



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-956456

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: PEMULWUY PROJECT, REDFERN

PANEL: **SOO-TEE CHEONG**
ILONA MILLAR
PETER WILLIAMS

ASSISTING PANEL: **MATTHEW TODD-JONES**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** **ANTHEA SARGEANT**
BRENDON ROBERTS
MATTHEW ROSEL

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

DATE: **10.03 AM, TUESDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR S. CHEONG: Good morning, everyone. 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 on the proposal seeking approval for a section 75W modification application to the
5 Pemulwuy Concept Approval, section 4.55(1A) modification application to the Pemulwuy Project approval, and State Significant Development consent for the construction of a three to 24-storey student accommodation building within Precinct 3 of the Pemulwuy Precinct.

10 My name is Soo-Tee Cheong. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the panel are my fellow Commissioners, Ilona Millar and Dr Peter Williams, and planner Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC Secretariat who is assisting the panel. The other attendees are from the department of Planning and Environment. I will get you to
15 introduce yourself in a little while. 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 a preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of
20 information upon which the 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 are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will the put on the website. We will now begin. If
25 I could ask the representatives from the department to introduce yourselves for the record.

MR M. ROSEL: Yes, my name is Matthew Rosel. I'm a planning case officer.

30 MR B. ROBERTS: My name is Brendon Roberts. I'm the team leader, Key Sites Assessments Team.

MS A. SARGEANT: And my name is Anthea Sargeant. I'm the executive director for Key Sites and Industry.

35

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Now, if I could ask you to take us through some background and history of the proposal and the key issues that arose from the modifications, that would be helpful.

40 MS SARGEANT: So what I will do is I will just run through a bit of the background, more as an introduction, and then that will, sort of, introduce what some of the key assessment issues were, and then we're happy to take any questions that you might have. So we have prepared a bit of an image pack that I will refer to as part of the overview. So as you indicated in the introduction, there are three
45 applications that are before the Commission today, one being an application to modify the precinct concept approval. The second one is a State Significant

Development application for the student accommodation building in Precinct number 3. And the third application is an application to modify the project approval.

5 The Pemulwuy Precinct is located in Redfern, which is about one kilometre out of the Sydney CBD. It's located diagonally opposite the Redfern Train Station. It's situated in a neighbourhood that is characteristic of two to three-storey residential terrace houses, and there are some higher level – or I should say high-density apartments that are being constructed opposite the train station, which is on the – I haven't got the image in front of me, but it's on the west of the train station. There's 10 some high-density residential development occurring there, both under construction and also some properties that have already been built.

The site is located on the boundary of the Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation Precinct. Concept approval was granted in 2009 for a mixed-use development on the 15 site, and the site was divided into three precincts. Precinct 3 is the precinct that is subject to this SSD application and the two modifications to the concept and project approval. The project approval – sorry, I should say the concept approval allowed a mixed-use development of student accommodation, affordable housing, retail and community uses. The project approval allowed for the development of a two to six- 20 storey building in Precinct 1, a three-storey building on Precinct 2, and an eight-storey student accommodation building on Precinct 3.

The proposal that's in front of you today for the SSD application is for the construction of a 24-storey student accommodation building, and, as I've already 25 indicated, there are the two modifications to allow for that development. The project and the design has been subject to a design review panel that was chaired by the Government Architect, and, in fact, the Government Architect has provided some independent expert advice in relation to the design evolution of the building. And the design review panel has indicated that it's supportive of the proposal. 30

The application was publically exhibited and 183 submissions were received, which included 171 objections. Council does not object to the proposal. The key concerns raised in the public submissions were around height, heritage and amenity. The department, in completing its assessment, has considered a number of issues, both 35 the issues raised through the submissions, but, also, we've had our own issues that we've considered through the assessment process. The key issues that we've considered through our assessment reports relate to the height of the building, because the height is changing from eight storeys to 24 storeys, and while we consider that change in height to be acceptable, because it is consistent with the vision of the area and the transformation that is occurring within that part of Redfern, 40 we do recognise, though, that it is an issue that needed quite careful consideration, which we feel we've done throughout assessment process.

Part of the reason that we are supportive of the increase in height is because we feel 45 that the building does achieve design excellence, and that we believe the overshadowing impacts and the relationship that the building has to the adjoining Redfern Station is appropriate, that the setbacks are appropriate, and the views do not

interrupt the views towards the station. In relation to amenity – I’ve already mentioned that – we’re comfortable with the overshadowing, and we are comfortable with the operational noise. Impacts can be appropriately managed. The only other issue that I wanted to raise was in relation to the student accommodation use itself.

5 The development will provide for 110 subsidised student beds for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. So we do feel that that provides some additional social benefit.

MR CHEONG: That’s - - -

10

MS SARGEANT: So yes, that’s - - -

MR CHEONG: That’s a – yes. Yes, I think the – as you pointed out, one of the main concerns is the height and perhaps the bulk and scale. So you are quite

15

MS SARGEANT: Yes. Look, I might ask Matt to go into a little bit more detail around the height and bulk and scale.

20 MR ROSEL: Yes. So in short, yes, we are quite satisfied with where the height is sitting. Particularly, the tallest part of the building is located centrally within the site, and the building itself steps down towards the periphery, and that allows for a transition to the lower scales around the site. As Anthea said, the building is set back approximately 40 metres from the station, so it gives that breathing space between

25 that heritage item. And also, the height itself is consistent with the strategic vision that’s set out for the Central and Eveleigh Urban Transformation Strategy, which envisages high-density developments along the railway corridor there. The last thing just to point out is that the building itself forms part of a cluster of tall buildings, so those existing 18-storey buildings on the opposite side of the railway corridor, there

30 is that synergy there, so they will form part of that cluster. So we think, on balance, the actual height there is appropriate and it knits in with the existing open context.

MR CHEONG: All right.

35 MR ROBERTS: And I should add to that just something that Anthea mentioned too, that the design review panel set up for this project, which was chaired by the Government Architect, and also on advice given to us by the Government Architect, they are quite supportive of the building bulk and scale.

40 MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR ROBERTS: So that was a key piece of advice that we’ve used in our assessment.

45 MR CHEONG: And with the increase in height and density, of course, there’s an increase in the requirement for providing amenity. How do you say that has been provided? I noticed that, in the design, there are, on several levels, community

rooms, such as a common study or communal room, but it's not provided on every floor. How do you see that – whether providing on every floor would probably be a better standard of amenities to compensate for the increase in density and uses.

5 MR ROSEL: So in terms of the – I suppose, the student amenities, at the ground floor level there is a – an open courtyard which is quite generous. There's also a rooftop terrace, as well, which is again – is quite generous and allows for views for future occupants. It may not be on every floor, but most floors have a study area or another amenity area and the layout of each floor is quite spacious, in terms of
10 corridor widths and so on. At the ground floor level, as well, there's other amenities available like a gym and there's a cinema room, another study area. So it is, we feel, at least, that the – the development has provided a high level of amenity for future residents.

15 The only other point I would make is that precinct 3 includes its own public open space, which is located at the southern tip of the site and that forms part of the threshold, as you enter into the Pemulwuy Precinct. The other point to make as – just to add, as well, is the modification to the project approval, includes a site-wide improvement to all the treatments and I believe they're moving from concrete to
20 granite, so it's going to be quite a visual improvement.

MR CHEONG: Yes. One of the concern, of course, unlike the apartment buildings, I think social interaction is one of the problems with modern high-rise building living, it would be advantage, wouldn't you say, if we can provide a common area
25 where they can easily meet, at every level?

MR ROBERTS: I can – I can take that. I mean, I – I think our assessment report has put forward the reasons why we think the proposal is acceptable in that regard, and I think that's summarised our points on that. I mean, you know, it's up to the –
30 the Commission, if that's something that they would like to pursue. You know, we're happy to – to have a look at or comment on any ideas that the Commission might have.

MR ROSEL: The only other – only other point – sorry, Brendon, I might just jump
35 in – to say is that the student accommodation itself isn't solely consisting of studio units for a single person. It's actually got quite a broad mix of studio – sorry, room types. So there's a five bed, there's the twins and there's the studio. So these kind of mixture of – of types of accommodation allows for a greater interaction and, as I said before, there are those other opportunities to gather and meet in ground floor areas,
40 on the roof and in the select parts of the study zones throughout the building.

MR CHEONG: Yes, we noticed that you have a cluster of five two bedroom - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.
45

MR CHEONG: - - - with the common area, which is – is a good sort of gathering place, but the student accommodation, if they all consist of only one bed, one desk,

you know, through – throughout, so that’s why the consideration could be placed on providing a bit better amenities for every floor, to given an opportunity to - - -

5 MR ROSEL: It may be the Commission may like to ask the applicant, and explore that, but – that question with the applicant, as well.

MR CHEONG: Any question from you?

10 MS I. MILLAR: I mean, one quick question, in terms of the maximum of 50 people permitted on the – the terrace at any point in time, how was that number arrived at?

15 MR ROSEL: It’s something that the department actually requested the applicant turn their mind to. Originally, the application didn’t include any maximums and it would just be open to whoever would like to go up there. The department raised concerns that, you know, this could create noise impacts and – and other issues, and so the applicant turned their mind to what would be a comfortable maximum. We considered that and we felt that, given the size of the space which, from memory, is almost 200 square metres, 50 people was actually not that high density use of that space. So we’re satisfied that would be appropriate.

20

Second to that is that there are conditions limiting the use of that space to ensure that there are no negative amenity impacts on the surrounding area.

25 MS MILLAR: And the time limits for – for access?

MR ROSEL: Yes. Yes - - -

MS MILLAR: Right.

30 MR ROSEL: - - - that’s right.

MR CHEONG: How do you see that it can enforce that maximum number of use on the roof?

35 MR ROSEL: It’d be – it’d be worked into their operational management plan.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

40 MR ROSEL: But as with these things, it’ll come down to, obviously, the operator adhering to that and if we, obviously, receive any complaints - - -

MR ROBERTS: Yes, then investigate it.

45 MR ROSEL: - - - the department will chase that up and ensure that that’s – that’s kept under control.

MS SARGEANT: Through our compliance function, we’d be able to review that.

MS MILLAR: In your report on page 62, under Design Excellence, there's a reference to the applicant's alternative design excellence process, which included selection of FJMT as part of the design process. We haven't seen anything in the documents that references any work by FJMT. Is that – were they actually involved at any – any point in time with the proposal?

MR ROSEL: Yes. Actually, I apologise, I – well picked up. It's actually Turner, who's the architect. I apologise for that. It was just a typographical error.

MS MILLAR: Okay, great. We just wanted to – to check that we weren't missing anything on that one.

MR ROSEL: No, apologise for that.

MS MILLAR: And then another, I guess, technical question, back to – page, on page 57, under section 6.2.5, you note that the original approval references 3095 square metres for GFA for the gym, childcare, gallery and office facilities, whereas the approved combined total is 1995 metres squared. Where does that – what's the discrepancy that has arisen there? Is it - - -

MR ROSEL: So on the original approved plans, the actual total of 1995 was what was shown on the plans itself. I'm not sure whether a change occurred during the assessment of the original application. However, the actual approval that was granted, the consent itself misquoted and said 3095. So it was just a case that the department wanted to draw attention to that was an error and - - -

MS MILLAR: So – yes - - -

MR ROSEL: - - - that's been taken on board, yes.

MS MILLAR: Great.

MR CHEONG: I have a question on overshadowing. In the shadow diagram, it – or in – actually, in your report, you did say there was a minor increase of shadow in the public open space. Can you point out where - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR CHEONG: - - - this overshadowing will increase, between I think 9 am and 10 am, you were saying?

MR ROSEL: Yes. So if you'd like to turn to page 54, at – actually, you have the largescale drawings there in front of you, too. But if you look at the 9 am and 12 am, it's actually referring to the – the comment in the report is referring to the additional overshadowing of the new open space at the southern tip of the site. So you'll see that the – because the original approval was only eight storeys, that shadow moved

quickly off that public open space but, however, because we've given it a – a tower structure, it – it lingers a bit longer.

5 MR CHEONG: When you say linger a bit longer, which is in numerical terms, how - - -

MR ROSEL: It – it most likely will be for an additional hour.

10 MR CHEONG: Ten minutes? Fifteen minutes? Or - - -

MR ROSEL: And additional hour, it seems.

MR CHEONG: An hour?

15 MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

20 MS MILLAR: And with the overshadowing, when we move to 2 to – 2 and 3 pm, the – the 1 Lawson Street building, what are the – the use of the floors that are being overshadowed there?

25 MR ROSEL: Yes. So the lowest ground floor is commercial use. So I'd just like to point out that the 1 Lawson Street is under construction at the moment. One tower is almost complete. The other tower hasn't commenced its extension or refurbishment. From my understanding, the ground floor levels of those buildings are in commercial use and then, above that level would be residential apartments. At the moment, both those buildings are entirely in office use.

30 MR CHEONG: Peter, you - - -

DR P. WILLIAMS: Thanks, Soo-Tee. I've got a couple of questions, if it's okay.

35 MR ROSEL: Sure.

DR WILLIAMS: On page 30, which deals with the permissibility and development standards, table 4 points out the extent of the variations sought from the controls, particularly height and FSR, in the SSP set.

40 MR ROSEL: Yes.

45 DR WILLIAMS: And the department rightly points out that, pursuant to schedule 3 of the – of that SEPP, there's no need to basically justify, in one sense, what is achieved, but nonetheless should do so, notwithstanding council's considered the variation to development standards in this report includes that variation is reasonable and justified, still haven't undertaken something like equivalent of a clause 4.6 or

SEPP 1 type of analysis to give more solid justification for the variation. Can you provide a bit more rationale for the variation, because it's a big variation.

5 MR ROSEL: I think the site is unique in the sense that it is within the Central to
Eveleigh Urban Transformation Strategy area, so it is within that zone where we are
expecting higher densities, taller buildings. Second to that, there are existing 18-
storey buildings within very close proximity to the site itself, so the department
hasn't undertaken an equivalent, for instance, 4.6 assessment, however, through the
10 detailed assessment in our report, we're quite comfortable that the increase in the
height is warranted and the increase in density above what was originally approved
on this site is appropriate and justified.

15 MR ROBERTS: And adding to that, you know, I think we also – in our assessment,
we would rely on the advice of various relevant stakeholders, including council, who
don't object to the application, and also, as I mentioned earlier, the government
architect and the design review panel, I think, and going to, I think, a procedural
matter, as you pointed out, because the concept plan applies to the site, it's actually
the concept plan itself that needs to get modified in the first instance, the merits of
which are considered, we would say, quite comprehensively through the assessment,
20 as Matt pointed out, and I think, in our – as you pointed out, I would, you know,
draw your attention to that clause 21(3) of part 5 of schedule 3, you know, which
pretty much, you know, is the basis that we would say we don't actually need – well,
the assessment doesn't need to include a formal SEPP 1 or clause 4.6 variation, so
yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Just on the affordable housing component, from what I can see
myself, precinct 3, the affordable housing component will be the – potentially the
110 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander units.

30 MR ROSEL: Correct, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Will there be some other affordable housing in precincts 1 and 2?

35 MR ROSEL: It's in precinct 2.

DR WILLIAMS: Two, right.

40 MR ROSEL: So as part of the original approval, the department granted 62
affordable dwellings, and they're arranged within terrace houses and also in a six-
storey flatted building at the end of those two rows of terrace houses, but in terms of
precinct 3, it's 110 subsidised student beds for the local Aboriginal community.

45 DR WILLIAMS: What happened to those 110 achieved at any one point in time?
In other words, you might find that there's 60 filled by Aboriginal and Torres Strait
Islander students. What happens to the other 50 in that situation?

MS SARGEANT: Are you suggesting, like, if the demand is not there? Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS SARGEANT: That's a good question.

5 MR ROBERTS: I think we might have to take that on notice if that's okay.

MR ROSEL: Yes, let's take that one on notice.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Yes, because I'm just wondering what – how that shortfall is
and obviously that means that the other 486, I think it is, units would be just at
normal market rental.

MR ROSEL: That's correct, yes.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. The contributions. Are the council still requesting
contributions? You're happy with the requirements for contributions?

MR ROSEL: Yes, so the department worked closely with UrbanGrowth
20 Development Corporation, who administers the Waterloo area, and we have worked
through the requirements of the contributions there, and we're both satisfied that
they're accurate. It is just a case, in this instance, that although the applicant says
they deserve a waiver from those contributions, they've not yet provided us any
justification for that. We've popped on a condition, two conditions, actually, to
25 require them to either pay the contributions or, you know, provide evidence to allow
us to wait.

DR WILLIAMS: Sure. No, that's very clear in the accepted report. That came out
well. Sorry, just on the affordable housing again, I should have asked it before, the
30 conditions to ensure that it is kept as affordable housing. Are you going down the
route of the Conveyancing Act with a restriction on user under the section 88B
instrument type route? How are you actually going to condition the – to ensure that
it stays as affordable housing?

MR ROSEL: I think if we turn to the condition, I'll just have a quick look to see
35 what condition. We have certainly conditioned the total number of student
accommodation units, and also the minimum number that is subsidised.

MS MILLAR: I thought I saw something in the – prior to occupation, yes, that's for
40 the concept not for - - -

MR ROBERTS: So there's condition A11 in the State Significant Development
recommended consent, development consent, that sets a specific requirement for a
minimum of 110 beds within the student accommodation shall be subsidised and
made available to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island students, and that we've
45 linked back to the AHC's letter of offer dated 15 February.

MS MILLAR: Just a – sorry.

MR ROBERTS: Sorry. No, carry on.

MS MILLAR: Just a question on that: is there any qualification around the mix of accommodation types, so, for example, that the 110 beds are provided across all of
5 the, you know, studio, one-bedroom, five-bedroom, five-bed unit?

MR ROSEL: The short answer is no, there's not. It's just a requirement to provide those, and obviously whoever may be choosing to rent those or have subsidised rent for those may have a preference for one or the other, so we didn't really feel it was
10 necessary at this stage to restrict that. The key point was to make sure that the 110 beds were provided. The only other point I will just make to the question you had was that, in the concept approval and – actually, in the concept approval as modified, the applicant has included a statement of commitment to confirm that they will be providing the 110 student beds that are subsidised in accordance with this letter as
15 well, so there is a little bit of crossover there in terms of securing that.

DR WILLIAMS: I mean, it's obviously in the condition, so I guess it can be enforced that way, but normally, like, Sydney City Council, for example, running the affordable housing schemes, it's a condition of consent that there's a restriction to
20 use it placed by way of a covenant under the Conveyancing Act to ensure that it's actually used as affordable housing, so for something more solid, too, and it's normally transferred to a community housing provider, and I think the council points out that the Aboriginal Housing Company isn't a community housing provider, so I'm just not quite sure how the logistics of all that is going to – I guess it's something
25 to ask the council.

MR ROBERTS: Yes, I mean, what – we need to kind of remind ourselves that we're speaking specifically to student accommodation, so these are student accommodation units, and they'll be run as part of the wider delivery of the student
30 accommodation which I think the AHC has, already, a partnership to deliver, and, I mean, it makes sense to the department that the student accommodation provider is responsible for providing all of the student accommodation within the whole building. I think affordable housing more generally is – I think one of the key kind of reasons for the, you know, the justification for the wider concept approval was to
35 deliver affordable housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and that's where the, predominantly, housing in precincts 1 and 2 will be provided for those. Yes.

MR CHEONG: I just – sorry – follow up with another question about the mix of the
40 affordable rental housing. I've got a question with the locations. There's no condition on what locations of these rooms should be, or – what I'm trying to get at is we don't end up just sort of – you've got a whole lot of rooms on the lower level, facing south, no sun. Is there any way that, you know, these affordable rental housing would have a reasonable outlook and sun access?
45

MR ROSEL: I think it wouldn't be too difficult to add a new condition or amend condition A11 to set a certain standard or a minimum requirement or a percentage.

There are a lot of options available to actually secure an improvement there, if the Commission is so minded to go down that path.

5 MR ROBERTS: It may be worthwhile for us to think about that a little bit further on notice, in the context of the question in relation to the, you know, mechanism to deliver it, and in terms of amenity and mix, but also in terms of making sure that the demand exists for that number. I think we might just need to just think about it all together.

10 MS MILLAR: So at this stage, the department hasn't done any assessment of the demand for student accommodation in, you know, that area around Sydney Uni, UTS, Notre Dame, given that there are a number of other student accommodation providers, you know, in proximity to this development?

15 MR ROSEL: The short answer, again, is no, we haven't.

MS MILLAR: Yes. All right.

20 MR ROSEL: However, it is very common for the department to secure bursaries as part of approval of its, you know, student accommodation applications.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

25 MR ROSEL: Certainly, the student accommodation towers that are located on the opposite side of the railway corridor have included a certain percentage of affordable accommodation as well, which wasn't limited just to the Aboriginal community, but more broadly to people in need.

30 MS MILLAR: And - - -

MR ROBERTS: I'm sorry - - -

35 MS MILLAR: I was going to say, most of those developments, have they been department developments, or Sydney City Council?

MR ROSEL: It is a mixture. In the Waterloo area, they have been department applications. So certainly there is a brand new one that was built on Redfern Street. That's the one with the black and the red facade.

40 MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR ROSEL: So that was a department application, and that include a bursary of – I think it was 15 to 20 per cent, yes.

45 MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR ROBERTS: And I think in answer to your question more generally, section 3 of our assessment report sets out the strategic context for student accommodation in that area, and, you know, we're relying on the City of Sydney Sustainable Sydney 2030, which identifies the need for student accommodation supporting all those
5 universities.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Sorry, Peter, I interrupted. I thought you had a question.
10

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, just a couple of minor ones, really. On table 15, which is on page 58, it's between the approved and modified non-residential land users. So in Precinct 3 – so you're treating the student accommodation as non-residential use, as a commercial use? Is that what you're saying?
15

MR ROSEL: Yes, as a non-residential use in this case, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. However you classify it in no way, shape or form affects its permissibility because I think it's the B4 mixed-use zone and permits a whole lot of residential and non-residential - - -
20

MR ROSEL: That's right, yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. There's also the – I haven't got the page, but there was the – just the capacity in terms of the footpaths.
25

MR ROSEL: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Page 70. And it talks about the footpath count being basically taken – actually, it's sixty - - -
30

MR CHEONG: 69.

DR WILLIAMS: 69. Pedestrian count occurred on the 23 November 2017 and basically saying that's typical of a peak period during semester. That's actually outside of semester.
35

MR ROSEL: Is it?

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. So it's actually going to be quite low because, at that time, they probably would have finished exam period. It's not a big issue, but just I think that that may to be an accurate reflection of the actual peak use from Redfern Station, particularly.
40

MR ROSEL: Yes.
45

DR WILLIAMS: Students pouring out of Redfern Station, particularly over Sydney or Notre Dame, and UTS for that matter as well.

5 MR ROSEL: Okay. Okay. The only thing I will just add to that –I think it’s something mentioned in our report as well on page 70 – is the fact that the department considers the count or the assumptions the report has made – the footpath capacity study has made is quite conservative - - -

10 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR ROSEL: - - - because they’re assuming almost – what is it – 80 per cent of all students will be on the street or on a footpath at that time, which we thought was quite conservative indeed.

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Okay. Yes.

MS MILLAR: Can I just follow up on a footpath question, just in terms of the Government Architect’s design review. One of the points they made in their recommendations was considering Eveleigh Street be made one-way to allow for planting and the widening of the footpath. Is that something that you’ve considered at all, or, as you say, the applicant hasn’t proposed it, but it’s interesting that the Government Architect has suggested that might improve amenity and flow.

25 MR ROSEL: Yes, I think it’s worth pointing out that there has been a holistic site-wide improvement to the approach to public domains. So there is obviously an uplift there. The department has secured improvements to allow for a greater use of the footpath by removing the originally proposed set-down area for loading and unloading. In terms of the creating a one-way street, on the face of it, the department felt that there was sufficient capacity and that wasn’t necessary. However, as you pointed out yourself, the – sorry, the applicant hadn’t chose to pursue that as well, but we felt, overall, that the improvements to the public domain, removal of that set-down area were sufficient to, you know, generally lift the area and to allow sufficient capacity.

35 MR CHEONG: Any more questions?

MS MILLAR: My final question was around the wind tunnel effects and the measures being put in place to minimise the impacts of that, particularly on the public open-space areas.

40 MR ROSEL: Yes. That’s on page 82.

MS MILLAR: 82. So could you talk through how those recommendations from the Pedestrian Wind Environment Study have been picked up in the development?

45 MR ROSEL: Yes. So the wind assessment found that there was three locations where, if there was no mitigation measures, it would be potentially uncomfortable for

a pedestrian walking, and they were at the northern entrance on Eveleigh Street to the application site, at the southern entrance, and also within the public open space. So the mitigation measures that have been put forward include ensuring there is full gates on the northern entrance and at the southern entrance, and then providing dense tree planting – trees with crowns in the public open space.

The department generally supports this. However, we've suggested that they need to take an additional step and undertake a CPTED assessment to ensure that the public open space is appropriate for its use in the sense that with very dense tree planting, it doesn't create locations for concealment or encourage antisocial behaviour. So there is a condition to require them to undertake that CPTED assessment and consider the landscaping approach.

MR CHEONG: Any other questions or - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Just with the conditions generally, have the other government agencies seen the draft conditions at this stage? Are they happy with them?

MR ROSEL: UrbanGrowth Development Corporation, we – as I said earlier, that we've been working very closely with them about the contributions and they've seen – they've actually worked with us to develop those conditions across all three applications. So they're happy with it. The council hasn't recommended a suite of standard conditions, which is their usual approach, but for this case, for whatever reason, they chose not to. However, they did give us conditions relating to public open space, and they also suggested the department explore this opportunity with the applicant to get the landscaping and the CPTED talking together. So that was, I suppose, the extent of council's interest in the conditions in this case.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Yes. Thanks, Soo-Tee.

MR CHEONG: Thanks. Do you have any other points that you want to raise?

MS SARGEANT: No. No, I think were okay.

MR CHEONG: No?

MR ROSEL: I've actually just got one.

MS SARGEANT: Okay. Yes.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR ROSEL: I'm pretty certain I said, maybe to Matthew, is the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities has written to confirm that they've approved the height of the building in terms of its penetration into the OLS.

MR CHEONG: Yes, we've got that.

MR ROSEL: Yes, you've got that. Okay. I'm only raising that because it may mean that the conditions in the development consent, which I can find in a second,
5 might need to be updated. So that's conditions B54 and B55 may just need to be revised to take account of that, because, currently, they're calling for confirmation of evidence that's being approved, where, I think it should just be that the application should be built in accordance with that approval. Yes.

10 MR CHEONG: All right. There being no other further discussion, I declare the meeting closed. Thank you.

MS SARGEANT: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR ROSEL: Okay. Thank you.

20 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[10.44 am]