentation that we've previously – we provided a discussion on that, because the Proponent had made an argument around the uplift aspect, but we've responded to that throughout the process.

MS GRANT: Thank you. Callum, did you have any questions?

MR CALLUM FIRTH: No, nothing from me.

MS GRANT: Brad, did you have any other questions?

MR JAMES: Nothing from me, Juliet.

5 **MS GRANT:** I think you've kindly answered all of my questions, and I've got a much more clearer understanding particularly about the feasibility side of things. One last, I guess, question is the Proponent was successful in terms of who should be the plan making authority moving forward, is it a role you think that Council would still be prepared to take on? Or is it a role that you would see – you would prefer the Department to take, moving forward, if something was to change?

10 **MR RAYNER:** Juliet, our Council's been unanimous in its support for this proposal. So, it's not controversial in that sense, and I see no concern with Council retaining its role as plan making authority in this instance. I think the approach to defining the affordable housing contributions have been consistent all the way. And our support with officers of the Department has also been consistent. So, I'm quite confident that our methodology has been appropriate. Thank you.

15 **MS GRANT:** And just – that's – just, sorry, triggered another question. Have you got other planning proposals in the pipeline that are likely then to slot into this clause?

MR HAY: I don't know... at the moment. We haven't had any ...

20 **MR SNEESBY:** Yes, there's none lodged, but, yes, there's a couple of sites that – where we've had queries seeking uplift. Some of those have popped up as a HDA, so I suppose depending on the outcome of that, they may come back as a planning proposal, and it may be that there isn't such a tussle with the percentage. Because I can see there's quite generous percentages being provided in those HDAs. So, yes,
25 certainly some of those sites have been put forward as HDA, but we'll see what the outcome of that is.

30 There's some other sites as well, and then you were also looking at the Bondi Junction Master Plan, so there may be some uplift associated with redoing that, and Council's leading that master plan, and it would be expected that we'd be, again, testing feasibility of all of those sites to see what an appropriate affordable housing contribution would be in those areas.

35 **MS GRANT:** Okay, thank you. Is there anything else that you would like to make me aware of before we wrap up?

MR RAYNER: No, thank you for your time.

40 **MS GRANT:** You're welcome. Thank you for making the time and, yes, thank you to all of you, it's always hugely valuable to have the chance to have that conversation. In terms of timeframes, we have KPIs to have our advice back to the Department, and our deadline is short, so we are hoping to have that back to the Department before the 17th of July. So, it's a quick turnaround. So, that advice will go to the Department and then I anticipate they will then contact Council.

45 **MR RAYNER:** Thank you. Well chaired. Right on time.

MS HUYNH: Thank you.

MS GRANT: Terrific. Thanks very much, everyone, thank you, bye-bye.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED