



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-938340

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH THE PROPONENT (PACIFIC PLANNING PTY LTD)

**RE: REQUEST FOR REZONING REVIEW TO LAND AT 68- 72 RAILWAY
PARADE AND 2-2A, 4-10 OXFORD STREET BURWOOD**

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON
CHRIS WILSON**

PARTICIPANTS: **MATTHEW TODD-JONES
ALEXANDER JELICIC
JAMES MATTHEWS
MATTHEW DANIEL**

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

DATE: **11.04 AM, THURSDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2018**

MS D. LEESON: Okay. Well, welcome. Let's get started. So we'll do some introductions. I'm Dianne Leeson - - -

5 MR J. MATTHEWS: Hi, Dianne. Nice to meet you. James.

MS LEESON: - - - chairing this panel.

MR M. DANIEL: Matthew.

10 MS LEESON: Matthew. Right.

MR A. JELICIC: Alex.

15 MS LEESON: Alex. Nice to meet you. And Chris Wilson is the other - - -

MR DANIEL: Hey, Chris. Good to see you

MR MATTHEWS: Hi, Chris. How are you?

20 MS LEESON: - - - panel member for this. And you obviously know Matt here.

MR DANIEL: Sorry. I'll just turn my phone off.

25 MR JELICIC: Yes. We just met.

MS LEESON: Just met? Okay. Fine.

MR JELICIC: We just met Matt.

30 MR MATTHEWS: Yeah

MR JELICIC: Yeah. Yeah.

35 MS LEESON: So have you got the attendees - - -

MR M. TODD-JONES: Yes, I do, somewhere.

MS LEESON: Doesn't matter that much.

40 MR TODD-JONES:

MS LEESON: We're fine. I've got the front-piece.

45 MR TODD-JONES: I do. Yeah.

MS LEESON: Great. Okay.

MR TODD-JONES: But I'm not sure - - -

MS LEESON: No. That's fine.

5 MR TODD-JONES: - - - I've got Alex's details

MS LEESON: Okay. No. That's great. That helps us. So welcome, and thanks for coming in. We have some formalities that we will get to, and then we'll get underway. So this morning, we have met with the Department of Planning, Burwood
10 Council and yourselves. And then we're going to go and walk around the site perimeter this afternoon, which will be very helpful, I think. And then we will look to make our conclusions and report in the next week or so. So that's our endeavour. So welcome.

15 Before we begin, I do need to go through some formalities. And, firstly, I'd like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to Elders past and present. Welcome today to the meeting on the rezoning review request of a planning proposal that seeks to amend the Burwood LEP 2012 in
20 2A and 4 to 10 Oxford Street, Burwood. My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm the chair of the panel today. And joining me is Chris Wilson as the other panel member. The other attendee is Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC Secretariat.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the
30 Commission will base its 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 are not in a position to answer, feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. So if
35 you table additional information, it will go up onto the website. So with that preliminary undertaken, we can now get on with the meeting. And we will have – you have sent these through. So Matt will put these up onto the website - - -

40 MR TODD-JONES: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - in due course.

MR JELICIC: Can I just ask a clarifying question.

45 MS LEESON: Certainly.

MR JELICIC: Sorry to interrupt. It may be more of a process one. Is the Commission's – is it a recommendation to the department, or is it a decision?

5 MS LEESON: Ours is actually – I mean, I think technically it's an advice to the department.

MR JELICIC: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS LEESON: Okay. So it - - -

MR TODD-JONES: Sorry. Could – just to interject as well, for the purposes of the audio, can I confirm your full name so - - -

15 MR DANIEL: Of course.

MR JELICIC: Yeah, sure. My name is Alexander Jelicic, J-e-l-i-c-i-c, and I'm the author of the urban design report that was prepared for this application.

20 MR DANIEL: Matthew Daniel from Pacific Planning.

MR MATTHEWS: And James Matthews, also from Pacific Planning. I'm the town planner, and author of the planning proposal.

25 MS LEESON: Terrific. Thank you. I think there's probably a lot that we will talk through this morning, but perhaps to get us started, it would be helpful for us if you could outline the process that you've been through to date, just so we have clarity around the history of the proposal and where it currently stands.

30 MR MATTHEWS: Yes.

MR JELICIC: Perhaps if you want to do that now.

35 MR MATTHEWS: Yeah, okay. So I guess this – I guess the entire process started quite a few years ago when the landowner had a few of the lots that fronted Railway Parade. The reason that we've ended up with a planning proposal scenario is because the landowner has amalgamated the entire block. And when I say "entire block", it's the land surrounded by Railway Parade, Oxford Street and the school. So you'll see when you go on-site this afternoon there is a hole in the ground which is the product of an early development approval for the land that fronted Railway
40 Parade. And the planning proposal talks through some of those stages of development as he's acquired more of the lots and the certain DAs that were approved in that process. And I guess it takes time for when some – when a neighbour sees a big hole in the ground and go, "This is actually happening", and then an agreement could be made to acquire the remaining allotments.

45 So in that context, we requested to review the planning controls for the site in the context of the strategic planning framework for not only Burwood but for the priority

precincts along the corridor and, obviously, that's still in early stages of work. But we felt that given that there was an amalgamated pattern here now, that some urban design analysis could be considered in terms of challenging and testing those controls that are currently on the site which, ultimately, is eight storeys. I can't
5 remember in metres, sorry, and three to one. So that's when we've brought Alex on, and Alex will talk through some of the urban design eventually. But during that process we worked really well with council and process. We've met with them many times. They brought their independent consultants on, Cardno, and I'm not sure if Cardno were with council today when they

10 MR C. WILSON: They were.

MS LEESON: They were.

15 MR MATTHEWS: Yeah, that's great. And I can't talk highly enough of our experience with DY and Cardno. We actually felt that this is what every council should do because we worked really well with them. Without going too much into our history, you know, I used to work in the department and in that Gateway process, so I feel the part 3 process is about evolving to a product with input from various
20 sources and community, obviously, as well to come up with the final product. And so what we did is we prepared an urban design report that looked at various scenarios and some testing and heights and that kind of thing, and that was considered by Cardno and council and it worked with them on those heights and those interfaces and came up with something that we were all quite happy with. And I guess - - -

25 MS LEESON: In a sequential sense, though, did you - - -

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah, this is the key - - -

30 MS LEESON: I'm just trying to get some clarification - - -

MR MATTHEWS: Yes, the key - - -

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

35 MS LEESON: - - - of the chronology that - - -

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

40 MR MATTHEWS: I was - - -

MS LEESON: Essentially, there was an 18-storey proposal put in, and then there was iterative work with council - - -

45 MR DANIEL: Yeah, that's right.

MS LEESON: - - - and Cardno, and then the three options came up which were presented to council as – with I think a recommendation from staff to say there’s an option in here that, subject to getting further refined, it might be approved to go ahead.

5

MR DANIEL: Yes.

MS LEESON: And council rejected - - -

10 MR DANIEL: Yeah, so what occurred was we come in with a proposal of 18, and we thought that that was fine and that was done in the context of quite large development and things were happening in Burwood. The council officers, when we met with them, DY and others there said, “Look, okay. Thank you very much for that lodgement application.” And then they had a process in there that we’d been
15 unaware of that James has mentioned which was having an independent person come in and assist the council staff, and they indicated to us at the time that was mainly about because they just don’t have the resources to have sort of those sort of strategic skills on staff - - -

20 MS LEESON: Right.

MR DANIEL: - - - all the time and deal with lots of applications because there’s a lot of things going on in that LGA. So they brought it on. So that was when they started testing the options and looking at them and we started working iteratively.
25 And during that process we decided that, “Well, look, okay. We’ll take that 18 one away and we’ll test other models and things like that.” And that’s when we came up – and we actually worked very, very well with Cardno and the council staff and it was – basically came up eventually to, like, a 12, 13, 10 and eight sort of scheme that we’re all basically in agreement and alignment on and saying, “This is one that
30 should probably go forward to Gateway.”

But then what – we had that unfortunate situation where we were trapped in a process. This is went to a – and they said, “Look, okay. That’s great. That’s good.” We said, “Well, how about we reframe everything, we bring it all up and we’ll bring
35 you this revised application from us that you can have that we’ve all agreed on.” And we missed that opportunity to do that because the council decided that they’d bring it up to a council meeting and it was right in – it was right before the September elections, and so – I mean, not that I want to read into that, but there’s not many councils in Sydney that have courageously, you know, endorsed a proposal
40 that’s sitting right next to a school, yeah, with all the unfortunate misinformation that was being spread around at that time about it and stand up and put their hands up when they’re about to run to an election. Right?

And so that was the context that we were caught in, and there was a lot of
45 disappointment from us that, “Oh, gee, that was really unfortunate. If we’d – you know, if we’d waited –” but to be fair to the staff, they were trying to get us through the process thinking, “We’ll get a recommendation, it’ll go to the Gateway, we’ll get

some conditions then we'll allow to do that further study." And that's where we got trapped in a process environment in that and, therefore, our only process was – then was to seek a Gateway review in that context and then months down the track we're here. Do you know what I mean? So – and then – and so that was how the process occurred during that stage if we came to it. Is there anything I've missed there?

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah, I might just add, so this was all in July, in the – and, obviously, the – it was in September that the elections came, and so the matter got rushed to the meeting and we were there, you know, on the – supporting the recommendation of the staff. But following the council's decision, the staff also said "Look, we've got this in our fees and charges for –" I think it was 1500, "You can have it reconsidered." So we said, "Well, that's great."

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MR MATTHEWS: And that's when we made sure we had the package - - -

MR DANIEL: That's right.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - of the revised proposal with the controls that Cardno recommended, and we put that in there with the fee, which has, I don't think, ever been refunded. But - - -

MR DANIEL: No.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - they rejected that opportunity to have it reconsidered under their fees and charges.

MR WILSON: So why did they reject it, sorry?

MR DANIEL: They said at – whereas this – the – we've got to be careful here because the planning staff – and again - - -

MR WILSON: We do understand.

MR DANIEL: Yeah, well - - -

MR WILSON: We do understand.

MR DANIEL: - - - the sprit and facilitation - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR DANIEL: - - - they were – they said to us, "Yeah, look, we've got this in our fees and charges." And we went, "Well, we've never seen this before, but we'll lodge in." That's a really positive process there, so we lodged everything in, paid the fee, put it there, but then, subsequently, a couple of weeks or so after that, we were

told by the senior executive of the council that, “No, we’re not going to accept that application in that way.”

5 MR MATTHEWS: “You just need to submit – lodge - - -”

MR DANIEL: “You need to lodge a Gateway review.”

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah.

10 MR DANIEL: And, look, you can – we can make our own determination as to why that occurred. We don’t know. But they – at one point it was offered to us, and then it was removed from us, to have that opportunity.

15 MS LEESON: And then you lodged the request for - - -

MR DANIEL: Then we lodged a request after that.

MS LEESON: - - - review.

20 MR DANIEL: Correct.

MS LEESON: And technically, the review can only consider the original proposal which was the 18-storey proposal.

25 MR MATTHEWS: As lodged.

MS LEESON: As lodged.

30 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JELICIC: Can I just add something.

MR DANIEL: Well - - -

35 MR JELICIC: My understanding was that the panel was given an opportunity to make recommendations on the alternative scheme which was Cardno scheme as well at the lower scale, but the panel chose not to make recommendations.

40 MS LEESON: The planning panel that did the review?

MR JELICIC: That’s correct, yes.

45 MS LEESON: Okay. So they’ve made comment in their report about the lower scheme - - -

MR JELICIC: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - not – also not being supported. I’m just trying to get clarification that we’re all on the same page in terms of what you think the review is currently doing, because the document you gave us today, that we’ve received today refers to some options for – well, you’ve got the approved DA at 10, eight and six.
5 There’s another one for 14, 10 and six, and one for 12, 10 and nine.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MS LEESON: The relevance of that I think we need to consider and say - - -
10

MR DANIEL: Sure.

MS LEESON: - - - well – are you thinking that this review is about a 14-storey development, for example - - -
15

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - as one of those options, or the 18-storey development?

MR DANIEL: No, we think that this – we’re hoping that this review is about getting the best outcome for the site because, at the end of the day, we’re trying to provide an appropriate and quality development that is appropriate for its scale and site and the emerging strategic nature of Burwood as a major centre. And, unfortunately, we’ve been – the process for some reason – which I don’t think it should do this because I don’t think there’s any legislative provision that says it should be like this – but we’re trapped from actually putting the proper science forward that’s been peer-reviewed with council, with Cardno and with ourselves, and an iterative process there - - -
20
25

MR WILSON: Unless you start again.
30

MR DANIEL: Unless we start again. And so - - -

MR MATTHEWS: already got the decision - - -
35

MR DANIEL: That’s right.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - from the council that refused the staff recommendation.

MR DANIEL: That’s right.
40

MR MATTHEWS: So

MR DANIEL: Yeah. No, that’s right. And so we’re trapped in a situation where we go and spend another 50 or more thousand dollars lodging an application to council where we know that council has said that, “No, we’re not having anything”, and we personally believe that’s not based on planning merit. We don’t believe it’s
45

based on the science because their experts actually gave a different opinion. We believe that was bound up in the politics of that at the time. And quite honestly, what we're about is trying to make sure that we get an appropriate development for that site that we've always been trying to do based on merit.

5

So I think – and that's why we've gone and done – and I think that's probably an interesting segue into the DA that's just been done because that then – we lodged a DA, and the reason that DA was lodged after we'd lodged the planned proposals was because our client was sitting there in a terrible finance position going, "I'm holding all this land. I've paid a lot of money for the – to amalgamate these sites on the encouragement of the council to do that to create a better planning outcome", which we as professionals then thought, "Yes, that's a much better way to do it." And that DA then has – and so he needed to get a DA approved for – basically to hold the site, and the quite extensive cost is there because, of course, that releases finances. There's something that's approved there on the site, and then he can access the capital to do that.

But the good thing about that DA process has been that it's – and this is why these sort of reports are in front of you now – is because it's been able to provide a really – another level of interrogation into the site as a whole about – and the key thing is that interface of the school, and that's the main thing that the objectors were concerned about at the school, and what sort of scale and bulk and what is the impact of that area there. And that's why – and that's come back with a result that we were happy with that said six levels on that back building, which we thought was appropriate, and we've done a whole lot of testing and had our landscape architects look at that, see what the impact is to that grass area and make sure that there's proper resolution of that. So that's why – and then, therefore, we've said, "Well, okay. If a planning proposal is going to be called, if a Gateway is going to provide further study, it's quite relevant that these – the study that was in that DA is placed into that context as well", because that's important for the - - -

25

30

MS LEESON: Okay.

35

MR DANIEL: For the outcome.

MS LEESON: Okay. So can we backtrack, then - - -

MR DANIEL: Yes.

40

45

MS LEESON: - - - a little. So we understand the process from your perspective, of how it's gone through, and we've clarified that; that's terrific. Thank you. Do you then want to talk – take us through your views on the strategic merit of greater development there, be it 18 storeys, 14 storeys, or whatever – we'll be agnostic about, you know, specifically what it is, or the process – the technicalities of it. So the strategic merit argument that you've got for the site going to a greater height and density than currently provided.

MR MATTHEWS: Well, if you've got your urban design report that shows the scale - - -

MR JELICIC: Yeah. So - - -

5

MR MATTHEWS: - - - that might be a good starting spot.

MR JELICIC: Well, I can talk about the scale of it, probably, more than about the additional density, necessarily, to start off with. So, I guess, one reason why the increased height on this site was recommended, or suggested, by us is because of the activity that's been taking place nearby. So there's a significant development, called Burwood Plaza, that basically has increased the height of Council's LEP by somewhat, I think - - -

15 MR WILSON: Well, has gateway determination. Hasn't increased yet - - -

MR JELICIC: Sure, sure. That's what I'm - sorry - trying to say, yes. In principle, up to, like, another, I think, 100 per cent. So it's pretty much doubled up in scale to what the council's LEP has suggested. The council's LEP now, I understand - - -

20

MS LEESON: This is a 144-metre proposal.

MR JELICIC: That's correct.

25 MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR JELICIC: And the Burwood town centre, I think, current LEP height is in the vicinity of - - -

30 MR WILSON: Fifty-eight - - -

MS LEESON: Burwood's 70 - - -

MR WILSON: Burwood's 70; sorry.

35

MR JELICIC: Yes, 70 metres. So what we were basically suggesting to the council urban designers is that, obviously, in a very short period of time, from the time that the LEP was adopted, at 70-odd metres, within five- or six-year period, that's been, obviously, increased by double. So what we're saying, basically - if you, obviously, increase the height and scale in one precinct, clearly, there is usually, kind of, a chain reaction of events that takes place around it, because, traditionally, what we are, obviously, looking at in this particular area is that kind of relationship of adjacent context to the town centre. So our recommendation of 18-storey proposal - which was only really suggested at the corner; the other parts of the site were stepping down, towards the school and - - -

45

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JELICIC: - - - towards the southern end.

MS LEESON: Yes.

5 MR JELICIC: So that was always our strategy. We were basically suggesting that
that proportion of the built form that's currently technically permissible, which is
roughly between our site and the town centre, is about 30 per cent of scale
relationship to the town centre. So with the town centre now increasing by 140
10 metres, and our building suggested to increase to 18 storeys, that proportion would
equal - - -

MS LEESON: So on building - - -

15 MR JELICIC: - - - what's currently - - -

MS LEESON: - - - form alone, you're looking at a proportional - - -

MR WILSON: Doubling.

20 MS LEESON: - - - relationship, yes.

MR JELICIC: That's correct, yes. And that's what we were trying to demonstrate
to the council. And we felt there was a reasonable – from a scale point of view, I'm
25 only talking about.

MR WILSON: Yep.

MS LEESON: Yes.

30 MR JELICIC: And it's a reasonable outcome, because – I mean, we're talking
about – like – I mean, people are still – and in other councils as well – using the
whole, you know, bell-curve relationship. And this is basically, if you apply the
current rationale – so this is elevation looking across Railway Parade from the
gateway approval, which is the Burwood Plaza, and then, obviously, what our
35 proposal is currently suggesting. And that relationship was, I guess, argued at the
time that it should be, kind of, proportionally the same. And that was the starting
point.

40 And subsequent to that, obviously, once Cardno, obviously, started looking at it in a
bit more detail – and we obviously work with them – it's been determined this way,
because what we ended up doing beyond this point is a number of sightlines from
different parts of Burwood, which also, I guess, were sensitive from a heritage point
of view. We, sort of, determined that that scale, of 18 storeys, was somewhat –
45 maybe not most appropriate when viewed from lower-density areas, because we are
in the sort of outer edge, which is obviously a bit more sensitive, than town centre.
And we sort of collectively agreed that a built form of somewhat – 12 storeys, or, to
be precise, 58-metre built form, would be appropriate on that corner, then potentially

stepping down towards the southern end of the site, based on analysis that we did in regards to the solar access and so on. And also further site analysis that we did from different parts of Burwood. And that's something that we pretty much collectively agreed on.

5

And then, during the development application with the council, we have discovered that – obviously, sensitivity in regards to interface to the small, and how that six-storey was developed. But Council felt comfortable in breaching the current allowable height by two storeys – approximately six, seven metres – to the corner site. So, obviously, the building, instead of being eight storeys across the whole site, the end approval on that site ended up being six, eight, 10. The panel obviously had issues in approving that. Obviously, there was a deferral - - -

10

MS LEESON: And did you have a merit argument to support 10, or it was all about just the scale of the - - -

15

MR JELICIC: Well, our argument from day one was always that having a built form that's somewhat stepping and fragmented is a better outcome than having a strict wall of unique height across the whole site. So because it is a very prominent site. It's kind of an – I don't like saying, well, it's a gateway, but it is an entry to, I guess, Burwood town centre when you're coming from Strathfield. And I think having that sort of a continuous – and it's a significant size site.

20

So having a built form that's basically suggesting an eight-storey continuous built form across the whole interface of the site – and that's got, obviously, prominent two frontages – it was not the ideal outcome. And that's all we've been arguing, from 18 storeys to 12 storeys, and all these different heights that were put forward, always for a variety of scales on this site. Except the DA; the DA, obviously, suggested eight-storey crew-cut built form, which we felt – even though we ended up putting it in, because it was the tick-a-box compliance scheme at the time, we did not feel comfortable to, sort of, suggest this is the best outcome for this site.

25

30

MS LEESON: Okay. And Council has, in approving a DA at 10 storeys, accepted the argument about a modulation of the - - -

35

MR JELICIC: Modulation.

MS LEESON: - - - height being - - -

40

MR JELICIC: Yes, and they've also used the external – a prominent external urban designer, Gabrielle Morrish. They do a lot of – I think GMU does a lot of work for Council – as in, advice in regards to the UDG – urban design guide 65.

45

MR WILSON: Does Gabrielle work for the government architect, though?

MR JELICIC: No, Gabrielle – she works – she's an independent practitioner.

MR WILSON: Okay. Sorry.

MR JELICIC: But she has got exclusive contract, my understanding is, with - - -

5 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR JELICIC: - - - Burwood Council, because Burwood Council doesn't have a design review panel.

10 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR JELICIC: So they use Gabrielle's office to get advice on the ADG principles. And we basically work with GMU closely to come up with best possible form. We've fragmented the building and, obviously, articulated in different shapes and
15 forms, not just, obviously, with regards to the height, but also some additional setbacks and articulation of the built form, to come up with the best solution for that development application. So this is why, in front of you today, there is another, I guess, variation of 12/10/nine. So what we did is, we, obviously, brought –
20 introduced another option, which is basically 14, 10 and six, which is the same density as 12/10/nine, but just somewhat in a different shape and form.

MS LEESON: Different form.

MR JELICIC: Yeah.
25

MR DANIEL: Sorry. I - - -

MR JELICIC: Yes?

30 MR DANIEL: I recall, the density's slightly lower, isn't it, in this model?

MR JELICIC: In the 14, 10 and six?

MR DANIEL: Yeah.
35

MR JELICIC: It is; that's correct.

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

40 MR JELICIC: Yeah, slightly lower, because, obviously, the whole approach of maintaining that six stories, we felt – having, obviously, discussions with the school, and the school's representatives, that's what they felt comfortable with. And we, obviously, wanted to evolve this scheme that was agreed with Cardno, of 12, 10 and nine, to see if there's another option that we can develop for this site that could
45 maintain that lower interface to the school.

MS LEESON: So you have been consulting with Education – with the school, at local level.

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

5

MR JELICIC: Yes.

MS LEESON: And they're comfortable with – have they seen these options, or - - -

10 MR JELICIC: Well, they're aware of the 12, 10 and nine. They haven't seen six, 10 and 14, as far as I know.

MR DANIEL: I think – we're able to do a lot of interface with representatives all through the time, and – but this latest round, where we were dealing with this
15 current DA, and there was – I think the panel saw, in its wisdom, to be able to have it over two or over three meetings, enabling the school to talk and information being brought forward, and they provided their critique; and then we were able to go and get expert opinion in relation to the landscaping requirements, and would the grass be right, and detailed overshadowing requirements – how many hours would be there
20 – just to start allaying some of their – their rightful concerns that, well, is the playing area going to be dramatically diminished in a certain way? So that iterative process that was there, we're able to, in a formal sense, through the panel, have that good consultation with representatives of the school, and provided them detailed documentation.

25

There was, at one point, where the panel decided – we actually brought to the meeting a whole lot of even more detailed shadowing diagrams, that provided even more integrity into the process – I think, at half-hour intervals – even more. And we presented them to the panel. And the panel, in its wisdom, decided, “Well, look, the council rep” – I mean – “the school reps – representatives here, and the parents,
30 haven't had opportunity to see this. We possibly cannot make a decision.” So they delayed us – appropriately, in hindsight – another month, to allow the school to look at all those plans, and to have their views on it, and then come back to the panel meeting. Then, after that, the panel then made their decision on the scale of that.
35 And that was what everybody was concentrating on on that rear building.

MR MATTHEWS: We found that a quite useful process - - -

MR DANIEL: Very useful.

40

MR MATTHEWS: - - - because we were able to provide – their concern is it was landscape, and the grass and the ability to grow, so that's why we provided this analysis to you today, because that just gives an idea of how much sunlight the fields actually get to enable the grass to grow.

45

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. Yes.

MR DANIEL: Yes.

5 MR MATTHEWS: - - - which is an important concern for the school.

MS LEESON: It is. I mean, we've talked – or you've talked - - -

MR DANIEL: Sure.

10

MS LEESON: - - - in detail about form and overshadowing and we feel we can happily discuss some more. I think we're also interested to understand your perspective of what this proposal is going to do in terms of public benefit, in terms of - - -

15

MR DANIEL: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - you know, the strategic precedent issues around height of building, whether it's 18 or 14, in an area where the controls say it's an eight-storey building, so we're interested to get your perspective on the strategic merit of the project.

20

MR MATTHEWS: Well, I guess when I first started to look at this, it was at a – well, firstly, 500 metres from two train stations may be a little bit caught out by being in the middle, but we're slightly closer to Burwood and, in that context, I thought, well, this is a very well-located site. Secondly, I think when I lodged this plan for growing Sydney and the draft plans were still in force – obviously since earlier this year, we've now got A Metropolis of Three Cities and the district plan – eastern – I think the Harbour CBD district plan, which continues to identify Burwood as a strategic centre and we're, you know, within 500 – well, we're in about 100 metres of the edge of – I guess you could define it by the other side of the school.

25

30

It was also in the context of additional height and density being proposed in the centre – obviously Burwood Plaza – and the vision for this area and transit-orientated development to occur in a good location. So, strategically, I thought the site was very well-located. It has got a good northern exposure with the train line on one side, obviously on the other side of Railway Parade, and, given the amalgamated site, it provided the opportunity then for the site-specific analysis Alex has undertaken, which then tested the controls and whether it could accommodate, on a site-specific basis, additional height and density.

35

40

And that's why the original report had a number scenarios. Depending on the appetite, obviously we're caught in a little bit of a, you know, early process for precinct planning in terms of the build of the Strathfield-Homebush corridor, but, again, when you compare, I guess, some of the proposals – I mean, Homebush is a little bit different, because part of that precinct is within the Parramatta Road corridor, so, you know, this 25-storey proposal is appearing there and greater, I think,

45

on the northern side of the railway line, but, notwithstanding any of that, we're not comparing that and we're certainly not here to – I think Burwood more close to you their housing targets.

5 So it wasn't necessarily an argument that you need more housing supply, even though Sydney does, but it was the location, it was the evolution – continuing evolution of Burwood as a major – as a strategic centre and the transit-orientated development opportunities. And that all came about because of the amalgamated site. That's what led to that opportunity, I think.

10

MR DANIEL: Yes. And also – I mean, James and I, when we attended the site in the early period of the time just getting our own view about, look, should this site be supported for more density in its context – I mean, like, one of the key things, you catch a train to Burwood there, it's a very excellent and easy level walk to the site.

15

It's near significant social infrastructure in relation to the school, and we actually contend that these future studies responds well to that, and it will actually create – I mean, if you live in this site, I mean, with additional density, you will not need to own a vehicle at this site.

20

You will be able to walk to everything that's there in the locality and things like that, and so we just think it's – it is prime, in the context of good design, to create extra density on this site, which will then create a lower price point for the sort of product that we're able to produce on this site, which will then mean people will be able to have their own home and that sort of thing, or the rent rates will be lower and this sort of thing. Just the site economics working in that sort of way that, if you have a lower density, will not be able to be encapsulated in the final product. And I think it's very important that, in the context to all those services, it's walkability and things like that.

25

30

And then, also, we saw on the site there was an opportunity to improve the setbacks on the front of the building and of that to improve the public walkway and those sort of things – and that sort of thing – and create some activity around it. So, you know, we ourselves have come through our – through – as we've studied and worked at the site, that it is an excellently located site for increased density for a number of reasons, particularly it will be quite sustainable once it's operational and people are living there.

35

40

MS LEESON: You talked – sorry – you talked about – it sounded like a threshold density that – at which you could have great diversity of housing take to be affordable or, you know - - -

MR DANIEL: Yes.

45

MS LEESON: - - - probably affordable, and that you need more development to be able to make that viable. What is your sort of threshold of providing some kind of affordable housing contribution - - -

MR DANIEL: Yes. Well, at the moment, the scheme has eight affordable housing units in it that the DA if it was going to be built – I think it's eight or is it 10? I can't – sorry.

5 MS LEESON: The 10-storey development?

MR WILSON: I thought it was nine, but anyway.

10 MR DANIEL: Is it nine, is it? Sorry. Well, there you go.

MS LEESON: In the 10-storey development?

MR DANIEL: Yes. In the current development.

15 MS LEESON: Right.

MR DANIEL: In the current schemed – yes. So there is an opportunity to expand on that if we need to, but I guess my original – my previous comments there were not just about prescribing something that's affordable housing in the sense of providing a rental – so someone that has an income of 30 – you know, doesn't spend more than 20 30 per cent of their income on their living costs – yes, we can provide it to accord with the SEPP in that sort of a way, but it's also just the general dynamics of the site. If you have more stock on the site – more housing available, all housing there will – all the stock will be able to be priced at a cheaper price point, because economies of 25 scale are producing it and your input costs into the delivery of the product are better, do you know what I mean, so, therefore, you can bring the product on at a cheaper rate. And, also, the future of rentals going forward will naturally need to be lower, because there's a greater supply.

30 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR DANIEL: Just a competitive analysis that happens there. So there's two fronts. Yes. There's more of a capability, and I think further study post gateway will be able to bring up an economic analysis in more detail about how much more 35 traditional affordable housing can be provided, but then we can also make commentary about what we – the natural - - -

MS LEESON: The general market dynamic.

40 MR DANIEL: General market dynamics of what will occur in that sort of sense. But – yes – but we're more than happy to be considering those sort of things. We think it's appropriate actually to have that diversity of product in the final scheme.

45 MS LEESON: Chris?

MR WILSON: Yes. I'm just trying to understand where you think the proposal sits within council's – I hear what you're saying about the housing targets; they're doing quite well in terms of housing.

5 MR DANIEL: Yes.

MR WILSON: And, council, you've got the priority precinct process, which has really just initiated. It hasn't and then – which I presume – we don't know what the values will be, but we understand this site probably will be in, I don't – not quite
10 sure. And you've got the – and that will be consistent with the regional district plan – and then you've got councils who have to prepare housing strategies to deliver, what is it, the residual housing outcomes for the LGA of the region. How do you think the site sits in within that sort of context of the work that council is doing in relation to those plans – those – what are they called – residential housing strategies,
15 are they, dictated by the district plan?

MR DANIEL: Yes. I'm not completely sure on what the terminology is.

MR WILSON: Well, let's just call it the housing - - -
20

MS LEESON: local strategies.

MR WILSON: Local housing strategy. Yes.

MR DANIEL: But when you look at the preliminary documents released by the department in relation to this study, you will – they have those circles that are there, and there's a circle for Strathfield and there's a circle for Burwood and we're well within both; do you know what I mean? So within – we're in about four, five
25 hundred metres, as James pointed out, between – walking distance between both of those. So I think, not that anyone can predict what will eventually happen with the final strategic plan - - -
30

MR WILSON: Because they dictate the study areas, as you said.

MR DANIEL: Yes. That's right. Yes. Well, I think they have a 400 and 800 metres - - -
35

MR WILSON: The interested area. Yes.

MR DANIEL: - - - yes – and we fall in there, and so that dictates the study in that sort of a way. In our preliminary conversations with the council, the senior staff there and executive level also said that, look, they're meeting with the department and – you know, and they were working forward and they said – there was an indication that it was just that, “We're at this scale of delivery, but, of course, the
40 strategic plan is coming behind us”, and so it makes that difficult sort of situation where we're kind of ahead in a way.
45

But we all agree that it seemed quite logical and obvious that this site was capable of – and there would be a need in the future for more density and more development in that sort of a way, and perhaps that’s why there was a lot of, you know, serious resources put into getting a peer-review consultant there just seeing what the site could produce in the future, but, of course, no one can predict what eventually that will be, but I would just say that there’s no way that there’s going to be lower housing targets in Burwood or those sort of areas in the future, and so, therefore, we see there is justification for us having a study of these greater densities in a sense.

5

10 MS LEESON: You’re right. There is that sort of timing issue about strategies coming forward, LEP reviews, etcetera - - -

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

15 MS LEESON: - - - and you being one step ahead of all of that

MR DANIEL: Yeah. And I guess the problem is that, of course, this building will be there for 50, 100 years, do you know what I mean, into the future. So, I mean, we’re trying to – on the timescale, trying to predict an outcome that will accommodate future planning outcomes that are not imminent but are being progressed as we speak, you know, and trying to make sure we accord with that, because, of course, then if we miss that opportunity and we stay with the current LEP controls that were studied, like, more than five years ago, well, then, more sites around the LGA will have to increase their densities to take up additional housing that not to produce, for example, on our site or others that are in this current cycle of development. But that’s just – that happens all over Sydney, of course.

20

25

MS LEESON: Okay.

30 MR DANIEL: But we’re looking for that opportunity to, obviously, have a product that meets its market needs for when it will be completed in three years time.

MS LEESON: Alex, you were going to say something.

35 MR JELICIC: Yes. I was going to also add that something that we’ve discussed with the council and the panel pretty much from day 1 is that in the current LEP maps, you can obviously clearly see the allocation of the high-density zoning in relationship to the – obviously the zoning itself, but also the density. Now, something that the school has made very clear – the school’s currently zoned as R4 high density as well, and it’s got a certain allocation of the FSR on that site, which is significant if, theoretically, it was to be redeveloped.

40

One thing that we were talking to them about is that apart from the school, there’s a lot of also local conservation-type properties which are currently zoned R4 high density as well. And what we were trying to describe to them as well is that there was, I guess, expectation of a certain amount of density from that precinct when they were preparing these maps. Now, we’re pretty comfortable in saying that it’s very

45

unlikely that most of these sites will be developed. So what I'm trying to say is that whilst there was expectation of allocating a certain amount of floor-space ratio and so on, it's really only, like, our site that's providing a significant kind of provision of the density in this precinct, at least adjacent to us.

5

MS LEESON: If I understand what you're saying - - -

MR JELICIC: Yeah.

10 MS LEESON: Are you saying that there are certain sites within this R4 zoning, being the school and some conservation things - - -

MR WILSON: Which constrains - - -

15 MR JELICIC: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - that cannot use - - -

MR JELICIC: The density.

20

MS LEESON: - - - that density - - -

MR JELICIC: That's correct.

25 MS LEESON: - - - that's available.

MR JELICIC: So if you look at it globally - - -

MS LEESON: And so if you - - -

30

MR JELICIC: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - averaged – not averaged; but if you took some of that density availability, I suppose, and put it onto the site – is what you're looking to achieve.

35

MR JELICIC: That's what I'm trying to say. So if I look at it globally, in the whole - - -

MS LEESON: Transfer of density, perhaps.

40

MR JELICIC: Yeah. Yeah. So – well, I mean, there's obviously expectation, when they do, obviously, allocation of the future housing – expecting that some of these sites are going to be all developed at a particular FSR. But that's going to be very unlikely, in our experience. And the counsel has already demonstrated, through some of the sites that are further, I think, south from our site that have those kind of conservation interface issues – and wouldn't allow to maximise the allowable FSR anyway. So that's been already kind of evident in more recent DAs.

45

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JELICIC: So – because we – always when we approach sites like this we try to
5 look things – at the global picture rather than just zooming in and just focusing on
our site alone. I think that’s important. Yeah.

MS LEESON: That’s a good explanation. Thank you. Chris, have you got any
other straight-up questions? Or - - -

10 MR WILSON: Did you consider – look, obviously you’ve – you’re suggesting
some of those sites are constrained, which they probably – they may be. In terms of
the school – and it’s zoned residential, isn’t it?

MR JELICIC: That’s correct, yes.

15

MR MATTHEWS: Yes. Yes.

MR WILSON: So you’ve looked at the potential impact of your proposals on
potential development on the school site?

20

MR JELICIC: So we assumed the school could potentially be - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

25 MR JELICIC: - - - hypothetically, developed. So all our setbacks in relationship to
the school are compliant with the ADG, SEPP 65.

MR WILSON: Okay.

30 MR JELICIC: So we have various – in fact, the way that our building was planned
is we did not – we actually – from day 1 we created significant setbacks and open
spaces that are interfacing to the school, so – which are not exactly the most ideal for
us, because those spaces are kind to the south of our major built form, but we did it
because we wanted to have deep soil interfaced to the school, significant landscaping
35 and so on. So that was kind of done from day 1. But now we hypothetically assume
if this was to be developed one day, that there would not be adverse impact from
what we are currently proposing. So all the setbacks that are being placed upon our
building are compliant with the ADG.

40 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR JELICIC: Yeah.

45 MR WILSON: Just in relation to the question we started with at the beginning, in
terms of what the role of this panel is, I just – so you’ve – what are you asking us to
consider? So there’s three different schemes in here.

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MR WILSON: 10, 14, 12.

5 MR MATTHEWS: I guess - - -

MR WILSON: I'm just – I'm trying to - - -

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah. No. No. No.

10

MR WILSON: I'm just trying to work out what - - -

MR MATTHEWS: I think

15

MR WILSON: - - - you're asking us to consider, because obviously - - -

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah. I think what we're asking for is – at the end of the day, we just to make – we want to make sure that

20

I guess - - -

MR WILSON: I'm just trying to - - -

25

MR DANIEL: Yeah. No, no - - -

MR WILSON: I'm just trying to work out - - -

MR DANIEL: I think - - -

30

MR WILSON: - - - what you're asking us to consider, because, obviously - - -

MR DANIEL: Yeah. I think we think what we're asking for is, at the end of the day, we just want to make – we want to make sure that we get an opportunity to have
35 – to undertake further study, so we can do the rigorous testing of what the appropriate controls of this site should be, within reason. And that's what the gateway processes are for. So we're hoping for a gateway recommendation to the department – or suggestion – that's able to encapsulate the right areas that we should be studying further and testing; do you know what I mean? We think that's very,
40 very important, because – I'm not asking for approval of a building today; we're just asking for – let's do the rigorous study, and what is the framework around that that'll allow us to do it.

45

And, as Mr Wilson said, we've got those two areas there. I think the difference from what has occurred in the – from when we lodged this planning application, and even after we lodged, originally, the revised scheme back to Council, is that we've had this DA process, that's further tested and provided a lot more integrity in relation to

what that back block should – height should be. And that’s been through a very rigorous planning meeting process, and lots of work with the community there.

MS LEESON: Yep.

5

MR DANIEL: And I think that they’ve settled on a six-level thing there. So we believe that that’s probably captured there is sensible within reason. I mean, we’re happy to test that some more, but we think that’s a good starting block. But it’s all about – if the site is capable, in a strategic context, with what’s emerging with the state and – for more housing, and appropriately – and all those sort of things there – what is the right form in – that should be placed on that to capture this more housing; what is the right public benefit that should be provided; if we get more density, you know, for example, more – should we providing more affordable housing. We should do that economic test and study in there, because that’s very important for the diversity of the product. What should be the appropriate height of that scheme, and how does it fall onto the impacts that we’ve seen of that six-storey development, and those sort of things.

20 So they’re the sort of things we’d like to just study, and put back on exhibition, and then get that assessed. Because, at the end of the day, that’s what we’re asking for to be able to do, to then get the right results, and get the right built-form outcome, at the end of the day, on the site. That’s the advice we’d like to see go back. So we wouldn’t like to be in a rigid process that says, “No, that one’s right, or this one’s right.” I think we’ve got the hard evidence to say what is right back there, but now we’d like to allow us to have a set of conditions that can guide the future study and testing of the right form on this site.

25

MS LEESON: And that would include another height limit, in your view?

30 MR DANIEL: Yeah. I mean, it wouldn’t – well, we think so. We think that’s appropriate. But we think that that’s something, again, that the gateway process should appropriately be able to test – do you know what I mean – as it goes through, is for us to be able to further – and Alex to be able to – and others to be able to further test that some more, about what is appropriate.

35

MR MATTHEWS: I guess, this is a product of this entire process, isn’t it? Is that we’ve worked with Council, and we’ve come up with a recommendation to the elected council, of 12, 10 and nine, and that – we were comfortable with that; the staff were comfortable with that; the independent consultants were comfortable with that. And then, during that process, the DA has been interrogated, and that’s how the six-storey came about; and we’ve tested the nine and the six with overshadowing and the impact on grass, and therefore done some more work on, well, there’s obviously some – you know – we’ve always felt that that corner site could accommodate more, and the stepping of the buildings provides more variety, and an improved built form; and so, therefore, you know, we’ve done more testing, with a 40 14 there and a six, and that’s just been provided you today. But that’s – the six is a 45 by-product of the DA, so it’s, I guess – we’re in – we were within a process - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - and that's why we've provided that additional material. But ultimately, I guess, coming back to what was recommended – and I know that
5 the previous panel commented on that as well, which was strange to see that in the minutes, because they seemed quite favourable, at the meeting, of the Cardno - - -

MR DANIEL:

10 MR MATTHEWS: - - - recommendation. So I didn't expect to see that in the - - -

MS LEESON: That they also thought it inappropriate?

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah, because they - - -
15

MS LEESON: The 12.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - seemed very supportive of it during the meeting; said, "Why are we even here?"
20

MS LEESON: Yeah.

MR MATTHEWS: And so that comment was a little bit of a surprise. But that's okay. But it has also, therefore, since that time, given us the opportunity to look at
25 other scenarios. So I see your position, in terms of what we've provided this morning, in terms of a recommendation from an independent consultant, council staff, and then the further additional work we've done in response to the DA comments from the panel. But, I guess, what we're asking is that we can therefore just study that further, and refine it, and with – yeah – through working with – well,
30 whether Council will be up here I don't know, but – or the panel.

MS LEESON: Well, what stops you doing that anyway? Your own further studies and investigation, or you - - -

35 MR WILSON: You don't want to start from scratch.

MR DANIEL: Well, it would typically be a 12-month process of getting toward – so let's see – if we re-lodge a full application - - -

40 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR DANIEL: - - - we then have to go before the council; there will be a three- to six-month or more – probably six-month – assessment period. Then we'll have to wait to get to a council meeting. The issue of that will be uncertain. It'll – the
45 Minister, in his wisdom, said that these things need to go through an IHAP process, a council process – there's another three to four months. Then we'll come forward to whether we get a yes or a no. Then we'd have to – if it's a yes, we can proceed; if

it's a no, we'd have to appeal that. And then – and so, by that time in the process, the commercial opportunity in relation to implementing these into the current scheme will start to be fading away.

5 And so, at the end of the day, what we're trying to do is get the right merit and the right focus on the issues now – because all the evidence is here, and we've got it there – in a timeframe, hopefully, if we can achieve getting a gateway now – we're not trying to not get away with doing the detail, and going on more exhibition, and going through a rigorous assessment process; we think that's absolutely appropriate, and we encourage that. But we'd just like a set of conditions that we can actually start doing that today, because, we think, that's the best way we're going to get the best outcome, not only for this project, but for the community, but also for the potential people that could live in this project in the future, and in a shorter timeframe. And the people that will work on this development; the people who have jobs – all those sort of things, and the increased economic activity that's going to occur. It just seems to me, to go, “Yep, you need to go back to the start,” is not – is just not appropriate, I think, and will actually have – you'll have a result of, perhaps, the application not proceeding - - -

20 MR MATTHEWS: Well, I - - -

MR DANIEL: - - - in the form it should.

25 MR MATTHEWS: Our biggest concern is that council have already considered a recommendation from staff and an independent consultant not supported it and that – and originally, we lodged the rezoning review at the recommended Cardno controls, and were told that, you know, “You need to –” after, well, four or five months we're told, “No, you need to revise it and put it in terms of what you actually lodged right at the beginning.” We thought, “Well, what's the point of an iterative collaborative process working with council staff if we've got to go back to the beginning?”

30 MS LEESON: All right. My question was really around if you were going to have to do more studies anyway on additional heights and things, that is a back-to-the-beginning step appropriate or not?

35 MR: But it's not the study so much, it's the process.

MS LEESON: But it sounds like the timings.

40 MR DANIEL: Yeah, it's the process and it's – so if it's going to come – and it's a fair question to ask. If we're going to come back to the same situation where we're going to be given eventually a set of Gateway conditions to study the relevant items, why not get those now? Do you know? Why not test them now, look at them now rather than wait what will realistically be, from experience – we run a lot of urban renewal applications – will be 18 months to get those? That's the difference. And it will be the same sort of situation where we'll have to study things.

We're hoping that, with respect, through the IPC process – and we actually – the transparency is excellent. Do you know what I mean? And we think it's important for the sake of the community that a set of conditions comes out that we do study that provides an integrity of saying, "Well, these are the items we've studied, and this is why this final recommendation in the future – what that may be – is the result", because it's gone through a transparent process with a lot of integrity but dealing with the actual particular science of the issues that need to be dealt with. We think that's the best way to get a good planning outcome.

10 MS LEESON: Right. I think that's quite clear. Chris, did you have any other questions?

MR WILSON: No, none. Fine, thanks.

15 MS LEESON: No. Is there something that was – anything that you wanted to tell us today that you haven't had an opportunity to cover or you haven't asked the right questions or there was - - -

MR DANIEL: I think - - -

20

MS LEESON: - - - more you wanted to talk about?

MR DANIEL: Yeah, look, it's only one small part, and this – it came up yesterday from the Landcape consultant who was naturally concerned about his area of expertise, which is, you know, how is this grass going to survive? How are these children going to have a great playing area at the back of there? Because that was something that was a primary concern. And the new piece of information has come out for us – and, obviously, for yourselves – about everything, is these recommendations is put forward there in relation to it.

30

So I think there's a fair bit of public benefit there that – and his advice is that we'd need to do specific vegetation management plans, change the style of grasses – I've learned a lot about this over the last 48 hours – and those sort of things, which I think are quite – they're – on the front of it when you're talking about, "Hey, should it be this big or that big", but these are the finer issues that are actually of a concern to actual parents at that school about what their kids will play and stuff like that. And I think that's also a challenge for us in a public offering in the future post a Gateway, how do we make sure that we provide the right public benefits offering that can be interrogated to actually target some of the key issues that the community and that school were concerned about? And that's not a complete picture, but it's part of the way there. And, you know, these are grass types, you know, vegetation management plans and that sort of - - -

40

MR JELICIC: One of the things that - - -

45

MR DANIEL: Which is very interesting.

MR JELICIC: Yeah, one of the things that we discovered during the DA process is that the condition of the vegetation and landscaping at the school is quite poor already, without any, I guess, development has taken place, just purely because of the wear and tear and all that sort of thing. So – and I think our consultant has - - -

5

MR MATTHEWS: Picture on page 5 there - - -

MR JELICIC: Yeah.

10 MR MATTHEWS: - - - if you've got it.

MR JELICIC: Our consultant - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah, we've got that.

15

MR JELICIC: - - - has also picked up that what they've got is – it's not ideal vegetation for that use. It should be something that's, obviously, a bit more robust, and – you know. And that's something that, obviously – what Matt was saying is that our client would be willing to actually put forward - - -

20

MR DANIEL: Yeah. I mean - - -

MR JELICIC: - - - improvements - - -

25 MR DANIEL: That's right. Yeah, we've encouraged them that there is an opportunity, if we're able to get some decent gateway conditions, to go re-engage with the school, re-engage with the Department of Education, and actually provide a meaningful public benefit offer in relation to specific items that may be of need for that community in relation to, you know, the physical there. But – I mean, of course – but that, again, needs more study, that we can't really do until we've got our gateway conditions. And that's the whole point.

30

MR MATTHEWS: I think – can I just add to that – it's important, on page 18, which is the winter solstice, obviously – just – the shortest day of the year – but we particularly did that analysis, I guess, of the 14, 10 and six, and the 12, 10 and nine, which is recommended by Cardno, just to see what the difference would be, in terms of just – you know – bringing the height down to the six and increasing the height on the front. And, as you'll see, it's very – there's very little difference, particularly to the grassy area, which still has, you know, six-plus hours, which is - - -

40

MS LEESON: Did you say page 18?

MR MATTHEWS: Yes. Yeah, just there. Which is – this is their main bit of grass where you saw, which is already, you know, in a poor condition already. So we just wanted to do some further analysis of the impacts between those two. And I guess that comes back to your question earlier, in terms of what are we actually seeking, and why have we done more study. And it was just in response – in response - - -

45

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MR MATTHEWS: - - - to the DA, but in particular just the concerns, then, of the school we're overshadowing. So that's - - -

5

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MR MATTHEWS: So that's why we've done that work.

10 MR DANIEL: I guess, we – you know – we could wax lyrical on about the macro- and microeconomic benefits and the sustainability benefits of increasing density near centres, but the parents at the school, if we end up killing their grass, and the children have to play and can't, there's no – well, they don't – that's what really matters, at the end of the day, for them, as a stakeholder, which is very important. So we're
15 trying to drill down onto making sure that that - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR DANIEL: - - - amenity is cared for and considered, you know.

20

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah. So then it comes back to - - -

MS LEESON: No, there's clearly been a lot of - - -

25

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - effort put into this.

MR MATTHEWS: Yeah. So then it comes back to an urban form, and what's more
30 appropriate on that corner: is it 12; is it 14; is it 25? Or is it six, or eight, you know? And is 12, 10 and nine the better transition, in terms of the heights within the development; or is from 14 to six? And I know that that impacts your recommendations in terms of a specific height. Well, we've kind of tried to put this
35 forward to be useful, rather than – not - - -

35

MS LEESON: No, it gives - - -

MR MATTHEWS: - - - to confuse things.

40

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

MS LEESON: It gives us food for thought.

MR DANIEL: Yeah.

45

MS LEESON: All right. I'm mindful of the time. I think Chris and I have asked pretty much all the questions we have. Matt, if we have any further questions arise while we're thinking this through - - -

5 MR TODD-JONES: Yep.

MS LEESON: - - - we'll come through you to go back to - - -

MR TODD-JONES: Yeah, that's all right.

10

MR MATTHEWS: Are we - - -

MS LEESON: Whether it's - - -

15 MR MATTHEWS: Sorry.

MS LEESON: - - - the proponent, or the department, or - - -

MR TODD-JONES: Yeah, that's with anyone. In terms of the site visit - - -

20

MR MATTHEWS: Yep.

MR TODD-JONES: So we've – well, you know, it's 12 o'clock now, so by the time we just have a little reconvene amongst the commissioners, and have a bit of lunch, I think we'd be heading over here about 12.45, so - - -

25

MR MATTHEWS: And we're okay – you'd like us on the site?

MS LEESON: We're just going to do a walk around. If there's anything in particular that you'd like to - - -

30

MR WILSON: Don't want to fall into that big hole.

MR DANIEL: Yeah. Yeah, just - - -

35

MS LEESON: We don't want to go onto site.

MR DANIEL: No, yeah.

40 MR MATTHEWS: Yeah.

MS LEESON: We just want to get a feel for the area, and context.

MR MATTHEWS: That's fine. And would you like us there, I guess, is a question – the one thing that we can provide is – sorry; obviously – there's a hole here, and there's two buildings here; we can provide access through these buildings to this

45

area. Obviously, there is a hole here, but that might be a good opportunity to see the school - - -

5 MR WILSON: We'll go over the back fence, towards the school.

MR MATTHEWS: That's as close as you're going to get to the school.

MR WILSON: Yeah, if it's not too – if it's not difficult.

10 MS LEESON: If it's no inconvenience to you.

MR MATTHEWS: No.

15 MR DANIEL: No, it's just a - - -

MR MATTHEWS: That'll be fine.

MR DANIEL: Just – there's a site office at the moment, so - - -

20 MR MATTHEWS: Yep.

MR DANIEL: - - - just have a walk through that.

25 MS LEESON: Okay. All right. No, if we can, that would be good, thank you.

MR MATTHEWS: Yep. Yep, we can see to that.

30 MR TODD-JONES: We can probably just meet you outside at 1.15, 1.20, 1.30, something like that – around that time.

MR DANIEL: Thank you.

MR TODD-JONES: Yep.

35 MR DANIEL: We will make sure we're there.

MS LEESON: All right. Thank you.

40 MR DANIEL: No, thank you very much.

MR MATTHEWS: Thanks for your time.

MR DANIEL: We really much appreciate the time.

45

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.59 am]