



**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-965014

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT**

**RE: LOCOMOTIVE WORKSHOPS PROJECT,  
AUSTRALIAN TECHNOLOGY PARK**

**PANEL:** **JOHN HANN  
PROF ZADA LIPMAN  
ADRIAN PILTON**

**ASSISTING PANEL:** **MICHAEL WOODLAND  
BRENT DEVINE**

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING AND  
ENVIRONEMNT:** **ANTHEA SARGEANT  
BRENDON ROBERTS  
EMILY DICKSON  
DAVID McNAMARA**

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

**DATE:** **10.01 AM, THURSDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR J. HANN: So, good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to the elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today. Mirvac Projects Proprietary Limited, the applicant, is proposing to undertake adaptive reuse of the Locomotive Workshop in the Australian Technology Park for retail and commercial use. My name is John Hann. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are Zada Lipman and Adrian Pilton. The other attendees at the meeting are Michael Woodland and Brent Devine from Keylan Consulting who are assisting the Commission Secretariat with this project. And we also have Anthea Sargeant, Brendon Roberts, Emily Dickson and David McNamara representing the Department of Planning and Environment.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It's taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and you're not in a position to provide an answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide that additional information to us in writing, which will then be put up on the website.

Thank you. So, look, we sent through late yesterday a set of points, if you like, that we thought were important for ourselves to understand and I think probably the best thing to do is if we just kick off with those and we will work through them. And, really, the first one is in terms of increases in gross floor area – sorry – I think I've got the right one. Yes. I do. Yes. If you could just take us through the increases in gross floor area and, look, the – and the reasoning behind that in particular. And, look, we will run through the rest as we go.

MS E. DICKSON: Yes. Emily Dickson speaking. So in bays 1 to 4, there was an increase in the gross floor area between the EIS and the response to submissions of around 300 square metres. That was mainly related to the retail tenancy in bays 1 to 2 integrated around the heritage items in that area of the bay. They included some areas which had previously been excluded from the calculations, such as waste rooms in the loading dock. They reduce the size of plant on level 1 and there was also some other minor changes, such as the addition of a blacksmith viewing platform.

And then in bays 5 to 15, the changes to the gross floor area were related to removing the light industrial use in bays 5 to 7 and they replaced it with – all of the ground floor south was replaced with the commercial use and there were some internal changes to bay 15, which related to sort of moving bicycle parking location and commercial tenancies in that bay.

MR HANN: Okay. And, in your view, there's no real – or the impact of that heritage point of view doesn't require any further assessment?

5 MS DICKSON: The changes that were proposed to the GFA and the increases didn't have any additional heritage impacts in our view. No.

MR HANN: Okay. All right. Have you got any queries on that, Zada or Adrian?

10 MR A. PILTON: No.

PROF Z. LIPMAN: No. No.

15 MR HANN: Okay. There was one item that isn't on your list, but it's probably one that we should knock off early on, and that's the permissibility of the associated retail space in the recreation zone.

MR D. McNAMARA: Yes. So David McNamara - - -

20 MR HANN: That's one we just want to understand, you know, how that works. I think it was driven by subsequent change in the application.

25 MR McNAMARA: So David McNamara, director key site assessments. In terms of the permissibility, the retail use is technically prohibited in Innovation Plaza. However, the approval of a prohibited use is possible with an SSD. You can approve something that's partly prohibited. So then the question came, well, what is the appropriateness of using that space, and our assessment report goes to the objectives of the public recreation zone, and has a discussion around those objectives and that, in view of the department's assessment report, the use of the space conceptually for outdoor seating is consistent with the objectives.

30 At this point in time, our report is recommending that the details about the precise size and location of that space be deferred and tied to future applications for fit-out and use of the retail tenancies. So once you know the exact use, the exact scale, you can do an assessment of the precise impact, but we are saying, conceptually, some use of that space, and noting it is only 300 square metres of a three-and-a-half-thousand square-metre space at the moment, was a contributing factor to us believing that, conceptually, it would be an acceptable outcome for a small proportion of that space to be used and it will activate the open space as well, having some public seating.

40 And so, on that basis, we're comfortable that, subject to further consultation with council and the Heritage Council, as those detailed applications for use of the retail tenancies are brought forward, then the details – final detail of the use of the outdoor seating can be confirmed and approved.

45 MR HANN: Okay. I guess a related issue – and I will jump forward a little bit to this – really is the loading bay, and how that works from an access point of view and

safety, and obviously – and it comes back to this issue of the retail use and the ability of the loading dock to work appropriately and safely. So, really, the question is, are you satisfied that, in terms of the permissibility, that you've addressed that in terms how the loading dock particularly works?

5

MR B. ROBERTS: Yes. My name is Brendon Roberts. I'm the team leader in the key sites assessments team. The issue of the loading dock in this portion of the Locomotive Workshop was something that we explored in quite a lot of detail. We asked the applicant to explore a range of different options in how the loading dock might work to be able – for us to be able to come up with – kind of be convinced that this option is the most beneficial. And one of the important elements in that is acknowledging that the loading dock on this eastern elevation of the Locomotive Workshop uses an existing opening in the heritage fabric and that, you know, while the vehicles might have to use Innovation Plaza to be able to access that loading dock, we thought that, with the introduction of a loading dock management plan and further details requiring that the paving and the actual public domain space, needs to be able to accommodate the vehicles into that space.

20 One of the important considerations there is making sure that the loading dock is not used during times when that space is used predominantly for pedestrians, acknowledging that it's a significant pedestrian connection from the south through the ATP towards Redfern Station to the north. And, on balance, we thought that the benefits of that option to the heritage fabric of the Locomotive Workshop outweighed some of the potential impacts to the amenity of that Innovation Plaza.

25

MR HANN: Perhaps if we can – we want to explore the loading dock and how it operates in a real amount of detail, but just before we do, if we come back to the permissibility. So are you satisfied that, in terms of the loading dock and how that will operate, that that has been taken account of in your assessment of the permissibility in relation to the retail use and the fact that - - -

30

MR McNAMARA: Well, the permissibility of the retail use is the permissibility that's afforded under section 4.3(8) of the Act. The future consideration of exactly where and what size those – that potential outdoor setting is. One of the key considerations of that will be the operation of the loading dock.

35

MR HANN: Okay.

40 MR McNAMARA: We're comfortable that, in a space of three-and-a-half-thousand square metres, 300 or so square metres of seating could be accommodated and located in such a way that it won't interfere with the loading dock operation and movement of pedestrians. Final details is recommended to be recommended to be dealt with through future applications. It will be most likely that a retail operator would want their seating adjacent to their retail tenancy and, therefore, it is going to locate it in a manner as indicated in the plans in the report that is not associated with the movement of vehicles, so there is a separation. So we are very confident that the

45

desired retail operator outcome will be consistent with a safe outcome for the interaction of the loading dock and the outdoor seating.

MR HANN: Okay.

5

MR PILTON: Just thinking about – we’ll go on to the safety aspects. I mean, they have got to reverse in to this, and if this is happening before 9 o’clock, or whatever the hours were – I can’t remember now – I mean, there’s people going to be walking through going to Redfern Station, so how are they going to handle that?

10

MR ROBERTS: Yes. We’ve recommended a condition – sorry – Brendon Roberts again.

MR PILTON: Sorry.

15

MR ROBERTS: We’ve recommended a condition that the loading dock is not used during those peak pedestrian times, acknowledging that there might be a little bit more pedestrian footfall during those times.

20

MR PILTON: Can we require that they have sort of men there sort of guiding the trucks in or – I don’t know if that’s allowable or - - -

MR ROBERTS: Again, we’ve recommended a condition requiring the loading dock management plan, and the loading dock management plan will set out a whole range of different mechanisms that can facilitate and reduce the potential impact between the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. And it could be a person; it could be, as you experience in the city when you’re walking past the loading dock entrance or a car park entrance, lights, sounds, those various different things, and that’s something that we will have a look at in terms of the actual content of the loading dock management plan and make sure that it’s adequate.

25

30

MR McNAMARA: I think we would be comfortable that there are a number of adopted operational ways that you can control loading docks and car park entrances that you do experience around the CBD that could be transferable and related to an appropriate management plan in this location to ensure those peak pedestrian times pedestrians have priority.

35

MR HANN: Can you just take us through – in terms of a typical truck path, will the truck be entering from the plaza in a forward direction or does it need to reverse in? And if it’s in a forward direction, then there needs to be sufficient – and I think there is some path analysis – so is it in a forward direction and then it turns within the loading dock? And so there are limitations on truck length obviously. 12 metre – I can’t remember what it is. 10 metres or 12.

40

MR PILTON: 10.2, I think, from memory.

45

MR HANN: 10. Yes.

MR ROBERTS: I would like to – in response to the first point, I would like to draw your attention to figure 21 in our assessment report, which just speaks to the access routes to the loading dock.

5 MR HANN: Yes. 21. Yes. Okay.

MR ROBERTS: Yes. And in response to the second point, the important thing is that the vehicles leave the loading dock in a forward direction. So there will be an element of the vehicles needing to turn to be able to access the loading dock.

10

MR HANN: So will they enter in a forward direction, turn within the loading dock and then exit in a forward direction; is that the plan?

MS DICKSON: Emily Dickson. They will reverse into the loading dock - - -

15

MR HANN: Right.

MS DICKSON: - - - and exit in a forward direction.

20 MR HANN: Okay.

MS DICKSON: If you turn to – figure 23 on the next page shows just the plan of the loading dock - - -

25 MR HANN: Yes. Yes. Yes.

MS DICKSON: - - - which – where – and shows where the trucks park and then also smaller vehicles as well.

30 PROF LIPMAN: So there will only be one truck going in at a time; is that correct?

MS DICKSON: Only one truck will be able to access at a time.

PROF LIPMAN: Because of the turning.

35

MS DICKSON: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

40 MR HANN: To reverse into - - -

MR ROBERTS: And, again, this is another – the procedure for managing reversing is something that the loading dock management plan has to cover off on and ensure there is an acceptable protocol and safe protocol, whether that's people escorting vehicles, etcetera, barriers, and there's a range of options again that will need to be documented and agreed there.

45

MR HANN: Okay.

MR PILTON: I think I would like to have a look at it on site, which we're going to do later, but it worries me, you know, that these are raised planter beds, I think, and  
5 the sort of the turning circle of the trucks, whether they're going to have to plonk bollards down there to stop them hitting the planter beds or – and I think I read somewhere in here that they have had engineers' confirmation that the pavement can stand the trucks and so on.

10 MR McNAMARA: Yes. Correct.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: And the City of Sydney are very interested in the public domain  
15 design and those outcomes.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: And they will be a key stakeholder in resolution of final design.  
20

MR PILTON: Okay.

MR McNAMARA: And I expect the loading dock management plan interaction with the public domain design will be a key concern for the city. They raised the  
25 issue of the pavement's ability to handle truck movements, so it is certainly something that's an issue for them and the final resolution of public domain will need to interact with the loading dock management plan requirements.

MR PILTON: Do we know how many trucks they expect every day?  
30

MS DICKSON: We don't have that detail at the moment.

MR McNAMARA: We can take that on notice.

35 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR HANN: So when - - -

MR PILTON: Well, we can ask the applicant later.  
40

MR McNAMARA: Yes. Okay. Yes.

MR HANN: John Hann. When the trucks are entering the loading dock, at which  
45 point do they make a – commence reversing? So on figure 21, they're coming along – they come along Margaret Street, no doubt in a forward direction, and then through to the entrance to the subject site. Do they – where do they do the turn?

MS DICKSON: Yes.

MR PILTON: They're going to – sorry. Well, you go Emily.

5 MS DICKSON: Yes. So they would drive – I haven't got the colour version. It's the green line on figure 21.

MR HANN: Yes.

10 MS DICKSON: They come into a forward direction facing south in Innovation Plaza - - -

MR HANN: So they go into the Innovation Plaza - - -

15 MS DICKSON: - - - and that's the point - - -

MR HANN: - - - and then they reverse back from there.

MS DICKSON: - - - where they will reverse - - -

20 MR HANN: Okay. Thank you.

MS DICKSON: - - - with a left turn.

25 MR HANN: Yes. No. That's good. Thank you, Emily. Adrian, do you have anything else?

MR PILTON: No. I think – yes.

30 MR HANN: Zada? On the loading - - -

PROF LIPMAN: No. No. That's - - -

MR PILTON: Sorry. Actually, if I just could come back quickly. When you say

35 you asked them to look at different options, I mean, what options did they look at in overall sense? I mean, did they look at moving it somewhere else or - - -

MR ROBERTS: Yes.

40 PROF LIPMAN: I think that's in the report at page - - -

MR HANN: It's on page 45. Yes.

MR PILTON: Page 45. I'm sorry.

45 MS A. SARGEANT: There's two options. Sorry. It's Anthea Sargeant.



MR PILTON: Yes. You're right.

MS SARGEANT: There's two options.

5 MR HANN: Via Marian Street versus Margaret Street; is that right?

MS SARGEANT: Yes. Yes.

MR HANN: Yes.

10 MR PILTON: That was the - - -

MR ROBERTS: That's to be able to access - - -

15 MR PILTON: That's the access - - -

MR HANN: That's the access .....

MR PILTON: Yes. But I'm just wondering, you know, could the loading dock be,  
20 you know, up here or whatever?

MR ROBERTS: Yes. Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: There's also - - -

25 MR PILTON: Obviously not, because you can't get in that side, I don't think, but  
- - -

PROF LIPMAN: - - - some options on that as well. Here we are. On page 43.

30 MR ROBERTS: That's right.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. I didn't - - -

35 MR HANN: Anything else on the loading dock at this point?

MR PILTON: No.

MR HANN: Zada?

40 PROF LIPMAN: I don't know if you wanted to talk about the protection of the  
Davy Furnace space.

45 MR HANN: Yes. Actually, we should do that, because I'm assuming that the  
loading dock and the configuration of it is part of the reason why the blacksmith's  
area is reduced in area and part of the loading dock impacts relate potentially to the

furnace; is that right; the Davy Furnace? So perhaps if you just elaborate on that from a heritage point of view.

5 MS DICKSON: Yes. So they're proposing around the Davy Furnace a glass barrier to protect the furnace from the loading truck vehicles and other servicing vehicles that will be in there. It's proposed to be glass so that views will still be possible from the mixed-use space in bays 1 and 2 through the loading dock wall through to the Davy Furnace and that will also retain the view between the furnace and the Davy Press, which is also retained in situ in bays 1 and 2 north. There will be some  
10 protective barriers associated with that glass wall around the Davy Furnace to protect the wall and also, you know, from any vehicles impacting through the wall.

The detail of that will be provided at the construction certificate stage in consultation with the Heritage Council. So, at the moment, we're advised that the barriers will be  
15 designed to be as minimal as possible, possibly using railing elements rather than solid so that that important view between the furnace and the press is retained for the public.

20 MR HANN: Okay. All right. Thanks. Michael, I think you had a point in relation to the loading dock.

MR M. WOODLAND: Yes. Thanks, Commissioner. Michael Woodland, Keylan Consulting. I just had one question around the permissibility. Could the department  
25 just clarify that the area we're talking about is only limited to the outdoor seating and not floor space at all?

MR ROBERTS: That's right.

30 MR WOODLAND: Okay. Thank you.

MR ROBERTS: So the area we're talking about is Innovation Plaza, which is zoned public recreation.

35 MR WOODLAND: So the 300 square metres that has been discussed is limited to outdoor seating only.

MR ROBERTS: Is outdoor seating.

40 MR McNAMARA: Correct.

MR ROBERTS: Correct. Yes. Associated with any retail that's within the Locomotive Workshop building.

45 MR WOODLAND: Okay.

MR McNAMARA: So retail being a permissible use within the building, but not being a permissible use in Innovation Plaza - - -

MR HANN: In a recreation - - -

MR McNAMARA: - - - because of its public recreation zoning.

5 MR WOODLAND: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. Yes.

MR WOODLAND: Just to – yes – but I suppose where I’m coming from is has the  
10 department considered that floor space per se or outdoor seating?

MR ROBERTS: Outdoor seating.

MR WOODLAND: Okay. Albeit associated with a retail use, which would be  
15 otherwise prohibited in that zone.

MR ROBERTS: The retail use is not prohibited. The retail use within the building?

MR WOODLAND: No. The retail use in the outdoor seating.  
20

MR ROBERTS: But it’s associated with the retail use.

MR WOODLAND: Yes. Correct. Okay.

25 MR ROBERTS: Yes. I should note on that that the relevant statutory planning  
controls are set out in the State Significant Precinct SEPP, which has provisions for  
some types of works and development being exempt, and that includes outdoor  
seating within the ATP precinct as long it’s associated with – as long as it’s of  
environmental impact – minimal environmental impact and associated with the use –  
30 a use – like a café use within the Locomotive Workshop.

MR HANN: So it satisfies the criteria, in your view - - -

MR ROBERTS: Yes. Yes.  
35

MR HANN: - - - without putting words in your mouth, but that’s what you - - -

MR ROBERTS: It satisfies the criteria for it to be exempt in the future – or for it to  
be exempt. Notwithstanding that, the department has assessed the merits of having  
40 outdoor seating in that space in the context of the zone and the permissibility as well  
- - -

MR HANN: Okay.

45 MR ROBERTS: - - - just to make it 100 per cent comprehensive.

MR WOODLAND: Thank you.

MR HANN: Zada.

5 PROF LIPMAN: The implications for the introduction of educational land use. The way I understood it, in bay 14, you have some sort of educational use, and there were submissions in respect of that about doing away with the educational facility after the lease expires in 2023 and whether there should be a social impact statement. Was that the reason why the educational use was added later on after the RTS?

10 MS DICKSON: Yes. So the submission that was received from Top Education, which currently operate out of bay 15, they said they would be displaced by the proposal, and so in the plans that were submitted with the RTS, the applicant added back in that educational use and showed it in bays 3 to 4A.

15 PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Thanks very much. Can I just carry on from there. It seems that, you know, after a whole bay being allocated to educational use, to try and squeeze it into one to 4A might be a bit difficult. Have you got any idea about the proposals for that and what the proponent has in mind?

20 MS DICKSON: All the individual tenancy uses will be subject to separate DAs. So the proposal is just seeking approval for the uses at the moment. So any further use within those sites will be, yes, subject to separate DA consent. So, I guess, that will also be, I guess, a negotiation between the current operators and the owners of the site.

25 MR McNAMARA: It might be a good question to ask Mirvac.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Yes. Yes. I think so. Thanks.

30 MR HANN: All right. Okay. Just – actually, going right back to the beginning really – why are there two separate applications in terms of – why is it split?

MR ROBERTS: That's a very good question. I would argue that's one for the applicant.

35 MR HANN: Okay. Yes.

MR ROBERTS: We've assessed the applications that have been put before us.

40 MR HANN: Sure. No. I understand. I just wondered whether you - - -

MR ROBERTS: Notwithstanding that, we've assessed them together. We've assessed them as one application while there might be two, if you like, recommended development consents, but the merits, the impacts, the principle of the proposal has been assessed comprehensively as one proposal.

45 MR HANN: Okay.

PROF LIPMAN: There may be some financial advantages in terms of contributions: affordable housing or something like that possibly.

MR McNAMARA: I would ask Mirvac. I'm sure there are reasons - - -

5 PROF LIPMAN: Yes. I'm sure they have reasons.

MR McNAMARA: - - - but I don't think – I would rather they speak to their reasons than me.

10 MR HANN: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

15 MR HANN: No. No. We will – rest assured, we will put it to them. Okay. Anything further on the educational aspect of it?

PROF LIPMAN: No. I don't think we can take it - - -

20 MR HANN: So next on our list is the travelator. Probably back to square 1 in terms of – part of it was approved, if you like, in a previous – in the previous determination and this really allows the linkage, but if you can just take us through the logic –the rationale, for why it's needed and then some of the issues around the impacts – construction and so on – given it's a fairly substantial feature that's proposed.

25 MR McNAMARA: Yes. To the first point, I think Mirvac would be able to speak to some of the commerciality around why this particular option is their preferred option, but, certainly, we can speak to the impacts that this option has.

30 MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR McNAMARA: And, yes, previous approvals have created a basement car parking structure in building 2 and there is a modification that has permitted an excavation zone that extends partway across the road.

35 MR HANN: Which mod was that; do you - - -

MR McNAMARA: I believe it was mod 5 for building 2.

40 PROF LIPMAN: Five.

MR HANN: Five. Okay. And that was approved by the department. I don't think it came to the Commission, did it - - -

45 PROF LIPMAN: No.

MR McNAMARA: No. It was approved - - -

MR HANN: - - - to analyse? Yes. Okay.

MR McNAMARA: So in terms of then looking at what is the impact of the installation of the travelator, the travelator does utilise an existing brick arch, so it  
5 doesn't require a new opening into the built fabric, which is a good outcome. The impact on the heritage fabric is the removal of some of the floor slab. The Heritage Council are comfortable with that on the basis of additional information, which was submitted around the structural implications of that and how that structurally needed to be undertaken. And there would be some contamination implications, which can  
10 be managed, as they are being managed in the wider precinct.

And so, from the department's point of view, the heritage impact to the fabric was minimal and, in theory, you could reverse the removal of the slab in the future, you could remove the travelator and you could reinstate a floor slab, so it was a low-  
15 impact resolution. There certainly would be some economic factors that would be driving wanting to have good access to a supermarket facility, but I think it's more appropriate for Mirvac to walk you through what they are. They're common, in my experience, on these type of adaptive reuse sites.

20 You may – another alternative would have been to try shoehorn a carpark structure into the building itself with a new entrance and that, I would expect, could have had a number of significant heritage impacts, as well as questions around creating additional access points for vehicles in the precinct. So the department is very comfortable that, subject to conditions around structural resolution and design and  
25 contamination being managed, that this is an appropriate outcome and the heritage impacts are minimal and acceptable.

MR HANN: And so the construction management plan will obviously be critical in terms of - - -

30 MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - it being properly cast, but also applied. Yes.

35 MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MR HANN: So the driver of it really is the supermarket and the access back to the car – the car-parking facilities.

40 MR McNAMARA: Correct. And Mirvac, as I said, would be able to talk you through how that market and attracting supermarket users works. There are a number of factors – and I've had experience on other similar sites where there are a number of viability and commercial factors that will drive the success of this type of mixed-use development, and convenience is one of those.

45 MR HANN: Okay. Adrian, have you got any comment on the travelator?

MR PILTON: No.

MR HANN: Zada?

5 PROF LIPMAN: No.

MR HANN: Michael?

MR WOODLAND: No.

10 MR HANN: Okay. All right. We've talked a little bit about traffic management onsite/offsite. I guess if you could just take us through the key impacts that you see and how that would be managed.

15 MS DICKSON: Do you mean with construction management of traffic or - - -

MR HANN: Well, it would include that - - -

MS DICKSON: - - - accesses, or just general - - -

20 MR HANN: - - - but also, once it's completed, how it works.

MS DICKSON: Starting with, I guess, with construction management, we think the project is – sort of a standard approach would be required. So standard conditions requiring construction and pedestrian management plan, but we are aware that there's quite a lot of development in that area. So consultation with preparing that plan will be – is recommended to occur with the Sydney Coordination Office Council to consider other developments in the area. Construction vehicle access will all occur via Locomotive Street. There's – because the building is heritage, the access for vehicles into the building is restricted to existing openings, which are only three, one of them being the loading dock, and two more off Locomotive Street.

25

30

In terms of the management of construction vehicles, the detail of that will be in that construction and pedestrian traffic management plan. We don't envisage that it will have a significant impact on traffic in the area during the construction. And then for traffic access when the site is operating, as we talked about, there will be a loading dock management plan recommended to manage access of loading vehicles. There will also be some smaller servicing vehicles on Locomotive Street and that's also required to be detailed in the loading dock management plan.

35

40

MR HANN: And one of the critical aspects of that will be the length of the vehicles and how that's controlled by the operators of the supermarket no doubt - - -

MS DICKSON: Yes.

45

MR HANN: - - - because – yes. Okay.

MR ROBERTS: Yes. I could add to that too that this proposal is one of several applications going on in the ATP precinct and the applicants are nearing completion on some of the other buildings in the ATP, namely buildings 1, 2 and 3 that were approved under SSD 7317, and through the construction of those buildings, the applicant has set up a community consultation group. They have had quite a number of community meetings. They do quite a regular newsletter advising the community of construction impacts, I think. The construction impacts associated with the adaptive reuse of an existing heritage building is quite minimal when compared to that of constructing a new building.

MR HANN: Yes. Yes. Yes. No. Understood. Okay. Anything else on traffic?

MR PILTON: Just a quick query. Is this open to traffic, Locomotive Street, all day? I just notice there's a turning circle right up the end here.

MR ROBERTS: That's how it currently operates.

MR PILTON: Yes. That's what I'm just - - -

MR ROBERTS: It predominantly services the Locomotive Workshop.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR ROBERTS: I guess the aspiration through both this application and SSD 7317, and as being taken forward as part of the public domain plans for those, is visualising that space more as a shared space; more as a - with a higher, I guess, pedestrian priority than it currently does now.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR HANN: Zada?

PROF LIPMAN: I was just wondering about the parking issues with removing those two parking spaces and relocating them if Margaret Street is to be used as the preferred option. I noticed initially the council didn't seem very keen on the idea, but they haven't raised anything further in relation to it. In order to turn left into Margaret Street, it's going to require the removal of two car parking spaces.

MS DICKSON: Yes. I think because there's the two options: Margaret or Marian.

PROF LIPMAN: Marian. Yes.

MS DICKSON: And Marian requires the trucks to traverse an area where there's an exit and entrance to Redfern Station, which is a higher pedestrian area. So, yes, initially, the council did raise issues with using the Margaret Street option, which, in later submissions, didn't raise as much of an issue with, I think, because that option



is better because it removes trucks and vehicles from that higher pedestrian area up near the Redfern Station entrance/exit.

5 The changes to the no-stopping zone, which would require the removal of two car spaces, would need to be approved by council's traffic committee, so there's a condition recommended which requires that to occur, but we also note that if the council's traffic committee are not supportive of that, there is still a viable option for trucks to access the site. And there are also some garden beds in the surrounding streets which, if removed, could provide the two car parking spaces, but, again, that's  
10 subject to council approval.

PROF LIPMAN: Okay. Thanks.

MR HANN: All right. Michael, anything in relation to the traffic?  
15

MR WOODLAND: No.

MR HANN: Okay. Perhaps when we – we can talk about the – just with the most recent amendments, which came through, I think, in September of this year, and there's a letter there that sets out a little table of what they are and the drivers, but, clearly, the important thing is that you're satisfied that the impacts don't require any further detailed assessment. So we just wanted to – perhaps if you could just take us through the key aspects of the changes and the issues around impacts.  
20

MS DICKSON: Yes. So within bays 1 to 4, it was really just some sort of minor internal refinements that the applicant wished to make to the layout within sort of the existing floor plates that were there; relocating a plant, which then sort of had some associated reconfiguration of fire stairs; public at the lift. So we don't see that there was any significant changes that occurred as a result of those sort of minor  
30 refinements. And then the other change that occurred was they are retaining the western turntable in Locomotive Street, which is sort of located outside bay 12, and that's actually due to some further heritage investigation that they had undertaken by their own heritage consultant and that's actually a better heritage outcome that that turntable will be retained. And, as a result of that, they also proposed some minor  
35 changes to location of loading spaces and accessible spaces; taxi drop-off as well.

MR HANN: Okay.

MR McNAMARA: So if I could just add, I think, in effect, those changes were a combination of design development, as well as the applicant responding to matters that came out of the assessment process and comments from stakeholders. And also, importantly, the department's assessment report does assess the proposal as it was revised, so it does consider and take into account those changes that were made and the assessment report is on the revised scheme.  
40  
45

MR HANN: Okay. Thanks. Right. Any queries on that, Adrian, Zada, Michael?

MR WOODLAND: Not from me.

MR HANN: Okay.

5 PROF LIPMAN: No.

MR HANN: All right. Look, I think it's down to one tree, as far as I understand it, but I think, nevertheless, it's important to ask what are the options for retaining that? You know, the community have raised it; it's an issue. So we just wanted to  
10 understand your take on it.

MS DICKSON: The tree removal is required for the loading dock access, and so it's interlinked with considering where the best location for the loading dock is and, as we've discussed, various options were considered and the location of the loading  
15 dock, as proposed, is a result of having the least heritage impact, but, as a result of that, it does require the removal of one London plane tree from Innovation Plaza and, on the balance of, I guess, the merits and the impacts, we're supportive of that tree removal because of it being the most suitable location for the loading dock.

20 MR HANN: Okay.

MR PILTON: It could be moved.

MR ROBERTS: I could add to that point that, when considering the loss of this one  
25 particular tree and slight pruning to adjacent trees, the department has considered the public domain improvements to the APT precinct beyond just the boundary of the Locomotive Workshop, acknowledging that the applicants, through this application and through SSD 7317, that they are proposing a significant amount of public domain improvements, including significant increase in tree planting across the  
30 whole precinct.

PROF LIPMAN: I note that the applicant – I think it was in the RTS – that they had considered transplanting and it wasn't feasible. We're advised that it wasn't  
35 possible. So if that - - -

MR PILTON: I haven't seen the tree yet, but I think it would be possible.

MS SARGEANT: Did we get an arborist's report?

40 MR ROBERTS: There was one with the application.

MS SARGEANT: Yes. Yes.

MS DICKSON: Yes.  
45

MR HANN: Yes. I thought there – yes – there's reference to it in your report, I think. Yes.

MS SARGEANT: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. But it wasn't feasible ..... transplant.

5 MR HANN: Yes. Yes. Speaking of the public domain, did you have any questions overall on the public domain treatment, Zada?

PROF LIPMAN: No. I've seen it's going to be integrated with the previous public domain plan that was done for the initial application, SSD - - -

10

MR ROBERTS: That's correct.

MR HANN: Is that right?

15 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

PROF LIPMAN: There was just one question, if we're ready to move onto signage.

20

MR HANN: Yes. Why don't we.

PROF LIPMAN: It's not on the list, but I just wanted to follow up on the proposed logo on the towers: whether you've got any – I notice the department recommended against that and I wondered if you had any additional information on what exactly was proposed other than the lettering we've got in the diagram?

25

MR ROBERTS: I'm pretty sure there's a - - -

30 PROF LIPMAN: There's a diagram of sort of letters there.

MR ROBERTS: Yes. There you go. So there's an image showing it in - - -

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

35

MR ROBERTS: It's figure 25 in the assessment report.

MR PILTON: Page 52.

40 MR ROBERTS: Page 52.

PROF LIPMAN: Was that, in fact, what was proposed?

MR ROBERTS: That was shown on the applicant's signage diagrams. Yes.

45

PROF LIPMAN: It's fairly large.

- MR ROBERTS: For various reasons, as set out in our assessment report, the department didn't support that signage and have recommended a condition requiring that it be removed.
- 5 PROF LIPMAN: Yes. What sort of signage was it? Was it just standard or - - -
- MR ROBERTS: As far as I understand, it's building identification signage identifying that it's the Locomotive Workshop, but we considered that a signage zone of that scale would have adverse heritage impacts on the character of the
- 10 buildings.
- MR SARGEANT: It wasn't illuminated or anything like that though, was it?
- PROF LIPMAN: That's what I was wondering. Yes.
- 15 MR SARGEANT: Yes. It was just a - - -
- MS DICKSON: All the content, and the detail and illumination would be subject to a - - -
- 20 PROF LIPMAN: A subsequent – yes. Yes.
- MR SARGEANT: Right.
- 25 MS DICKSON: - - - separate signage application, but it was seeking approval for a zone for signage - - -
- MR SARGEANT: Okay.
- 30 MS DICKSON: - - - but we didn't have any detail on – yes – illumination and content.
- PROF LIPMAN: Right. But on the size – the size you've been given is approximately correct, is it?
- 35 MS DICKSON: Mmm.
- PROF LIPMAN: All right.
- 40 MR HANN: Okay. Anything else on - - -
- PROF LIPMAN: No. The only other thing you've got is the contamination and remediation. I don't know if you want to proceed on that.
- 45 MR HANN: Well – yes – I mean, it's obviously a – it is an important issue and you've addressed it in your report, but, clearly, that – I mean, SEPP 55, I think, is the driver of how it's to be managed. We just want a little bit more information perhaps

on your views of the risks, given, you know, 100 years of industrial activity on the site and no doubt there's lots of nasty things - - -

MR ROBERTS: That's right.

5

MR HANN: - - - to be encountered on – and while the disturbance is probably going to be fairly minimal - - -

MR ROBERTS: Yes.

10

MR HANN: - - - unlike perhaps a whole new construction. Yes.

MR ROBERTS: That's right. Yes. That's right. So in our assessment report, we acknowledge that there are some penetrations into the existing ground slab that has the potential to result in some land contamination issues. The applicant has submitted a remedial action plan, which notes that there's elevated subsoil vapour concentrations. The department has considered the works to the Locomotive Workshop, I guess, in the context of contamination being a big issue in the assessment of, as I said, the original SSD 7317 where quite a well – comprehensive framework was established to be able to consider and address any land contamination impacts in accordance with SEPP 55, as you mention.

20

The department has considered the potential land contamination at the Locomotive Workshop, in the context of that framework, and has recommended conditions consistent with the way that land contamination has been addressed, such as requiring monitoring – air quality action plans and the – producing various – I can't think of the word – the environmental remediation.

25

MS DICKSON: Action plan?

30

MR ROBERTS: That's it. Yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

35

MR SARGEANT: Is there are a site auditor on the site?

MR ROBERTS: There is.

MR McNAMARA: Yes. There is. Yes.

40

MR SARGEANT: Yes. Okay.

PROF LIPMAN: Okay.

45

MR HANN: Okay.

MR McNAMARA: Yes. There's an appointed site auditor, which is Graham Nyland - - -

MR SARGEANT: Yes.

5

MR HANN: Okay.

MR McNAMARA: - - - and the history of development on the site and having to have gone through remediation protocols on some of the other development, he's building up a nice body of evidence. And I would also note that Mirvac have experience on similar sites in Sydney, and so, therefore, there's also a body of experience there where they have adaptively reused Tramsheds sites, such as Harold Park, so they have got experience dealing with similar contamination issues.

10  
15 MR HANN: Okay. All right. ....

PROF LIPMAN: Have we dealt with car park - - -

MR HANN: Well, not really.

20

PROF LIPMAN: But - - -

MR HANN: I guess, at the end of the day, there's some 300 – 3000 workers that will be busy there and I think there's six or seven car spaces for this particular application. Now, obviously, with the travelator, there's provision, and we talked about it earlier, where the supermarket – not everyone is going to carry a couple of bags to the railway station, so we're assuming, and the way I've read your assessment report, is that there's the ability to park in building 2, I think it is, in the basement and access that. For those that are working there, there's the ability to lease spaces. I think there's a reference to that, but I might have misunderstood it.

25  
30

So, in other words, while obviously there's a major deterrent for driving there to work, the supermarket will attract not only the workers that are going to be using the supermarket, but also the public generally who are going to want to bring their car. So it's just a matter of understanding that that's the way it's going to work, is that you use a public-and-pay car space in the basement of building 2 and the travelator to the supermarket. If you're working there and you really, for whatever reason, don't catch the train or whatever else – ride your bicycle there – then you will use building 2 car space and lease it, and the capacity is going to be there to do that.

35  
40

MR ROBERTS: That's correct. In terms of car parking, I guess, one of the key things to remember is that the planning control in the SEPP sets a maximum limit of 1600 car parking spaces within the ATP precinct, so any applications across the whole precinct, you know, can't exceed that maximum cap. And then, with that, there's a balance between providing enough car parking to service the retail component and the commercial component, which is provided in one of the levels in building 2, and that's – the department's assessment report doesn't really consider

45

any leasing arrangements or anything like that, it just acknowledges that there's sufficient car parking to service the retail and the commercial components within the Locomotive Workshop.

5 And the – but there's a major acknowledgment that, predominantly, the retail will service the needs of the employees within the precinct and within the surrounding local community, acknowledging that somebody might work in the city or somewhere else, catch a train to Redfern and walk through the ATP precinct, pop into the shop on the way to their homes, south, or east, or west.

10 MR HANN: Okay. Right.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Just on the car parking, there seemed to be a bit of a difference of opinion between – I think it was the Heritage Council and the  
15 proponent – about the accessible parking and whether it could be perpendicular to the Locomotive Workshops. I noticed the Heritage Council were against that, but it was firmly rejected by the proponent as being the acceptable method and one currently used. So I don't know where that's going to be end up. Are they going to work it out further down the track?

20 MR ROBERTS: Our assessment report acknowledges that that car parking perpendicular to the Locomotive Workshop is a current arrangement and the applicant contended that, you know, that's the current arrangement; it doesn't have any adverse impacts on the heritage character of the Locomotive Workshop, and our  
25 assessment report tends to support the position of the applicant on this one.

PROF LIPMAN: Although the Heritage Council has recommended against it.

30 MR ROBERTS: That's correct. The heritage council prefer parallel parking.

PROF LIPMAN: Okay. Thank you. And just one other question. It's just on a smaller detail. I noticed with, you know, protecting the moveable heritage items, there's some discussion by the applicant of using the, sort of, industrial-type mesh, and that seemed to be a problem with the heritage council as well where they wanted  
35 something that was, sort of, more sophisticated like a sort of stainless steel mesh or something like that. That seems to be left in limbo. It hasn't really been addressed anywhere that – will that be a detail that's addressed - - -

40 MR ROBERTS: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: - - - down the track by the heritage council?

45 MR ROBERTS: That's correct. In both the development – or the recommended development ..... condition requiring details of a large number of, kind of, very detailed works to be prepared in consultation with the heritage council and with council, and that's one of them – the barriers of all the heritage items.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: That's the heritage interpretation plan or in addition .....

5 MR ROBERTS: No, that's in addition to the heritage interpretation plan.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

10 MR ROBERTS: Yes. That's just to do with the actual detailed design of - - -

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

15 MR ROBERTS: - - - these particular things which – it includes the detailed design of the loading dock and the travelator and all the, kind of, arrangements for moveable heritage.

20 PROF LIPMAN: Yes. I just ask because there was a condition relating to not having tinted glass which is a minute detail and I wondered if, you know, there was a corresponding interest in the mesh.

MR McNAMARA: Definitely an interest and a matter to be resolved in consultation with - - -

25 PROF LIPMAN: Further down the track.

MR McNAMARA: - - - with heritage council.

MR ROBERTS: Yes.

30 MR McNAMARA: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes. Thank you.

35 MR HANN: There's one other matter that really relates to the blacksmith workshop and, as I understand it, that's a current operation there. With the introduction of the retail amenity, I know that studies have already been done in terms of some of the key criteria for the co-existence, if you like, but what level of risk would you see? I mean, it's not hard to envisage in the future that there might be some risk to the blacksmith operation imposed by the retail operators there, co-tenants, but  
40 nevertheless, and that will be a significant impact if the blacksmith workshop facility was not able to operate ultimately just because of not being able to meet the criteria, you know, for that operation versus a café or whatever. What sort of risk do you put on that?

45 MR ROBERTS: I would say that the – there's widespread acknowledgment that the blacksmith operation in bays 1 and 2 is quite an integral part of the heritage character of the building, and there's an intention that that use is carried forward in this



development, and I know that when you ask the applicant a similar question they will tell you that they are quite – they are very committed to retaining the blacksmith use within this, and in terms of the department’s assessment, it has acknowledged that that forms a key component of the heritage interpretation plan. So it goes beyond it  
5 just being a type of use within the building to actually be forming part of a key heritage part of the building, and that also forms part of the key reason the applicant is – wants that use to retain because that’s one of the – it sees that as attracting additional people to the retail component.

10 MR HANN: Yes. Yes.

MS SARGEANT: The applicant has also done quite a bit of studies around environmental impacts like air quality and .....

15 MR HANN: Yes. Yes.

MS SARGEANT: Airborne contamination as well. So I think they’ve put a bit of effort into trying to understand how it does relate to other uses that may be in the area such as, you know, that sort of – a blacksmith, sort of, operating right next to a  
20 café.

MR HANN: Yes. Yes.

MS SARGEANT: So I think they’ve done quite a bit of study - - -

25 MR HANN: Yes.

MS SARGEANT: - - - to support that.

30 MR HANN: And, look, I – to be – I haven’t gone back and looked at the detail of those studies. I just – I note that you’ve referred to it in several locations, but it’s an unusual circumstance - - -

MS SARGEANT: Yes.

35 MR HANN: - - - and yet acknowledging that the heritage value of the blacksmith operation is really right up there as an important matter, and clearly it would be most unfortunate if there was – it became incompatible, particularly if ultimately the economic driver of the retail drove out the blacksmith. That - - -

40 MR .....: Yes.

MR HANN: I’m being extreme, but I’m just - - -

45 MR .....: Yes.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - saying that's a risk - - -

MR ROBERTS: Yes.

5 MR HANN: - - - that we want to consider and we will talk to the applicant about it.  
All right.

10 PROF LIPMAN: So am I right in assuming that the whole slab – concrete slab is  
going to be removed to try and return it to compacted earth which could have an  
impact on the contamination?

MS SARGEANT: They are, yes, proposing to, yes, in the blacksmith return it, like,  
hard-packed earth. Yes.

15 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR HANN: To reinstate it - - -

MS SARGEANT: Yes.

20 MR HANN: - - - to what it originally - - -

MS SARGEANT: To - - -

25 PROF LIPMAN: Yes. So – but there was concern that, sort of, disturbing the slab  
could give off vapours and contribute to the contamination, so - - -

MR McNAMARA: Yes. So that's something that has to be managed - - -

30 MS SARGEANT: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: - - - same as for the excavation for the travelator.

35 PROF LIPMAN: But that would – yes.

MR McNAMARA: Exposing a slab and excavating it is a manageable risk - - -

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

40 MR McNAMARA: - - - and those works would have to be done. In effect, you  
would have to excavate out a certain amount and ensure any contamination that  
remained was capped - - -

45 MR ROBERTS: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: - - - and then reinstate soil and compact it on top would be the  
likely way you go about doing it - - -

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR McNAMARA: - - - but again, it's fairly well understood risks and management frameworks which can accommodate that type of work. In theory, from a  
5 contamination perspective you could probably remove all the slab. It would be –  
from an engineering and contamination perspective it would be possible. It's not  
desirable for a number of other reasons, but it's technically feasible.

MR ROBERTS: Yes. Yes.

10 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MS SARGEANT: And the remediation action plan would cover up - - -

15 MR McNAMARA: Yes.

MR ROBERTS: Yes.

MS SARGEANT: - - - on those works as well.

20 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes.

25 MR ROBERTS: Yes. The range of conditions in the recommended consent.

PROF LIPMAN: Thank you.

MR HANN: All right. Anything else? Adrian.

30 MR .....: No more from me.

MR HANN: Michael.

35 MR WOODLAND: I just had one last question around public domain.

MR HANN: Yes.

MR WOODLAND: I noted in the application that the public domain proposed for  
40 bays 1 to 4A consist of public domain improvements to Locomotive Street and  
Innovation Plaza and there's no public domain works for the second application for  
bays 5 to 15. Brendan, you mention that there's another application that has been  
approved next door. Can you just explain to me the delivery of the public domain  
works and the interface between those two applications if you can?

45 MR ROBERTS: That's correct. So the SSD for bays 1 to 4A include all the public  
domain works, so that's the section along Locomotive Street that relates to the

locomotive workshop and it includes some – the majority of works to Innovation Plaza. The public domain works to the rest of the ATP precinct are contemplated under the approval for the three buildings under SSD 7317 and in that development consent there's conditions requiring detailed public domain and landscaping plans to  
5 be prepared, and then there's a mechanism for those to be updated and reviewed, so those detailed public domain plans have been pretty much finalised, and now with this application, once this application is determined then those public domain and landscaping plans will be updated and amended to include the bit along – that's related to SSD 8517 so that they are integrated so that the public domain is read as  
10 one space.

MR McNAMARA: It might be worth asking the applicant to mark up a site plan to show the delineation between public domain works and the different approvals for the entire site so that can be absolutely clear to you. I think that would be the best  
15 way to clarify that.

MR HANN: Okay .....

MR WOODLAND: Yes, I think that's a good idea, particularly in relation to timing and delivery of these works given that they're subject to separate applications and separate approvals.  
20

MR HANN: Is there anything else, Zada, Adrian?

25 MR PILTON: None from me.

MR HANN: ..... Michael.

PROF LIPMAN: No .....  
30

MR .....: No, thank you.

MR HANN: All right. Well, I think we're done. Thank you very much. Yes.

35 MS SARGEANT: Great. Thank you.

MR .....: Thank you.

40 MR .....: Thank you.

MR .....: Thank you.

PROF LIPMAN: Thank you.

45

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[10.59 pm]**