



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

**TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE**

---

O/N H-1075280

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT**

**RE: EDMONDSON PARK CONCEPT APPROVED MOD 8**

**PANEL:** **PROF HELEN LOCKHEAD (CHAIR)**  
**SOO TEE CHEONG**

**PANEL ASSISTING:** **DENNIS LEE**  
**CALLUM FIRTH**

**DEPARTMENT:** **ANTHONY WITHERDIN**  
**EMMA BUTCHER**

**LOCATION:** **IPC OFFICE,**  
**LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET,**  
**SYDNEY, 2000**

**DATE:** **9.39 AM, TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2019**

PROF H. LOCHHEAD: Good morning. 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 and present and elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting today on the concepts proposal seeking approval for the  
5 modification to Frasers Town Centre Concept Plan to reduce the car parking rate for two-bedroom dwe – dwellings within residential flat buildings in the town centre from 1.2 spaces per dwelling to one space per dwelling. My name is Helen Lochhead. I'm the chair of the IPC panel today and joining me is my fellow  
10 commissioner, Soo-Tee Cheong, and Dennis Lee and Callum Firth from the Commission Secretariat.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the  
15 Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at a prelimins – preliminary stage and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important that the Commission is to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the  
20 question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which will then be 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 accuracy of the transcript as it is recorded. And so we'll now begin. So thanks for joining us today.

25 MR A. WITHERDIN: No problem. Ah, so good morning, everyone. My name is Anthony Witherdin. I'm the director of Regional Assessments. Um, this morning, ah, I'm going to ask Emma, ah, to take you through some of the background of the proposal, summarise some of the key issues that were raised during the, ah,  
30 exhibition process and go through the key findings of our assessment report.

MS E. BUTCHER: Yep. Ah, thank you. So hi everyone. I'm Emma Butcher from the Regional Assessments team. Ah, so I'll just go through some – some of the background Anthony mentioned. Ah, so this proposal - - -  
35

PROF LOCHHEAD: You might want to speak up a little bit.

MS BUTCHER: Okay. This proposal relates to the concept approval for the Edmondson Park South Town Centre, um, within the Liverpool LGA. Ah,  
40 Edmondson Park was approved as part of the south-west growth area and it spans across both the Liverpool and Campbelltown LGAs. This subject modification, ah, relates to the area known as the Frasers Town Centre which is directly south of the Edmondson Park Station and/or within the Liverpool LGA. So the town centre is currently under construction, um, and when completed it – it's intended to provide a  
45 full range of retail, commercial and high density residential uses, ah, and to maximise opportunities for local employment and business.

Um, so as mentioned before, this proposal seeks to amend the carparking rate for two-bedroom apartments in the Frasers Town Centre, ah, from 1.2 spaces per apartment to one space. So the current car parking rates, ah, were imposed as part of MOD4 to the concept plan. Ah, this also approved an increase in GFA height and density within the town centre and these rates are currently contained within the design guidelines. Um, the proponent initially proposed them as maximum rates but in its assessment of MOD4, the department recommended that they be amended so car parking is provided generally in accordance with them.

5

10 Um, so the proposal seeks to reduce the car parking rate for two-bedroom apartments from 1.2 space per apartment to one space, um, and it's requested on the basis that the proponent receive feedback from the purchasers of two-bedroom apartments in the approved eastern portion of the town centre that they didn't require that second car parking space. Um, it's also requested on the basis that the proposed rates would align with the requirements of the Apartment Design Guide, the ADG, and the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Development. Um, so we received 32 public submissions, um, in relation to the proposal. Um, 31 of these were objects – objections.

15

20 Um, they mainly raise concern about the current lack of car parking provision within the Edmondson Park area, um, and in particular the commuter car park for the train station, um, and how this proposal would exacerbate this problem and contribute to pressure on – on street parking. Um, we also received five agency submissions. So, firstly, Liverpool Council. Um, they had a number of concerns including that the proposed modification would not be consistent with previous town planning for the centre, um, that the rates for a subregional centre in the RMS guide, ah, may not be appropriate for Edmondson Park, um, that the proposal is likely to aggravate the current car parking issues in the area, ah, and create unnecessary pressure on on-street parking.

25

30 They also mentioned that any modification to car parking requirements needs to be evaluated in the broader planning context and that a detailed parking assessment identify occupancy rates, um, with consideration of similar developments, ah, in Western Sydney as required. Ah, Campbelltown Council, RMS and Sydney Water raised no concerns to the proposal. So the department has considered the proposal and all of the submissions that we've received and we consider it's acceptable for the following reasons. Ah, firstly, it is consistent with strategic policies for reducing car dependency and encouraging alternative forms of transport in highly accessible areas.

35

40 Ah, we note the proposal seeks to reduce car parking rates in a town centre which is directly adjacent to a train station. So the Edmondson Park, ah, train station is directly to the north of the town centre and the furthest distance from the town centre to the train station is 500 metres. Um, so we think this proposal would help encourage people to use active and public transport which is consistent with objectives from A Plan for Growing Sydney, the Western District Plan and the Future Transport Strategy. Ah, secondly, we think the proposal is acceptable

45

because it complies with the ADG and the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Development car parking rates.

5 So the ADG states that on sites within 800 metres of a railway station in the Sydney metropolitan area, the minimum car parking rate is set out in the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments or the car parking requirement prescribed by the relevant council, whichever is less. So Edmondson Park Town Centre, as I previously mentioned, is directly adjacent to the station, um, with the furthest distance being 500 metres. So the rate for a high density residential flat building, um, in the RMS guide for a two-bedroom apartment is 0.9 spaces per apartment and 10 the rate required by the Liverpool DCP is 1.5 spaces. So, therefore, a rate of 0.9 spaces per two-bedroom apartment is required and the proposed rate of one space per two-bedroom apartment complies with this.

15 Ah, we also think the proposal is acceptable because it's consistent with car parking rates applied in town centres with similar characteristics. So the department has consistently applied reduced car parking rates in town centres across the south- and north-west growth centres. Oran Park, Schofields and Riverstone, for example, all require one space per two-bedroom dwelling and the current proposal is consistent 20 with this. Ah, in addition, the proponent provided an updated parking demand assessment as part of their RTS documentation and this contained analysis of census data on vehicle ownership in other centres with similar characteristics to Edmondson Park.

25 And it found that approximately 80 per cent of two-bedroom dwelling residents, um, in these other town centres own either one or no vehicle. Um, so, ah, council raised concern that the proposed parking rate would not be adequate, noting that, according to census data, approximately 66 per cent of households in Edmondson Park, um, South and Bardia own two or more cars. But the department considers this figure 30 doesn't provide an adequate representation, um, as approximately 96 per cent of households in Edmondson Park have three or more bedrooms. So the department is, therefore, satisfied that the proposal is consistent, um, with car parking rates for other areas with similar characteristics.

35 And, ah, lastly, um, we note that the reduction in – in car parking spaces is relatively minor, so it equates to 16.7 per cent, and that the proposal would, therefore, not have a significant impact on on-street parking. And we also consider the proposal would not increase demand for car parking spaces at the train station, ah, because the town centre is directly adjacent within that 800 metre walking catchment so people are 40 more likely to walk there than drive. So, overall, we consider that the proposed parking rate is acceptable due to the location of the development in a town centre adjacent to a train station. It complies with the ADG and is consistent with strategic policies for reducing car dependency and is also consistent with car parking rates in other centres. Thank you.

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: Thanks for that.

MR S. CHEONG: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, that's a good summary of your report. Um, I just wanted to ask a question. We – we obviously, ah, we're – we were out at Liverpool  
5 yesterday, um, and we had our opportunity to go on a site visit. Have you been to Edmondson Park?

MS BUTCHER: I haven't been on a site inspection as part of this proposal but I  
10 have visited the area a few years ago.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Because I would say that probably the site visit was, um, a watershed for us in terms of looking at the impacts of, um, informal car parking around the town centre.

15 MS BUTCHER: Mmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Probably, I would say, ah, even in places like Italy, not seen, ah, the degree of informal and illegal parking. Um, most – every footpath was, um, parked on.  
20

MS BUTCHER: Mmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Um, every verge was parked on. Um, quite – quite some way out of - - -  
25

MR CHEONG: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - the town centre. Probably more than a kilometre out of the town centre there was 90 degree parking along road verges. Every No Stopping  
30 area, clearly signposted, was obviously parked with long-term car parking with people with their sun visors up. So they weren't there just dropping and picking up. They were there for the long haul.

MS BUTCHER: Mmm.  
35

PROF LOCHHEAD: So people have made a commitment to find whatever opportunity they have to park. Um, so I think that was probably significant for us in terms of, um, looking at the impacts of this – this – this town centre in its very formative stage which is not functioning really at the moment. It's really under  
40 construction. Um, we also had representations from the councillors which, I think, were all, ah, fairly considered and, um, balanced in their views. And while we would acknowledge, ah, as commissioners that this development cannot take into account the demands of commuter parking or, um, traffic generating development beyond its own, um, boundaries, um, there are implications for the kind of demographic of the  
45 area and the sub-region which we probably do need to consider.

And, um, the fact that people – and they had co – I think we’ve got some numbers, percentages here, the people who, ah, commute to work from one destination to another via car or from one drive and then, um, get a train or different variations and combinations thereof which put a higher dependency on car usage and car ownership  
5 just to, um, carry out your normal day-to-day life. So, um, we felt that there were a number of considerations beyond, um, what was presented in the report when you actually went out there and heard the – the various specifics of the locality that we thought needed to, um, be taken into account. And considering that the – the 1.2 versus the one, um, was – I think it’s 60 spaces in all.

10 MR CHEONG: And I just wonder whether you realise that we had meeting with the proponent and they have developed, ah, the town centre. 60 per cent of the residential, ah, development have been carried out according to the – in compliance with 1.2 spaces for two bedroom. So what is left to – to be developed if it – if it’s to  
15 be changed to one to – per two bedroom, ah, it would involve something like 60 car parking. Do you realise that, ah, is the case?

MR WITHERDIN: Not the specifics, no.

20 MR CHEONG: No.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: So in real terms, one can’t real – I mean, the whole point of planning is to plan – to future proof places. One could see that, quite clearly now, it hasn’t been future proofed at this point in time, um, and that, really, what we need to ensure is that by, um, approving any proposal, we put in place a robust framework  
30 which has resiliency to flex to future demands, um, whatever they may be. And, um, it – the – it seemed that while the current market who may be investors who – or who – I don’t know who they are, may have one predisposition and also I would – I would imagine affordability is the number 1, um, consideration that one can’t anticipate – um, one can anticipate the different kinds of, ah, occupancy may include  
35 two adults with two cars, um, or adults or with children who may grow up and need a car.

Um, so, I mean, I don’t think anyone would be advocating that we should be promoting excessive car, um, parking in the town centre. Um, but considering it’s a  
40 marginal, um, difference between – and it is consistent with what they already have in the rest of their development, um, we question whether, in fact, the request is – is, um – is really going to make a difference to them but could make the difference to the, um, acceptance by the community and the – the local council who seem to be very concerned about the narrowness of roads, the lack of on-street parking, the  
45 demands being pushed into these new town centres because of the – the, um, ease of driving to, um, the station which, of course, we want to do. We want to encourage onto trains. Um, that was probably underestimated in terms of the original planning.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, so – yeah. So it sounds like there’s a broader issue there around commuter car parking that may currently exist on the site. Um, I guess we’ve looked at the proposal, um, within the scope of the – ah, the modification and that only applies to the residential flat buildings and what’s an appropriate car parking rate for those residential flat buildings.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: So as Emma described earlier, we’ve tried to, ah, maintain a consistent approach in that regard, ah, particularly where we are very close to a train station. So we feel that all those residents within that area will likely walk to the train station rather than get in their car and drive to the station because it’s a – such a short distance. So I guess there’s two issues there. There’s a broader, ah, commuter car parking issue.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm. And we acknowledge that that is a separate issue.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: And is not a concern of this development - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - or cannot be put all onto this development. It’s I think – and I think that the councillors in their representations acknowledge that. They acknowledge there were broad – just broader strategic framing – sorry, planning, um, ah, of the area which had been - - -

25

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - underestimated but has knock-on effects. Um, but I think what the point’s being made which are firmly, ah, relevant to this development are the occupancy rates, the, um, growing families, the – the high car ownership and dependency because of the nature of work which is not particularly walk – I mean, you know, one could anticipate long term but I – I – I can tell you right now – I’m sure you don’t actually work in your local area, um, and I don’t work in my local area, too. I work where I’ve got the best job to suit me and often we all, in our metropolitan lives, um, travel longer distances to get to work.

35

So one can envisage in the short to medium term that people will be, you know, just relying on active and – and, um, public transport. They will have different modes of transport and we need to ensure that it’s workable for everybody. Um, so that – that was our prime concern: the high car ownership in the area; the future occupancy of the development which one can’t anticipate at this moment but, based on statistics that, ah, were provided by the council, would imply that there was a higher car ownership need than in other parts of Sydney that there may be - - -

45

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - a legitimate case for - - -

5 MR WITHERDIN: So - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - particularity.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. Yeah. In terms of the ownership, ah, ah, issue, we did  
10 look at council's, um, statistics that they did provide us in the assessment. Um, and I  
guess we came to our position, um, because the, ah, numbers that were provided to  
us by the council at that point were based on households with a larger size, um, and  
so that's what those statistics captured in terms of those households needing more  
15 than one car parking space. And this proposal is very much differentiated from those  
households, um, where they're smaller, ah, and that's the difference. So we – we, ah,  
were of the opinion that, ah, one space per, ah, two-bedroom dwelling would be  
sufficient. Yeah. So there's a - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah. Whi – while we acknowledge, you know, the analysis of the  
20 proponents about, ah, the number of, ah, car parking people, ah, require when they  
purchase the, ah, units – a two-bedroom unit, say, ah, but we also heard the council –  
the councillors have, ah, emphasised that the reason people purchase, ah, residence in  
– in the Liverpool area is not because it's – of the closeness to the station but because  
it is econo – it's cheaper than everywhere else and, ah, it's not necessary that, ah, the  
25 residents would be travelling from station to station. So there will still be car  
dependence, etcetera.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

30 MR CHEONG: And I just wonder what's - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: They – they've also - - -

MR CHEONG: - - - your view on that.  
35

PROF LOCHHEAD: They also made the point that, you know, the demand in – in  
other centres for residents parking which also compromises business usage, um,  
because then you don't have that flow of – of kerbside parking or short-term parking  
because residents are using kerbside. Um, I did also observe in Edmondson town  
40 centre that there's not really capacity for kerbside parking because of the narrowness  
of the streets which is probably a shortcoming, um, which probably wasn't thought  
about in – in detail. Um, so, yeah, I think it's probably – has, um, additional  
pressures. I – I mean, I also would suggest that, um, again, in longer term and if  
you're thinking about the – the maturity of the community, people when they go and  
45 leave home, um, they share households.

You're more – you're more likely to get two – two independent adults or two couples or, you know, a couple and a, you know, whatever, so you – there is more likelihood of, um, in an – a high density apartment development, multiple adults with independent transport needs.

5

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. So there's – it's always a, ah, I guess, a bit of a balancing act in terms of, um, trying to reduce car parking within, ah, highly accessible locations but yet providing enough car parking and acknowledging that people won't always use public transport to, you know, access different destinations. Um, and based on, you know, that – trying to balance those two competing objectives, um, and then looking at the policy guidance that we've got for these kind of areas, um, ah, yeah, we were comfortable with the one space per - - -

10

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm. Yeah.

15

MR WITHERDIN: Per two dwelling units.

PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean, I think in – in reality, though, if – if you weren't down the, sort of, worst case scenario that, in fact, people do have more than one car in the longer term and then it pushes cars out onto the street and I think about inner – inner city area or other parts of Sydney where they do have wider streets and there is kerb space to accommodate – I mean, you know, most inner city suburbs have cars lined along every, ah, street and every frontage. Um, that is a possibility but I – I can't see that the infrastructure can accommodate it. The fact that people are actually parked from the commu – so forgetting about the development for a moment, but the commuter parking already doesn't have enough kerbside or if you think about once it's all operational as a retail centre, there is just no kerbside to accommodate that – that flex.

20

25

So eve – even if the – the problem is moo – shifted from one place to another, there isn't a place to shift it to within the infrastructure framework provided by the current, um, town centre. So I think we have to anticipate the shortcomings in the – the existing town centre design which needs to be mitigated by the development actually dealing with its own issues onsite or anticipating that - - -

30

35

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - if there are issues it can accommodate those, um, onsite without deferring those to some other location which hasn't got the resiliency of flex to – to do that like, ah, you know, an older suburb may have. So, um, yeah.

40

MR CHEONG: Yeah. I notice the – in modification 4 is when the increase of residential numbers in the, ah, town centre was at the greatest, that is, go from a few hundred to 1800, something like that.

45

MS BUTCHER: 912 to 1800.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. So at that point – and that was only in October 2017.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

5 MR CHEONG: Right. And at that time it was justifiable to have 1.2 but with – between that short time, why has the shift been, ah, agreed?

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. So, look, we reviewed that previous assessment.

10 MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, and, ah, we looked at the proposal, um, but based on the reasoning that we've provided today, we were comfortable that, um, it met all the policy guidance around, um, suppressing car parking around highly accessible  
15 locations. Um, and I know, as I said before, it is a – a bit of a balance there, um, ah, but I don't think, ah, um, applying, ah, a higher car parking rate to this area will necessarily, ah, have a significant impact on – in terms of reducing the pressure that might be currently, um, experienced on - - -

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: No, I think we - - -

MR WITHERDIN: - - - surrounding streets.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - acknowledge the commuter car parking is a separate issue.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: And notwithstanding that, I think one has to acknowledge that there isn't much resiliency to any additional overflow parking that may be generated by this development in the current street network or the future street network based on what's been built today.

35 MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. Yeah. And so part of, ah, the issue around car parking is if you provide those onsite car parking spaces, it will have the effect of discouraging multiple car ownership, I guess. Um, so the more car parking spaces you provide, um, ah, the likely more car parking spaces – cars that will be using that surrounding road network. Um, so it's – as I say, it's trying to balance that up.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm. It's just that we're not reducing. We're just maintaining the exis – the current, um, state which is 1.2. I mean, there is an – there's a – there's a current framework which says 1.2, so that is see – deemed to be acceptable or suitable. Um, and this would be a reduction as opposed to what was considered to be the – yeah.

45

MS BUTCHER: So those rates, um, were imposed as part of MOD4, um, because they were seen to generally reflect the minimum rates in the DCPs or the RMS guide

but as we had a look at the ADG which references the RMS guide, um, their rate is, ah, 0.9 spaces.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

5

MS BUTCHER: So it was - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: But that is in subregional centres, isn't it?

10 MS BUTCHER: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. And - - -

15 MS BUTCHER: Yeah. Which, um, according our practice note, um, Edmondson Park would be classified as one of those.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Is it?

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

20

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm. Okay.

25 MR CHEONG: Could I assume that 1.2 at a time when it was approved for the, ah, development, ah, it seems to be a compromise between .9 per two-bedroom unit in the RM – in the ADG as against the council 1.5 spaces per two-bedroom unit. So it seems to be a compromise at that time. Would I be right?

30 MS BUTCHER: Yeah. Yeah. Perhaps, yeah. Yeah. Um, so the current proposal is more in line with their – the RMS guide which is what's required under the ADG. But, yeah, definitely the 1.2 seems to be a midway between those.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

35 MR CHEONG: Yeah. We heard the councillors. Ah, they – the reason they gave was more site specific in a way that, ah, because of the socio-economic, ah, demographic in that area, people – as I said, I think they impressed on us the people who bought in the Liverpool area is because of the cheapness of being economical in prices - - -

40 MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: - - - rather than any other consideration.

45 MR WITHERDIN: Right. And, of course, reduced car parking, sort of, goes to that - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - affordability issue as well.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm.

5 MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. Mmm.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Mmm. Okay. Do you have any other questions, Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: No. Not any more.

10

PROF LOCHHEAD: Have you got anything else that you would like to add? Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: No.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So thank you for your presentation today and thanks for your consideration of the planning issues and for, um, telling us your rationale.

MS BUTCHER: Thank you.

20

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: Thank you.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you.

25

**MATTER ADJOURNED at 10.07 am INDEFINITELY**