



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: GREGORY PLACE BUILD-TO-RENT (SSD-31179510)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	JULIET GRANT (Chair) MICHAEL CHILCOTT
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	GEOFF KWOK
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	RAYMOND RAAD (2A Gregory Place Pty Ltd) JAMES MATTHEWS (Pacific Planning) MATTHEW DANIEL (Pacific Planning) ALEC TZANNES (Tzannes) CHRISTIAN HAMPSON (Yerrabingin) GRAHAM BROOKS (GBA Heritage) ROBERTA RYAN (Forward Thinking) STEPHEN GRAY (GRC Hydro)
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE & TIME:	2:00PM – 3:00PM FRIDAY, 9 th OCTOBER 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS JULIET GRANT: Good afternoon, everyone. Hello, James. Are you expecting others – oh, there’s still a couple more people popping up.

MR JAMES MATTHEWS: Yes, we might have one or two more, I think. Alec is not here yet, is he?

MR GRAHAM BROOKS: Alec ... It looks like he might be.

MR MATTHEW DANIEL: It just took me a while because I don’t use Zoom that much. My apologies.

MR ALEC TZANNES: Sorry, here I am. I had trouble finding the little tabs, because I’m usually on Teams.

MS GRANT: It does throw people. Does that look like everyone you’re expecting from your side?

MR RAYMOND RAAD: That’s everyone, thank you.

MS GRANT: Perfect, all right. Well, good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I’m speaking to you from Gadigal 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.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss Gregory Place Build-to-Rent state significant development application (SSD-31179510) currently before the Commission for determination.

My name is Juliet Grant, and I am the Chair of this Commission Panel. I am joined by my fellow commissioner, Michael Chilcott. And I’m also joined by Geoff Kwok 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 considerations of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you’re asked a question and are not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. Following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

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

5 We'll now begin. Perhaps we could start by introductions from the Applicant's team, if you don't mind.

MR RAAD: I'll start. Raymond Raad. Hi, I'm Project Manager and the client's representative for the Proponent. James, I'll pass to you.

10 **MR MATTHEWS:** Yes. Yes, James Matthews – hi again, Juliet – Pacific Planning, town planning for the project.

MR DANIEL: Hi, Panel. Matthew Daniel, Pacific Planning but also Pacific
15 Community Housing, the community housing provider for the project.

MR RAAD: Alec, please?

MR TZANNES: Alec Tzannes, Architect for the project.

20 **MR RAAD:** Christian?

MR CHRISTIAN HAMPSON: Christian Hampson from Yerrabingin, so the
25 designer with country and landscape architecture.

MR RAAD: Beautiful. Graham?

MR BROOKS: Thank you. Graham Brooks, Director of GBA Heritage. We've been
30 looking after the heritage aspects of this project right from the very beginning.

MR RAAD: Roberta?

MS ROBERTA RYAN: G'day. Roberta Ryan – hello to you both – social planning
35 and community engagement.

MR RAAD: And Stephen Gray we've got as our last attendee.

MR STEPHEN GRAY: Hello, I'm Stephen Gray. I'm a Director from GRC Hydro,
40 we did the flooding work for the project. Thank you.

MS GRANT: Terrific, thank you.

MR RAAD: That's our team, Madam Chair.

45 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. Okay. We received a copy of the presentation you're going to run through, and we note that there's about 15 minutes allocated to run through that. Who's taking the lead on that one?

MR RAAD: Look, I'll run the presentation. Just before we start, noting that there is 15 minutes, what we have sort of taken the liberty of doing, I hope it's okay with the Panel, is we've got a portion of that slide pack which we'd like to present through. Then the balance of it sort of talks to those key issues and the balance of the agenda that's been shared.

MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT: Great.

MS GRANT: Okay.

MR RAAD: So, for the first part we'll sort of run as a presentation, the rest can be iterative and jump in at any time to ask any questions as necessary. So, I'll just – bear with me, I'll share the screen.

Sorry, Geoff, I've had to request to share, so ...

MR GEOFF KWOK: Yes. You should be able to now.

MR RAAD: Oh, thank you. Okay. Can everyone see the document?

[Multiple people say yes]

MR RAAD: Full screen mode. What I'll – just for the benefit of our team, I'll be running the presentation the whole way through. So, as the relevant person's speaking, just let me know 'next slide please'.

So, thank you to the Panel and Madam Chair and the IPC team for allowing us to brief you today. So, just thought I'd quickly before we jump into the design aspects of the project, just really quickly, we all know the project is a concept application, so we're aware there's obviously a subsequent detailed design stage to go through, notwithstanding the intensive amount of – and extensive, rather – amount of work undertaken to get to this point.

The project is build-to-rent, so to clarify, it's 100% build-to-rent and of the dwellings, 50% of those are noted as affordable. The site, we all know very well, is very well located and you'll see that on the next slide. Look, we have owned this site for about 25 years and up until recently we actually occupied it as our office. So, for us, we've held it for a long time, build-to-rent works for us in aligning with us where we'd like to go with this site and long-term tenure moving forward.

Just quickly, because Alec will talk to it as well, so the site's been the home of manufacturing since the '50s. You can see there what's surrounding us. Immediately to our south, you've got the Our Lady of Lebanon Co Cathedral, which has been there since about the '70s, the parkland setting. There's a number of low-rise/high-rise and proposed development in the vicinity. And what you do see too through here is Clay Cliff Creek stormwater channel which bisects that precinct, and of interest which we'll pick up on our site visit is, what that does, it creates a four-storey difference between Gregory Place and Alice Street to the south of us.

I won't labour on background, but as noted before, we've been there in occupation since about the early 2000s. What that's meant is though that the site hasn't been operating in its capacity since then, so you'll see when we're out on our site visit, no truck movements, no noise generated, anything like that. We know there's a need for housing, we don't have to go through that here, it's a large issue in the society at the moment.

Dealing quickly with history, we have been working on this site for over the last sort of 10 years, and in that time done an extensive amount of engagement and consultation with the NSW Heritage Council (excuse me) and their approvals committee. That was – they've then endorsed us and start the EIS process and the lodgement. And they've been part of that and have re-examined and provided feedback and support for the scheme as amended and as in front of us today.

I'll pass onto Roberta, please.

MS RYAN: Yes, thanks very much. There's a bit of information on these slides and again, I won't talk to it all. But in terms of the Proponent consultation, the work was done in term so the pre-SSD pathway, engagement with the Heritage Council, which was very extensive between 2017 and 2021, and then of course ongoing engagement with Parramatta Council. So, there's been, you know, the targeted engagement through the State Design Review process and that feedback's been responded to in terms of stages. And so, this is the pre-EIS lodgement in 2022.

Raymond, could I ask you to go to the next slide please. Just for the benefit of the commissioners, we've just put some of this detail on here so that you've got it all kind of neatly in one spot. But again, I won't take you through it all in detail.

The post public exhibition and the pre-amendment submission, of course, engagement with the Department in terms of the briefings on the updated Concept Plan and subsequent design changes, extensive engagement with the NSW Heritage – or the Heritage Council of NSW, I'll get it round the right way – the SDRP, Parramatta Council.

In terms of the local community, we've had several rounds of engagement, extensive postcards, letterbox dropping, a survey available on the site, and the provision of information sessions. I think it'll be fair to say that in terms of the local community, you know, the people who are living near the site, there's very little interest in the proposal, and there's been almost no objections. We held three online information sessions, we canvassed and advertised those widely, and they were attended by eight participants in total.

We've had a project website the whole time. We've given you here the updated web traffic on that website, and that's been a core source of information for the wider community as well as the stakeholders. And what I've done here by providing you with some detail about the kind of visits and the page view and the time is only to indicate to you that the traffic on the website is generated by the campaign that's being run by the local members of parliament and the church. But those objections and feedback have not come from the local community.

Can I have the next slide, please, Raymond. So, how we've responded, which of course is the reason why we seek to engage with the community and the stakeholders. This will be talked through in some detail when Alec goes through the design process. But the early concerns in the 2022 plan were around height and massing, that was reduced from the 2022 plan, the community feedback updated the Concept Plan.

There was strong support for the approach to Indigenous and Aboriginal heritage and the connecting with country approach. A small number of local heritage stakeholders continued to raise concern about the impacts on post-colonial heritage. The open space and connectivity, very strong support for the pedestrian and cycle connections. Traffic and parking, the main concern was raised, which is really connected to the traffic associated with the school in Alice Street, and the kind of cul-de-sac adjacent to the site. In terms of the overall response to the amended proposal, we received positive response across the surveys in the information sessions.

The next slide, please, Raymond. So, you can see here, with careful consideration of the submissions and feedback have result in these changes, and these diagrams just present that information to you graphically.

The next slide if I could, please, Raymond. So, in terms of the EIS, the exhibition of the EIS which occurred in August-September 2022, there was a fair bit of media coverage, again coming out of the kind of localised sort of broader political campaigns, I guess. There were 104 submissions made by the major project's portal. Of these, there are 70 unique submissions, 21 of those are duplicates, 2 are very similar but aren't direct duplicates, there's been 2 petitions and 7 form letters. So, that's just an analysis of the submissions that are before you.

Thanks, Raymond.

MR RAAD: Thank you. We'll pass to Christian, please.

MR HAMPSON: Yes, thank you. Essentially, from the beginning of this process, we looked at the opportunity rather than just consultation with the Aboriginal community about actually a collaborative design approach that really looked at how the building could have principles that were based around understanding both the unique place in country that the site is situated within, but also how country could support its aspiration to create a socially cohesive space for people to come together and live.

But then also to look at an empathetic approach to other things such as our non-human kin, and even the sentience of the Parramatta River system as itself. But also, within that, the early co-design process also talked about how we would like to see that collective story of this place told as a story that was brought together. So, you know, there are many strong stories that are discussed from a historical context within the Parramatta area, but in particular Baramadagal people were very keen to see both contemporary stories of all cultures.

And, in fact, the idea of designing with country was seen as an opportunity that as we are a multicultural first nations, we also see the country as a way to bring other people

into the lens that we see country through but also a way that we can see similarities through many cultures. So, the design with country process was really seen as an opportunity to think about the design embracing the context of country that it's in but also this idea of sort of shared connection within the space.

5

Next slide, please. So, from that we started to think about, with the design team, how would that create different types of social and environmental and cultural [eco-tains? 00:16:28] within the site and how those functions could be guided about how the built form would relate to the landscape, but then also how that would connect people to other contexts that surrounded the site.

10

So, the historical context of the state listed buildings, even thinking about and people understanding the actual original context of the hydrological system of the space, so the floating patterns, the ephemeral character of places, and how that could also be a way for people to both understand the context that they're in but also be a way to, I suppose, give their own character and connection to the site. So, this was where we started to think about the different functions and spaces within that but also how country and the landscape and the built form together could define those spaces within the design.

15

20

Next, please. And so, for us, we just started to think about those ideas about how the landscape could have many different functions around people having refuge in the space, respite, wanting to use the space, how families and different groups would want to engage in that. But then also, how that would help us guide the relationship it has with the parkland, and also the types of landscapes that we would like to bring back into the space, and the community were very interested in, in relation to cultural keystone species that represent the local endemic ecology, but then also cultural species that may be also used for medicinal and food purposes. And that opportunity to almost create a living library within the landscape.

25

30

Next, please.

MR RAAD: We'll pass over to Alec, if we can. Alec, I'll turn to your first.

35

MR TZANNES: Thank you. So, Raymond, we have about five minutes from my calculation, so I'll have to be very, very quick for everybody. Just to understand that the place is evolving, continuously evolving.

40

Next slide. We critically started to study the solar access and have achieved compliance, and better than compliance, on the sensitive areas where the Experiment Farm and the Young Academics Early Learning Centre open space, is all protected.

45

Next slide. The key concept was maybe not so obvious, but this is a plan or an urban framework which allows permeability from all adjacent conditions – whether you're south of the canal, and you can move now all for the first time to Hambledon Cottage, you connect to the east and to the west.

Next slide, please. And this is a key design move where we created a connection between the community facilities and Hambledon Cottage and a route to get between the two.

- 5 The next slide. And with the vistas from moving around the open space, or from the other side of the park connecting for the first time, parkland to parkland on the south side, to create this centre as outlined by Christian, the community hub.

- 10 Next slide, please. And to amplify that point, we are now connecting all of the heritage items more effectively, because we are able to cross the channel, increasing the crossings to the west to Experiment Farm, and providing much better access through our channel walk to Elizabeth Farm.

- 15 Next slide, please. And so, one of the key moves was not to use all the site, but to create a continuous open space which is approximately the same width all around, tipping people, if you like, by the curving form from into Experiment Farm and vice versa to Hambledon Cottage.

- 20 Next slide, please. And the canal walk is now an exciting walk because it's capable to be [unintelligible 00:20:18] our brief, but it has compression and expansion, gigantic vistas, for example, opposite the cathedral, a compression, but generally speaking, it's a modulated space with the resting places in the winter sun and also movement places where you can enjoy the experience of the canal and also the built form around it.

- 25 Next slide. One of the key moves was to create a shared way which did a number of things, provide of course access and egress for emergency vehicles. It also allowed vehicles to go through to Experiment Farm. It's also heavily landscaped, trees on both sides provide a landscape setting for Hambledon Cottage.

- 30 Next slide. And also separated the architecture, so the buildings, from the public domain. And this broadly establishes the setbacks, of course they're not as – they're minimum setbacks, we have obviously huge setbacks where there's courtyards and open spaces.

- 35 Next slide. So, the key idea was to create a relationship of the built form to Hambledon Cottage. You will see it steps down to two storeys on the bottom part of this design, focusing the vista through to the cathedral and creating a scale relationship that's appropriate. But also, you really will see with two layers of landscaping behind, so it's really a landscape setting but also where you do see the built form, it responds to the
40 cottage.

- 45 Next slide, please. And so, this is a general map where we've placed, complying with the solar access plane, and in fact, lower than solar access plane mostly, we've placed the built form where it's appropriately low and appropriately high to modulate and to create identity between the three sub-precincts, and to modulate the form so it's not monolithic. And we also identify, for example, Gregory Place itself is more open, it's obviously changing to the right, and we also have the shaped form to connect Experiment Farm with Hambledon Cottage.

Next slide, please. And this is an overview of the built form.

Next slide, please. And the solar analysis is much deeper than this, but just to demonstrate the performance. It performs appropriate.

5

Next slide, please. And one of the important points is the landscape design, which is also by Yerrabingin, but it creates another layer of heritage, because we have now for the first time a connected environment with publicly accessible private open spaces, and those spaces are landscaped with a First Nations lens, connecting colonial, pre-colonial and post-colonial with the cathedral.

10

Thank you, next slide. So, this is the Hambledon Cottage experienced from the shared way.

15

Next slide. We did an extensive VA. On the left-hand side we had, I think, about 150, oh, I'm not sure, a very large number of views that we photographed and analysed. And in the report are the ones on the right, and they're basically aligned with where there is the most sensitive views. And overall, the visual impact assessment, you can see for yourselves, we're neutral, moderately worse, or sometimes better and significantly better.

20

Next slide. An example of this would be the very sensitive one, which is Hambledon Cottage, which is existing is on the left, proposed is on the right, and you can hardly see the built form.

25

Next slide. And again, from Hambledon Cottage, where again you can see in grey the additional built form, but also you see the start of the landscape screen between – it can be even denser.

30

Next slide. And again, when we look at – this is Elizabeth Farm. The left is existing, right is proposed. And what we're establishing here is there's no real visual connection between the two.

35

Next slide. This is Experiment Farm Cottage where again there's some built form above the existing buildings, the houses, but again it's an urbanised area which is transforming.

Next slide. So, to finish, this is one of the most important places, a precinct which is at the heart of the neighbourhood, and you can see the vista from the back of the Hambledon Cottage, if you like, through to the cathedral.

40

Next slide. Again, looking the other way, we see, and coming from Our Lady of Lebanon Cathedral through to Hambledon Cottage. Again, we think with the corner retail near Hambledon Cottage and with the connections to Elizabeth Farm, and if you like, Elizabeth Farm, we think this will revitalise heritage interest, also with the First Nations layer.

45

Next slide. And again, looking through the shared way, connecting the four-storey buildings, it becomes two-storey further along, to Hambledon Cottage. And you see the city in the background.

5 Next slide. And the channel walk which is, at the moment, you can't walk, becomes a connecting tissue right back through to the city and part of a good reason to enjoy this park, expanding the park and the connections to the south on the right.

10 Next slide. Again, looking the other way with one of the bridges that enables the south and the north, if you like, of the channel to be connected for the first time at that point.

Next slide.

15 **MR RAAD:** Alec, that brings us to probably the completion of our presentation portion of it. So, probably maybe subject to yourself, Madam Chair, and the Panel, did we want to have questions now, or do you want to follow the agenda, how would we like to proceed?

20 **MS GRANT:** I'm happy if you've, the remaining slides follow the key issues, I'm happy for you to talk through those and then Michael and I may well have some questions as you go through that additional material, if you don't mind.

25 **MR RAAD:** Yes, yes, no problem at all. Okay, I'll just sort of keep stepping through then. [Clears throat] Excuse me. So, built form, we believe that we've sort of addressed it with our presentation just now, but we'll take any questions on it.

30 **MS GRANT:** The one question that we have from the material that we've been presented today is, just the design philosophy behind the modulated – Graham talked about the building heights being modulated and articulated versus perhaps a more consistent height limit across the site. Is there a design rationale that sits behind that, or some guidance you can give us about why one approach is better than the other?

MR TZANNES: I could – do you want me to have a go at that answer, Raymond?

35 **MR RAAD:** Oh, I was going to pass to you, Alec, in any way. But I would just, if I can make one note, Alec, before you do start. When this project was originally submitted, and we've had a partial change of design team over the course of this project, one of the items, from recollection, I've got to sort of confirm, take it on notice, but one of the comments we did get earlier on from the SDRP was they were –
40 they didn't want to see, I guess, uniformity in height. So, that was one of those things on the previous, so what we call, so the EIS scheme. Now I'll pass to Alec to talk to his amended or updated scheme.

45 Alec, do you want me to turn back? Oh, sorry.

MR TZANNES: Maybe go to the height map or the 3D.

MR DANIEL: If I can just add to that, Ray, it was also through the extensive work with the Heritage Council as well ...

MR RAAD: Yes.

MR DANIEL: ... in relation to how that was assessed, not just the SDRP [unintelligible 00:29:13]. Because the site compatibility certificate, Juliet, specifically required us to work with Heritage NSW informing the response to the certified flat building that the certificate was carrying forward.

MS GRANT: Thank you.

MR TZANNES: Two overarching concepts, to start with, in the detail. Overarching concept number one, and this is landscape-led built form, and we sought and have created, we believe, a sequence of publicly accessible spaces as well as some private communal spaces. And the inter-relationship of all those spaces connects all the surrounding neighbourhoods around it.

The second point is that we have, in our opinion, a responsibility for environmental sustainability reasons as well as social and economic reasons, feasibility reasons, we have to optimise the use of land. But in that respect, if we blight the public domain by optimising use of land, then we defeat the purpose of making a successful, enduring and desirable neighbourhood in which to live.

So, the modulation is a response to the built form, not optimising, if you like, volume, but creating distinctive places within the sub-precinct, within this part of the park. And what that means – not the park – it's obviously developable land, but adjacent to the park. So, for example, the through-site link, well, not the through-site link, I'm sorry, the shared way is a place which separates the park from the development but also creates access. And along that link we have low-rise buildings, and those buildings, and even down to two storeys with special corners, and that is to modulate the built form against the park setting, and also to modulate the built form specifically around Hambledon Place.

And then on Gregory Place, we setback above the four storeys and we have architectural articulation required even within the four storeys, separating the two storeys from the upper two storeys. And then a setback for the tallest elements of the development, because we are of the view that there's a car park opposite on the canal, there's also a very likely redevelopment of the neighbourhood to the left, if you like, which is to the east. And also, this is where there is no overshadowing.

And then the corridor, if you like, or the communal middle space modulates from low to rise, noting what Raymond said at the very start – there's a four-storey difference from our side of the channel to the upper side of the channel, and so the perception of bulk from the upper side is much lower. Plus, again, we want to optimise the use of land, and this is where we could put residential units with high levels of amenity with solar access, with cross-vent and all the rest of it.

And again, we modulated the built form cognisant of the three-dimensionality of the park setting, because on the Experiment Farm site, there are parklands on the other side as well. So, you see the built form in the round, we also wanted to acknowledge, if

you like, the turn to Experiment Farm from this point of view, and vice versa to Hambledon Cottage, and to express in the built form that turn, so encouraging people to go to connect the two and to enhance the open space arrangements.

5 So, these are some of the reasons why we have done the built form the way it is.

MS GRANT: Excellent, thank you. Did you ...

MR CHILCOTT: No, that's fine for the moment.

10

MS GRANT: Thank you.

MR RAAD: Apologies. I realise I was on mute. So, back to where we were. So, built form which we've sort of stepped through. Graham, if you wanted to sort of just talk through the heritage elements of the site and the items.

15

MR BROOKS: Yes, thank you, Ray and members of the Panel. This area has been one of the most densely or deeply studied by way of our historic research ever for GBA Heritage. And it's been a great honour to work with Christian and with Dominic looking at the pre-colonial, understanding the waterways, and really getting down to how this site transfer from Aboriginal, a meeting of the two waters, salt water and natural water, and then also the way that the colonial expansion worked across the property.

20

MR BROOKS: So, next slide. Basically, the way Parramatta was opened up, when they set up a township there was a lot of very small lots used for the future townscape, and two very, very large grants to the east – one to John Harris and one to John Macarthur. Those two land grants effectively quarantined the whole eastern end of the locality for the best part of a hundred years. So, all of the rest of the development in Parramatta went to the south and the southwest.

25

30

Interesting enough, our site is actually crossed over – sorry, it crosses over the two original Harris and Macarthur grants. Now, a lot of people have thought, "Oh, this is terrific, those must have been very closely related," and they appear in some of the early drawings. In fact, Harris and Macarthur despised each other. They had fights, they had lack of communication, even with the topography, their houses didn't even look at each other. So, it's an amusing exercise historically to have a property now in the middle of these two sites that in fact has a boundary, a very broad historical boundary right through the middle of the site.

35

40

In terms of the research and the work we did with Heritage NSW and other people, ultimately the big moves that were made was to take away from the triangle that shows on those three coloured dots, a plan based on a triangular of those three properties, into and in fact an extension of the grids that came through in the 19th century.

45

So, go to the next slide please, Ray. There you can see 1822 in the bottom left, you can see the great big grants. And the one drawing which has confused an awful lot of people was drawn in the 1820s after the artist had actually gone back to England, and it

was a little bit of a promotion job for John Macarthur. But that landscape has long gone.

5 And I think the next slide, Ray, shows you the extraordinary change in what would have been just two open grants, to a very densely set up residential historic suburb. So, those horizontal – the scale was horizontal, but the geometry was very much a grid. And I think there was a comment made by the Heritage Council Chairman at the time saying, “The move to a grid means that this property when it’s opened up as a number of built forms, will reflect the main geometry of the surrounding areas, which helps it fit in.”

10 One of the other things we found, just to name just one more, Hambledon Cottage basically faced to the east, as Ray mentioned before, in the 1822s. In the 1850s, they added an extension to the back, and they moved the front door around to the north. So, all of the debate about what the backdrop to Hambledon Cottage should be, in a way it’s been misunderstanding that historical rear to rotation, that the house in fact experienced. That’s come through now very clearly in Alec’s work.

15 And finally, the biggest move we made in terms of heritage advantage is that now the link between Experiment and Elizabeth Farm properties. That link, apart from the actual roadway, the link along the river or the creek and now the channel, has never been opened, never been used. So, we’re now creating a most remarkable link for the pedestrian movement between the three major properties of historic value.

20 So, fundamentally, Ray, I think there’s one more slide. Yes. You can just get a quick snapshot – 1943 and 2026. You can see the strong density. You can see the amount of change that took place before the middle of the 20th century and now at the end or the beginning of the 21st century. And we’re now of course in a major growth phase yet again. And so, this property really fits into that evolutionary history of Harris Park. Thank you.

25 **MR RAAD:** Thanks, Graham. So, I’ll just, I will make a comment to flooding. We’ve obviously had the benefit of receiving the Department’s peer review and we have, Stephen Gray, on the meeting, we’ve only had the opportunity to review it or to look through it since it’s been referred.

30 I’ll pass to Stephen, but at this point in time, we accept where the peer review has landed in regards to the conditions or the draft conditions imposed. We will obviously make our way through the report and the assumptions made and the like with all their modelling, however, I don’t – unless – I’ll pass to Stephen, but there’s not a lot more for us really to discuss or to add to that with respect to flooding.

35 Stephen, is there anything else you wanted to say?

40 **MR GRAY:** Well, I guess I would just say that GRC Hydro has been working on the flooding at this site for, I think, about five to six years. And that our work, our most recent work followed on from our involvement in the Novus Build-to-Rent application, which was approved by the IPC. And in that application, or sorry, that matter before the IPC, we had Parramatta Council who were very unhappy with the independent

flood assessment that had been undertaken by Lyall's in that situation. But the IPC in that situation accepted the modelling from Lyall's, yes, and our work has continued that Lyall's modelling.

5 At all times, we've tried to get the official council model, so that we could be better compatible with Council. They didn't adopt the PRFS, their latest flood study, until, oh, I think it was August of 2024. And when we did receive that model, it just wasn't a suitable for use. There have been problems with the PRFS, the Parramatta Council Flood Study that have been documented.

10 So, as I say, we followed on from the methodology that had been used at Novus Build-to-Rent, we're on the same creek, Clay Cliff Creek. It's a funny sort of creek because what happens, as it starts upstream of Church Street, but then all it continues through is a boxed culvert, and there's a lot of water that's left in a lows point around Church Street. So, essentially, we identified flood levels that were in the vicinity of 5.2.

15 The revision that Council have undertaken via way of Rhelm, a consulting firm, that incorporates the Parramatta River and their own assumptions, I guess, about the Parramatta River, which I think – I don't want to get into it too much, but it's a relatively conservative assumption that they've made. But what that's done is it's bumped the level at our site by about 0.4 of a metre, but it's also changed the nature of that flooding. It's now a backwater from the Parramatta River rather than flowing conveyance, if you like, yes.

20 So, as Raymond says, we haven't had a chance yet to really get to grips with that, except that we are aware of those level changes and the nature of those level changes pertaining to the introduction of a relatively conservative estimate of the 1% flood, with 2150 climate change in the Parramatta River.

25 I think I'll have to leave it there, because it's just a huge sort of thing, and if there are any questions, happy to answer them. Thank you.

30 **MR RAAD:** But I'd say to that though, Steve, is we have a detailed design DA subsequent to this, should this application be approved. So, there is that process in which we'll have to go through.

35 **MR GRAY:** Thank you, yes.

40 **MR RAAD:** Thank you. I'll step through. So, that to me was us sort of, we've talked through those key issues. Comments on the Department's Assessment Report –

MS GRANT: Sorry, before you go –

45 **MR RAAD:** Oh, sorry, yes, sorry, Madam Chair.

MS GRANT: Yes. Just before you go onto the Department's Assessment Report and the conditions. So, in some of your illustrations it looks like that northern accessway was more pedestrian than vehicular. Is that the intention, or is that northern road

intended to allow future access to basements or for servicing emergency vehicles and the like?

MR CHILCOTT: Deliveries.

5

MR RAAD: Yes, so Alec I'll have a go at this and then you can step in.

MR TZANNES: Okay.

10

MR RAAD: I think, so one of the first, one of the main initial moves made with this, was to give all the buildings an address. So, I think firstly, because we only front Gregory Place, there was perceived a sort of lack of address to the buildings within the site. So, I think firstly it does that. Secondly, it does allow for – we run through the pizza, or at the time pizza, now the Uber delivery driver test, you know, how can they get to where you are for those deliveries. But the idea is no, it's not for basement or heavy vehicles for the purposes of, like, waste and the like. It's a drop-off and a pick-up, very much a pedestrian biased zone. Alec, do you want to add to that?

15

20

MR TZANNES: Only that if you look at the drawings, the main address for the basement, and that includes also our waste services, is below ground and it still enables our deep soil planting and it also enables structured large trees at the critical point, because we've got enough space between the finished ground level and the underside of the soffit of the first basement to achieve all that.

25

The northern road is mostly there, almost entirely there to provide an Uber drop-off if somebody wants to go further into the site, rather than use the basement, for example, a visitor. And also, to provide additional access for firefighting and for ambulance.

30

MS GRANT: So, just clarify, so the main entrance to the basement would be where your cursor is, from Gregory –

MR RAAD: Correct. Yes.

35

MR TZANNES: Yes, yes. And also, I should say, it really came about through those functional reasons. But also had this very important role to separate the development from the park and to create a buffer zone of landscape between all the built form and Hambledon Cottage.

40

MS GRANT: And I noticed in some of the CGIs, it looks like you're not envisaging fencing between your site and Hambledon Cottage. Is that an accurate depiction?

45

MR TZANNES: It's not quite accurate. Others, Graham may want to comment on this. It's really up to Hambledon Cottage. Our view is that there shouldn't be fencing, or at least I should be specific, my view is that there shouldn't be fencing. Hambledon Cottage, I believe, they may need a fence. I don't know why.

MR BROOKS: If I could just pick up on that then. The conversations that we had with the managers of Hambledon Cottage, which is like a citizens group/heritage group, they do have a lot of education days, a lot of education activities on the site, and

particularly at this northeastern part of their site, which in itself is a major historical, very heavily treed landscape. They were worried that if children were not ‘contained’, let’s call it, not using the word ‘controlled’, but ‘contained’ in their outdoor activities, there could be irresponsible acts taken place, which then places problems on their credibility.

So, the discussions haven’t progressed since that time, and they’re planned that they will. But at this point, whatever fencing is done will obviously have a very good landscaping intertwined in the fence.

MR RAAD: I will just add to that, that in the work that Alec prepared and he’s shared prepared, submitted with the Amendment Report, that body of work actually works through, I guess, that rationale, and also provided for the Department staff at the time, alternatives of how we’d envisage it would look with and without.

MR BROOKS: So, it’s an open question at this stage.

MS GRANT: Okay, thank you. And maybe related, but for Steve, is that road, if that’s predominantly a pedestrian-focused road, is that road needed for any emergency access in the event of flooding?

MR RAAD: Steve, you’re on mute.

MR GRAY: Thank you. I think that yes, you would probably want that for secondary in a risk management, yes, yes. Although, I mean, how essential it is, I’m just thinking. Yes, look I do think yes, I do think that’s what it would be – that would be one of its roles, yes.

MR RAAD: I think, just on that, as well, how Alec, and it wasn’t part of this pack, but it’s definitely in our design, it’s in the extensive body of work that we’ve prepared for the application. The planning of the dwellings we envisage to contain, so those ground, well, the ground and first floor would be predominantly a townhouse or a terrace-style property, which then for us we envisage then that the first floor within that dwelling could act as, if we overlap it with the flooding in considerations, as that location for shelter-in-place of those dwellings themselves.

MR CHILCOTT: So, you’re saying it’ll be a double-storey sort of arrangement, would it, for the ...

MR RAAD: Yes, so Commissioner, at this stage, that’s how we’ve sort of envisaged these buildings being planned out through the detailed design. There is a reference scheme that’s been prepared and provided, which we could provide to the Panel. But yes, that’s the idea.

MR TZANNES: So, if I can just amplify that. You’ve seen the renderings in the plan, so we envisage that there are two-storey residences right along there, and there’s separate access for above those two storeys by way of lifts. So, that’s the current intent.

MR CHILCOTT: Lifts that would access from that northern roadway?

MR TZANNES: They actually generally access from the side. So, you see the cause –

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** But you'd come along the northern road and then go down into the ...

10 **MR TZANNES:** Correct. Correct. Or you can come off Gregory Place, or you can come off the channel. But generally speaking, the northern road, but generally speaking, you'll come from the basement, for most people, they'll drive.

MR CHILCOTT: And so, as people move in, do you envisage removal vans and so forth will come into the basement?

15 **MR TZANNES:** Correct. And it's been designed for that.

MR CHILCOTT: Right. And is the – and waste, you know, the waste vehicles from Council similarly to come in and out of that?

20 **MR RAAD:** Correct.

MR TZANNES: Correct. It's very innovative in that respect, and that's allowed us to have a landscape dominated built form.

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** And with the, I'm not sure if you've used it, have you got your traffic modeller there, but in terms of the movement of vehicles from this complex with other service vehicles and so forth through that singular access, that flow in and out of a singular space has good functionality, does it?

30 **MR TZANNES:** It does. Raymond might want to speak to that, but my [cross-talk 00:51:31]. Go to it, yes.

35 **MR RAAD:** Sorry, Alec. Yes, so that has been designed with our traffic consultants. So, look, when determining who should attend, can I say, Commissioner, the idea was not to bring a cast of thousands.

MR CHILCOTT: Sure.

40 **MR RAAD:** And based obviously on the Assessment Report and the fact that Transport for NSW's own referral considers there to be no issue with what's proposed at this stage, we elected to omit them from the list. But happy to take that on notice, to provide a written confirmation. But I can confirm now that that design of that northern way has been done in full consultation between Alec's office and our traffic engineers.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, obviously we haven't been out on site yet, so we need to have a look at how that works. And just a question for Steve Gray. Steve, notwithstanding that the full implications perhaps of the Rhelm modelling haven't quite been taken into account in terms of this iteration of design, do you see particular themes emerging

from it that might suggest certain modifications at all, that might be made at a strategic and concept level at this point?

5 **MR GRAY:** I don't see that it would necessitate a major divergence from where we are. It's just a bit of a detail around the fact that it will now be, perhaps a need to demonstrate a balanced cut and fill over the site in order to assure that there's no impact with displacement of floodwater. But besides that, I think it's very similar. I mean, it's really ...

10 Raymond chose an elevated flood plan, well, a finished floor level of 6.0 in that concept design phase, which was well above where he needed to be according to the FPL. So, it's an amendment of about 0.1 compared to the level that he previously had. So, it's not a huge disruption to the overall sort of concept design, if you like. I think that there may be some amendment required in the landscape, is what I would say.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** What's the – I'm interested in your perspective on that, where the built form in the, what would it be, the southeast corner, you know, it's relatively narrow, narrows down that pathway between it and the cathedral lands and so forth. What, if any, thoughts you've got in relation to that specific area. It does seem to be
20 [cross-talk 00:54:20].

MR GRAY: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner, yes. I guess, the paradigm in your head is sort of a conveyance situation, where flow is moving from the left of page to the right of page towards the Parramatta River in extremeness, if you like. Yes?

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, and I qualify my question by I haven't been out on site to appreciate how this all sort of works in the landscape.

MR GRAY: Oh, sure, sure.

30 **MR CHILCOTT:** But I guess it just looks like there's a pinch-point there ...

MR GRAY: Yes, yes.

35 **MR CHILCOTT:** ... where buildings [cross-talk 00:54:48] together and there's a flow.

40 **MR GRAY:** That's not really been the situation, I suppose, and particularly given this latest sort of flood design level that's been provided which, as I said before, is based on actually a very elevated Parramatta River level that's propagating back up the channel to our site, yes? And so, there's no real pinch that happens, because it's a backwater. The velocities will be very low, close to zero in fact, yes? So, it just becomes a storage really, the channel does, it's storing water from the elevated Parramatta River at that point, you know.

45 The other thing I'd say to you too, Commissioner, in the course of this work, we've done a lot of impact assessment, and of course the impact assessment always includes the existing building as the status quo, you know. So, it's relative to the existing

building which took up a fair portion of the site in the overbank, yes? And so, you know, it's like for like, if you like, in that regard. Yes.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you.

5

MS GRANT: Just one quick question of clarification which, as Michael says, we haven't had the opportunity to go out onto the site as yet. But are those canal crossings existing or are they proposed as part of your development?

10

MR GRAY: That's a proposed crossing, I think.

MR RAAD: Yes, correct. So, the ones that you see in the image on the screen now, they're proposed. There is an existing one upstream about where my cursor is, Commissioner, and then we have the road crossing downstream.

15

MR CHILCOTT: And –

MR GRAY: And if I could just – Sorry. You go.

20

MR CHILCOTT: I was just going to ask, you're seeking a – it's obviously a concept approval, but in concept, approval for those proposals, what is the view of the, or what's your relationship to the landowners on the other side and have you engaged to receive their consent to make use of the land as proposed?

25

MR RAAD: So, the, where my cursor is now, that's Council, like a reserve space, and that's – this is our, this is still our site here, which you'll see on site, to the south of the channel. So, obviously having both sides here [cross-talk 00:57:10].

MR CHILCOTT: That's fine.

30

MR RAAD: Here, we'd be – we've had, we presented to Council. There is a general support with seeking to improve or enhance them movement north-south. But at this stage, there has been no further, I guess, resolution on it whilst this concept application is still under consideration.

35

MR CHILCOTT: Okay, thank you.

MS GRANT: Thank you. I'm mindful we're getting close to time.

40

MR RAAD: Understood, Madam Chair. Would you like me to move through just the comments to the Assessment Report?

MS GRANT: Yes.

45

MR RAAD: Thank you. I'll just flick back. So, with comments on the Department's Assessment Report, or firstly, look, we'd like to thank the Department obviously for their work and the good, and the well-considered Assessment Report that's been passed on to yourselves.

We just thought some points of note would be beneficial. Look, they are there, they are in the pack, but there is the reference to the channel walks and the through-site link, and that's dimension, that's ... So, the point here we'd like to just make is that their clear distances, so that 30 metres is from building line to building line, that is, you will see on the last, of if you recall, on that last slide, in that 30-metre wide through-site link, there are the courtyards of those ground floor townhouse units or terrace units we discussed. So, it's 30 metres clear building to building, but not from courtyard to courtyard. The Department is aware of that, and you'll see in the conditions of consent, or the draft conditions of consent, that's been picked up there.

Likewise, that 6-metre-wide channel walk is a dimension back from the channel, so in parts it's obviously entirely on our site, and then there's a portion here where it's not, the channel doesn't run parallel with the boundary.

I will just keep flicking through. If at any time, please just raise it with me. This was identified as being part of the Experiment Farm parklands here. Just to clarify, that that's not part the listing, when you look at Experiment Farm's reserves heritage listing.

And then just sort of a few points of clarification regarding the amendment scheme, having gone through the Heritage Council Approvals Committee, and received their support. We'd seek to make comment that as well there's a note in the Assessment Report that John Macarthur and John Harris were working together back in the 1700s/1800s. As Graham clarified, from our research, that's not the case.

And just, I guess the last point is, there's a reference in that Assessment Report to a position paper from the Our Lady of Lebanon Co Cathedral. We haven't had, up until this week, haven't had the benefit of that. We weren't aware it existed, we've never been asked to respond to it through the RFI/Response to Submissions processes. So, we have at request received it but haven't had the opportunity to review it and to make any comment to that. So, just a note there.

And then with respect to the Department's recommended conditions, we kind of had the opportunity to review a draft set, the comments we made have been adopted, in that draft set that's been passed on to yourselves, so we've got nothing further at this stage to add to those draft conditions of consent.

And that's probably – oh sorry, there is permissibility, which we're aware of how the site's permissible. I'll skip through these in interest of time, if I can ...

MS GRANT: Yes, thank you.

MR RAAD: ... Madam Chair. I guess there's some comments, for engineering, real quick, if I can, quickly, just with respect to acoustics. So, we have on a number of occasions over the years undertaken monitoring of the Our Lady of Lebanon Co Cathedral, especially during those scheduled event periods. And just, I guess, make a note that apart from once over the course of the year, the noise that was generated by the Co Cathedral's events was similar to noise expected from a collector road or a busy local road. So, I guess the takeaway from this is, and not against anything that's been

said in the Assessment Report, but the noise generated is not uncommon in being able to deliver or being able to respond to through standard engineering means in the detailed design process.

5 **MS GRANT:** You're saying the ability to design the residential ...

MR RAAD: Correct.

10 **MS GRANT:** ... development, that wouldn't be impacted by ...

MR RAAD: Correct.

MS GRANT: ... the existing church.

15 **MR RAAD:** Yes, that's exactly, Madam Chair, thank you very much. And then just sort of finally, the comments are made through the Assessment Report about the perception of traffic impacts. Like, what we've got here is a photo taken, that is in our Traffic Report, and it just highlights that there are, there is a traffic issue on Alice Street when it is school pickup time, people double-parked to wait to pick up their
20 kids. So, there is a localised peak that's generated by that, and a localised impact to the network, rather, but that doesn't align with the network peaks from our development.

And then contamination, we'll deal with it through the conditions. We've done the full gamut of reports, noting that the reporting was undertaken a couple of years ago, however, the site hasn't materially changed since then. But we can update as
25 necessary, so.

And that's us at this point in time. Thank you, Madam Chair, back to yourself and the Panel if there's any other questions.
30

MS GRANT: Terrific. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions?

MR CHILCOTT: I just want to make sure. Geoff, we've got the compatibility certificate, have we?
35

MR KWOK: Yes, we do.

MR CHILCOTT: Great, thanks.

40 **MR KWOK:** It's on the Department's website.

MR CHILCOTT: Okay, brilliant, thanks. No, that's fine. Thank you.

MR RAAD: I can turn back to it, Commissioner, if you'd like, I did have an extract of the Schedule 2 which was the requirement that we had to comply with.
45

MR CHILCOTT: Yes, just quickly, if you can [cross-talk 01:03:48] too much time, I can have a look at it.

MR RAAD: That's okay. So, this is sort of Schedule 2, provided here for your benefit. But I guess we can talk to the fact that we've ad nauseam gone through a whole lot of that consultation as required. We've partnered with the social housing provider, being Civic Community Housing, and we are confident that this final development layer addresses and resolves those items in the –

MR CHILCOTT: Thanks, thanks.

MR RAAD: Thank you, Commissioner.

MR CHILCOTT: Oh sorry, just go back again.

MR RAAD: Oh, sorry. Yes. Where to, Commissioner?

MR CHILCOTT: Just to the slide that you just had on, with the compatibility certificate.

MR RAAD: Yes.

MR CHILCOTT: I thought it said ... So, it's said to be current for five years from issuing.

MR DANIEL: Michael, there's a savings provision in the Housing SEPP.

MR CHILCOTT: There's a savings ...

MR DANIEL: And what it does, what it's intended, so in the Housing SEPP, what it does, it enables the continuation of the power of the certificate while a development application has been lodged within that time period. So, that's the –

MR CHILCOTT: A DA had been lodged in that period for this development, is that right?

MR DANIEL: Yes, that's correct, yes.

MR CHILCOTT: Okay. No, I was just trying to get my head around the permissibility side.

MR DANIEL: No, it's a very good point. And also, if I can just follow up, it also assists to understand why there's been this consultative process and refinement of the built form to where eventually Alec and Graham and Christian have landed on. Because this has been a very iterative and consultative process with the Heritage Council and Heritage NSW particularly, and of course the Department, and also Council as well at certain times. So, and that's why it's refined down to this point from ...

The residential flat building was originally certified but of course it was certified on the land but then subject to these things. And it's been a while, but it has been a site that required a detailed level of consultation and consideration through that, and a

number of meetings with the Heritage Council and it's resolved that. And I don't know if Graham wants to talk about some of that journey. And that's how it's been – the area's benefited a lot from Graham's work and doing a lot of heritage assessment and those sort of things which are significant public benefit for these areas. But it's also provided a very good study of how this area can provide this type of housing within its contemporary setting as well, those heritage settings, so.

MR CHILCOTT: No, thanks Matthew. I mean, I just want to, the second-last dot-point, the EIS was lodged prior to the 19th of July, it's actually the DA that needs to be lodged prior to that. I assume you meant the DA was lodged, not the EIS.

MR DANIEL: Yes, of course, yes, that's correct, Michael. Sorry, that pointed turn of phrase, yes.

MR CHILCOTT: Sorry, I spent too much time in the court.

MR DANIEL: No, that's okay.

MR CHILCOTT: And lots of meetings.

MR DANIEL: Of course, yes, no, no, it certainly was, and your exactness is appreciated, it's very important.

MR CHILCOTT: No, it's okay, I'm just a bit finicky when it comes to words.

MR DANIEL: Of course.

MR CHILCOTT: Thanks.

MS GRANT: If you've got –

MR RAAD: That was me, Commissioner, my apologies.

MR CHILCOTT: Okay, thank you.

MS GRANT: If you've got one more minute, I have one more question. At the very, very beginning when you opened, Raymond, there was discussion that it was 50% of dwellings to be affordable housing, and 100% to be build-to-rent.

MR RAAD: Correct.

MS GRANT: I get the build-to-rent, no worries. Affordable housing 50%, you've got obviously your community housing provider, you've got Pacific there, you've got Matt. Is there – and apologies if it's in the detailed documentation, but is it intended that that, I'm assuming that's for 15 years and not in perpetuity, but I'd be happy to be corrected?

MR RAAD: That's correct, yes.

MS GRANT: And then is the intent that it be sort of, presumably this gets developed in stages once the concept, if it moves past a concept. So, is it intended that it's 50% sort of continually per stage, or does 50% not come till ...

5 **MR RAAD:** No, so I'll answer that. And there's actually a condition of – there's a condition of consent around it. So, we're committing to, and the conditions reflect that, that there's a single stage after this.

MS GRANT: Oh, okay, right.

10

MR DANIEL: Juliet, can I just make a comment about the in perpetuity and those sorts of things. And it's something that I think I find in the planning system, we're lodging a lot of affordable housing, Juliet, and we're finding that it's an interesting thing, this discussion around perpetuity.

15

The way the NSW planning system interfaces on these things is that we, and we've done this with a couple of projects, where we've got the consent, we have this 15 years put onto it, and then at that stage we go off to the Commonwealth and just talk to them, or Housing NSW, and then we work the financial model around and then with different sort of incentive provisions on that sort of front, and the things they can do with bond aggregators and those sort of aspects to do it. And then the date can change to 25 years or more, and things like that. And it happens post that.

20

And so, that sort of discussion needs to be considered within that context of how the system actually works in that way. And it's quite important for those time periods to be there to be able to finance and bring these projects together from inception, and then after they're delivered and planned, then that's the time when you go up and talk to the Commonwealth for those sort of areas that can provide that sort of financial support for a longer time period, connected to the social need in that way.

25

30

MS GRANT: Thank you, no, I'm well aware that there's a lot of confusion. That's why I just wanted to – a lot of people make different assumptions about what it is and what it means. So, yes, no, appreciate that.

35

MR DANIEL: Yes, just a general bear in mind, that's all, so appreciate [cross-talk 01:09:35].

MS GRANT: Yes, I know, I totally understand.

40

MR CHILCOTT: We're good.

MS GRANT: Okay. Well, thank you everybody for your time, and really appreciate you sharing the detailed journey and evolution with us. It is early days for us and we'll go out to the site and obviously meet you on site to be shown and have the public meeting. Anything else, Geoff?

45

MR KWOK: No, I think we've covered everything. Nothing else.

MS GRANT: Fabulous. Thank you so much for your time.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you.

MS GRANT: Have a lovely weekend.

5

MR MATTHEWS: Thanks, everyone.

[Multiple people say thank you]

10

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED