



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-988428

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCIL

RE: REZONING REVIEW OF ROSEHILL STREET, REDFERN

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN**
RICHARD MACKAY

ASSISTING PANEL: **ANDREW McANESPIE**

COUNCIL: **TAMARA BRUCKSHAW**
JESSE McNICOLL
KEN BAIRD

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

DATE: **9.51 AM, TUESDAY, 5 FEBRUARY 2019**

MR P. DUNCAN: All right. Well, as I said, my name is Peter Duncan. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet, and pay my respects to elders past and present.

5

Welcome to the meeting today, on the request for the request for a rezoning review, seeking to amend the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012, for land at 44 to 78 Rosehill Street, Redfern. The proposal seeks to amend the Sydney LEP 2012 by increasing development standards to facilitate a mixed-use development comprising 312 dwellings and commercial floor space. Specifically, the increased development standards comprise increasing the maximum floor space ratio from two to one to 10.4 to one, and increasing the maximum building height from 18 metres to 99.6 metres. No change to the current B4 mixed-use zone is proposed.

10

15 My name is Peter Duncan. I'm the chair of the IPC panel, and joining me on the panel is Richard Mackay. The other attendee is Andrew McAnespie, from the Commission Secretariat. In the interest of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information today, the meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be provided and made available on the Commission's website. Could I also ask you to identify yourself when you're talking, too; that just makes it easier for the transcript, so that we can follow that.

20

This meeting is one part of the Commission's process of providing advice. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of the process, and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take that question on notice and provide additional information in writing, which we will then put on the website, so that completes the picture. We'll now begin.

25

30

MS T. BRUCKSHAW: Great.

MR DUNCAN: Over to you, I suppose, Tamara.

35

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay. So we – not being sure of exactly the format, but we thought we would just take you through our initial discussions with the proponent, and then where we've kind of progressed in our thinking around the strategic and site-specific merits of this planning proposal.

40

MR DUNCAN: That's good. And we've got about an hour.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

45 MR DUNCAN: So you go through that process, and then we can ask questions, either - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: - - - along the way or at the end.

5 MR J. McNICOLL: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Andrew, I might - - -

10 MR McANESPIE: Yes. Thanks.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - just pass that to you.

MR McANESPIE: Thank you.

15 MR DUNCAN: You might just describe what we've got - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Sure.

20 MR DUNCAN: - - - on the table as well.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

25 MS BRUCKSHAW: I, Tamara, am going to speak to the strategic merits test that's
in the department's guideline for preparing planning proposals. And Ken, who is the
lead urban designer on this project, is going to talk to the site-specific merits test that
we've undertaken. So on the table is a map that identifies all of the strategic
30 influences on this site, that identifies the site here, and it looks at the – kind of – the
wider area, and all of those, you know, kind of bits and pieces, and strategic ideas,
and - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - projects that are happening in the area.

MR R. MACKAY: Is this in Council's report?

40 MS BRUCKSHAW: No, this is something we prepared - - -

MR MACKAY: No. Yes. So - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - just to give you guidance, and it does - - -

45 MR McNICOLL: And we'll leave - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - talk about - - -

MR McNICOLL: We'll leave the plan with you.

MR MACKAY: Could you also – it's Richard – could you also, please, supply an electronic copy, as well.

5

MS BRUCKSHAW: Will do, yes.

MR MACKAY: We'll need to put that up - - -

10 MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - in conjunction with the transcript.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, please.

15

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

MR McNICOLL: And additional material that we'll speak – that Ken will speak to, we'll also - - -

20

MR MACKAY: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: - - - provide to you.

25 MR MACKAY: That's really helpful. And then - - -

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - it's all available to anyone who - - -

30

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR MACKAY: - - - needs to see it. Good.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay. So the City first had discussions with the proponent on this site in 2017. And it – you know – regarding various concepts for this site. From the outset, the City expressed concerns that the proponent – to the proponent, in both writing and in its meetings, that a planning proposal was not appropriate at the time, because of the department's work in reviewing the land use and infrastructure in the
40 – Redfern and Waterloo area.

So after the proponent – after that, the proponent – after that advice from the City, the proponent went away and – and made submissions to the Department of Planning, and then the City received a letter from the Deputy Secretary, that the
45 proponent should not be precluded from making a planning proposal, and that the City would need to consider it on its merits. So another letter was given to the proponent, saying that they could lodge a planning proposal, and that it – you know –

it would be considered. So the proponent, in their submission, you know, have seemed to have asserted that the planning proposal was encouraged by the City, which is not really the case. The City did receive that letter from the department, asking them to receive the planning proposal - - -

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - and assess it on its merits. Now, to do that, to assess something on its merits, you need to totality of the information.

10

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: So we did ask them for additional information about overshadowing. Again, the proponent seems to have taken this as an indication that the City was encouraging this planning proposal, but in actual fact we just needed all of the information so we could do that thorough assessment - - -

15

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - of the planning proposal. So, following that assessment, the City has really not moved off the view that this site fails on the strategic merits test in the department's guidelines, and the site-specific merits test that's in the guideline also. I think that, once we got more detail about the built form, our concerns increased even further, on the site-specific test, about the impact of this development.

20
25

Okay. So, first of all, the area is, you know – the Redfern-Waterloo area is going to undergo substantial growth in the coming years, and the subject site is really at the epicentre of a number of significant strategic projects and investigations, by both the City and the department, with a particular focus on supporting economic growth and jobs growth. The site is in the Eastern Economic Corridor in the District Plan, which stretches all the way, kind of, from Chatswood and, you know, Parramatta, out to – and down to the south. And it's located in the Harbour CBD Strategic Centre that's identified in the District Plan.

30

35

And this corridor is really – you know, and this strategic centre – is really identified as an innovation corridor, and an area to support, kind of, knowledge-intensive industries: creative industries, and health and education and research. It also – sorry – the District Plan also identified this as a future area for growth for the expansion of the CBD. It is starting to get quite full; we do need to find room for – for that kind of economic prosperity that the CBD brings to the city to expand and kind of create opportunities for that to happen. So the District Plan identifies, the CBD has lost 15 years of office supply since 2012, and it further identifies that the – over two thousand – sorry – 230,000 jobs need to be provided in this strategic centre to 2036. That's a high forecast, by the way. Okay.

40

45

So the – our concern, with the planning proposal, is that it focuses on a – very much on a residential outcome for the site, and it would result in a loss of floor space for employment. And while the proponent argues that the similar number of jobs will be retained on the site, the planning proposal itself doesn't seek to make any
5 contribution to growth – economic growth – or the jobs envisaged in this strategic centre. It really just maintains what's there; it doesn't make any strategic contribution to that goal of the District Plan.

10 MR DUNCAN: So could I just ask a question on that?

MS BRUCKSHAW: Not at all, yes.

MR DUNCAN: On the basis of – talking about that economic corridor – any development in this area that is putting jobs back into it, you'd – the council would
15 be expecting to see growth; that's what - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: That's what you're saying, isn't it?
20

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

25 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: And I think, even though we haven't completed the modelling as part of – sorry; this is Jesse speaking – as – although we haven't completed the work as part of the LSPS, the jobs target is very substantial.
30

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MR McNICOLL: It's not a little bit substantial. And all of the lands, particularly lands around transport nodes, would be expected to contribute very strongly.
35

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS BRUCKSHAW: So, moving on from that, the site is adjacent to the C to E corridor, the Central to Eveleigh corridor, for which Urban Growth has developed
40 the Urban Transformation Strategy. This area has been flagged for 10,000 technology-focused jobs by 2036, and the Premier herself has gone on public record to say the precinct will cement Sydney as the technical – technology capital of Australia. So this is an area that the government itself sees the need to really focus on jobs creation and protecting those industries that – you know, that the – you
45 know, Australia's GDP really relies on, those knowledge industries and those creative industries.

So the – excuse me – the strategy also talks about and flags some potential upgrades to Redfern Station, but there is no, really, further information available for us to interrogate on that. It is something that may happen; it's certainly not funded, you know. But irrespective of that, like – as Jesse was saying, it is an area that actually
5 needs to still focus on jobs, irrespective of the availability of access to the Redfern train station.

Again, there is no real strategic rationale for a site-specific planning proposal: why it should be progressed ahead of other sites in the area, when it doesn't really make a
10 contribution to the wider strategic goals of this corridor, or the innovation corridor. The site is in the Botany Road corridor, here labelled pink on the map in front of you. And the City has been working with the department to develop a Land Use and Infrastructure Implementation Plan – so LUIIP for short.

15 MR McNICOLL: Gone through a lot of names.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, this – yes, this is here. Yes. And there've been – that – the role of that investigation is twofold: it's to look at land use, and priorities for
20 land use in the future; and it's also to look at built form, with the idea that a master plan would be undertaken for all of the development in this area, to understand how the height and FSRs might be distributed.

MR DUNCAN: What would be the timeframe of the output of that work?

25 MS BRUCKSHAW: It is difficult to say, because the department have stalled on the LUIIP, but it is something that we see coming into our Local Strategic Planning Statement work - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30 MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - which I'll speak to a little bit more later.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: But we will be progressing that alongside any work the department might be doing.

MR DUNCAN: So, just sort of broadly, then, is it short-term, medium-term? You know - - -

40 MR McNICOLL: Short-term.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Short-term.

45 MR DUNCAN: One to two years?

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: So they – the department have done substantial work. They haven't transferred all of the work to us - - -

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: - - - but we're seeking to have that work - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

15

MR McNICOLL: - - - transferred, and then, depending on how much they hand over to us, we'll then be able to work out the - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: To progress it.

20

MR McNICOLL: - - - timeframe. But I don't imagine it would take more than 18 months.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

25

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes. So the other part of that work, of the LUIIP work, is of course infrastructure planning. I note department's flagged, in its finalisation report to you, that it would be thinking about a SIC – like, a State Infrastructure Contribution - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - scheme – in this area. How that broadly works is that that's applied to any uplift that's given in the area. And that is really important to pay for the infrastructure that might be needed to support any growth that we might see at the Waterloo Metro, at the Waterloo precinct, on those housing sites, ATP. All of those demands are going to create a great deal of infrastructure need, not just
40 transport but also, you know, social infrastructure. All of those things that are needed to support such a big community need to be reviewed and figured out how – how we're going to pay for them, and make sure that that burden is shared equitably across all of the sites. So that's the work that is broadly happening in the LUIIP. As I said, it's a little bit in flux, but it will kind of come back to Council to have a much
45 closer look at in its LSPS work.

MR DUNCAN: And that will cover all of this Botany Road corridor that you show, that - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

5

MR McNICOLL: That's right.

MS BRUCKSHAW: That's right.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes, okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, yes.

15 MR McNICOLL: So – sorry. I should just say, the Local Strategic Planning Statement work will cover all of these strategic areas - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

20 MR McNICOLL: - - - but we know that there's a particular need to deal with the land that is identified in the LUIIP, because of the implementation of the Waterloo train station.

25 MR DUNCAN: Well, there's both, isn't there? There's Waterloo, and there's also - - -

MR McNICOLL: Redfern upgrade.

30 MR DUNCAN: - - - that the boundary goes around here, so it's sort of – it's in between.

MR McNICOLL: That's right.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

40 MS BRUCKSHAW: Then we come to the Camperdown–Ultimo Collaboration Area. Now, this is led by the GSC, and the priority of the area is “to support economic vitality and growth”: that is the stated aim of that collaboration area. And the GSC will be working with key stakeholders and agencies – state agencies – to really try and move that strategic intent forward, and take a very place-based strategy approach to supporting health and education in particular in this precinct, and
45 moving that forward. So that work is underway.

The GSC is working with – as far as we know – is working with Transport for New South Wales, and all of those agencies that will be – have strong influences on how this area will develop over time. Again we would say, the planning proposal is ahead of that work. It really isn't able to take in any – into consideration, or respond to,
5 anything concrete in that work. Again we would argue that a site-specific planning proposal, rather than a precinct-based approach – you know, a planning – a place-based approach, that the District Plan demands, is not happening here, with a site-specific planning proposal.

10 Just further down, not directly affecting the site but certainly close to the site, is the Waterloo precinct, the Waterloo precinct that includes the Metro station, of which we know a little bit about the built form outcomes, but also the renewal of the social housing that's currently on that site. Now, there has been – there has been, kind of,
15 publicly mooted ideas about what might happen on that site, but it has not as yet been identified as a state-significant precinct - - -

MR DUNCAN: Precinct.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - SSP, and there has been no planning controls floated or
20 publicly exhibited, and no lodgement of DAs, anything of that nature. For a planning proposal to rely on the heights that it imagines will be delivered on this site, we think, is ahead of what is reasonable. It's not – it shouldn't provide any justification about why the heights, you know, that are being proposed in the planning proposal should be acceptable, from the City's view.

25 So – and then, to just round off all of the – that list of strategic work that's going on in this area is, of course, the City's LSPS work. The Local Strategic Planning Statement is part of a requirement under the Act for the City to go ahead and make the link between its LEP and the District Plan. Now, that work – that work is
30 progressed, and is essentially required to go on public exhibition by July. And in that will include – there'll be priorities and actions that speak to what changes need to be made in our LEP, or in – you know – what investigations we need to do to make changes into the LE – in the LEP. And that will come, kind of, a year later, the – you know – the LEP changes. That's broadly the timeline for that package of work.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: It covers all of the local government area, but, as Jesse has already flagged, this area is – we already know – needs to be a focus of this strategy.
40 So that strategy asked us – asks us to look at both the housing targets in the district plan, and also asks us to look at the jobs targets, and it asks us to make some decisions about how our LEP needs to be changed to accommodate those kind of strategic goals of the District Plan. So, I suppose, just in summary, for this reason, we are concerned that this planning proposal is very premature, and pre-empts the
45 outcomes of the strategic work being done by both the department, the GSC and the City. We simply don't know, at this stage, what growth in Redfern is going to look like - - -

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - and what the – what it’s going to look like in the Botany Road corridor; what infrastructure will be needed to support that growth; what
5 contributions the landowners should make so it’s an equitable process and everybody is contributing to infrastructure; demand that’s generated by the, kind of, collective growth in the area, and we don’t know how the city and the GSC is going to reconcile this need for jobs growth in this area, like, what that means for land use needs in this area. We don’t have that information, and we feel, for these reasons,
10 that it really, kind of, doesn’t meet those priorities that are articulated in the district plan. We’re concerned it’s taking advantage – the planning proposal kind of seeks to take advantage of the mooted changes in the area without actually having a good understanding of what those changes will be and will result in.

15 MR McNICOLL: Well, it has been very selective on focusing on the height and intensity without having any regard to the use. All of these plans speak very, very strongly to employment uses and they’re being very selective in saying, “We just like the intensity, but we would like to just think differently about the use.”

20 MS BRUCKSHAW: Do housing.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes. So it is seeking to kind of leverage and approve – not
25 even yet lodged proposals for height, you know, to justify heights and FSRs that are really ahead of a good understanding of what’s going to happen in the area.

MR DUNCAN: And just in summary, then, on that good understanding, from what you’re saying, that’s about 18 months away. More detail - - -
30

MR McNICOLL: Well, the initial work will be provided to the department and the GSC mid-year - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.
35

MR McNICOLL: - - - and then the actual change is implemented in the LEP through about 18 months from now.

MR MACKAY: Okay. So is that through the LSPS or - - -
40

MR McNICOLL: Through the LSPS process.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, and then the LEP review process that follows on from that.
45

MR DUNCAN: Yes. And – I mean, just to delve down a little bit on a couple of the specifics and that, in terms of employment, my recollection is that the proposal sort

of says, “There will be these entrepreneurial start-up opportunities of around 50” – I mean, does council have a view on what – I mean, you’re clearly implying that’s inadequate. What is adequate? What’s - - -

5 MR McNICOLL: What is adequate?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Yes, and I’m not - - -

MR McNICOLL: Well, until - - -

10

MR DUNCAN: - - - seeking a number. I’m seeking – I guess - - -

MR McNICOLL: Yes. Yes.

15 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - I’m asking about the philosophy that - - -

MR McNICOLL: Yes. So I think that simply replacing is inadequate. So the
20 position that we’ll be taking across the local government area, and specifically in
relation to Redfern and Botany Road, is to look at the projected demand, to look at
the available sites and then to allocate growth on that basis and, in parallel, to be
looking at the environmental fit of those things. So it will be coordinated across all
of the available sites and distributing that growth across all of the available sites, but
25 we imagine that that will be much more substantial growth than this site is
anticipating. Now, I will be having a stab in the dark, but it will be something in the
order of five or six to one, probably, of commercial use.

MR DUNCAN: And when – and, again, I’m inferring that council’s position is,
30 “We can’t really determine that now because we need to complete - - -”

MR McNICOLL: That’s right.

MS BRUCKSHAW: All that work.

35

MR DUNCAN: “- - - local strategic planning process, having regard to all of these
overlays - - -”

MR McNICOLL: That’s right.

40

MR DUNCAN: “- - - before they can be answered.” Yes. That – and then just – I
mean - - -

MR McNICOLL: That’s the orderly part.

45

MR DUNCAN: Yes. I guess – yes, yes. And – no, no, I understand that, but the – I guess, the very big picture question to ask is council’s position is not that this site doesn’t warrant up-zoning. It’s really - - -

5 MR McNICOLL: No, that’s correct.

MR DUNCAN: And I don’t want to put words in your mouth, but I’m hearing two things. One is, “Not now and not in this manner, but we’re not quite sure yet what manner because that’s why we’re saying not now.”

10

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, I think that’s a fair summation.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

15 MS BRUCKSHAW: I think that we – there are – there is potential for growth in this corridor. We know that that’s to be true. We just don’t know exactly what that needs to look like yet, and we’re concerned that bringing forward a site ahead of a precinct based understanding will really, you know, perhaps allow an inequitable distribution of the growth that the – that we envisage in this. So it’s really potentially
20 taking away from opportunities on other sites. It’s also well ahead of understanding what they might need to contribute to infrastructure. Now, there was a public benefit offer in the form of affordable housing, and they also talked about some affordable floor space for employment uses, but, really, it’s just not enough from the city’s view, particularly when we don’t know what those infrastructure pieces might be.

25

MR DUNCAN: As the – the term “affordable employment space”, is that common in other developments in this area?

30 MR McNICOLL: We have had a similar approach up in a site towards Circular Quay where some space was provided at very low rent - - -

MR DUNCAN: In the CBD.

35 MR McNICOLL: - - - in the CBD, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: For a defined period of time.

40 MR DUNCAN: But there’s one other – are there others that you’ve had in this area?

MR McNICOLL: No, not to date.

45 MS BRUCKSHAW: No.

MR DUNCAN: No, because affordable housing quite – is quite an accepted character concept.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: But affordable employment space is something relatively - - -

5 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: That's right.

10 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, that's right, and, again, the city doesn't, you know, accepts a need for affordable employment space in this area.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

15 MS BRUCKSHAW: It's not that we don't see a role for that. Again, it needs to be defined in future – it's a missing public benefit order that we're uncertain of in terms of, maybe, even the SIP contribution that might be required through the department.

MR DUNCAN: And then affordable housing – what – does the city have a view – a policy itself on affordable housing?

20

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, we do.

MR McNICOLL: We do.

25 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: And it's sitting with the department at the moment.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

30

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay. What – for review or consideration?

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes. It's post-exhibition planning proposal.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: And that envisages about a 10 per cent – 10 to 12 per cent contribution for affordable housing. That – on this site, that's in lieu of any other – you know – excuse me. That's assuming that no other contribution is made to other infrastructure so that - - -

40

MR DUNCAN: I don't think it's - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - that may be kind of - - -

45

MR DUNCAN: I see what you mean.

MS BRUCKSHAW: That number would move around a little bit.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5 MS BRUCKSHAW: But, even still, the district plan identifies a five to 10 per cent increase – excuse me – five to 10 per cent contribution requirement for affordable housing in the district plan. That’s the affordable housing target. Now, you know, a lot of value would be created on this site.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: If we’re putting two point – if we’re going from 2.4 to – what’s it – 2.5 to 10.4 - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: That’s right. That’s right.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - it’s a lot of value being created there. The city does not see any reason why that – you know, that that value that’s being created shouldn’t make its fair contribution to the - - -

20

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - infrastructure requirements, part of which may be affordable housing.

25

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR MACKAY: Well, you – you’re sort of just stepping across there from strategic merits into site-specific merits. You’re about to do that. Okay. Okay.

30

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, I will leave that to Ken.

MR MACKAY: Can I have one of these.

35 MS BRUCKSHAW: Of course, yes. I have a spare.

MR MACKAY: They’re – a little one would be - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: There you go. There you go.

40

MR MACKAY: So that – that composite plan - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: That one, and we’ll send that.

45 MR MACKAY: - - - is very informative. Thank you.

MR K. BAIRD: Just – do you just want to leave that there? I can just - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay. Yes. Of course.

MR BAIRD: I think it might be useful just to - - -

5 MR DUNCAN: They're all the same, aren't they?

MR McNICOLL: Yes, they're the same. Yes. We do like - - -

MR DUNCAN: Thanks. Yes.

10

MR BAIRD: Can we have the - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: And we'll provide - - -

15

MR DUNCAN: It's a good background context map.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - that electronically today.

MR A. McANESPIE: You can send that through to me, all that information.

20

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay. Great. Thank you, Andrew. Yes.

MR McNICOLL: And those boundaries are from the relevant plans. We've just overlaid them.

25

MR BAIRD: Okay. So this is Ken speaking now. What I wanted to do was to take you through some of the site-specific considerations that we made when considering the proposal. I guess there're a couple of points I just want to pick up on from what Tamara was talking to just towards the end was needing to know what growth might look like in Redfern in the future, and during our conversations around the proposal from an urban design perspective, we're also very conscious of that, in that, anything that were to go on this site being of a significant nature that it's proposing could possibly set itself up as a precedent and then colour expectations as to how the rest of the neighbouring sites might be developed in the future as well. And so that was something that we were very conscious of when I'm making this assessment as how does this bode for how things develop in the future.

30

35

The other major point that I wanted to start with was that when it comes to urban design considerations, what we seek to do when making these kinds of assessments is to optimise development, but also within the constraints of the environmental and amenity concerns that we have to have regard with. Specifically, a lot of those come under the requirements of SEPP 65, and those are embodied in the apartment design guide. So a lot of – some of the discussion that I'm going to be taking you through today – it's quite detailed, in a sense. It speak directly to those requirements. And this, in turn, I think you'll see, will start to reinform and point back to the need for a more broader, more strategic consideration and master planning process that needs to

40

45

inform a site like this. So the first sheet that I'm going to speak to today is one to do with site context and built form.

MR McNICOLL: We've got copies for you.

5

MR BAIRD: So what we are looking at here, in this top plan, is the site here outlined dotted in red. And then below this we see an elevation taken from the east, looking across the precinct. So you can see the proposal here on the right, 30 storeys high; and this group of towers to the north, which are Lawson Square and two apartment developments along Gibbons Street.

10

It's interesting to note, when you look at the pattern of the blocks in particular – and I might just flip back to Tamara's plan initially – if you look at – if you consider the grain of the blocks through this area, you can see that, historically, the grain has been informed by terrace development, that – many of – much of which has been renewed over time, and specifically around this area, we've seen some renewal over time into low-level industrial/light industrial/warehouse kind of use. So there are opportunities for this kind of terrace block typology to renew itself into other uses, but needing to consider the constraints of the dimensions that you are left with, or that you inherit, when you come to an area like this in the city. And that's possibly – you'll see, hopefully, later on in the discussion that that's one of the points that comes through in the proposal.

15

20

25

What's interesting to note here is that this site – proposed site – is around 25 metres deep. So – and there are terrace – still extant terraces right next to the site. So typically the kind of depth you would see in the terrace typology. These towers that, further north along Gibbons Street, the proponent cited in their proposal as part of an argument for – based on context – for the appropriateness of the tower form that they're proposing here – but you'll note that these tower forms are 18 and 20 storeys respectively, approximately; and then the TNT towers, which are 12 storeys high – they're the ones sitting directly in front of the police station, or on – above the police station.

30

35

MR DUNCAN: The TNT towers have been there for quite some time; what about the other two that you point out?

MR BAIRD: These – the TNT towers were built shortly – or during the construction of the Eastern Suburbs Railway.

40

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BAIRD: So I think they were already there by 1975.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

45

MR BAIRD: These two towers are roughly 10 years ago.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR BAIRD: So these towers – and a lot of this section of the city is under the jurisdiction of the Redfern–Waterloo Authority. So these development applications
5 were approved by those – by that authority. One thing you’ll note here is that their heights, being 18, 20 storeys – in that vicinity – represents – the proposal represents a significant increase in that height. But it’s interesting to note, when you consider the width of the site, this site here is about 25 per cent wider than the site – the subject site that we’re considering today.

10 So not only is it an increase in height, but you can also come to an understanding, when you compare the width of the site, the increase in intensity that we are looking at here, in terms of urban form. So this was just the broad overview that we started with as part of our consideration. And then we started to drill down to the level of
15 the site, and the building envelope that was being proposed on the site, as well. So I’ll just - - -

MR McNICOLL: Just for your information, going back – this is Jesse speaking – just for your information, going back to what Tammie was saying – the small amount
20 of information that we have about the future upgrade of Redfern Station suggests that the concourse, which is currently located at the north end of the platforms, facing Lawson, will be moved to the centre of the platforms, and will probably land in front of the water tower building on this side, and on – I think this is Little Eveleigh on the other side – requiring the demolition of a building here. So that is uncertain, and
25 there have been different iterations, but it seems, from other major station redevelopments, the most likely outcome for Redfern. So it means that the station entry would move substantially closer to this site, being the major concourse for Redfern station.

30 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR BAIRD: I guess, as part of that point, as well, that Jesse just made, that Gibbons Street, at this section, is northbound only; and it also forms the only – once
35 WestConnex becomes operational – it will form one of the only routes north for hazardous heavy traffic – trucks and the like – wanting to move north through the city.

To access the site in terms of parking, you would really need to come up beside the ATP here, and then turn right. And then this kind of a one-way loop that runs around
40 this group of sites, of which the subject site is one, faces onto Gibbons Reserve here. These streets here are rough – are around 12 – in the order of 12 metres wide; but Cornwallis Lane, which is the lane separating the site from the site immediately to the west, is three metres wide; and around six metres for the east – for this cross-street to the north.

45 As I said, there’s a – well, the water tower is already a residential development; there’s a five-story apartment building immediately to the south of that. So you can

see that, in terms of traffic environments, for example, that any parking – and anybody accessing this site via vehicular access would need to circulate around that block and find its way back out north.

5 So you can see that, coupled with the mooted changes to the entry around Redfern Station, this is going to become quite an intensive use – intensively used area in terms of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The next sheet, then, that I'll move on to, we started to look at the specifics of the built form itself. And, in a way, we were fortunate to get the – there was an independent report that the proponent lodged,
10 subsequent to the call for the hearing. And in a way, that was - - -

MR MACKAY: Sorry, Ken. Can I just interrupt and say – I mean, you're welcome to present whatever you want to present, but with respect to that report, I think both the council and the department have provided advice that they think we should not
15 have regard to that report.

MR BAIRD: Right.

MR MACKAY: We are seeking separate advice as to what - - -
20

MS BRUCKSHAW: Sure.

MR MACKAY: - - - we should do.

25 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR MACKAY: So at the moment, just in terms of what – Council is welcome to present what it wants to present today, but we, at the moment, have not had regard to that report. So, in - - -
30

MR BAIRD: Right.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

35 MR McNICOLL: We're not - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: Thank you for clarifying - - -

MR McNICOLL: We're not relying on that report - - -
40

MR MACKAY: Yes. So you just need to - - -

MR McNICOLL: - - - for our analysis.

45 MR MACKAY: In terms of our understanding - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BAIRD: Yes, okay.

MR MACKAY: - - - because it's been said, "Hey, perhaps you shouldn't have regard to this," or – in fact, two agencies have said, "You should not have regard to this. We're seeking advice, and - - -"

MR BAIRD: Right. Okay.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay. Thank you. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: We just want to make sure that - - -

MR MACKAY: - - - we're yet to resolve that.

MR McNICOLL: Yes. So maybe just – the context for this analysis is that the relationship between the envelope that the proponents are putting forward and the FSR is very, very tight, and it's unusually tight, in our experience. And so the reason that we have to go through this more detailed analysis is to check that there is actually a scheme that can comply, within the relationship between height and FSR, with our environmental externality and internal amenity standards set by both the State Government and Council. So Ken is going to take you through some of the issues that we've - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR McNICOLL: - - - found in relation to that.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks.

MR BAIRD: That's – yes – one point that I was going to start with is that these are a series of aerial views, looking from the east, and then from the north-west, and the south-west as well. And you can tell – as is indicated in the schematic plan on the top left. And you can tell, by looking at the modelling of the envelope that they're proposing, that it's a very detailed, highly articulated model at this stage.

This is possibly the kind of model that you would see developing during a DA stage; it's not necessarily the kind of model you would consider at a planning proposal stage, because the need for – to be able to accommodate the expectations of GFA need to be balanced out against the surety that you could meet amenity requirements. And that's not normally the kind of examination – the detail of examination that we would carry out at this stage.

But one – the approach would call for an envelope, essentially, that would be of a lot looser fit, a lot simpler form, to ensure that, further on down the track, any kinds of inherent problems that come out through the design process – there's enough room to move around, in that envelope, to solve those – to solve those requirements.

So the first point I wanted to speak to, in terms of set 65 in the ADG, is the requirement for visual and acoustic privacy. And the way that the ADG deals with that is by setting out certain criteria for minimum separation between building development – apartment buildings. And in this case, we’re looking at a minimum
5 of 12-metre separation to any future development across the laneway, and also the proponent has proposed a 12-metre separation between the north and the south – and the south tower, with this through-site link.

So you can see from – this is an excerpt of one of the floor plans, a typical floor plan,
10 sitting below that. And you can see that they’ve provided an indicative layout, being a combination of one-, two- and three-bedroom apartments, across the floorplate. Most of the apartments have an outlook directly onto Gibbons Reserve, facing east; and some of them have an outlook, or rely on an outlook, facing towards the north; and some to the south-west. So what we’ve indicated - - -

15 MR McNICOLL: So that’s – I’m just going to show you – that’s the plan that they provided as part of the Willowtree Planning document, page 40; and so all of those dimensions are shown on that plan.

20 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR BAIRD: What we’ve done is had a look at how those requirements for visual outlook and amenity would be met, and acoustic amenity as well, in the modelling. So, in the façade facing over the park, you can see, I’ve coloured, in this diagram,
25 grey, being that – meaning that there would be no restriction in terms of visual outlook, no restrictions in terms of separation, and no limitations in terms of acoustic privacy.

The situation becomes a lot tighter when you are looking at the façade that faces west
30 across the laneway to the neighbouring building. Because of the dimensional constraints across that laneway, this is where the envelope starts to become quite detailed, and you can see that the proponent has worked quite hard at trying to get these requirements for visual separation, or physical separation, satisfied.

35 So parts of the – parts of the façade of the building that are coloured in pink in this diagram represent parts of – or face – parts of the façade that would need to have some kind of screening. It could actually be a blank wall; it could be some kind of visual privacy screen; it could be opaque treatment. And that is to prevent issues of overlooking with any kind of subsequent development on neighbouring sites.

40 MR McNICOLL: Sorry. I should just jump in there, because, basically, those apartments would be relying on that orientation for their outlook; but they can’t rely on it for outlook, because there’s a visual privacy issue.

45 MR BAIRD: So when you look further down, you can see that, in this case, it’s possible to understand how these apartments, to the north, might have an outlook towards the north, and be able to deal with that problem; but these – this apartment

here, in the south-west, on the corner, does have a problem, because when you do look across and consider that this is only a 12-metre separation across the through-site link, you can see that the southern façade of the north tower and the northern façade of the southern tower both have a conflict in terms of being able to look
5 directly across into one another. So – and in this case, it would require, then – in order for them to meet the separation requirements across the laneway and to the southern tower would require this apartment to be screened in some manner, to prevent the visual overlooking - - -

10 MR McNICOLL: So, just as - - -

MR MACKAY: What's the green on this - - -

MR BAIRD: That's a planter box, I'm assuming. Yes.

15

MR McNICOLL: So, just as an indication – so this is the plan that they lodged; this is the kind of modification, at the tower level, that would need to be made. So some portions of the tower could be within the separation that they are indicating; but other portions of the tower would need to be set back substantially more than they
20 are proposing in order to meet those visual privacy requirements.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR McNICOLL: And that would obviously have an implication for the total yield
25 on the site. We'll come back to that diagram in a minute.

MR BAIRD: So, I guess, the point to consider, after this quite detailed explanation, is that what we see in front of us is a proposed building envelope that is very detailed – as I said, highly articulated, and really limits you to one particular design outcome,
30 which is what they've provided in these four plate designs. But that, at the same time, this doesn't show us that they've been able to resolve all of the issues that they need to look to in terms in visual and acoustic privacy by proposing a built form of the intensity that they are considering here.

MR McNICOLL: I think, before we move off that point, as well, I think it's also worth dwelling on this diagram that they have proposed consideration of how the adjacent site could redevelop, and we will come back to this in relation to wind, but I think what this indicates is a very substantial misunderstanding of how reasonable amenity can be created between very large apartment buildings. So it really speaks
40 - - -

MR BAIRD: So you should – you should note that we're looking at page 42 in their report at this stage.

45 MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Under Willowtree Planning Proprietary Limited.

MR McNICOLL: That's right. It speaks to a real incomprehension about what constitutes reasonable dwelling amenity.

5 MR BAIRD: Another consideration that we must have regard to in an assessment of
this kind is also the ability for the residents of the apartment to get access to natural –
to sunlight during the day, and the requirement is to be able to guarantee at least two
hours of sunlight to a living space, whether it be an internal or external living space,
on the shortest day of the year – 21 June. So, typically, during a DA assessment for
an apartment building, we would carry out this kind of analysis. And what we see
10 here, for the record, is – this is the access to sunlight sheet – we're looking at a
typical apartment, a typical floor plan of the northern tower, and then the detailed
floor plan of a two-bedroom apartment that would be part of that overall floor plate
layout.

15 What I did then was to build, in just very basic form, the apartment block itself
according to the arrangement you see on the floor plate, and then ran a solar analysis
test on that, accounting for the fact that the living room – that accounts for the fact
that the living spaces are recessed behind this three-metre wide balcony, as you
would expect there to be in a normal arrangement of an apartment layout. And what
20 we can see here is that for the yellow sections of the building, they're getting more
than two hours of sunlight, so there's absolutely no problem with sunlight access to
the bedrooms.

But there is a problem when it comes to sunlight access to the living spaces that are
25 set behind the balcony here, and you can see that in this case – this test showing us
that none of the apartments facing towards the east are going to be able to achieve
the minimum two hours sunlight that they would need to achieve during – during the
winter solstice. And I think this is partly for two reasons. One is the orientation of
the site is slightly off north, and we found in our experience with other sites,
30 especially around this area, when you're dealing with parts of the city grid that are
not aligned directly or not so placed in line to direct them north. It only takes in the
order of between five and 10 degrees sometimes to know a site out of its
performance when you're relying on the eastern façade to achieve the sunlight access
that you need to achieve.

35 MR McNICOLL: The implication, again, of this is not that this can't be solved, but
the solutions require typically a slightly narrower floor plate which goes to the
amount of floor space that is yielded in the end. So it's just saying it's not that there
isn't a solution here. That they haven't demonstrated the solution and they haven't
40 followed the consequences through to the calculation of the FSR.

MR BAIRD: The third consideration we also took into account was the impact of
the tower form in terms of the downdraft of wind from the tower onto the street
below, and part of that – part of the requirement was to – the proponent supplied us
45 with a wind impact study, as you would normally expect to see. The study identified
that, because of – well, I guess we should start by saying that because of the width of
the site and the width of the tower plate needed to become a viable apartment layout

as far as the proponent is concerned, it provides very little opportunity to set the tower back off the alignment of the main building podium below.

5 And, typically, when it – especially when it comes to inner-city environments where you have significant tower developments, we usually require around an eight-metre setback from the podium alignment back to the tower alignment to allow the winds to be deflected away from the street environment below and ensure an acceptable pedestrian amenity at street level. The envelope that they’re proposing here doesn’t
10 achieve those kinds of setbacks, and so what the wind engineering consultant has proposed is a series of treatments at street level that would attempt to deal with the impacts of wind.

15 And, in this case, what they’re proposing along the northern edges of the site where they’ve provided a setback to the public domain and also through the through-site link here in-between the two towers, they’re proposing full height screens, either permeable, semi-permeable, screens or possibly glazed screens that act as a series of wind foils, essentially, to prevent, you know, the extreme wind conditions that you would expect to result off deflection from a tower from above.

20 My concern here at ground level – and you can see here with the X on the metric diagram that we show here, the podium form of the development is shown here in sort of semi-transparent. And then these blue screens are an approximation of what they’ve indicated on their – what the wind consultant has indicated on their drawing. And so we can see here that it’s going to have significant impact in terms of the
25 activation and the street amenity for people in the area.

MR McNICOLL: I would go further to say this is a completely unacceptable arrangements for an area of public domain.

30 MR BAIRD: I think it’s interesting to note, when you look at the image below that they’ve provided of the through-site link between the two towers, and I’ve just dotted in over the top - - -

35 MR DUNCAN: Where those screens would be.

MR BAIRD: - - - what the implication of those screens might be.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

40 MR BAIRD: And in terms of an urban design outcome, it’s not an acceptable solution.

45 MR McNICOLL: I think, as well, where we have seen these type of arrangements actually implemented in central Sydney on private land that is not intended to be public but just has outdoor dining and so on, these kind of arrangements generally are much tighter than they have indicated indicatively at this stage. The screens generally have to be within about three metres of each other. So they really create a

very strong barrier to people moving through and to visual permeability and the sense of publicness.

5 MR MACKAY: Okay. Just to help us – this is Richard – land that very clearly, I’m understanding that council’s position is, firstly, that there is a substantive wind issue and, secondly, that the proponent has not demonstrated that there is a satisfactory solution, leaving aside whether it’s urban design or operations - - -

10 MR McNICOLL: That’s right.

MR MACKAY: - - - that’s what it comes down to.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

15 MR MACKAY: Wind issue not satisfactorily resolved - - -

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

20 MR MACKAY: - - - to provide a workable way forward.

MR McNICOLL: So, yes, that’s correct.

MR BAIRD: environmental amenity, yes.

25 MR McNICOLL: So our normal position would be to say, “If you identify an issue from your design, that you should proffer another design that deals with those issues without having to put elements in public places,” and that’s not what they’ve done. So the wind report has identified that the form that they have generates issues, and the response has been, “You should put elements in the proposed areas of public
30 domain.” Our additional concern is that they haven’t done a comprehensive test of locations surrounding the site. They’ve tested a few selective areas around the site. That, actually, the issues may be more widespread than the report currently picks up.

35 MR DUNCAN: Thanks.

MR BAIRD: So just – I guess if we just return to - - -

40 MR DUNCAN: We’ve probably got about 15 minutes – well, actually, probably 10 – a bit more than 10 minutes left.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

45 MR BAIRD: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: So, just depending on how you're going, I would like to give maybe some opportunity for extra questions at the end.

MR McNICOLL: Yes, sure.

5

MR DUNCAN: Just to give you a time check.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

10 MR BAIRD: Just to quickly sum up, then, with the concerns that we've found around privacy and around solar access and around wind, you can start to see how very limiting the proposed envelope that they are considering has become, and it's still not – we're still not confident that they have shown us an envelope that can deal with all of these issues adequately. The only way that you could see a way forward
15 in dealing with – solving these issues would be to reduce the floor space and the GFA, and the bulk of the envelope, essentially, to be able to come up with the setbacks required for both management of wind issues and also the environmental constraints that we – that are related back to set 65.

20 MR McNICOLL: Just – can I mention something else, because it came up a little bit in what Tammie was talking about, which is that, in treating this site in isolation, we don't know – we can't be certain what the cumulative environmental conditions are likely to be. So, in doing our coordinated planning, what we would do is look at all of the future form, and assess the total environmental conditions that are going to
25 result. Because of the nature of this being a site-specific proposal, we can't do that.

MR BAIRD: So, I guess - - -

MR DUNCAN: So – goes to the diagram you've shown - - -

30

MR BAIRD: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - on page 41 - - -

35 MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR BAIRD: We return to the diagram from page 41 of the Willowtree Planning report. And you can see that the implications, if – assuming, then, the point that I made at the beginning, that whatever happened – might happen on this site could end
40 up – could set up expectations for future development in the area, which is what they've presaged here in this diagram. You could see that the intensity of development that you see resulting in these two sites, if you project that across the precinct, could end up resulting in a built environment outcome that is very, very low in amenity.

45

And especially if you consider that Cornwallis Lane, here, is only three metres in width, the implications of the wind impacts – considering that they're not able to

demonstrate that they can deal with them acceptably on their site alone – when coupled with, potentially, another site developing in the same fashion, would make that an uninhabitable laneway, as far as public – a public domain, and public amenity, perspective is concerned, which is – which is not an outcome that we can support.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

MR MACKAY: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR McNICOLL: So, just to go to this – this is the kind of thing that we would need to do at the next stage, and then follow through on all of the sites as a totality. So we would be looking at increasing the setbacks, particularly to try and deal with the wind environment, which means that where they're currently assuming no setbacks on the eastern side, we would probably have to assume some setbacks; to deal with visual privacy issues, we would either have to increase the separation between the buildings and/or increase the separations from the laneway.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Can I just - - -

MR McNICOLL: And that's irrespective of the kind of total height of the building; those discussions still need to be had.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Can I just jump in to say that, in terms of master planning precincts, this is not an unusual approach for the City. We do a lot of precinct planning: the Green Square Town Centre; the - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - wider Green Square Urban Renewal Area, and all of the precincts inside of that. It's a usual approach that the City would take, looking at those sites, making sure that growth can happen on all of them in an equitable way. It's the approach that we prefer to take in this precinct, in the LSPS process.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MR McNICOLL: We've got copies of all of those diagrams for you guys to keep as well.

MR DUNCAN: No, that's helpful. That's good. Thank you.

MR McANESPIE: I'll give you your – you've written on this one, so - - -

MR McNICOLL: You can – that's fine.

MR DUNCAN: And likewise, we'll get - - -

MR McNICOLL: You can keep that.

5 MR McNICOLL: - - - those electronically, as well.

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes, we'll send them along.

MR McNICOLL: Yes.

10

MS BRUCKSHAW: There you go. And would you like to keep these? Or I'll take these away and send them on.

MR DUNCAN: I think you can keep those.

15

MS BRUCKSHAW: Okay.

MR McANESPIE: But just so – I think probably Peter has already said it – but all this goes up on the website. So there's nothing here that Council - - -

20

MS BRUCKSHAW: No, no, nothing.

MR McNICOLL: All public.

25 MS BRUCKSHAW: All good.

MR DUNCAN: Before we completely finish, I think there might be - - -

MR MACKAY: I've just got one question, which is - - -

30

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR MACKAY: I mean, I've asked all the strategic merits questions, but – traffic. Council have a position on traffic, parking, with respect to the - - -

35

MR DUNCAN: You mentioned circulation.

MR MACKAY: - - - site-specific considerations?

40 MR BAIRD: Well, the – we don't have a minimum requirement for parking, for a residential development in the LGA. So they - - -

MS BRUCKSHAW: I think they've said around 240 - - -

45 MR DUNCAN: That's good.

MR BAIRD: Yes.

MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - parking spaces, and that - - -

MR BAIRD: That's right.

5 MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - takes them to the maximum that would be allowed under
the planning controls. I think, in addition to that, they'd talked about – well, I don't
have the exact numbers in my head – of a certain increase in movements, that, from
their preliminary investigations, didn't look significant. But, even so, on a site this
10 reducing parking to perhaps even below what is in our LEP. And that's just because
of the good accessibility on the site, in - - -

MR McNICOLL: Yes, but - - -

15 MS BRUCKSHAW: - - - terms of its access to the train station.

MR McNICOLL: - - - also, we would be encouraging them to have discussions with
Transport for - - -

20 MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: - - - New South Wales about the future plans for Redfern Station
access, because the circulation via the northern area in front of the water tower could
potentially create conflicts with the very large number of pedestrians - - -
25

MS BRUCKSHAW: Yes.

MR McNICOLL: - - - coming out of Redfern Station.

30 MR BAIRD: And I think, in – just from memory – and I need to confirm this with
you – in the internal reports that I submitted to the planning officer concerned,
initially, I think we calculated that, coupled with the sites – the residential
development that's already existing to the north – that that circuit would be dealing
with in the order of 450 cars in total, shared across - - -

35

MR DUNCAN: The whole - - -

MR BAIRD: - - - those three sites.

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you. All right, Richard?

MR MACKAY: I'm good.

MR DUNCAN: Andrew?
45

MR McANESPIE: No.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR McANESPIE: Thank you.

5 MR DUNCAN: Well, thanks very much - - -

MR McNICOLL: No problem.

MR BAIRD: Okay, then.

10

MR DUNCAN: - - - for the presentation.

MS BRUCKSHAW: So - - -

15

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. And we'll switch off the recording at this point.
Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.51 am]