



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: 242-244 BEECROFT ROAD, EPPING (SSD-31576972)
242-244 BEECROFT ROAD, EPPING – MOD 1 (SSD-8784-Mod-1)

APPLICANT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: CHRIS WILSON (Panel Chair)
WENDY LEWIN
PROFESSOR ELIZABETH TAYLOR AO

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRADLEY JAMES
GEOFF KWOK

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES: DANIEL NICOLAS
JACK MALOUF
ADAM BYRNES
BRAD DELAPIERRE
CHRIS RYAN
JAMES MCCARTHY
THEO KRALLIS
CLAIRA KRATOCHVIL

LOCATION: IPC, STE 15.02 L15, 135 KING STREET
SYDNEY NSW 000

DATE: 1.00PM, MONDAY, 04 SEPTEMBER 2023

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

MR WILSON: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land of which we meet, the Gadigal people of the Eora nation and pay my respects to their Elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the SSD application and modification of concept approval at 242 to 244 Beecroft Road, Epping currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant is Beecroft Property Development Pty Limited.

10 My name is Chris Wilson, I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioners Wendy Lewin on my left and Elizabeth Taylor on my right. We're also joined by Brad James and Geoff Kwok from the Officer of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture information today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

20 This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration in this matter and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission base its determination. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin.

Welcome. Now, who is going to - you're going to kick off?

30 MR ADAM BYRNES: I'm happy to, sure. I think we have a presentation which is preloaded.

MR WILSON: Yes, which we've got, thank you.

MR BYRNES: Would you like us to briefly introduce ourselves, run around the table?

MR WILSON: Yeah, let's do it and then we can - then we might just hand it straight over to the presentation.

40 MR BYRNES: That would be perfect.

MS LEWIN: Great.

MR BYRNES: My name's Adam Byrnes, I'm from Think Planner.

MR BRAD DELAPIERRE: My name's Brad Delapierre, I'm also from Think Planners.

MR DANIEL NICOLAS: Daniel Nicolas from DASCO, owner.

MR CHRIS RYAN: Chris Ryan, Development Manager.

MR JACK MALOUF: Jack Malouf, DASCO.

MR JAMES McCARTHY: James McCarthy from Turner Architects.

MR THEO KRALLIS: Theo Krallis from Turner Architects.

10 MS CLAIRA KRATOCHVIL: I'm Clair Kratochvil from Site Image Landscape Architects.

MR WILSON: Who wasn't on the site on Friday. O.K. All right. Over to you.

MR BYRNES: Thank you. So we might it to James (not transcribable 1.00.38)

MR McCARTHY: So thank you for the panel for the chance to present today. It's a very quick presentation just to give an overview and, I guess, following on from the site meeting that we had on Friday. So we were all there on Friday, we saw where the site is located on the ridge line on Beecroft Road where the topography starts to fall away down towards Ray Road and the surrounding suburbs. A prominent site, important part of the development of Epping Town Centre and definitely a great opportunity to bookend Epping Town Centre as a transition from high rise more towards the train station down into the more lower lie suburbs to the north-west.

20 Next image. So just on (not transcribable 1.01.24). Overall the level GFA is 38,700, our GFA is sitting under that, so slightly under at 38,622. With regards to the - between residential and non-residential 37,700 residential, non-residential which is a component to along Beecroft Road is 922 square metres again which sits within the guidelines for the site.

30 Yield. The original concept plan had 432 apartments in it, that was the indicative scheme that they used to prove up the concept approval. Our proposal sits substantial below that at 374 and the reason for that is the change in mix. That original concept plan had a focus potentially on yield as opposed to necessarily larger apartment types (not transcribable 1.02.15) apartments. So we, with our proposal, for example, have 31 per cent three-beds versus the original concept plan that was 13.8 per cent. We have no studios where the original concept plan had several studios, almost 10 per cent studios. So there's definitely a shift in this application towards quality apartment planning, larger apartments and amenity.

40 Building Numerics. Just as, I guess, an idea of scale building A on Ray Road, 31 apartments, building B, 94 apartments, C at 124 apartments, building D which faces onto Beecroft Road has 28 apartments and then there's 97 apartments in building E on the site.

Energy. With regards to compliance we're at 24.5 per cent liveable, 10 per cent deductible (not transcribable 1.03.05) criteria. Our solar is at 72.2 per cent. We've

had to work hard on this site because of the amount of south-facing envelope in the concept plan so we've worked hard to achieve that. And cross-ventilation is sitting at 60 per cent.

Landscaping considerations through site image. So 40.9 per cent communal open space for residents. So it's a substantial quantum amenity. Of which we're getting more than 50 per cent to our solar access. Deep soil is greater than 20 per cent across the site so again substantially beyond ADG and canopy coverage greater than 25 per cent. So Site Image team have worked hard to get substantial trees onto the site.

10

Next image. So just quickly just to touch on, I guess, the approved envelopes. As we discussed on site those envelopes, I guess, were based on a quick testing of yield as opposed to necessarily a robust detailed architectural language but what we do raise is the manner in which the three buildings open up view lines of permeability from Beecroft Road down to Ray Road which is really going to improve the quality of experience on Beecroft Road and our proposal on the right-hand side you can see how it has retained the design intent of that original concept plan. Any minor deviations in the envelope are localised and it is to achieve true ADG compliance which we felt the original proposal didn't.

20

Image. This is a landscape-driven approach. As mentioned, this is a transitional site as we move from Epping Town Centre down into Ray Road. This site due to its sheer scale offers us a great opportunity to create a really beautiful landscaped approach, buildings set within much landscaping and a highly programmed landscape as well with a clear delineation between what's public and what's private and down on Ray Road achieving some really quality setbacks. I think, the quality of the streetscape on Ray Road will be improved.

30

Next image. Public Domain. So Site Image have worked hard to make sure that all of this landscaping is properly programmed, public space and communal space works well if it's used and it's loved and we've made sure that the programming of the space is considered and varied.

40

Next image. So just on - just quickly on the ground floor plan. Just touching on the fact that our lobby entries are located - are dispersed around the edges of the site, that they have good site lines back to the street, that they're legible and intuitive and that the retail are at the non-residential space that we create is flexible. So we've denoted a potential break-up of space but it's completely flexible in how we use it and it could be used which gives it some hope of success as a space with level access out onto the streetscape.

Next Image. Suburb (not transcribable 1.06.05) is the fine-grain approach. We've looked to make sure that the retail or non-residential component is not just a sea of glass along Beecroft Road. That is broken up into a series of bays or components, the level of detail around awnings around each of those bays how brick comes to ground and brick is grounded. The detail of that brick and looking at in areas where (not transcribable 1.06.26) and other - other interesting features that brick offers.

Next image. And just importantly that streetscape. So it is the bookend of the town centre, it's very confronting as you sit on the edges of Beecroft Road which you all experienced in a busy traffic condition on Friday. So with this proposal it's the double line of trees obviously which is going to hugely help with softening that interface, offering shade to the streetscape and also a visual buffer between the apartments on that edge and the traffic.

10 Next image. Through-site link. There was a lot of discussion through the SDOP process about achieving a successful through-site link. The key focus of our discussion was making it useable so it didn't become an exercise in (not transcribable 1.07.15) access. So what we've landed on is the use of (not transcribable 1.07.18) midway on that through-site link (not transcribable 1.07.20) get some large lawn areas that are poor spaces that are useable and allows the (not transcribable 1.07.26) to be much more integrated (not transcribable 1.07.30) and it gives us two zones, more urban hardscape zone to Beecroft and more lush green zone to Ray Road.

20 Next image. Just on amenity, I guess, it's looking at all these spaces. So this is the connection of the primary lawn for residents and how that is again programmed with multiple uses. It also connects down to Devlins Creek so it doesn't become isolated, it's attached. So the landscaping is cascading down to form that essential courtyard down to the creek edge and then again as part of that SDOP space we worked through how we could get some meaningful level spaces in those ledges that were useable by residents.

30 Next image. Just on the mid levels. I just touching on the fact that the apartments are all (not transcribable 1.08.16) requirement for unit sizes. We've worked hard on our solar compliance but also worked hard to make sure that the apartments have clean planning, so good open plan, living, dining, kitchen spaces with the connections onto the balconies and (not transcribable 1.08.35) are properly placed with views and outlook. We've also through that SDOP process carefully went through privacy between apartments to make sure that there's no overlooking issues, particularly where you've got the two forks of the buildings on that western edge to make sure that the interface of those apartments (not transcribable 1.08.51) and still has (not transcribable 1.08.52).

40 Next image. Just touching on that mid level. So the proposal looks to have a whole range of rooftop terraces and just key points is that all buildings have direct access from their (not transcribable 1.09.07) to the rooftop terrace as well as obviously the (not transcribable 1.09.11) landscaping and all buildings can move between the rooftop terraces of each building. So residents get a whole array of rooftops they can go to depending on the time of day or the particular use that they have.

Then moving up to the upper levels. So good clean planning and definitely maximising use to the west. Again building separation is a minimum of 24 metres between the towers. The red dotted outline is the original concept plan approval so we've tried to minimise deviation from that and why we do do that is to improve amenity and building separation.

(not transcribable 1.09.50) the importance of amenity for residents. So we've (not transcribable 1.09.55) on one of the (not transcribable 1.09.55) of uses with our swimming pool and the deck (not transcribable 1.09.59) areas, there's dining, there's an outdoor gym and that core location hopefully will lead to a really good space that can be managed well for (not transcribable 1.10.06) and other communities o interact.

10 On materially. We feel it's important that this building uses high quality and low maintenance materials. There's a focus on (not transcribable 1.10.20) surfaces where we discussed on site (not transcribable 1.10.25) a lot of painted white concrete, there's a (not transcribable 1.10.30) against that. So we've looked at a series of warm tones to this project which allude to the more landscape-driven approach for the design. We will retain a brick and pre-finished materials that will stand the test of time. The brick offers us a level of texture and detail at eye height which I think will really benefit the scheme, particularly this location of busy Beecroft road. The brick will be a good resilient material and application.

20 Next image. So as part of the application (not transcribable 1.11.00) further studies have (not transcribable 1.11.05) details, modulation of the façade, making sure those (not transcribable 1.11.06) of façade (not transcribable 1.11.09) series of bays.

Next image. And moving down onto Ray Road again trying to get a diversity of architecture along that streetscape. Also new things like the curved balconies, the use of the black metal vertical balustrade as a deliberate move away from the typical glass balustrade you see so often but then in the taller buildings there is a deliberate use of the glass balustrade there where the outlook and (not transcribable 1.11.35) are to the west of the Blue Mountains (not transcribable 1.11.37).

30 MR WILSON: Just, sorry to interrupt. So the previous design was that Beecroft Road, was it? Do you want to just go back one slide? O.K. So you've got them all curvular angles there on the front in Beecroft, (not transcribable 1.11.52) Ray Road - -

40 MR McCARTHY: The lower level here is quite (not transcribable 1.11.56), I guess, in its approach with the use of brick. The buildings overhead have a lighter appearance with the use of the terracotta and the (not transcribable 11.12.03) and then the next image is down on Ray Road (not transcribable 11.12.08) opening up to those views. The (not transcribable 1.12.11) curves, I guess, is the nuance of the architecture we start looking at the detail and how the balconies tuck in, the wedging of the step work in this corner, the use of 1.12.20) for the brick and (not transcribable 1.12.23) on this edge. So, I guess, the zooming in to these images you start to unpack the detail that's been put into the (not transcribable 1.12.30).

And then final image, I guess, is just setting back on Beecroft Road. So look, we see this as being potential to be a really dynamic mixed-use precinct. It does carry the responsibility of being the bookend to the town centre both from a sight line perspective as you come from the train station but also just as a quality point of entry to the wider precinct and connecting busy Beecroft Road down into Ray Road. So we're interested to get the panel's feedback today.

MR WILSON: Thank you. O.K. So we'll just - I think we'll just probably just go through the agenda (not transcribable 1.13.07). I guess my first question is the department - we had the department this morning - the department basically said - this relates to commercial, I guess, we're just - you know, because there's objection in relation to commercial space that we're prosecuting it probably more than we would normally but the department's reasoning for - I understand the site's not part of the town centre and I understand it's rezoning which was prior to the concept or the concept that's been adopted is R4, is that correct?

10

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR WILSON: So the site next door which has been developed on the corner is a different zoning, my understanding, similar height controls and so forth and - but different commercial but it's part of the commercial centre; yet, the department's reasoning for - my understanding the concept limiting the amount of commercial was that pedestrian access across the road. So I'm just trying to - I'm just trying to, I guess, understand that, you know, if it's suitable for that building on the corner, and I'm not suggesting it is suitable for yours, all I'm saying is I'm trying to ascertain why that building's so different in terms of so much further from yours.

20

If the road's the issue for the department, why isn't that building R4 and why is it - why has it got so much more - probably got more commercial, I don't know, I haven't looked at it but I'm just trying to understand the rationale. Probably a question I probably should've asked the department this morning. I still will but if you've got any explanation I'd appreciate it.

MR BYRNES: I can't explain the department's rationale but I've got a couple of other pieces to add to the jigsaw puzzle.

30

MR WILSON: O.K. Yes.

MR BYRNES: So obviously we have an R4 zone and the R4 zone's the R4 zone. So we've got a planning hierarchy we've got to work with (not transcribable 1.14.54). What was also interesting is council pursued its own planning proposal for Epping Town Centre to increase commercial across the entire centre. So it's (not transcribable 1.15.05) important piece to add in. That failed in October '21 on the basis of - there were two main reasons. Firstly, Transport for New South Wales just cannot cope with the additional traffic in this - in this region. By increasing the number of commercial (not transcribable 1.15.24) 6,000 extra jobs, it just can't cope with it and they also said there was a bit of a disconnect between council's argument that council said to the department we want to not allow clause 4.6's in Epping or to limit the scope of clause 4.6 variations on the basis of traffic and, yet, we want to - on a different proposition to the - on the planning proposal too the department said we want to radically increase every site by one to one of commercial and kind of essentially (not transcribable 1.15.58) the traffic issue.

40

So we're happy to cop the traffic that arises. The department said there's a bit of disconnect in that in their report and so for those two reasons, Transport for New South Wales objection (not transcribable 1.16.09) argument it failed. This doesn't answer your question - - -

MR WILSON: No, that's O.K.

10 MR BYRNES: - - - in particular. It's just important framework to how we arrived at it but at the end of the day we have an R4 zoning up at the upper end of the band under the concept plan. The concept plan's 750 to 1000 (not transcribable 1.16.29) and we'd be providing an appropriate response to both the zone and the band. The one other thing is we've been - have sought a particular condition in the consent to ensure that we can go beyond a neighbourhood stop. So an R4 zone you can only do a neighbourhood shop (not transcribable 1.16.47) square metres and there's a condition in there that preapproves because (not transcribable 1.16.52) preapproved a greater commercial plate size per tenancy.

MALE SPEAKER: (not transcribable 1.16.59) bits of info.

20 MR WILSON: No, no, I probably should've - I mean, it didn't dawn onto me until the department left so but we can ask that, we said we're going to ask more questions. I Mean, from my perspective going for that walkthrough town centre to town centre needs a bit of help and, I guess, the last thing you want, you know, tenancies competing to which might undermine the renewal of the town centre. That's my view, I don't know what my colleagues' is but I think - I understand the department's position so - so do you have any questions on commerciality? I mean, when you talk about bigger tenancy you're talking about an (not transcribable 1.17.40).

30 MR BYRNES: I don't think - - -

MR WILSON: Because I did see one of the buildings near - on the other side of the railway line (not transcribable 1.17.46) in it.

MR BYRNES: You're taking 923 square metres over - of all the commercial floor space?

MR WILSON: Yeah. It's not much, is it?

40 MR BYRNES: No. So it's in terms of an IGA, like - - -

MR WILSON: What would a normal IGA be?

MR BYRNES: They're still around 1500.

MR WILSON: O.K. All right.

MR BYRNES: For a decent size.

MR McCARTHY: Configuration is across to (not transcribable 1.18.00) 900 so there's building B, it's two smaller tenancies and then it's deliberately designed as a low risk space that can be subdivided so you get maximum frontage and (not transcribable 1.18.15) tenancies. There's an interesting interface there as well with the traffic. I think that it's an appropriate use considering how busy the traffic interface is.

10 MR BYRNES: It's obviously set up for a café to go in (not transcribable 1.18.25) tenancies further back and then, yeah, whether it's - it could be a whole range of uses such as a small retail shop, it could be medical, it could be a gym, it sets it up for that because, you know, there isn't a lot of passing pedestrian traffic.

MR WILSON: So it's more used as - used by residents of the site as opposed to people who come and go from town centre?

MR BYRNES: Yeah, and the immediate locality because, you're right, it's not going to be someone driving to pick up a loaf of bread, it's someone that happens to be passing through that will pick it up and have a coffee.

20 MR WILSON: O.K. Thank you for that. Got any questions on - - -

FEMALE SPEAKER: (not transcribable 1.19.03).

30 MR WILSON: No, no. So land use. (not transcribable 1.19.08) build form, should we talk about build form? Can you explain to us a couple of things here and they're minor, they're just - we couldn't find the bike parks. A, there's a lot of bike parking, I guess that's been dictated in the concept plan, ground 74. It's a lot of bikes. And how are they - I guess, how they're distributed - how they're distributed - the bike parking how is that distributed across the site? We were struggling to find it this morning in terms of (not transcribable 1.19.36) access and so forth. How those bikes interact with the network.

MS LEWIN: How you access (not transcribable 1.19.42). They seem to be under one ruling and servicing all three and your rationale behind that.

40 MR McCARTHY: They're located on Ray Road which is at the midways of cycling. (not transcribable 1.20.05) cycling was how we could consider quick and easy access to the bicycle parking. We allow the cyclists to (not transcribable 1.20.18) main car park entry (not transcribable 1.20.19) but as a central means of entry. At this point (not transcribable 1.20.24) access into the car park which is sitting underneath to the left or to the north (not transcribable 1.20.31) facility which shows changes areas, et cetera, for residents and then to the right sitting under this building is the hospital parking which is one large secure zone. Its location was - I guess to have a close (not transcribable 1.20.47) facility so you can have all of those things together, you lock your bike, you go have your shower, you change and where it is located particularly (not transcribable 1.20.55) facilities is central to the site which allows you to move through the basement.

MALE SPEAKER: It was a deliberate intention not to have a scattered bicycle parking throughout the complex. Sometimes see bicycle parking scattered (not transcribable 1.21.12) it was a deliberate intention, as James has outlined, to have it in a centralised area which comes with insurance, et cetera, because it's often hard to actually put a bike in a basement car park to get insurance so the idea of having it more centralised and more secured system is actually to allow someone to park their bike there and get insurance for it rather than scattered around in leftover spaces on racks beside highways, et cetera.

10 MR WILSON: And effectively it's one bike per unit?

MR BYRNES: Correct. Which came from - obviously we've heard through the presentation that traffic is an underlying issue here so this is part of (not transcribable 1.21.46) with a green travel plan to incentivise people to utilise another mode of transport.

MR WILSON: And the end of trip facilities, they're - - -

MR McCARTHY: They're sitting under building C (not transcribable 1.21.59).
20

MR WILSON: O.K. And then the bikes come in and out on Ray - - -

MS LEWIN: Ray Road.

MR WILSON: Ray Road, do they, or - - -

MS LEWIN: Beecroft Road.

MR McCARTHY: Yes, next to the lift. The through cycling you see an access, they
30 have access point there.

MS LEWIN: So you come off Ray Road?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MALE SPEAKER: Or you could come off Beecroft.

MR McCARTHY: You could come off Beecroft if you wanted to and there's a lift to
40 go straight down and access the level that has all of the bicycle parking where there's doors at this point here. So most pedestrians - in our studies the area we're coming through in this direction and could actually - our cyclist could come through and get easy access at this point or if they wanted to they could come down the ramp. I guess there's a selection of ways of getting into the car park.

MR WILSON: It's fairly accessible regardless.

MS TAYLOR: So what if you do (not transcribable 1.22.49). They're all under one building impact the access - the people from the others (not transcribable 1.23.01) body corporate what you were thinking you had mentioned?

MR DELAPIERRE: The strata lots (not transcribable 1.23.08) so they've all got access through to the (not transcribable 1.23.12) they're shared facility.

MS TAYLOR: O.K.

10 MR DELAPIERRE: Same as the fire services in their shared management statement between (not transcribable 1.23.20) statement. So if you do subdivide you can have the same fire emergency system, all that stuff - - -

MS TAYLOR: Access to the pool (not transcribable 1.23.29).

MR DELAPIERRE: Access to the garbage room, so they're all - - -

MS TAYLOR: There's an operational overlay for the whole site.

20 SPEAKER: Across the whole - - -

MS TAYLOR: The services both strata.

MR DELAPIERRE: Yeah, correct.

MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.23.43) and today. (not transcribable 1.23.45) presented the advantages of the visual connectivity for a town - further up the town centre to the public open space opening up the (not transcribable 1.23.59) corridor. On your drawings you have a (not transcribable 1.24.05) substation, kiosks in the
30 south-east corner. A couple of questions around that. Is that absolutely the required location for those kiosks or could they be moved further to the west to allow for greater connectivity visually and also perhaps promote more easy access - equitable access to what might be the commercial component? I can't - or perhaps if you take us through how equitable access to the commercial component occurs from that corner of the site.

MR McCARTHY: To your right the opening of the aperture of the view is really important.

40 MS LEWIN: Yes, and the - - -

MR McCARTHY: Which as you come to this point that the buildings start to set back and that the podium definition restarts on the other side of this space.

MS LEWIN: And the substation kiosk - - -

MR McCARTHY: The relationship - - -

MS LEWIN: - - - seemingly in conflict with that.

MR McCARTHY: The relationship to the street (not transcribable 1.25.12) requirements of Energy Australia and how you can configure energy, kiosks on street edge so there's not a lot of capacity (not transcribable 1.25.23). We could review and there's a little bit of capacity to do that but there is a requirement that they have to be on or close to the boundary line - - -

MS LEWIN: Absolutely.

10

MR McCARTHY: - - - (not transcribable 1.25.35). So I guess the query is that you're looking whether there's the ability for this to shift, shift inwards to lessen the impact.

MS LEWIN: Because you finesse it so that there is actually a more consistent approach to the way in which the development is cited and read on the street and whether that's a possibility or not is something that we'd be interested to - - -

20

MR BYRNES: Yeah, look, we're happy to - generally as James was saying they require them on the street frontage unfortunately because, you're right, we all agree that it's not the best thing at your front entry on the street so it's probably more a matter about whereabouts on the front setback it could be located - better located.

MS LEWIN: Yes. And I am - I'm familiar with the (not transcribable 1.26.22) so it's just a question of whether there is an opportunity to (not transcribable 1.26.25).

MR McCARTHY: Maybe we can see if it can be moved to the south.

MS LEWIN: Maybe.

30

MR McCARTHY: Towards the petrol station.

MS LEWIN: And would that assist in equitable access to the commercial?

MR WILSON: Greater access to - - -

40

MR McCARTHY: Yeah, it's almost - actually this (not transcribable 1.26.38) level so, yes, you're correct that potentially you could actually just (not transcribable 1.26.45) to get access to this point so there's multiple ways (not transcribable 1.26.50) of getting onto this (not transcribable 1.26.50) which is the (not transcribable 1.26.54) potentially can be a café.

MS LEWIN: Exactly.

MR McCARTHY: So, yeah, we'll take that on board and I guess we'd have to investigate (not transcribable 1.26.59) consultant just to how much we can (not transcribable 1.27.02) the aperture.

MR WILSON: How long will it take you to look at that? Would you be able to get back to us by Friday?

MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.27.05) today.

MR WILSON: O.K.

MALE SPEAKER: We've already engaged level 3 so (not transcribable 1.27.11).

10 MR WILSON: Just ask you to look at it, yeah, potential.

MR BYRNES: Sorry, it might create - I'll come back to you with more detail.

MR WILSON: Yeah, that's O.K. Do we need to talk about the access to the - rear access in Ray Street and the condition that's put in by the department?

MS LEWIN: Yeah, it might be worthwhile to canvass your views on the - - -

20 MR WILSON: Your views on the department's recommended change to - - -

MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.27.41) could be (not transcribable 1.27.48) so that (not transcribable 1.27.49).

MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.27.50) that the applicant's happy to embrace that condition.

MR WILSON: Well, I'd like to hear your thoughts on it. I'm sure - we understand from the department you are happy to embrace it but we'd like to hear it from you.

30 MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.28.06) important. As we mentioned on site, flood implications have been really tricky down in that whole interface. At the base (not transcribable 1.28.13) you can have building C comes to ground but the lobby entry, I think, we agree will benefit from the extra width that's suggested in that condition. So it allows a little bit more generosity in the width of the lobby and in the site line from the street into the lobby. We'll also think about the configuration of (not transcribable 1.28.33) wriggle room to deal with landscaping and other considerations in that space also it will help us further increase the landscape offered to the adjacent unit.

40 MALE SPEAKER: Is the panel suggesting we might want to consider reconfiguring the unit

MR WILSON: No, we were just thinking, if there's landscaping on the footpath or in the - sorry, in the immediate - sorry, what do you call it, in the road - beside the road, in front of the unit that some of the benefits of reconfiguring that might be lost.

MS LEWIN: It's an open discussion.

MR WILSON: It's an open discussion, we're just - we're just looking at that thinking, well, you know, is it absolutely necessary. We're not trying to undermine the department's assessment in any way, we're just trying to understand the rationale of - you know, I understand why it should be really opened but then we think some of those compromised by the landscaping itself. The need to open up is compromised by some of the landscaping (not transcribable 1.29.30) undertaking in front of that entry point.

10 MR McCARTHY: In the opening (not transcribable 1.29.37) width of the lobby, it doesn't necessarily mean that we have to increase (not transcribable 1.29.41) zone. There's a lot of requirement around (not transcribable 1.29.46) deep soil on this site as well so we tried to minimise hardscape where possible (not transcribable 1.29.53) zones like on Beecroft. In this location I think that you can actually increase the size of the lobby but not necessarily do away with all of the soft landscaping and (not transcribable 1.30.01) which I think was what you were alluding to.

MR WILSON: (not transcribable 1.30.07) allude you, if you put the appropriate landscaping along the footpath then you're probably not going to see the - you need to see the entry though from the street.

20

MR BYRNES: We've got on this screen what we've (not transcribable 1.30.19).

MR WILSON: Yeah. O.K. Is that as redesigned as required by the department.?

MR McCARTHY: Yeah. So it's a two-storey space and it's - as part of that redesign we looked at the canopy detail as well. So making sure that there's a marker within the streetscape (not transcribable 1.30.33) so you're drawn to it. The shape of the awning as it wraps down also assists with that visual buffer between the lobby arrival and the adjacent apartments.

30

MR WILSON: So if you're pulling up outside in a taxi you'll know where to pull up?

MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.30.50).

MR WILSON: All right. I think the front door works with or without the three bedroom - the third bedroom because essentially the bit that we're adding in is this piece here.

40

MR BYRNES: The front - front doors success regardless so we're open to the - - -

MR WILSON: I just wanted to understand the (not transcribable 1.31.08).

MALE SPEAKER: The panel says the front door works still with a three bedroom - you having the three-bedroom, we'll be fine with that as well.

MR WILSON: All right. We move onto - just in terms of landscaping how does the - how does it look? So landscaping - I mean, we read some of the conditions in relation to landscaping. How does the landscaping - how does the landscaping - once you get

your occupation certificate what happens to the maintenance of the landscaping? I understand the condition says you've got to do it 12 months or something.

MS KRATOCHVIL: We always have a 12-month maintenance plan in place.

MR WILSON: Sure. And then - that then - when does that stop and start?

MS KRATOCHVIL: It starts from the defects liability period and goes for 12 months and then it would up to strata to - - -

10

MR WILSON: So that liability period occurs after occupation certificate's issued?

MS KRATOCHVIL: Yes.

MR WILSON: O.K.

MS KRATOCHVIL: Three months usually.

20

MR WILSON: So in other words if there's a problem with the maintenance, there's a problem with the landscaping, that's part of that liability maintenance - whatever you call it.

MS KRATOCHVIL: To replace plants and - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah. O.K. And then after the 12 months it's the responsibility of the strata to maintain the landscaping?

MS KRATOCHVIL: Yes.

30

MR WILSON: Yep. I understand that. Thank you. Should we talk about traffic? And we asked a question on Friday in relation to - you've got the 374 units, there's - we did ask the department and it's - their response was that, well, that's just how you - the generation rates are based on whether it's one, two or three, is that - is it that basic, is it that simple?

MR BYRNES: We had a traffic engineer look at it and I shot an email through to Geoff, we could probably put it on the screen if we wanted it, outline - there was three or four bullet points from our traffic engineer outline what it was and (not transcribable 1.33.10) on this screen.

40

MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.33.14) the question of - - -

MR BYRNES: Yeah, 11 per cent generation.

MS LEWIN: 11 per cent reduction, yep, retaining the same number of spaces.

MR BYRNES: 11 per cent, I think it was at the peak - in peak time, exactly 15 per cent, I think, from the AM peak as well (not transcribable 1.33.26).

MR WILSON: Is that because there's just less people that can use the cars in the basement?

MR BYRNES: You've got three-bedroom apartment - - -

MR WILSON: Logically, we're thinking about it logically as opposed to (not transcribable 1.33.40) criteria.

10 MR BYRNES: I can read out what our traffic - I'll just share my screen. Scroll down to the four dot points from the traffic engineer. Keep going down. Effectively they're saying because there's less studios and the mix is altered to more, you know, family-friendly apartments is that, you know, someone's been allocated two car parking spaces for a three-bedroom apartment, they're effectively less likely - - -

MR WILSON: O.K.

MR BYRNES: - - - to have car trips compared to, you know, studios, et cetera.

20 MR WILSON: Right. O.K. So there's - probably third dot point, I think it's the second sentence, This indicates that car ownership does not necessarily to car usage in the busy commuter peak areas. That's probably the key point.

MALE SPEAKER: They're saying like it might be busier on the weekends than during the week.

MR DELAPIERRE: If you've got a three-bedroom unit and two cars you're probably more likely anecdotally to only have the one traffic generation as opposed to two-bedders with one space each.

30 MS LEWIN: So the fact that you have so many bicycle options is that going to have an impact on the footpaths around the place or the (not transcribable 1.35.11) around the place? Would that be (not transcribable 1.35.14) anybody asked the question?

MR WILSON: You know, you mean like the amount of usage - the additional use and the physical impact upon the infrastructure?

MR DELAPIERRE: Potential conflicts between pedestrians, cars - - -

40 MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.35.25).

MR DELAPIERRE: Well, I guess, yeah, it certainly has been considered because there - there is some designated bike paths in front of the site so your bicycle would be riding on the road if (not transcribable 1.35.37) as required, you know, the road rules so there is - there is limited bike paths that don't quite connect to the site, there's obviously a bike path along the M2, that's quite well utilised, effectively commuter trips so (not transcribable 1.35.52) the M2 there. So it's certainly - yes, it has been considered that there is - once you come to the edge of the bike paths you'll be joining

cars and there's obviously options to get onto (not transcribable 1.36.02) quite quickly to make your way into the site and into the bicycle parking.

MR WILSON: We asked you on Friday all garbage trucks - there will be no garbage - no waste picked up on the road at all and is that covered in your - that's covered in your application, isn't it?

10 MR BYRNES: A loading bay within the site from Ray Road, all garbage trucks will go so there's no ability to put them in - garbage - garbage on the street, it's all being collected (not transcribable 1.36.35).

MALE SPEAKER: A normal management strategy has all been - it's been taken into a garbage holding area near adjacent to the loading dock.

MR WILSON: We'll come to the conditions later. There's a waste management strategy (not transcribable 1.36.49).

20 MR MAALOUF: It's indicated on level B1 from memory. So just before - so you come off Ray Road entry and you'll see there's a turning circle for the truck to enter the loading bay.

MR WILSON: O.K.

MS LEWIN: That's cold as well? Cold storage as well for waste? Sometimes - - -

30 MR WILSON: Traffic and transport, I guess we've covered off on now. Design excellence. I'm not quite sure we have any questions there. You're comfortable with (not transcribable 1.37.48) conditions and I guess there's a requirement for your architects? Ongoing engagement? I understand there's - - -

MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.38.03).

(MIXED VOICES - UNABLE TO DECIPHER)

40 MR WILSON: All right. So it's just a very - look, we understand why the department's imposed it because they want to make sure and maintain (not transcribable 1.38.23) excellences outcomes are achieved. We just had a few questions in terms of probative (not transcribable 1.38.29) but we'll raise that with (not transcribable 1.38.31). Yeah. So, O.K. So (not transcribable 1.38.35) recommendation so, all right. Moving on from design excellence. I guess another one is affordable housing. The expectations in terms of affordable housing that continue to rise in the community. I understand in the concept plan you dictated a minimum of five per cent, is that correct? And personally I'd like to - I'm good - I'm glad to see that you've salt and peppered those units throughout the development and not in the darkest corners of the - of the development which is a good thing.

I guess one thing I would like - we would like to see as a group, I guess, is - I mean, we can't mandate additional affordable housing on the development but in line with, I

guess, current - current statutory requirements which we understand is not covered in this application but in terms of the amount of time of affordable housing is required to be kept, used to be 10 years, it's now 15 years and I'm just wondering whether you'd be able to consider that? I'll put it on the table. I mean, we're here to try and - we're here to try and meet community expectations. You can take it on notice, that's fine.

MALE SPEAKER: We'll take it on notice.

10 MR WILSON: The housing SEPP. Now, I note it doesn't apply to you, the housing SEPP does require 15 years and I think the time went through just before the housing SEPP was amended which it used to be 10 years and that was the standard. I mean, I have views in terms of - I know you haven't gained any (not transcribable 1.40.10) in relation to affordable housing in this respect but I'd just like you to consider it anyway. It's a request. Is there anything else? Same goes for energy which - we note that you've - here they are too, the changes to the MPC. So one of the rationales of the height exceedance was the floor to ceiling - floor to ceiling requirements coming into the national code - (not transcribable 1.40.55) code.

MALE SPEAKER: 3.15.

20

MR WILSON: Yeah. So - - -

MS LEWIN: (not transcribable 1.41.00) uplift.

MR WILSON: Yeah. So I'm just wondering if we had - we had the times where, other aspects of the national code - construction code that are coming in to place soon and in relation to sustainability and other measures. I guess we're looking at the - the conditions say a minimum of five star. What's your objective?

30 MR DELAPIERRE: Five star, green star design.

MR WILSON: Right. Yeah.

MR DELAPIERRE: And I think it's probably even more than that. If you look at the Northcott report and the sustainability report we're way above capacity, we're going excessive.

MR WILSON: Closer to six?

40 MS LEWIN: And you'd be aware that as of now you have seven stars.

MR DELAPIERRE: (not transcribable 1.41.46) green star's different.

MS LEWIN: Green stars, it will be seven stars shortly and (not transcribable 1.41.51). So we're just wondering where you might consider landing?

MR BYRNES: I think there's sustainability obligations already in the submissions we've put in there (not transcribable 1.42.05) above the standard that what you'd normally see out in the marketplace. Hasn't come with a (not transcribable 1.42.08).

MR WILSON: No, we appreciate that. But we're just trying to understand what they are actually are at a bare minimum. I mean, it would be nice - it would be nice if we had - because the minimum looks like you're just doing the minimum.

MR BYRNES: We're in excess of the minimum.

10

MR WILSON: So maybe you come back to us and identify that and just so advise us actually what you think you're going to achieve. We're not saying we want to dictate that in any consent but we want - we just want a greater understanding of what you are going to achieve without delving into reams and reams of paper so you come back to us by Friday as well it would be useful for us. We need to understand - we'd like to understand greater what you are going to achieve.

MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.42.50) we can summarise.

20

MR WILSON: Summarise it.

MR McCARTHY: (not transcribable 1.42.55) energy use, water use, thermal qualities (not transcribable 1.42.59).

MR WILSON: And you might explain to us what Wells is because I'm not quite sure. There's some conditions in there in relation to water usage.

MALE SPEAKER: (not transcribable 1.43.06).

30

MR WILSON: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

MR McCARTHY: Make sure that our water usage or appliances and fittings meet a certain level (not transcribable 1.43.14) and that's linked as well to our green star rating as well.

40

MR WILSON: Yeah, because, I mean, I could look at Wells (not transcribable 1.43.19) and it doesn't mean much to me, I'm sorry, so you might want to just elaborate on that as well. We only want a page or two, we don't want - summarise what the sustainability outcomes (not transcribable 1.43.31) you're proposing. We're satisfied, there was a few inconsistencies in the department's report but we've addressed that. So we understand it was 3. - the maximum height in the DA was 3.83, the RTS, it came down to 2.9.

MR NICOLS: That's our understanding.

MR WILSON: Yeah. And is that - we're just trying to understand - you want to talk about the rationale?

MS TAYLOR: It was more the way it was noted in the department's response tended to suggest it was all about (not transcribable 1.44.16) but it was actually partly because the difference in the topography and the relationship also with the Hornsby Council. So it (not transcribable 1.44.26) more complex issue and so - - -

MR DELAPIERRE: It's a refinement of the amount of plant that was required or when we lodged the original DA we took a slightly more conservative approach but as the project moved along we were able to actually define what plant zones were more likely and that also assisted to (not transcribable 1.44.46).

10

MS TAYLOR: So the other part of that issue, got no plans for chimneys and big flags and things like that on top?

MR NICOLAS: No, there's no - there's no (not transcribable 1.44.55).

MR WILSON: There's a condition in there that talks about chimneys. O.K. I don't think we have anymore - if you could just address those couple of things, we have to have - we have to have this wrapped up by the end of next week so if you could attend to those couple of matters we asked you to we'd appreciate it. Look, I think affordable housing, so, I mean, almost obliged to raise it, affordable housing, if prosecute that as much as we can. The other issues are just more clarification and confirmation.

20

MR BYRNES: Brad might know this already but I wouldn't mind just understanding the process because we haven't been before the IPC too much and there aren't too many outstanding objections but we've got this process at the moment whereby we are given an opportunity to make some comments.

MR WILSON: Well, they - that submission along with any other submission - Brad - we've asked for submissions by Friday, haven't we?

30

MR JAMES: It's Friday, 5.00pm.

MR WILSON: I understand we've had three so far?

MR JAMES: Yes, we've had three.

MR WILSON: And then the process after that is the applicant able to make a response to that or we just consider it.

40

MR JAMES: If you'd be open to it, they could.

MR WILSON: O.K. It's up to me.

MR JAMES: Yes.

MR WILSON: O.K. So we'll make a decision whether or not we feel we need extra information or whether or not it's just part of our deliberation but amongst ourselves we want to have this wrapped up by the end of next week so we don't particularly

want to - unless it's something which is determinative. We probably won't go back and ask for - that would be my view.

MR JAMES: Or it raises something new that you want to be addressed.

MALE SPEAKER: Submissions will be on the website?

MR WILSON: They'll go up on Friday, won't they?

10 MR JAMES: Probably Monday.

MR WILSON: Monday.

MR JAMES: Just after - - -

MR WILSON: And every time you - every time you submit more information we go around again. And I'm not trying to suggest you shouldn't put something in but I'm just saying that's what happens.

20 MR BYRNES: No, I think it's fair to say if the panel's comfortable with the general tenor of the recommendation then we don't seek to - - -

MR WILSON: Council has declined to meet with us but they will be providing a written submission by Friday.

MR BYRNES: O.K. Thank you.

MR WILSON: Thank you for coming in today. Appreciate it.

30 MEETING CONCLUDED