



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1051576

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH CITY OF SYDNEY COUNCIL

RE: 80 TO 88 REGENT STREET REDFERN STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

PANEL:

**STEVE O'CONNOR
CAROL AUSTIN
DR PETER WILLIAMS**

ASSISTING PANEL:

MATTHEW TODD-JONES

COUNCIL:

**VANESSA CAGLIOSTRO
ALLISON CRONIN**

LOCATION:

**IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

10.46 AM, MONDAY, 22 JULY 2019

MR S. O'CONNOR: Thank you very much. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their Elders, past and present, and to the Elders from other communities who may be here today.

5

Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal seeking approval for the construction of an 18-storey student accommodation development at 80 to 88 Regent Street, Redfern. My name is Steve O'Connor. I'm the chair of the IPC Panel. Ah, joining me are my fellow commissioners, on my right, Carol Austin and, on my left, Dr Peter Williams. Ah, Matthew Todd-Jones is attending on behalf of the Secretariat and Matthew's just over there.

10

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

15

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice, provide additional information in writing at a later date and we will ensure that it's put on the website.

25

I request that all members 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 each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we can begin. Well, thanks again for making the time to come and see us. Is there an opening address that you would like to give us or some comments you want to make or how would you like to proceed.

30

MS V. CAGLIOSTRO: Um, Vanessa, um, Senior Planner of the City. Um, yeah, well, I guess being my first time at IPC - - -

35 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - um, I think that the City has provided a number of responses to the application, and I guess we're just here to understand what you need to know, um, in order, I guess, to progress the application further. Um, obviously the City, um, maintains its objection, um, and I think we're just here to sort of answer any concerns you may have or additional information you need to know from what we can give you. So - - -

40

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. So I've looked at both the council's initial response to the public exhibition and to the more recent response to the amended document that was prepared and some changes made. Is it worth going to that document, which I

45

think's dated 15 November 2018, because that document has just a short covering letter from your City Planning director and then itemises the – the various concerns council has. So maybe if we just scroll through that and – and you can elaborate, if you feel you need to, on any of those issues. So the first one is the SEPP objection in
5 relation to height and floor space ratio, and basically you felt that the objection wasn't well-founded.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: So would you like me - - -

10 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah. Yeah, do you want to - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - to elaborate on that? Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: Yeah, just expand on why you think it wasn't well-founded.
15

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Ah, yeah. So I didn't – I didn't think the – I think the SEPP 1 objection relied heavily on the fact that there was a previous, um, approval of a – a tower building on that same site. I don't think it really focused on what the actual environmental, um, impacts of the actual development that we were assessing were.
20 I don't think it really took into consideration the fact that the, um, additional FSR represented a 24 per cent increase in floor area, and in – in – in conjunction with that, breaching the setback controls as well. I think that there's an overall impact of – of what the sort of, I guess, exceedance of the FSR and height control were doing to the surrounding environment. I don't think, um, you know, the environmental, I guess,
25 impacts such as wind, um, and overshadowing and building separation was really considered. I think they relied heavily on the fact that there was a recent approval, um, and that sort of made the, I guess – they said – I think they were sort of saying that that sort of justified the grounds - - -

30 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - for the – for the objection.

MR O'CONNOR: Can I ask, did the council object to the application that was
35 approved by the - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - Planning Assessment Commission?
40

MS CAGLIOSTRO: My – I – I wasn't part of that, but my understanding was that they did object, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Right. Okay. So, presumably, the council wasn't happy that the
45 project – the previous project was approved on the site, so, therefore, the logic you've just explained of this project relying on what that's been approved, and we're

slightly below the height – the height that that achieves, etcetera, is not necessarily going to wash with the City.

5 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Right. And I just think that there was really – the – the primary focus wasn't on the actual environmental sort of impacts. It was more on the fact that we've already got one building here.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Um, and I just think that, um, wind impacts, um, building separation and overshadowing impacts do play an important role in assessing, um
- - -

15 MR O'CONNOR: Well, I think we'll come to those - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - whether a variation to the control is acceptable.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - separately in a moment. The next heading was Affordable Housing Contribution and I think that's now been resolved, that issue.
20

MS CAGLIOSTRO: That's resolved.

MR O'CONNOR: They're not - - -

25 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - objecting - - -

30 MS CAGLIOSTRO: No.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - to having to pay that contribution.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: No, that's correct.

35 MR O'CONNOR: So council's happy there.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

40 MR O'CONNOR: The next one relates to zone objectives. Ah, it's a business zone
- - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

45 MR O'CONNOR: - - - commercial core, and I think, in particular, around objective E and F, which was to ensure the vitality of the safety of the community in the public domain and to ensure buildings achieve design excellence.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Right.

MR O'CONNOR: So do you want to - - -

5 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Well, yes. I mean, I do have a definition of what, um, the city
considers design excellence to be, and I think it's got to do with – sorry, I'm getting
my paperwork here. Um, so we play – well, I – I guess the City takes design
excellence, um, into account in every new development and we – we hold it, you
know, high – highly within the City, and we think that any new building must respect
10 the amenity of the environment, especially for the public domain.

So, again, we had wind – wind impacts that were – were extreme, um, and we also
had the issue of building separation and, um, overshadowing. So I think – I think,
again, the SEPP 1 sort of comes back into when, you know, the SEPP 1 has to also
15 address the zone objectives, and one of the zone objectives was to ensure that there's
a high level of design excellence in the public domain. So, again, we were sort of
just interrelating those back together.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.
20

MS A. CRONIN: Can I add something.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, by all means.

25 MS CRONIN: Allison Cronin, Urban Designer, City of Sydney. So in the SEPP for
major development, and it's on the second page of, um, the document you were –
attachment A that you were just reading to – reading. Sorry; the third page, design
excellence, page number 3.

30 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS CRONIN: So the design excellence is also enshrined in the SEPP for major
development, and there is those two points which have been highlighted in this
document. So points – clause 2, points B and C, um, to do with the form and
35 external appearance of the building, improving the quality and amenity of the public
domain, that comes down to overshadowing and, um, wind impacts, and C, whether
the building meets the sustainable design principles in terms of sunlight, natural
ventilation, wind, reflectivity, visual and acoustic privacy, etcetera, and that also
comes down to, um, wind impacts, um, and sunlight to the level 1 courtyard.

40 MR O'CONNOR: So just correct me if I'm wrong here, but the – the project's been
through State Significant Design Excellence processes with the Government
Architect. Does council have a role in that? Are you an observer or are you an
active participant, or you're excluded, or what?

45 MS CAGLIOSTRO: I think we sit on the panel. I'm pretty sure we have a
representative on the panel there.

MS CRONIN: We do. Peter John Cantrill - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

5 MS CRONIN: - - - is an observer on that panel. We could give more information – we could get more information on that and provide it to you, if that would be helpful.

MR O’CONNOR: I think that’d be useful.

10 MS CRONIN: Yes.

MR O’CONNOR: Yes, because if - - -

MS CRONIN: Yep.

15 MR O’CONNOR: - - - council’s been a party, even though as an observer, to this whole design excellence process, then – and we’ve got correspondence from the Government Architect saying it’s been through that process and they’re basically happy with it, um, yes, just to try and understand - - -

20 MS CRONIN: We’ll come back to you - - -

MR O’CONNOR: - - - how we reconcile those two things.

25 MS CRONIN: Yep.

DR P. WILLIAMS: Because it’s gone – sorry, Peter Williams. It’s – it’s gone through, um, both the State Design Review Panel and the Government Architect New South Wales is also effectively signed off on it, for want of a better word - - -

30 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - so given that design review process, we would be very keen to see what council’s views are on that process, um, and the outcomes. Um - - -

35 MS CRONIN: My opinion – and I’m not sure if this is the answer – is it comes down to the level of scrutiny of the background reports such as the wind engineering report. I’m not sure whether the design excellence process takes that level of scrutiny into consideration, and we have more information on that - - -

40 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MS CRONIN: - - - to talk to you about today.

45 MR O’CONNOR: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Well, in fact, that's the very next topic on that correspondence so the wind impacts. So we might let you talk a bit more about that.

5 MS CRONIN: Okay. Yes. So, um, the original application included a wind and – pedestrian wind environment study – sorry – of 23 August 2018 and this is based on wind tunnel testing, which is good. However, in our review of this, we've picked up a couple of areas where we think it needs, um, additional – well, amendments and retesting. So it, um – the Windtech report concludes that with a few amelioration treatments, um, the development should be suitable for its intended use. It includes,
10 um, on page 14, table 3 – table 3, the pedestrian comfort criteria – and there's three different comfort criteria and I'm not sure whether you're aware of - - -

MR O'CONNOR: No. Assume we don't have a lot of knowledge about this.

15 MS CRONIN: Okay. Sitting, standing and walking. And each of those has a different metres-per-second which cannot be – a wind speed measured in metres per second which cannot be exceeded for more than five per cent of the time. So – and they – each of them has a – if you – you know, if you're not a wind engineer, you don't understand metres per second. It has a performance-based description. So
20 sitting is:

Outdoor areas that involve seating, such as parks, dining areas and restaurants, amphitheatres –

25 etcetera. Standing – that's the lowest one. Standing is:

Short duration stationary activities, generally less than one hour, including window shopping, waiting areas –

30 etcetera. And walking is for:

Pedestrian thoroughfares, private swimming pools, most communal areas, private balconies and terraces.

35 Now, our issue with the wind report is that it – it uses inappropriate criteria for certain areas. So for example, on Marian Street is the main residential entry. They've used, um, walking where we think that the more correct criteria in terms of comfort for people standing at the main entry to the, um – the development, they're waiting for a taxi, waiting for a friend, um, is standing of six metres per second,
40 which is:

Short duration stationary activities, including waiting areas.

45 That seems to make a lot of sense for us. The level 1 courtyard, which is intended to integrate with the as built courtyard of the development to the north, we think should have the sitting criteria, which is:

Outdoor areas that involve seating.

- It's very clear to us that this performance description can only be interpreted one way. However, in each of those cases, the wind report assumes the next criteria up
5 and in fact they make, um – they make the point, when we've gone back to them a couple of times, or when – sorry – the department has gone back to them a couple of times, that imposing those criteria would result in changes to the building form or building fabric, um, because they're more stringent.
- 10 But we don't think that they're more stringent in a negative way. We think that's a very positive thing to do, to ensure that the level 1 courtyard and the building entry along the footpath provide the best amenity they can for users of the building and for just the public – the public in general because this is an area which is already significantly wind impacted.
- 15 If you've – if you've been for a stroll through the towers of Redfern, the slightest – the calmest day anywhere else, a couple of blocks away, will be very, very – will have very strong winds in this area because of the past approvals which have not included sufficient setbacks above the podium or awnings – continuous awnings.
- 20 And, in fact, the wind – Windtech's wind report says that the conditions in the level 1 courtyard of Iglu are not good but – but we're proposing to continue that courtyard along and achieve this – and use the same comfort criteria. The last point about the Windtech report which we're not satisfied with – and this comes from our landscape architect who couldn't be here today.
- 25 She's got a day off – the – one of the amelioration treatments is to plant dense evergreen trees – a dense canopy of evergreen trees in that level 1 courtyard but the solar diagram show that it gets a glance of sunlight at some point around 11 o'clock.
- 30 It's probably not 15 minutes. The conditions there, with the strong winds and the lack of sunlight, mean that a dense evergreen tree will not be viable so it cannot be – sorry, it cannot be relied upon to mitigate wind successfully. So to summarise, we think that the comfort criteria needs to be changed for a couple – four of the locations and they are point 6 on Marian Street, point 11, 12 and 13 on the level 1 courtyard.
- 35 Um, we think that the wind tunnel testing should test all of the suggested amelioration treatments, with is the full-length awning along Marian Street, to confirm that they are actually adequate. Um, and, sorry, I forgot one point. That point, um – one of the points, um – point 6 is the residential entry point. The criteria
- 40 is GEM. It's the gust equivalent mean – I'm not a wind engineer.
- I get this information from just reading many, many wind reports – is, um, a wind speed that can be exceeded for five per cent of the time. Um, at point 6, that entry, it's exceeded 32 per cent of the time so that's a major exceedance of the comfort
- 45 criteria already assigned to it by Windtech. So we're asking for it to comply with the comfort criteria, ie, come back to five per cent exceedance and also use the lower one, so the standing one at six metres per second rather than eight metres per second.

MR O'CONNOR: So you're referring to a 2018 report, um, the original report. Wasn't there a subsequent report prepared in response to submissions?

MS CRONIN: I think there was just some letters.

5

MS CAGLIOSTRO: It was a cover – it was a cover letter.

MR O'CONNOR: Just a covering letter?

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: It wasn't an actual - - -

MR O'CONNOR: I know they didn't do further wind tunnel testing, etcetera - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

15

MR O'CONNOR: - - - but I thought there was more.

MS CRONIN: No. No, we have two tests and we – we haven't had any satisfaction from these two – sorry, these two letters.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. All right.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: I think – sorry. Just to add to, um, Alison's comments is that the level 1 courtyard that the wind criterion has been assessed as standing, there are 265 students proposed to be in this building and – and in their landscape design report, the – the level 1 courtyard is supposed to be like a break out area, very relaxed area for students to actually sit and be comfortable. So I think to say that, you know, um – to assess – to assess the criteria as standing I think is just – it just doesn't make too much sense to – to us. And I think that, you know, to have that many students with small rooms and unopenable windows, the – the best thing would be to sit in the communal courtyard and enjoy the – enjoy the open air. So I just think that was sort of a little bit disturbing.

25

30

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Just that point you made about unopenable windows. I thought they were proposing that the - - -

35

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Openable windows?

MR O'CONNOR: The windows could be opened, not that they would be most of the time - - -

40

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - but there was that opportunity to open windows.

45

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Okay. Well, I didn't – I didn't see that, but my understanding was that they were fixed.

MR O'CONNOR: Fine.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: The – I mean, I guess just the amenity of the rooms being small, um, any break out space would be really important.

5

MR O'CONNOR: Yep.

MS CRONIN: Can I add something as well. There is a rooftop terrace, um, but the design of the building at this level 1 courtyard area has a lot of, um, the communal spaces around it so there is a communal study, there's also a community space, um, some sort of seating space.

10

MR O'CONNOR: Yep.

MS CRONIN: I'm not 100 per cent sure what these are. There's a gym here as well. It would be a very successful development if this could be used in, um, the majority of wind conditions. And the answer might well be that it has a small glass awning or something like that, or a larger glass awning, I don't know. I don't – I'm not a wind engineer. Um, but I think it's important that we do do all that we can to improve the amenity of this courtyard space, rather than just relying on the rooftop courtyard as a place to go to because if this is continually unusable - - -

20

MR O'CONNOR: Is that level 3 - - -

MS CRONIN: Well - - -

25

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Level 1.

MS CRONIN: It's called level 1.

30

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah, it's called level 1. Yeah.

MS CRONIN: Yeah. It's called level 1.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

35

MS CRONIN: It might be level – it might be the third storey of the building.

MR O'CONNOR: Yeah. Yep.

40

MS CRONIN: Yep.

MS C. AUSTIN: Carol Austin. If you were drafting the conditions or the council is drafting the conditions, what are the changes that you would like to see? So in the case of the entrance area, given it's a relatively small footpath, um, what are feasible ways of addressing the wind intensity for the entrance area? Um, and again with the

45

level 1. So if you were given the responsibility for drafting the conditions, what would you like to see?

5 MS CRONIN: It would – if it was going to be a condition – we’ve debated about this and we think it’s difficult to impose this as a condition of consent because the Windtech report says – and I’m not going to be able to find it – that, um – it might – might have been in one of the letters. Yeah, I think it’s in one of the letters, um, that the changes required if you – to, um – to achieve lesser comfort – a higher comfort
10 criteria would result – may result in significant design changes and that’s something that, from a planning perspective – Vanessa might comment on this – we wouldn’t ordinarily condition unless it was a deferred commencement condition.

But it’s very difficult. So this is – through the whole process we have said, from the very beginning, wind tunnel testing with the amelioration and the different criteria is
15 what is required during the assessment process. Um, however, if it has to be a condition of consent, it has to include the correct comfort criteria, the fact that all the amelioration treatments recommended in the report are built into the model, the wind tunnel testing is done and, um – I think it would be good if it could come back to the City of Sydney to peer-review – sorry; not to peer-review, to review – to have some
20 say in.

MS AUSTIN: So I’m – sorry. I’m unclear. So let’s start with the entrance. Are there technical solutions to reduce the wind impact in the area, um, or - - -

25 MS CRONIN: Yes.

MS AUSTIN: Other than redesign of the building?

30 MS CRONIN: So - - -

MS AUSTIN: So are there, um, sort of add-on amendments that could be made?

MS CRONIN: So the changes that may affect – we’re not wind specialists, so we can’t answer your question, but the changes that may have to happen are a large
35 awning or a greater setback of the tower. So larger awning, easy. Greater setback of tower – of the tower, more difficult.

MS AUSTIN: Mmhmm.

40 MS CRONIN: So the answer to your question is no, we can’t specify.

MS AUSTIN: Okay. So that’s the entrance, and so in the – in respect of, ah, level 1, you – your, um, solutions are potentially, um, some sort of, um, barriers that - - -

45 MS CAGLIOSTRO: I – to be honest, I think – and I – you can correct me if I’m wrong – I think to understand what the impacts of the level-1 courtyard would be to have the testing undertaken – again, based on the proper criteria in which we think

would be sit in. And I think that may – I think that would tell us a lot more of what we may need to know. They’ve recommended, um, as Allison, ah, said, some trees through the middle of the courtyard, but the landscaping plan doesn’t reflect that. So I’m not sure if the landscapers are thinking, “Well –” as Allison said “– because of
5 the minimal amount of sunlight going into there, this is not going to work, so we will have planters scattered around and – and whatever else.” I think, to have the – and I think we’ve raised this with them a number of times in our response – is that we don’t agree with the criteria that you’ve tested it in. So that may – that might add some, I guess, information as to what they may need to do. I don’t think by – I
10 mean, they could add a cover – more of a covered area.

MS CRONIN: Mmhmm. Possibly.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: But then again, it’s just – it’s the downdraught of the wind
15 coming off the buildings, um, and adding into that area, so I don’t know if could – could another awning help. I wouldn’t be able to tell you that - - -

MS CRONIN: We - - -

20 MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - and I think - - -

MS CRONIN: I wouldn’t either.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - the testing would need to be undertaken at the proper
25 criteria to understand what you need to do.

MS AUSTIN: And the rooftop garden, are there any concerns about - - -

30 MS CRONIN: No.

MS AUSTIN: Okay. So it’s two areas particularly - - -

MS CRONIN: For the wind. Yes.

35 MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MR O’CONNOR: If I can go back to your submission and take on board your comments about wind, the next heading is Overshadowing, and I think initially you were concerned you didn’t have enough information to make some comments. Has
40 that been addressed now, or - - -

MS CRONIN: Initially, the – um, the sun was coming from the north-west in the morning. Um, so when the sun was put into its correct position, um, we got the information that we needed. Um, we’ve sort of made an agreement not to really
45 press overshadowing further.

MR O’CONNOR: Right.

MS CRONIN: Um, the – through the rounds of, um, modifications, um, the main issue is that it's – the impact hasn't been quantified or justified. However, the impact to residential areas to the south-east falls within the approved shadow. So - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: Sure. I understand.

MS CRONIN: Yeah.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Noncompliance setbacks to Regent Street, Marian Street and Williams Lane.

MS CRONIN: So these are tied in with the wind impact.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS CRONIN: So a greater setback has, um, ah, better ability to reduce downwash. Um, the setbacks to Regent Street – I can't remember exactly what they are, but they follow the established pattern from - - -

20 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS CRONIN: - - - Iglu - - -

25 MS AUSTIN: Yep.

MS CRONIN: - - - which is good in terms of urban form. To Marian Street, they range from 1.3 to 2.6. The Redfern Design – Urban Design Principles - - -

30 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Up to three – yeah. So the - - -

MS CRONIN: Yeah.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: It says to three – it says – so the - - -

35 MS CRONIN: The three is at ground level.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Oh yeah. Right.

40 MS CRONIN: This is street setback.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MS CRONIN: And above that it's four metres.

45 MS CAGLIOSTRO: That's right.

MS CRONIN: A four-metre setback. And that's not achieved. Um, our urban design concerns about that is that it may prejudice development on this site to the south, for which we've already seen some applications.

5 MR O'CONNOR: Yep.

MS CRONIN: Um, and that – it would be better if we could achieve ADG compliant – though ADG doesn't apply – to this building so that we could have, um, 24-metre separation between the two towers.

10

MR O'CONNOR: And what's achieved at the moment?

MS CRONIN: Ah - - -

15 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Ah - - -

MS CRONIN: About two or three metres.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

20

MR O'CONNOR: 12.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah. Yeah, I've got it in here. I've got it in here. Sorry. I'll find it.

25

MR O'CONNOR: Just while you're looking for that, do you know, um, in terms of the 800-millimetre setback - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Oh, they did - - -

30

MR O'CONNOR: - - - to William Lane - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: They did sort that out.

35 MR O'CONNOR: They provided that - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - but my question relates to the footpath. So that 800 metres is going to be a footpath, I take it.

40

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmhmm.

MR O'CONNOR: Is there already a footpath in the council road reserve of Williams Lane? So are we going to get something more than 800 metres when that 800 metres is added, or is – that will be the sum total?

45

MS CAGLIOSTRO: I think that is the sum total of the footpath, and I think that's what we needed to have as a minimum. So - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: Well, maybe if you could take that on notice and come back to us - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

10 MR O'CONNOR: - - - just to confirm - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

15 MR O'CONNOR: - - - whether – well, two things – firstly, whether 800 millimetres is the ultimate size of the footpath when you - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

20 MR O'CONNOR: - - - add that in, and, secondly, is council looking for that land then to be dedicated to it so it becomes a council footpath, or are you comfortable with it remaining in private ownership?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah. Okay. We'll find that out.

25 MR O'CONNOR: What's the future there?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: So the proposed setback to Marian Street at the moment, it ranges between 1.3 and 2.65 metres. Um, there's a minimum of four metres setback required for that area. Is that - - -

30 MS CRONIN: Yes.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: And that's what we're saying prejudices this site here.

35 MS CRONIN: Yes. Yes.

40 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Um – sorry. I was just going to find in the urban design guidelines that it says any building above a certain height, even though the ADG doesn't comply, should – it should still – okay. So for building separation, it says for any tower elements above the street wall, the separation distance between non-habitable rooms is still to be 18 metres for buildings in excess of eight storeys. So even though the ADG doesn't comply, the urban design principles do still want, you know - - -

45 MR O'CONNOR: Sure.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - adequate building separation.

MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: So it's not as if, you know, "Oh, the ADG doesn't comply. You know, it doesn't really - - -"

5 MR O'CONNOR: And we're looking to establish what the actual, um, separation that has been achieved with this design is.

MS CRONIN: 1.3 to 2.65.

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MS CRONIN: That is the tower separation from the street wall.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Talking about building separations, aren't we?

MS CRONIN: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Oh yeah.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Sorry. You're right. Yeah, yeah. I've got that.

25 MR O'CONNOR: You said ADG recommends 24 metres.

MS CRONIN: It does.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

30 MR O'CONNOR: I'm just trying to ascertain - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

35 MS CRONIN: So they do - - -

MR O'CONNOR: - - - what's - - -

40 MS CRONIN: It's tricky because the ADG gives you separation distances for buildings on the same site. It doesn't speak to, um, buildings on a street frontage, but if you were to apply the same - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Principles.

45 MS CRONIN: - - - principles, it would be measured from the centre-line of the street. So it would be 12 metres from the centre-line of the street, and I think, from

memory, that if the four metres from the Redfern Urban Design Principles was incorporated, it would be satisfactory.

MR O'CONNOR: Right.

5

MS CRONIN: We don't know - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah, we don't know

10 MS CRONIN: We don't have information.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Okay.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. So the next heading is Visual Privacy, and that probably is - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah, they all - - -

20 MR O'CONNOR: - - - interrelated to the issue we've just discussed. Um, floor to height - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yep.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Floor-to-floor heights. So council's raised a concern here about possible repurposing of these buildings in future, if that happens, and the need to have a greater floor-to-floor height to be able to accommodate that.

MS CRONIN: What do we have at the moment?

30 MS CAGLIOSTRO: 2.9 floor-to-floor.

MS CRONIN: 2.9 floor-to-floor. So - - -

35 MR O'CONNOR: And council's asked for 3.1, I think.

MS CRONIN: Yes. Following the ADG.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

40 MS CRONIN: I think that we didn't press that in the third version.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Well, no, they didn't do it. We didn't - - -

45 MS CRONIN: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: We didn't continue with that.

MS CRONIN: All right. So we didn't continue it - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: No.

5 MS CRONIN: - - - on with it.

MS AUSTIN: There has been a large number of buildings specially developed for student accommodation. Um, is that something that you've requested in respect of other developments, or is 2.9 the norm for student accommodation?

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Ah, for city DAs we always press for the, um, 3.1.

MS AUSTIN: And what has been the standard that's typically been achieved for - - -

15 MS CAGLIOSTRO: They do normally come back with 3.1. So normally – do you get – do you – is that your understanding as well?

MS CRONIN: Yep. Yep.
20

MS CAGLIOSTRO: So normally they're pretty compliant when it comes to that.

MS AUSTIN: And Iglu, the one that's adjoining - - -

25 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

MS AUSTIN: - - - that is 3.1?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Probably not, but I can't confirm that.
30

MR O'CONNOR: Because it wasn't dealt with by the city. Yes.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

MS AUSTIN: Mmm.
40

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Um, then there's a heading Door Openings Williams Lane.
45

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Is that still a - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: No, that's - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: That's gone - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: They've sorted that.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - once the 800 has been sorted.

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

MR O'CONNOR: The Elevation to William Lane?

15 MS CRONIN: That has been resolved.

MR O'CONNOR: That's been resolved. Building Expression to Marian Street; has that also been - - -

20 MS CRONIN: That's been resolved.

MR O'CONNOR: Resolved. Land Contamination, you're just pointing the department - - -

25 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - that it's got an obligation there - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmhmm.

30 MR O'CONNOR: - - - or the I should say.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmhmm.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Common Open Space, we've talked about. Soil Depth for Planting on Podium or Slab?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah. Ah, so – so which one, sorry? We're talking about level – the level 1 or level 17?

40 DR WILLIAMS: If the podium wasn't – it would be level 1, I think.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah, level 1. Um, so they've amended the – so our landscape officer said that, ah – so they're saying the – the landscape report doesn't match the wind report in terms of tree species specified. So I think they were still outstanding

45 - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Still concerned.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - yeah, in terms of what they're trying to – what type of species they're proposing there.

5

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: And then for level 17 that's partially been resolved. So the applicant says they've increased some of the plans and depths and our landscaper has said that's partially resolved.

10

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmhmm.

15

MR O'CONNOR: End-of-trip facilities, I think they've now - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes, they've resolved that.

20 MR O'CONNOR: - - - designated some of those.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmhmm.

MR O'CONNOR: So that's no longer an issue. Laundry facilities?

25

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah. Well - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Still have a concern about the inadequacy?

30 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah. They've provided justification but we didn't continue to raise that. But we did say that it should be, um, a greater number.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

35 MS CAGLIOSTRO: But we didn't press that.

MR O'CONNOR: Right. And then the basic certificate – they've come forward with a basic certificate.

40 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: So I think that covers most of the things that were mentioned in your submission. Is there anything over and above that you'd like to bring to our attention - - -

45

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Ah - - -

MR O'CONNOR: - - - or do you see certain things? It seems that that the wind is a particular - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah.

5 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Mmm.

MR O'CONNOR: If you had a hierarchy - - -

10 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - of concerns, it's fairly well - - -

MS CRONIN: Yeah, it is.

15 MR O'CONNOR: - - - up the top of the list.

MS CRONIN: It is.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Is that a fair statement?

MS CRONIN: It's - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

25 MS CRONIN: Because it also impacts on the landscaping issue, the street setback issue - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: And the internal communal area.

30 MS CRONIN: Yes. And the amenity.

DR WILLIAMS: What you're saying there is insufficient internal communal space and - or - - -

35 MS CAGLIOSTRO: Oh no, we're saying it's fine - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

40 MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - we're just saying that the - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Has it been designed so it can be used?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: The amenity of it in terms of wind impact is - - -

45 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - it's probably not going to be an enjoyable space. Like, it's probably not going to be usable as they're, I guess, promoting it to be.

DR WILLIAMS: That's on level 1?

5

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yep. All right.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. And, Peter, have you any, ah, questions that you would like to pose?

DR WILLIAMS: Are the council with what's been proposed in terms of construction vehicles and construction zones? Ah - - -

15

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes. Well, they'll be subject – I think they'll need to submit a construction traffic management plan and that would be all discussed through that condition.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. Right. And council's happy with the bicycle parking provision?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Have you had – have you seen the recommended conditions of consent at all?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: I think I did flash through them.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. But, I mean, that - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: I didn't really - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yeah. No, that's fine. Because they are on the - - -

35

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: On the - - -

40 MS CAGLIOSTRO: On the website, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: On our website. So we just didn't know whether council - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes. We had a look at the record, yes.

45

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Okay. Thanks, Steve.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you. And Carol?

MS AUSTIN: And, ah, council's happy with no parking at all in this site?

5 MS CAGLIOSTRO: No car parking?

MS AUSTIN: Mmhmm.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes. Yes.

10 MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. I just had one question about the mechanical ventilation system. They're proposing, apparently, a refinement of the system they put in to the

15 existing building, the Iglu building next door, has council looked at that in any detail or have any views they want to express about how good or bad it's been and – no?

MS CAGLIOSTRO: No, that wasn't raised by our - - -

20 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: - - - environmental health officers at all.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

25 MS CAGLIOSTRO: So it was not in issue.

MR O'CONNOR: Matt, have you any comments or questions?

30 MR TODD-JONES: Ah, no. Just that, ah, anything you've taken on notice, then, send through to me, I will send you my email address so you can - - -

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Okay.

35 MR TODD-JONES: - - - respond to me rather than

MS CRONIN: Is there a timeframe for our response to you? It's just – my only concern is that I know Peter John Cantrill is on an overseas holiday at the moment

- - -

40 MR TODD-JONES: Okay.

MS CRONIN: - - - and he was the person that we needed to speak to about, um, his involvement and as an observer in the design excellence process.

45 MR TODD-JONES: Okay. When – do you when he's - - -

MS CRONIN: I don't, I'm sorry.

MR TODD-JONES: That's okay.

5 MR O'CONNOR: We normally have about a week's turnaround is what we'd look for.

MR TODD-JONES: Yeah. That's usually about - - -

10 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS CRONIN: Okay. Well, I can talk to someone else in his team.

MR TODD-JONES: Okay.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS CRONIN: Hopefully they'll know.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR TODD-JONES: No, that's great. Thanks.

MR O'CONNOR: So just to recap the material that you might come back to us
25 with, it's about the states development design review process and involvement with the Government Architect. Um, what else have you got down, Matt, in terms of our expectations about what we're going to get back from council?

MS CRONIN: The land dedication to - - -
30

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR TODD-JONES: Yes, dedication.

35 MR O'CONNOR: And the footpath width. I mean – yes, taking it on board if there's an existing path – footpath there or council proposes something. So just those two items? Just so we're clear.

MR TODD-JONES: What I've got here.
40

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS CRONIN: Would it help if I – if we just summarised, um, our wind – the wind issues in a very simple - - -
45

MR O'CONNOR: By all means. Yes.

MS CRONIN: - - - couple of points - - -

MS AUSTIN: That would be very helpful.

5 MS CRONIN: - - - for you.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

10 MS CRONIN: Okay. We will do that too.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. That would be great.

MS CRONIN: Thank you.

15 MS AUSTIN: Excellent.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. If there's no further questions, we will call the meeting to a close. Thanks, again, council officers, for making the time and - - -

20 MS CRONIN: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - effort to come along and talk to us - - -

25 MS CRONIN: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - and for the detailed submissions. Um, your – well, we'll be hearing from you in due course and you'll no doubt hear our outcome as well.

30 MS CRONIN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS CAGLIOSTRO: Yes. Thank you. Thanks.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

35 MS AUSTIN: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.22 am]