

PROF H. LOCHHEAD: Okay. I've just got some formalities - - -

MR G. SHELTON: Mmm.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - that I need to take – undertake. So good morning
everyone and welcome. And before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional
custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay my respects to elders past,
present and future and the elders from other communities who may be here today.
10 Welcome to the meeting on the proposal seeking approval for the modification to the
Fraser's Town Centre concept plan to reduce the car parking rate for two-bedroom
dwellings within residential flat buildings in the town centre from 1.2 spaces to one
space per dwelling. My name is Helen Lochhead and I'm the chair of the IPC panel
today. And I'm joined by my fellow commissioner Soo-Tee Cheong, and Dennis
15 Lee and Callum Firth who are attending from the commission secretariat.

In the interest 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. The meeting is one of the
commission's decision making – part of the commission's decision making process
20 and is taking place – the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of
several sources of information upon which we rely to base our decision. It is
important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues
whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position
to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any information
25 to us after the meeting, um, in writing, and this will then be put on our website as
well.

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
30 other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So now we'll begin. So thank you for
joining us. And I understand that, um, today from council we have Councillor Geoff
Shelton.

MR SHELTON: Yep.
35

PROF LOCHHEAD: Is – that's correct.

MR SHELTON: Okay.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you. Doctor – ah, sorry, Councillor Nathan Hagarty.

MR N. HAGARTY: Ah, not – not quite a doctor.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Well – sorry, I was just – and – and Councillor Mazhar
45 Hadid.

MR M. HADID: Yep.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Is that correct? And we do not have, um, Councillor Charishma Kaliyanda; she's not able to attend?

5

MR D. LEE: I believe she's running a little bit late.

PROF LOCHHEAD: She may be a – a little bit late. Okay. And I also understand, um, David Smith, manager Planning and Transport Strategy will not be joining us today. Okay. Great. So, um, I was just hoping that each of you in turn may be able to provide your comments on the proposal that we may be able to take into account for our deliberation. And so perhaps you would like to start, Councillor Shelton.

10

MR SHELTON: talking very generally, parking has been an issue, ah, in this precinct and in this vicinity for quite some time. There's significant community concern in relation to the availability of parking, and the – um, the modification that you described, ah, is an area that constituents have raised pretty frequently.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: And do you – do you have any views about what may be the solution to that, other than, um, more parking within the development or – because as we understand it, there's quite an issue with commuter parking.

20

MR SHELTON: Yes. Ah, the, um – so the issue with commuter parking has been an issue for, um, at least a year or so. Ah, the, um – ah, that's got a number of dimensions to it. It's not just within Edmondson Park, but also surrounding areas that have been parking next to Edmondson Park Railway Station. I think the upshot of that is that, ah, planners did not conceive of the extent to which, ah, commuters would travel to Edmondson Park in order to park. Ah, that's one thing. The scale of the development, particularly in relation to the subsection of the proposal, is, um, ah, also a cause for concern amongst constituents. Ah, the, ah – the density of the development that's proposed around that area, ah, um, comes at a time when parking's already an issue. Ah, the upshot is that increasing the density, as has been proposed by various modifications, is also causing concern in the community.

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

35

MR SHELTON: And it's a little bit horse before cart to talk about how the increased parking will fix the parking problem when it starts with a question in relation to density.

40

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right.

MR SHELTON: Ah, the, um - - -

MR S. CHEONG: May I - - -

45

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yep.

MR SHELTON: You look at what was originally proposed - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yep.

5 MR SHELTON: - - - and what's subsequently proposed.

MR CHEONG: The density you're talking about – increased density, was approved last October - - -

10 MR SHELTON: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: 2017.

MR SHELTON: Yeah.

15

MR CHEONG: Yep. So it hasn't been any increase since then.

MR HAGARTY: On the other side of the station - - -

20 MR CHEONG: Yep.

MR HAGARTY: - - - ah, the town – town centre north, ah, I think Landcom has put in a modification to increase density on – on the other side. So not the Frasers development - - -

25

MR CHEONG: Mmhmm.

MR HAGARTY: - - - but the Landcom development on the opposite side.

30 MR CHEONG: Right.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Um, is there anything else that you'd like to add?

MR SHELTON: That's it for me for the moment, thanks.

35

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Shelton. Um, perhaps Councillor Hagarty - - -

40 MR HAGARTY: Yep. Um, yeah, just to echo Councillor Shelton's comments: significant issues around parking, um, in the precinct. Ah, there have been a number of petitions, um, ah, a – a local community member has got a petition which he claims to have 7000 signatures. Ah, the Federal Member has run a couple of petitions that have got, you know, ah, over 1000 petitions. Um, ah, I know from working in her office that, you know, we – we get, ah, a handful of, ah, complaints at
45 least every week about parking fines, um, and – and on the flipside, complaints from residents, so the person that lives – basically, the person that lives in a – ah, sort of

acreage nearest to that, um, her driveway's constantly blocked, um, because cars park in her driveway.

5 Um, it's – you know, it's a sort of utter and total planning failure, I – I think is the best way to describe it. You've got cars up on, ah – ah, around the station you've got cars up on the footpath, um, parking anywhere and everywhere. Um, I've heard stories of, um, families where the husband and wife will get – will take two cars to the station at 5.30. The wife will drop her car off, get back in the car, come back, and then that'll allow her to, you know, do the school pick-up and come back. Um,
10 ah, so stories like that.

Um, and, ah, in – I read the submission – the response to council submission, um, on the website, um, and just – I – I guess I've got some issues with that, namely, ah, you know, the comparisons to – there were comparisons to Fairfield, Rhodes, Liverpool,
15 Cabramatta. Um, I did a bit of digging: um, Fairfield has 13 bus routes servicing the station, Rhodes has four, Liverpool has 29, Cabramatta has six. Um, Edmondson Park currently has two bus services, so one to the north of the suburb, one to the south. Um, despite that, those suburbs still have pretty significant on-street parking issues with residents. Um, and despite that, those suburbs have multi-storey car
20 parks.

So, ah, I know in Liverpool, um, we've got issues down sort of the – the northern end where we – we've put some, um, high-rise there with – with on-street parking. So – and that's a direct result of this type of thing, where, you know, you – there's one or
25 1.5 parking per apartment. What you're finding is that with house prices, ah, you know, people in their twenties and thirties are – are still living with their parents. They've got a car. Their parents have got a car each. You've got three cars, you know, in a – in a dwelling that's got either one or two car parks. They're, therefore, parking out on the street. Um, and I think that's what's gonna happen – I'm – I'm
30 almost certain that's what's gonna happen here.

Um, we've also got that issue out in the suburbs. So we've got, ah, suburbs that were built in the sort of nineties that have very narrow streets, similar to what's being
35 proposed here. Um, and so what happens is you've got two or three cars per dwelling. Um, they park on the verge. We fine them 'cause you're not allowed to park on the verge. They park in the street. That means emergency services vehicles can't get past or garbage trucks can't get past. So we've – we're currently developing a policy where we're trying to retrofit these streets, so put in little parking bays or remove the traffic islands in order to get more cars in, which – I guess we
40 need to solve these problems, but it – it – in effect, it's a – it's cost shifting. So these are decisions that are made by, you know, the – the State Government, in terms of planning, um, and five, 10, 15 years later council's having to pick up the bill and retrofit suburbs, ah, in order to, you know, facilitate more parking. So that – that's – that's me.

45

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

MR HAGARTY: Um, and you – you asked Councillor Shelton about sort of what I – what he sees the – the answer as or how do you – you know, it's not just more commuter car parking. Um, so I – I think it's a three-pronged thing. I think yes, you need more commuter car parking, ah, but you also need better public transport to and from these major transport hubs. Um, as I said, currently there's two bus routes: one to the north of the suburb, one to the south. Um, there is an on-demand bus service, but that only services Edmondson Park. Um, and the situation you've got there is that Edmondson Park Station is – basically captures, ah, a very large sort of proportion of all the suburbs north of it, um, you know; and people sort of as far north as Cecil Hills, ah, you know, trying to – trying to go to that station because there is a lack of commuter car parking at – at Liverpool. So that becomes um, if you're not there by 7, you – you can't get in.

And so then what we're seeing is flow-on effects, where even if you live in Edmondson Park and you need to get – you know, you get – you catch the 8 o'clock train, you're not – you don't drive to Edmondson Park. You drive to Holsworthy or you drive to Glenfield. And so there's flow-on effect down the line. Um, I've, ah, spoken to people who live, you know, as far – far out as Wollondilly who drive to Holsworthy to catch the train to work because that's – that's the most effective way for them to catch the train. So adding – I guess, adding more cars to the streets means you're gonna have this issue.

So, ah – so I think three-pronged is obviously commuter car parking, but that's a sort of short-term solution, better public transport to all the areas, but better jobs in – in – in the area. So, um, that's something that council's working on. Um, you know, the less people that have to get on a train and go to the city or go to Parramatta, ah, obviously means there's less people going to the train station. So more commuter car parking in the short-term, in the medium-term and long-term, ah, better public transport and – and better jobs in Liverpool.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmhmm. Um - - -

MS K. RHODES: And, actually, we should put that around the other way. I think we – we've got to have the public transport in there. There's no sense in putting in new car parks because they're just going to fill up. You're never going to be able to provide enough parking because we're servicing all the other areas.

MR HAGARTY: Yep. And, like, making - - -

MR C. FIRTH: Sorry - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry, just - - -

MR HAGARTY: Yep.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Just, um, is this – are you Councillor Kaliyanda?

MS RHODES: I'm Councillor Karress Rhodes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Oh.

5 MR FIRTH: You're not on the list, but you are now.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Are you on the – are you registered to participate in this meeting?

10 MS RHODES: Ah, well, I couldn't register, no. So I can't speak?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Are you a – you're - - -

MS RHODES: I'm a councillor.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So – no, no. We just – first of all, we just like to hear from one – just for the record - - -

MS RHODES: Okay.

20

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - so it's clear, only one speaker at a time.

MS RHODES: Yeah.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: And then you will have an opportunity to speak when the other speakers have spoken.

MS RHODES: Okay. Thank you.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: And then we can identify you clearly, so for the transcript it's very straight forward.

MS RHODES: Okay.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: So if you could pause, and then I'll get your details - - -

MS RHODES: Okay.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - at the time that you speak - - -

40

MS RHODES: All right.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - so we've got it for the record. So - - -

45 MR SHELTON: Just – just jumping in there too, there's another councillor

MS RHODES: Councillor Peter Harle.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, you're – you're welcome to join the table, but if we could just, um, ask everyone to identify themselves and – and I'll get the correct spelling of your name before you speak. But I'll just let, um, Councillor Hagarty finish.

5

MS RHODES: Mmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: And then we'll move on to Councillor Hadid and then on to you as well. So that's perfectly fine. So, um, Councillor Hagarty, have you finished what you were saying?

10

MR HAGARTY: Yeah, pretty much. Um, ah, you know, a commuter car park will, I guess, provide temporary relief, but it – it's a demand inducing sort of piece of infrastructure. It's – you know, every time you add an additional lane to a freeway it – it brings in more cars. If you build a bigger park – car park, that's gonna bring more cars. So, ah, that was all.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: So I have a question: notwithstanding, um, what you see as, um, potential shortcomings in the – the planning of the area, in terms of not meeting potential demand in the short and potentially longer term - - -

20

MR HAGARTY: Mmhmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: But we don't know about the longer term at this point, but at – at – there's – we have to sort of develop or see a clear nexus between this development and the impacts of parking, um, and traffic on the streets.

25

MR HAGARTY: Mmhmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, so do you – I mean, I – I – you – one thing you said was that there was probably two to three cars per dwelling and, therefore, they maybe tried to be accommodated on adjoining streets using street parking - - -

30

MR HAGARTY: Yep.

35

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - if they don't have adequate parking on site. Um, is – would you – would you consider, um, timed parking to ensure that the commuter parking or the street parking is not congested with long-term parking by residents who use the streets inappropriately?

40

MR HAGARTY: Um, I think, ah, timed parking is sort of – ah, timed parking is sort of fixing a problem that you – that's – it's already out the back. Um, you know, when we sort of deal with this stuff on the traffic committee it – it's – you know, it – it's too late to undo the problem. And – and timed parking's really just a way to mitigate the problem. Um, this is an opportunity to stop the problem from occurring. Um, and – and just in terms of that two or three cars per dwelling, ah, you know, the – the developer may make the argument that, you know, they're – they're pitching

45

5 this to – to young families, and that might be the case, and so you – you might only have one or two cars, but the problem we see as councillors is that once these developments have been there five, 10, 15 years and those families and those kids have grown up, um, you’ve then got two, three, four cars per household. And we’re stuck holding the bag as councillors and the – you know, the developer’s now, you know, moved on and it – it becomes a cost shifting problem, where these – these, ah, developments are approved, you know, via state planning instruments, via state decision making bodies, but 10 to 15 years later councillors are left to clean up the problem.

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

15 MR HAGARTY: So, ah, the – you know, the example I gave was where we’re now trying to retrofit tiny streets, um, to put in more parking bays because the – you know, you can’t get a – you can’t get trucks or emergency services vehicles past the streets. Um, from what I look at, this very sort of similar style development here in Edmondson Park, where you’ve got sort of villas and villages and – and rather small streets, um, and I can see in 10, 15 years the same problems occurring here.

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, and you’re aware that the residential flat code, um, and the, um, RTA guidelines say that this is, um – what’s being proposed is more than what’s required - - -

25 MR HAGARTY: Yep.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - under those planning instruments?

MR HAGARTY: Yes.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yep.

35 MR HAGARTY: Yeah. So, I guess, going back and saying this is what the – I guess, why was it – was it one – ah, whatever the original was, 1.2, why was it 1.2 in the first place? There was obviously a reason for it to be 1.2. So, um, you know, the argument shouldn’t be we’re going back to what’s allowed. It – the argument should be 1.2 was deemed appropriate. You know, your argument can’t be that’s what’s in the letter of the law. Your argument can be what – what’s – what’s gonna be the impact of going from 1.2 to 0.9. So I hope that makes sense.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, I – I suggest you’re probably saying based on your experience of the Liverpool, um, municipality this is what was deemed appropriate by the council.

45 MR HADID: Would you please raise – raise your voice, please?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry. Um, there’s a difference between what the council proposed - - -

MR HAGARTY: Mmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - and – and what the state planning instrument - - -

5 MR HAGARTY: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - proposes. So I suppose what you're saying is anecdotally from your experience there is more parking demand in this area than there is - - -

10 MR HAGARTY: Yeah. The – the problem with state – state planning instruments is that they imply, ah, you know, a – a statewide approach, but there is always local context. Um, and the local context in Liverpool is that, you know, .9 is not appropriate. Ah, and we've got plenty of examples of that. Ah, the Liverpool CBD is a perfect example of that. Um, you know, I – I – the – the state instruments
15 obviously need to be uniform across the state, but Liverpool's very different to Dubbo, which is very different to Coffs Harbour, which is very different to Camperdown.

Um, and – and the context here is that we're a, ah, outer suburban suburb. Um, I
20 think it's something like 80 per cent of the people in Liverpool travel outside of Liverpool to go to work, ah, therefore, there's – ah, there's a lot more car use. Um, we don't have as much transport options as, you know, ah, suburbs in the inner city. Um, we've got – ah, we've got bus services and we've got a couple of train lines, um, but for most people, you know, to get to and from those buses or get to and from
25 those train stations cars are the only option. Ah, and so when you take the local context into account – ah, that might be the state instrument, but I think the local context says that, you know, it needs to be a bit higher for Liverpool.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmhmm. Okay. Soo-Tee?
30

MR CHEONG: Yeah. I understand the – the main problem with the parking is actually coming from commuter parking; is that right?

MR HAGARTY: Mmhmm.
35

MR CHEONG: So would you say, ah, increasing commuter – commuter parking, ah, spaces would be a better answer to, ah – or the answer to, ah, mitigate this problem?

40 MR HAGARTY: Ah, no. I think it's a holistic problem. Um, you know, these things aren't – don't work in isolation. They all feed into each other and – and feed off each other. So having a higher requirement for parking at the dwellings in the precinct, also having commuter car parking, also having better public transport options and also having better local jobs, you know, it – it's those four things that are
45 the answer and working together. So they all don't operate in isolation. They all – you know, it's a – it's a systemic issue and it needs to be looked at as such.

MR CHEONG: Ah, I just want to clarify, did you have – you say you have a problem with the timed parking on the – on the street?

MR HADID: It's not the not talking about the time issues.

5

MR HAGARTY: Ah, look, ah - - -

MR HADID: The whole planning of the area.

10 MR HAGARTY: I – I do have a problem with timed parking because it – the way – it's sort of used as a – as a – as a mitigating factor after the problem's been created. That – that – that's my view of – of timed parking. Rather than create the problem and have to put in the timed parking, let's prevent the problem from originally occurring.

15

MR CHEONG: Okay.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, I suppose timed parking does give a more equitable sharing of the – the – the kerbside for people undertaking business, drop-offs, pick-ups and all the sorts of commercial activities that you would expect in a town centre, as opposed to long-term residential parking which may be a sleeper activity.

20

MR HAGARTY: Yeah. Um, but I guess the – the context in regards to sort of Liverpool is that we do have the timed parking, um, but now we get asked for resident permits, that, you know, residents now can't find parking and there's a request for resident permits, ah, which I don't believe we've approved yet. But, you know, we're – we're gonna have this – this issue between, ah, people wanting to conduct commercial activities during the day and residents wanting resident parking and – and trying to balance what – you know, it – it's a lose-lose situation. So rather than create the lose-lose situation, um, let's nip it in the bud and make sure there's adequate parking, ah, per dwelling.

25

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Obviously, um, we can't control bus services or, um, local jobs.

35

MR HAGARTY: Yep.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, we can only advise with regard to the considerations of this development.

40

MR HAGARTY: Yep. Yep. Um, but as I said, it's – ah, this – it's not in isolation. There are, you know, probably three or four solutions to this holistic problem, um, but you will be making a decision on one of them and on the other three council's, you know, doing it's bit. We're – we're lobbying, um, in regards to public transport. We're even investigating providing our own public transport along Fifteenth Avenue. Um, you know, we're – we're doing our bit in terms of – of jobs. Um, we're working with the State and Federal Government with the airport. You know, trying

45

– we’re doing our best to make sure we’ve got good, high quality jobs in the area. Ah, and we’re lobbying quite hard on the commuter car park.

5 So, ah, you guys have a responsibility in regards to being the – um, you know, making a decision on this, which is one piece of the puzzle. Um, Local, State and Federal Governments have a – have a bit to do in regards to the other three issues, which is, you know, jobs, public transport, um, and the commuter car park. And – and council’s doing its bit and we’re trying to make sure the State and Federal Government do their bit. So if all four of us work together, we can solve this, ah,
10 problem.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Um, any other questions - - -

15 MR CHEONG: No.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - Soo-Tee? Okay.

MR HAGARTY: All right.

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, great. Thank you for that. Um, and of course if there’s anything else you think of, you can put it in writing.

MR HAGARTY: Sure. Thank you.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, okay. So thank you. Um, Councillor Mazhar – Mazhar Hadid - - -

MR HADID: Yeah.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - is now going to speak.

MR HADID: Well, I first of all thank you today, but, ah, I have to agree with my colleagues: most of the problems, you know, has been raised now. But what I believe, if we’re coming to talk about Edmondson Park planning now, from my point
35 of view, it’s too late because most of the area is developed now. We have issue with the car – ah, car – car park. We have issue with the public transport. But there is a major issue like the road and street. The road and streets itself, it’s very narrow. So if a resident have, like, a party or whatever, it’s very hard to drive through. This is one. Secondly, the size in – of the land – size of the allotments, it’s too small. It’s
40 too small, you know. It’s inadequate with the population, inadequate with the size of the widths of the street. So if you can’t park on your driveway, you can’t, you know – ah, we all know now if you’ve got, like, five, six kids – teenagers, every one has a car. There is no place to park their car. And in a very narrow street you can’t park
45 as well.

If you go and have a look at the public transport – we encourage people to use the public transport, but there is no parking for it. You know what I mean? So that is

the issue. Such, this planning, information session should be held before the start of development and now it's too late. More than 60 per cent, 70 per cent of Edmondson Park is built. So what the use of this session now? I can't see any point of it. You can't fix. It's unfixable now. You can't start demolishing some of the – of the – ah,
5 of – of the properties on the side of the street now, okay, to widen the street, to widen the road. It's too late now.

I dunno what we're doing there. We can't do anything. You go and look other suburbs, it's like you cannot park your car on the street. You are not able to park
10 your car. See, this the problem with the State Government, this the problem with Department of Planning, they go and start doing what they want to do and come speak to us, "What do you thinks?" Well, I think it's rubbish. It's nothing good at all. That – that's what – all what I can say now.

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: So just to clarify, I mean, you're talking about narrow streets and small lots, we're talking about the town centre which is quite a – a major development site and it's a - - -

MR HADID: But what does it matter if we're talking about there, when all relate to
20 each other? When you bring more people to a suburb with inadequate streets, inadequate allotments, so you will face a transport problem, parking problem and a lot of issues.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, again, we can't deal with, um, systemic planning
25 problems for the whole municipality. We can only deal with the issues with regards to the impacts of this development. So, um, our understanding is that parking is proposed within the development and they were seeking to reduce the amount of parking to conform with the – the state - - -

30 MR HADID: talking about this issue now, it's too late because – from my point of view, it's – it's too late to fix the issues now. It's too late to fix it now. All what you have to do, just build more car park everywhere in Edmondson Park. It's not only next to the – to the train station. You have more car park everywhere in the area to accommodate more cars. That's how you solve it. Plus an adequate public
35 transport, like buses go around the hours. You know what I mean?

MR CHEONG: Mmm.

MR HADID: So that's the only things we can do now.
40

PROF LOCHHEAD: So - - -

MR CHEONG: When – when you said - - -

45 MR HADID: But – but all I would say, just – you know, just – you know, ah – ah, go to the Department of Planning and tell them – tell them how much we are suffering in Liverpool area. This is the growth area. It has to be planned in – in – in

– in – in very proper way. It’s not like that. Just – we need affordable housing. Just make the lots very small, okay, and put a lot of people in. It doesn’t work like that. We have plenty of lands to be released, to be sub – ah – ah, divided. But what you need, you need to put the right infrastructures to make it working. They’re not doing that. That – that’s what I believe.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: Ah, when you said about, ah, the narrow street, you are talking about the streets that is, ah, within the development?

MR HADID: The suburbs, yes.

MR CHEONG: Within the - - -

15 MR HADID: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: This development. Right.

20 MR HADID: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: In the town centre or in the surrounding area?

MR HADID: Well, everywhere in the suburb. It’s not the main road. Well, even the main road, when State Government come and put, like, a highway, only two lane each carriageway, and after a few years, well, we have to widen it. Go and spend millions of dollars, a lot of headache, to go and fix their problem the people before were smarter than us when they built the – the – the Harbour Bridge. It’s built more than 100 years ago, okay, for the future generations. That’s exactly what the State Government should do: put a proper plan for the future generation, 30, 40, 50, 60 years ahead. It’s not for today. Not for one, two, three years and go and face the problem, go try to solve it, how you can fix it. You can’t do that.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. All right.

MR CHEONG: Thank you.

MR HADID: Maybe I’m wrong. I dunno.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. No, no. Thank – thank you. Um, no more questions?

MR CHEONG: No more.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Thank you very much, Councillor.

45 MR HADID: No worries.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So can you please, um, say your name and - - -

MS RHODES: Ah, okay. My - - -

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - spell it for me.

MS RHODES: My name's Karress, K-a-r-r-e-s-s, Rhodes.

10 PROF H. LOCHHEAD: And Rhodes as in this - - -

MS RHODES: R-h-o-d-e-s.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Thank you, Councillor. And, perhaps, while you're doing that, maybe you could just say your name.

15

MR P. HARLE: Counsellor Peter Harle, H-a-r-l-e.

PROF LOCHHEAD: H-a - - -

20 MR HARLE: Harley without the Y.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. All right. So Councillor Rhodes, would you please make your representation, thank you.

25 MS RHODES: Okay. Certainly. As my fellow councillors have reiterated already, the problem that we have got specific to the western city is that the state SEPPs are designed for a community that is more similar and in tune with the inner city areas where they have already established transportation networks. And 90 per cent of the problems that we're having out here is that that state, one size fits all, SEPP, does not
30 work in our particular case. You've heard councillors say that we have over 80 per cent of the people that have to leave our LGA every day to get work. So that means that the car is the only means of transport in our area.

35 The state SEPPs have designed roads that are so narrow that you cannot park your car on the side of the road in both directions without, in some cases, minimising and even stopping the traffic flow. That's one problem. So the problems with the SEPP, we realise, are not in your control. And you've done everything in accordance with the state environmental planning policies and we accept that, but we need to point out to people such as yourselves, that that doesn't work out here in the western
40 suburbs because of our specific issues and problems. You've heard Councillor Mazhar Hadid say that our problem out here, people come out here to have families. That's what they do in the suburbs because people who want to do that can't afford to buy in the city areas, so they come out here to have big families. What is
45 happening now, is that the big families are not leaving home and as they grow older, it's a point of progression that they all get given cars. So out here, it is not uncommon for there to be four or five cars per property development.

And the Edmonson Park as nice as it is and everything, is certainly not fitting that particular needs that we have out here in the western suburbs. So we have insufficient rail transport, and that's the problem with providing commuter parking at our stations because as soon as we build them, and it doesn't matter how big we
5 make them, because we're building them and everybody – this problem that we've got in Liverpool is not just Liverpool, it's everybody in the western city. So if we build the stations, we have got more people on our roads which is congesting our roads because they're all coming here in the hope that they'll be able to park their cars and catch transport to go to their jobs.

10

The other problem that we've got is that a lot of the job opportunities are not in any train transport or bus transport infrastructure needs. So, again, it's putting the emphasis back on to the car as the only means of transport and our developments that we're seeing go through in our area are not accommodating those needs in this
15 specific area. So as Councillor Hagarty has already pointed out, what is happening to us here is that in our existing units, they're now – which will be similar to what will happen in Edmonson Park, the families have grown up, they've all got cars. They've got nowhere to park them. They're racing out every two hours and trying to move their cars around if you put in your timed parking. So timed parking does help
20 the commercial part of any sort of development, it certainly does, because it gives the people moving in and the customers come in, do their business and move on.

25

But what we have done, and in Edmondson Park what we have done, we have combined the residential proportions with the retail proportions, so it's all mixed up, and we're going to find it compounded in that particular area as generations grow up and still have their cars, and still are living at home because they can't afford to move out. This is the situation. So as the councillors have already pointed out, it is a systemic problem that we've got with a one size fits all state environmental planning, and we realise that and we realise that we've got to do a big job to try and lobby, so
30 that we can change that. One size fits all does not work. They have to take into consideration that they haven't built the infrastructure here. It'll probably be 20 or 30 years before they do get the infrastructure here. And in the meantime, we've got developments based on the state environmental planning policies that are going to be producing cities that are unliveable, unliveable.

35

And we've seen developments, as have been already reported by the other councillors, Middleton Grange, it isn't specific just to Edmonson town centre and Edmonson development out there. The development out here happened so quickly in our area that councillors were not totally aware of the problems we were creating. I
40 remember sitting in and seeing the Edmondson's town centre developments and certainly it well advertised to us, and we knew what was going on. And we thought, yes, we can go along with that because we were also thinking, it works in the inner city, why doesn't it work out here? Now we know why it doesn't work out here. And, so we would appreciate assistance in fighting the state government for them to realise that they can't have a one size fits all state environmental policy because it
45 just simply doesn't work, a) because of the lack of infrastructure needs and b) because of the development that is happening so quickly based on those state's

environmental planning policies. The streets are far too narrow, that just simply doesn't work. The - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Even in the town centre?

5

MS RHODES: Even in the town centres. What you will find in your town centre, in time, is that it becomes so congested and you will find that the constituents say, "Oh, no, we don't go there. We'll go to this other place," where they can find parking, so that they can get their goods and put them in their car because they've got to put them in their car because they have to use their car to be able to get to their place of residences. The centre that you have built out there Edmonson Park will work for people that live in the actual community and are within walking distance of the shops and everything like that. But they need their cars to be able to have work.

10

15 There is no other way that you can look at it, out in that area, you need a car to be able to get to work or to the station where you won't be able to park. So, I guess, in summary, I just have to agree with all my fellow councillors and the reason why we're so passionate about it is because, yes, there is an issue and it needs to be fixed, but if we can advise you of the problems that we are experiencing - - -

20

MR HARLE: Can I - - -

MS RHODES: - - - we might stop it from happening - - -

25

MR HARLE: - - - in the future.

MS RHODES: - - - again.

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So just, again, I mean, we can take that on board and note that, but, in fact, we can only actually affect the parameters of this development.

MS RHODES: That's right.

35

PROF LOCHHEAD: So do you have any solutions - - -

MS RHODES: Suggestions?

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - that you would like to see - - -

40

MS RHODES: As to the timed parking, the timed parking will create you issues with the residences just as we are experiencing here in Liverpool. So if we can impart to you the problems that we are experiencing here in a well developed city, whereas Edmonson Park is new, we can tell you that in time, you will have problems with your residences, that they haven't got enough parking for the cars that they need to be able to live in Edmonson Park and to also have employment. So as to what you do about that, I would suggest that you put in my car parking stations that they can possibly walk to their residences, and, maybe, that parking should be just for the

45

residences in the area. We'd be very much interested in hearing what sort of solutions that you could think of that might solve some of the problems now that if we can make you aware of what we see happening in our local area.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: No, I'm fine.

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: You're fine. Okay. All right. Thank you very much, Councillor. And Councillor Peter Harle, would you like to make a representation, please?

15 MR HARLE: I think my fellow councillor has eloquently explained exactly what the problem is. I'm also on the Greater Sydney West Planning Panel as a member of that. And, again, I believe the issue is to do with SEPP 65 in particular, which governs the amount of parking in – the ratio of parking to residential buildings. To give you an example, we recently had to approve what's called an affordable housing building with 61 units in there, of various sizes, one bedroom, two bedroom and three bedroom. And in that particular building, they allowed 31 parking spaces, 20 woefully inadequate.

In particular, as Liverpool has said before, is an area where the majority of workers travel by car. In Sadleir, an older area, 68 per cent of people leave the 2168 area to travel by car to work. Now, you might think, yes, we do have public transport that 25 gets to the railway station, but if you work at a place, say, St Marys which I used to, it takes you three hours to get to St Marys via public transport. That's a bus to the railway station, then a train to Granville or Parramatta. You need to change to go back to – can you imagine? It's just impossible. Not impossible, but it's - - -

30 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A headache.

35 MR HARLE: - - - just not practical to travel by public transport to an area where there is no public transport. And you're going to have the same at Edmonson Park. The problem with Edmonson Park is that the state government in their wisdom, put in the two new railway stations, Leppington and Edmonson Park. At the same time, they widened Camden Valley Way to a four lane highway which meant the traffic from the outer suburbs towards Narellan, Camden and Campbelltown, now have a practical means of travelling by car to Edmonson Park and Leppington and used the parking facilities at the railway station intended for the Edmonson Park people. So 40 somebody obviously hadn't thought that through very carefully or thought the effects would be negligible, but they're not.

The majority of people that park at both of those railway stations are in fact not from Edmonson Park, they're from as far away as Narellan. So that's compounding the 45 problem and sadly, the SEPP doesn't take those conditions into account when allocating the conditions for the number of parking spaces. So when you have a multi-used building as in the town centre, you're going to have residences in there

with – the ratio is 1.2, I believe, somebody said – even that, after a while, it will not be adequate. Timed parking, I don't think will answer the problem, and one of the things we've tried here in Liverpool, we have two buildings, they call them Skyhaus, those two big towers, they were looking at that in terms of shared parking. The idea is that while residences have driven their car to work, there is available parking for businesses to use during the day. When the residences get home in the evening, the businesses shut down, and they can then use that. Now, I don't know successful that is, but I imagine that would be a pain to administer. The administration of that, I think would be difficult. Personally, I think it's insufficient parking. I think you need more.

It needs to be specific to the suburbs rather than, as other councillors have said, one size fits all. It doesn't. What happens in the inner suburbs where you've adequate public transport, we don't have that here. We don't have that luxury. People have to have cars. We probably find in our suburbs here, residences will have two or three cars, unlike in the inner suburbs, a lot of residences don't have cars at all. They rely on taxis, Uber and public transport. So we can't have this one size fits all. So that's, basically, repeating what everybody else has said, but in a slightly different way. Thank you.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Thank you. Soo-Tee, do you have any questions?

MR CHEONG: Just going to back to your problem with the parking in the town centre, are you satisfied with the parking spaces that's been provided, 4.1 spaces per 100 square metre in the retail and other commercial, medical, cinema and entertainment users?

MR N. HAGARTY: Yes. I think the, again, the closest thing we have here is the Liverpool town centre to compare it to. So within Westfields, it seems to be adequate. The problem is outside of Liverpool – outside of Westfields where you've got the residential towers, out on the street is where it's inadequate. And that's a result of people having more cars than carpark spaces per apartment.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So just to clarify, the parking for retail and entertainment in Liverpool town centre is adequate in the full commercial area, but where there is mixed use development, it is deemed to be a challenge.

MR HAGARTY: Yes. So within Westfields, parking's not a problem and I would assume that as part of the Edmonson Park development, the public parking is part of the commercial aspect, that should be fine. It's the residences and that where the problems are going to be.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's certainly at least pockets around the commercial centre where there's concerns, for example, in front of medical centres and other particular areas within the commercial centre, there is frequent feedback. Also, generalising within Westfields and it's immediate surrounds there might be sufficient parking, but I wouldn't like that – for it to be a blanket statement in relation to the

entire CBD of Liverpool. We certainly get feedback that there are particular areas where bottlenecks form as far as parking is concerned, and it's fairly frequent.

PROF LOCHHEAD: But that would be a more mixed use precinct.

5

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MS RHODES: And can I just add some advice there as well. From the Chamber of Commerce, in Liverpool, the parking issues restrain the types of businesses you're going to be able to get into your business area. For a long time here, the parking issues in Liverpool have had numerous businesses saying, "We're moving out. We don't want to be here. We can't get our customers in to the area." They're losing their business because of the parking issues. So in saying that Liverpool has got enough parking for our commercial uses, I would say that we've got twice as many people that would possibly come to Liverpool, but they do not come here because of the lack of parking, and that's even to Westfields. We know that people choose to go to other shopping centres where the - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Where do they go as an alternative? Because, obviously, Liverpool would have a whole range of services that other smaller centres wouldn't be able to provide.

20

MR HARLE: Macarthur Square - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Casula.

25

MR HAGARTY: Casula.

MR HARLE: - - - Casula.

30

MS RHODES: Casula.

MR HAGARTY: Wetherill Park, Stocklands.

MS RHODES: They prefer to go to those shopping centres, rather than come into Liverpool. So - - -

35

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And those retail trade centres.

MS RHODES: - - - you should be aware - - -

40

MR M. HADID: Well, these are the very important issues. We're talking about parking today. If you take into consideration the population of Liverpool of the government, it's something around 220,000. By year 2030/35, the population forecast will be double. Now, we have Leppington, Edmonson Park, Glenfield, Holsworthy, Warwick Farm, carpark next to the station. By 7 o'clock, you will be

45

very, very lucky if you can find a car space to park your car. So just imagine in 2030/35, with double of the population, what we will have, just think about it.

5 MR HAGARTY: Will you be doing a site visit?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Potentially after this, yes.

10 MR HAGARTY: Yes. I think it's – it's hard to describe, you actually have to go down there and see it because – yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

15 MR HAGARTY: So just back to that bit about where people go shopping, so in Macarthur Square, Stocklands at Wetherill Park, that's an economic drain on Liverpool because one's in Campbelltown and one's in Fairfield. So, yes, there is a significant number of people who live in Liverpool who take their money outside of Liverpool because of - - -

20 MR HARLE: These parking issues.

MS RHODES: Parking issues. And where that reflects is the types of businesses that you will attract into your commercial centres there at Edmonson Park. It's a matter of economics for the business, they want to be where they've got the greatest opportunity for their business to grow and succeed. And we find that it has been
25 restricted here in Liverpool.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I just say this as sort of tying together some of the things my councillor colleagues have said, I noticed a proponent in their response to a submission that has said that they've provided a parking demand assessment,
30 providing analysis using 2016 census data of vehicle ownership in other centres that show characteristics similar to the future of Frasers Town Centre. Well, you've just heard five councillors tell you that there are unique features in relation to this town centre that cannot be replicated simply by pulling out statistics in relation to other town centres. And that seems to be a large part of what they've based their position
35 on.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, I think - - -

40 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Comparisons which five councillors would suggest were invalid.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. I think we've heard that a one size fits all is not suitable here from your representations across the board. But I also take on board that their examples are not that relevant to you. Okay.

45 MR HAGARTY: Yes. Well, I made the point about the number of bus routes to those that they've converted to - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So in relation to that, I know departmental side, it is consistent with strategic policies for reducing car dependency and encouraging alternative forms of transport. So in the one hand, it might be suggested that alternative forms of transport are outside the question, yet that's the very thing that the department's referred to in it's own conclusions. And further, the department
5 seems to be acknowledging that the proposal that is put forward to reduce 1.2 to 1, will be consistent with reducing dependency. And, so there seems to be an acknowledgement that it's inadequate as it stands and wants to bring about a – engineer a change in social use as far as car parking is concerned which isn't going
10 to happen until there's better public transport.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. Okay. Is there anything else that we need to take on board before we conclude?

15 MS RHODES: The other issue that we have out here in the western suburbs is that our temperatures in the summer months are extremely high and higher than those suburbs closer to the coast and even in the inner city, and, again, the SEPPS that we have – the state SEPPS are also producing cities that are not accommodating to that need that we have out here. So I would suggest that tree canopies are absolutely
20 essential out in this area.

MR HARLE: And adding to that, a similar thing, urban heat sinking is a major problem in the western suburbs, and as a member of a panel, my constant argument with architects is why are you choosing black cladding? You need to pick lighter
25 colours. You have buildings that are black. You've got windows frames that are black. You've got roofs that are black, and we all know black is an absorbing, a heat absorbing colour. Why not have lighter colours? And, again, the problem comes in basics, it needs to be changed, governments need to look at that and mandate so that you can't have black and charcoal. Look at the areas, the newer release areas, take
30 an aerial photo of that, and what have you got?

You can pick out the light coloured roofs because they're very far in between, and then they actually have the black cladding and – sorry, I could go on, but you understand what I'm getting at. Bitumen is black, it absorbs heat. We should have
35 tree canopies, shade trees in the streets to make sure that neither the car nor the street surface gets the direct sunlight. Pick deciduous trees, so if you want the warmth in the winter, you certainly don't get the heat in the summer that you've got the leaves. These are issues that are very, very basic, but who's looking at

40 MR HADID: to some, it – likes the symmetry.

MS RHODES: And this is where we have problems with the lot sizes. Again, going back to the SEPPS, out here, it just doesn't work. It is not conducive to delivering liveable cities. It is very conducive to delivering cities that, in the end, people will
45 come here because it's cheap, not because they want to live here, because the outcome is creating situations for them. It'll be more expensive because of the dark roofs, the dark building products, air conditioning during the summer months to try

and keep the place cool. There's a lot of things that, in time, people will learn about and they will not be choosing areas that have not addressed these issues.

5 MR HARLE: To add to that, if you're going to have a black roof, why not put solar cells on it to mitigate the effect, so that you can at least run an air conditioner to remove the heat that the black attracts. These are – sorry, I could – as I say, I have this argument on the Greater Sydney West Planning Panel with architects with every time.

10 MR HADID: You can't win.

MR HARLE: You can't win.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I just add this and just getting back a little bit too, the immediate issue, the – and as I understand, there were no registered speakers this morning, and if you're inclined to making any sort of comment in relation to that, first of all, obviously, there are a large number of written objections prior to that, try not to be political. A large number of petitions as you've heard from some of the
20 councillors in the last few months, and in fact, the last year or so in relation to the parking problem generally at Edmonson Park, that reached a crescendo prior to the last state government election, various promises were made.

And now there's a feeling that people are moving back from the promises that were made and there's an analysis of the amount of money that's been budgeted in relation
25 to that. So what I'm suggesting is that there's been a fair amount of exhaustion in the public as to whether anything will be achieved. You've heard from Councillor Hadid that it's all too late anyway, and if there's going to be some comment as to the lack of registered speakers this morning, it will be nice if that was in a context of all of what's happened in relation to the parking issue, generally, at Edmonson Park
30 over about the last 18 months, 24 months, leading up to this. And certain expectations have been raised and at least there's a perception subsequently dashed, and they suspect it's got a lot to do with you having received a large number of written complaints. You've heard from a federal member. You've heard from councillors that are just troubled that there was a lack of registered speakers earlier
35 today.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. That's noted, thank you.

40 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

PROF LOCHHEAD: I think if there's no more – I think we've actually got a very good snapshot of the key issues that you've represented across the board from the holistic, right down to the specific issues of this development, and we can appreciate the concerns that you have as councillors representing your community. So thank
45 you for your time today, and we'll go out and have a look at this site ourselves before we go back and have our next meeting with the department.

MR HAGARTY: So both the south and north of the station

MS RHODES: And thank you for the opportunity for us to come in and share our
5 experiences in what we can see is going wrong that we couldn't foresee when
Edmonson Park was first – went on exhibition.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

10 MR HADID: And it's going to be thanks if you could do anything about it.

MS RHODES: Or at least have documentation stating that the state planning SEPPS
are not conducive to good outcomes out in the western city.

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay, noted.

MR HADID: Thank you.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you very much.

20

MATTER ADJOURNED at 12.09 pm INDEFINITELY