



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**MARONITE SISTERS OF THE HOLY FAMILY,
MARRICKVILLE SENIORS HOUSING (SSD-69377980)**

COUNCIL MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: SUELLEN FITZGERALD (Acting Chair)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON

INNER WEST COUNCIL: KAITLIN ZIEME
 RUBA OSMAN

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 9:45AM – 10:15AM
 WEDNESDAY, 1st APRIL 2026

THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD:** Good morning and thanks for coming. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Wangal land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10 Welcome to this meeting today to discuss the Maronite Sisters of the Holy Family Marrickville Seniors Housing state significant development application currently before the Commission for determination.

15 The Applicant, The Maronite Sisters of the Holy Family Village, proposes the demolition of an existing 54-bed residential care facility and the construction of a four-storey 100-bed residential care facility at 28 Marrickville Avenue, Marrickville in the Inner West local government area.

20 My name is Suellen Fitzgerald. I'm the Acting Chair of the Commission Panel today. Our Chair, Ken Kanofski, was unable to join us, with a last minute, unavoidable delay, but he'll review the transcript of today's meeting, and he can submit any further questions in writing that we don't cover today. I'm also joined by Jane Anderson of the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure a 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 after this meeting.

The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of the matter and will form one of several sources of information upon we'll base our determination.

30 It's important that we can ask questions of you and to clarify any issues as appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, you can take the question on notice of course. Following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice, and any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

35 I'm requesting – we're only a small group today, but if all participants could introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and just to make sure that you don't speak over the top of each other, to make sure we get an accurate transcript.

40 So, let's kick off. Kaitlin, Ruba, would you like to briefly introduce yourselves and then we'll get going.

MS RUBA OSMAN: I'm Ruba Osman. I am the DA Manager here at Inner West.

45 **MS FITZGERALD:** Hi, Ruba.

MS OSMAN: Morning.

MS ZIEME: I'm Kaitlin Zieme. I'm one of the Team Leaders here at Inner West.

MS FITZGERALD: Hi Kaitlin, great. Okay. Well, look, we have an agenda for today's meeting. How would you like to get going – would you like to start off with any points from your own submission perhaps? Have you got a presentation or are we just going to do this verbally?

MS ZIEME: No, we don't have a presentation, it's really, I mean, as evident in Council's correspondence to the Department about this item, we don't have any major issues and a lot has been resolved along the way or as part of the conditions of consent that Council recommended which, I think, almost all have been implemented, which is positive. So, we don't have too much to say on this. Like, we obviously encourage the redevelopment of the site for seniors living which is a type of development that is in demand in the area.

There were probably only two real points that are on unresolved from the correspondence between Council and the Department. The first one probably was the building setbacks of the upper floor, and Council had requested that that fourth storey be set back further, given there is a height and FSA breach and that there's lots of community concern about visual bulk and scale and then privacy or perceived privacy from those neighbours. Noting there is no overshadowing issues, like it is compliant, and they are quite generous setbacks to the building. I guess the request was that that upper floor had an increased setback than what was proposed, but that hasn't been adopted.

I think in an ideal world we would like to see probably – I think it's the western corner which is the closest portion that is shared with the neighbours on Challis Avenue. I think there's four units that have the same setback as the first, second and third floor, so it's all in a line, and then there's a communal terrace, so that's a 10-metre setback to that boundary. Those four units, if they were set back further, I think that would probably be something the neighbours would be happier about. But understanding that there is – it is compliant with overshadowing; that it's really a visual bulk. And there is a lot of mature trees that are being retained.

So, I understand the Department's recommendation on that, that it was acceptable. Look, it's not something that we're going to continue to push. It would be a nice to have, but so just to make you aware that's one thing that's still probably unresolved really.

And then the only other item is tree removal and replacement. So, the application proposes to remove four trees; three of them are highest retention value, one is moderate. The reason for the removal is just because it conflicts with the development, it's not obviously because of the health of the trees. And I think the tree canopy's being used in the 4.6 is a lot – there's a reason why there's a reduced impact to neighbouring properties, because it does have that beautiful tree-lined, big mature trees surrounding the site, so it does kind of protect the development from the public domain.

So, Council don't really support the removal of the trees but understand that it's to facilitate the development. And we had requested that a condition be implemented to

plant four 400-litre trees, and that hasn't been adopted in the recommended conditions of consent.

5 So, the reasoning was that the Applicant explains that they're replacing those trees with two tree plantings, but those tree plantings are much smaller. So, one is a 200-litre and one is a 100-litre. Both of those trees, well, one of those is being planted in the central courtyard. I don't know if you want me to share plans or anything to show this.

10 **MS FITZGERALD:** Kaitlin, we've gone through the plans. We actually have the advantage of a site visit [cross-talk 00:08:22]. So, yes, no, I take your point. Your point is about where they're being replaced and the size of the replacement trees.

15 **MS ZIEME:** Yes. Because one's in the centre of the site, so its ability to grow will be limited. It does have a void space to the sky, but it's small. And then the other one is on the roof terrace, again, it's restricted in terms of its ability to grow and its size. I think the Applicant's justification that there's no alternative space to plant trees is not really, like, been founded, there's been no evidence provided to demonstrate that.

20 It appears that there could be spaces to plant, to replace, for example, the tree that is being removed that is along that boundary with the properties on Challis Avenue. There is space probably to plant another tree where they're removing the other one. Maybe it's in a slightly tweaked location given the elevated walkway there. But, look, that's probably it really from us, that we feel that there is an ability for them to plant more significant sized trees, and the four trees that they're removing, replace them with four. But again, that's in your hands to determine if that's acceptable or not.

25 But they're really the two points that we have outstanding. Otherwise, all of the conditions have been included in the recommendation and we're really happy with the work that we've done with Tia at the Department on this application, so we don't have any other real concerns.

30 **MS FITZGERALD:** Okay. One thing I wondered about reading through submissions that were originally made to the Department on the first exhibition. Impact on Marrickville Avenue, particularly construction traffic. I noted that the residents had been impacted by construction traffic from nearby train works, I think it was. Is that something that you're aware of – has there been traditionally an issue there or ...?

35 **MS ZIEME:** It's not something that I'm personally aware of, but I could imagine it would be given the location near that train line. And it will be the main thoroughfare for the works to be carried out because it's obviously quite land-locked with the school on the other side. And they probably have also maybe been impacted because the school also had a regional planning application determined not so long ago, that I believe they've started some works on. It's a staged development, so it's over time. But so, I guess the combination of that, probably they have had some impacts. But I guess it can only be managed through a Construction and Management Plan, which I believe is one of the conditions.

45 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, it is, Kaitlin, there is a requirement for them to do that.

MS ZIEME: Yes.

MS FITZGERALD: The other thing too is the question of operational noise, I suppose. Council doesn't have any specific concerns about that. Is there anything in the conditions that concern you about the operational noise ongoing?

MS ZIEME: No. I think, like, we'd have our standard condition in there about, you know, compliance with the POE Act regarding noise and that operational noise. I think they have to provide the certifier – I'm just looking – with an acoustic report prior to OC, to demonstrate that the noise and vibration is acceptable.

MS FITZGERALD: Right.

MS ZIEME: I know in the submissions there were some concerns about the use of that rooftop terrace, I think. But the Response to Submissions is pretty good in explaining that. Like, it's intended to be quite a passive space, and, I guess, I think it set a maximum of 10 people have been modelled as being able to use that space at any one time and they would restrict the hours, I guess, being an institution like that, they can kind of control that.

MS FITZGERALD: Mm, mm, yes.

MS ZIEME: So, it's not a huge space either. So, I think we're not too worried about the use of that terrace.

MS FITZGERALD: Okay. I'm just looking at the key issues we had on our agenda. We touched on built form and density and heard your comments there, also in relation to overshadowing, privacy and visual. The heritage issues, the removal of part of the boundary wall for the pedestrian access, and the structural stability of the boundary wall. My understanding is that the structural stability of the boundary wall has actually already been dealt with in previous works.

MS ZIEME: Yes. It was quite a point of contention with the school works, and there was a little bit of some issues with probably the drafting of conditions surrounding that structural stability. So, I think we were quite particular about the wording of the conditions in this application as well just to be consistent and learn from, I guess, our mistakes in the last one.

But yes, and then we don't really have a huge issue with the intervention into the wall for pedestrian and widening that vehicular access – it is necessary, it's quite narrow through Marrickville Avenue. So, we're not too concerned. I think the conditions will suffice that have been put on.

And then the other heritage matters that were raised by our Heritage Officers have been addressed through conditions that have been placed on. It's just about some materiality. So, yes.

MS FITZGERALD: Yes. I think that the widening of the entry gate might actually alleviate some of the traffic problems in Marrickville Avenue.

5 **MS ZIEME:** Yes, and also maybe prevent further damage. Because I'm guessing, like, squeezing vehicles, like trucks and things in and out of that space at the moment, it's very tight and there's always a risk that they then damage that wall. So, making it wider is more practical and protects that wall and ensures its better longevity as well. So, I think it's a positive.

MS FITZGERALD: Okay.

10 **MS JANE ANDERSON:** Commissioner Fitzgerald, sorry to interrupt. May I just add a clarification for the purpose of the transcript? Given our discussions of conditions, I note that they are only recommended conditions from the Department at this stage - they haven't been implemented. So, they are recommended conditions.

15 **MS ZIEME:** Sure, yes, of course.

MS ANDERSON: Thank you.

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, thanks for that, Jane. We've touched on landscaping and construction impacts and the operational noise. Waste management – any issues? Again, it looked from the site visit as though waste management might actually be improved with this new development if it was to go ahead. It's now going to be dealt with in the basement of the building, whereas at the moment it seems to be happening externally.

25 **MS ZIEME:** That's right.

MS FITZGERALD: Any issues from Council in relation to that matter?

30 **MS ZIEME:** No, we don't have any concerns, and again, the recommended conditions, if implemented, we feel would be sufficient to alleviate any concerns. But yes, I think putting it into the basement is a positive.

35 **MS FITZGERALD:** Okay. And I noticed in submissions too that there were some concerns around community consultation. I also note the Proponent's steps that they took in relation to community engagement. So, any comment from Council in relation to that, for a final matter?

40 **MS ZIEME:** I think as long as the application was exhibited as required, then Council has no objection, that's the process.

MS FITZGERALD: Okay. Well, look, thanks for being so clear in those two points you've raised, we'll take them into consideration. Before we close up, anything else you wanted to touch on?

45 **MS ZIEME:** No, not really. I think, yes, for us, if the recommended conditions are implemented, I mean, we would love to see the tree condition improved or additional planting or size improved. But other than that, I think as long as those conditions are implemented. We have gone back and forth with Tia at the Department about those

recommended conditions and the Applicant had questioned a few of them, and we provided some detailed response on why we think they should be retained. So, I think that, you know, we've seen that that's followed through to the recommendations, so we're happy with what's been put forward really, generally.

5

MS FITZGERALD: Great, okay. And Jane, have you got any comments before – anything further before we finish up?

10

MS ANDERSON: I think we've covered the agenda items. So, just to advise the Council that we are holding a public meeting for this project next Wednesday the 8th of April. You may have received some notifications about that. And if Council, any councillors would like to speak at the public meeting, they are welcome to register. That was all from me, Suellen.

15

MS FITZGERALD: Okay, great. Well, thank you very much for your time to make this meeting with us. And we'll bring it to an early close. I'm sure we could all do with a bit of extra time in our working day.

20

MS ZIEME: Thank you for giving us an opportunity to chat with yourselves today, and yes, we appreciate it.

MS FITZGERALD: Great.

25

MS ZIEME: If you have anymore questions, just reach out.

MS FITZGERALD: The officers will do so. Thank you very much. Bye.

MS OSMAN: Thank you.

30

THE MEETING CONCLUDED