



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

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

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

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-975703

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH COUNCIL**

**RE: REZONING REVIEW OF SHOWGROUNDS PRECINCT, CASTLE HILL**

**PANEL:** **PETER DUNCAN**  
**CAROL AUSTIN**

**ASSISTING PANEL:** **ANDREW McANESPIE**  
**DAN KEARY**  
**BRENT DAVINE**

**COUNCIL:** **MEGAN MUNARI**  
**BRENT WOODHAMS**  
**BRONWYN INGLIS**

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

**DATE:** **9.54 AM, WEDNESDAY, 19 DECEMBER 2018**

MR P. DUNCAN: Good morning everybody and welcome. Before I begin I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today and this meeting is on the request for a rezoning review for a planning proposal seeking to amend the Hills Local Environment Plan 2012 in relation to planning controls applying to multiple sites in the Showground Station Precinct, Castle Hill. The proposal seeks to amend the Hills LEP 2012 by adding a new key sites clause and amending the associated LEP maps to identify the subject land, including a bonus incentive floor space ratio and bonus incentive building height clause for these key sites and including a requirement for the provision of community infrastructure and affordable housing on the land if the bonus incentive floor space ratio and height is utilised.

My name is Peter Duncan and I am the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me on the panel is Carol Austin. The other attendees are Andrew McAnespie from the Commission Secretariat and Dan Keary and Brent Davine from Keylan Consulting, who are assisting the Commission Secretariat on this project. 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 provided and produced and made available on the Commission's website. The meeting is one of part of the Commission's process of providing advice. It is taking place on 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 the position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing. We will also then place that on the website. Thank you, and we will now begin. So I think to start with we've got an agenda, so we might work through the agenda. The first item is council's assessment of the proposal. If you could cover that for us and any background that you wish, and then council's view of the Sydney Central City Planning Panel's decision. At the end of that then we might have some questions and discussions.

MS M. MUNARI: Not a problem.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS MUNARI: All right. So the proposal had been put in prior to the showground precinct being rezoned.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS MUNARI: So there was in – I suppose, even more background would be the introduction of a rail line – a metro line – through the Hills Shire with the Showground Station included was, you know, funded by the government in around 2011. In 2013 the State Government released a corridor strategy that identified what

kind of development might be appropriate in the locations around the stations and identified growth over a 20-year timeframe for those stations. In response to that, the Showground Station was identified as a planned precinct, I think they're called now. They've had several names since then. And the Department of Planning led the process for that station precinct. So they have done a majority of the work, I suppose, in getting the planning controls to the point that they are now. This proposal was lodged with council prior to that precinct planning process being finalised.

10 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: So it was lodged at a time when there was a bit of uncertainty about what would actually happen in the showground precinct and what kind of timeframe we'd be looking at for that.

15

MS C. AUSTIN: So prior to 2013?

MS MUNARI: No, sorry. So prior to, I think, about - - -

20 MR .....: Prior - - -

MS MUNARI: It was lodged in - - -

MR .....: Yeah.

25

MS MUNARI: - - - 2016.

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

30 MS MUNARI: SO, sorry, the 2013 strategy is something the Department of Planning released as an overarching strategy - - -

MS AUSTIN: Yeah.

35 MS MUNARI: - - - for the whole corridor.

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MS MUNARI: And then, as - within that - - -

40

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: - - - there's then the next stage, which is the precinct planning, which is more detailed - - -

45

MS AUSTIN: Yeah.

MS MUNARI: - - - where they've actually come up with floor space ratios, heights, zones – that sort of thing – and that's the set of planning controls that are currently in place, and they were put in place in December 2017.

5 MS AUSTIN: Yes, yeah.

MS MUNARI: But this planning proposal that we're dealing with was lodged prior to that being put in place.

10 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: So it has been – or had been with council for some time while the precinct planning process was ongoing. They kind of ran parallel for a period of time. Ultimately the Showground Station Precinct planning proposal, if you like,  
15 was made by the State Government in December 2017 and council didn't formally consider this proposal until April 2018. So that was after that precinct plan was in place. Council's assessment primarily focused on the infrastructure benefits that were being put forward by the proponent and the built form and urban design outcomes and how those would relate to the precinct plan as it has been put in place.

20

So the precinct plan has quite a deliberate urban design background in terms of studies and testing that was undertaken, you know, by the State Government and with council's involvement of having obviously the highest densities concentrated at the station's site, at the centre where the, you know, new infrastructure's going to be,  
25 and then tapering away with a reduction in heights as you move further away from the station. This planning proposal sought to increase some of the heights further away from the station and almost, you know, across the road from the station, having them be as high as they would be, essentially, on the station site itself.

30 The infrastructure issues that we looked at relate primarily to regional infrastructure. So there's a lack of a school for the precinct. There's, you know, approximately 9000 dwellings we anticipate will be delivered in that precinct and at the moment there is no school to cater for that. That's something that has led to a dwelling cap on the precinct being put in place. So in the planning controls, in the Hills LEP at  
35 the moment there's a 5000 dwelling cap, and until those regional infrastructure issues are resolved, that cap is not going to be lifted, as far as we're aware. I don't know if you have any more background on that, Brent.

40 MR B. WOODHAMS: Yeah. Well, it is. The school is the principal reason for that cap and there is work underway to try to resolve that issue, but it's not – I'm not aware of it being close to being resolved by now. So - - -

MS MUNARI: So the identification of land is a challenge and a majority of  
45 landowners and developers in the location are obviously looking for significant, you know, additional density on other sites or other locations in order to provide that land. So it's proving to be a challenging thing.

MR WOODHAMS: Very challenging. In order for a private landowner to dedicate one hectare of land for nothing for a school, they will require a substantial uplift in density, and the concern is that the extent of uplift that would be required would result in an unacceptable built form and urban design outcome. So, needless to say, the investigation is ongoing. The department is looking into it. It - - -

MS MUNARI: With the Department of Education. They're obviously involved, as well.

MR WOODHAMS: With the Department of Education. But it's an unresolved regional infrastructure issue, and part of the problem here is that for us to be proceeding with a planning proposal to further increase density in a precinct that is already subject to significant regional infrastructure complaints, we are of the view that that wouldn't be appropriate.

MS MUNARI: Sorry. That assessment also dealt with the voluntary planning agreement offer that the proponent had put on the table. You have all of the things that the panel had. So you have our report and our response to the rezoning review criteria and that sort of thing. So within the report there's an assessment of what we believe to be legitimate public benefits within that offer and what things we felt were something that should be provided with development anyway, or things that are going to be facilitated throughout DCP that we thought were not an additional public benefit that would warrant any further density increase on the property.

So there are two principal things that we thought were worthy of consideration. That is the additional public parks, so approximately 5000 square metres for passive open space within the precinct, and the widening of Middleton Avenue further. So that's sort of a spine road down the centre of the precinct that will be carrying a lot of traffic, as well as providing a new, I suppose, you know, key road to get to the station. So a key pedestrian desire line, as well, from within the precinct. So the widening of that road not only for traffic purposes as well as providing sort of some amenity for future residence and providing a key way for them to get from, you know, wherever in the precinct – I get to Middleton, it's a nice wide street, it's got some nice trees, it's got, you know, space. I can see the big tall buildings at the station. It helps with legibility.

We thought that was something that was really worthy of consideration. So those are some of the primary things that we looked at in the assessment. Ultimately our recommendation to the council was to consider talking to the Department of Planning about whether they would be open to any further changes to the planning controls. It should be – you know, it's within the report, but I will make the point that we didn't do any further urban design testing on a reduced yield or reduced heights. That was something that we would do if we thought that the councillors were going to be keen to go and talk to the department about further exploring those public benefits and whether we wanted to consider further density.

In the end, they felt that the Showground Station precinct needs time to do its job. So it was only, you know, put in place four months prior to them considering this, so that's approximately 12 months prior to now. It really needs some time to actually allow those planning controls to allow some development to occur, to allow something to happen, and that we don't have any compelling reason and that they didn't feel the public benefits on offer were enough of a compelling reason to change those controls.

MR WOODHAMS: I might – yes, timing is a critical issue because it was rezoned in December of last year, and since then, we've had four major development applications lodged with a combined yield of over 930 dwellings, and we've had a further six - - -

MR KEARY: Sorry, Brent. How many?

MR WOODHAMS: Over 930 dwellings, combined yield. So they're currently under assessment.

MR DUNCAN: In the last 12 months?

MS MUNARI: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: Yes, since the rezoning, and there's been a further six pre-lodgement meetings for other sites - - -

MS AUSTIN: So have they been approved?

MR WOODHAMS: No, under assessment - - -

MS MUNARI: They're under assessment.

MR WOODHAMS: Under assessment, but there's been a further six pre-lodgement meetings for other sites with a combined yield of over 1000 dwellings. So what that indicates is that there's development activity in the precinct and the condition hasn't changed or to warrant a further change to the planning controls – the new planning controls that have only recently been put in place.

MS MUNARI: And I guess that fed into, you know, where we sit now, knowing that, you know, really, the decision that was made is correct because we have a development activity happening. We have people coming in wanting to do development - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - and that's exactly what the plan precinct process was supposed to do, get a rezoning in place and get some activity actually occurring.

5 MR KEARY: And do all those DAs substantially comply with the controls? Are there requests for variations of the controls?

MR WOODHAMS: Yes, there are some requests - - -

10 MR KEARY: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: - - - for variations. It's a little bit – certain standards, certain controls.

15 MR KEARY: Right.

MR WOODHAMS: Height and certain locations, but that's to be expected when you're – you know, with any DA - - -

20 MR KEARY: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: - - - that comes in, but, generally, they comply with the floor space ratio requirements.

25 MS MUNARI: We have built into the DCP as well some ability to be flexible with things like height. We've found that we can get some better urban design outcomes if we do allow a little bit more flexibility, particularly when it comes to things like where the riparian corridor is that part of this site backs onto. You know, one of the key problems with the urban design here is, obviously, quite bulky buildings that overshadow this, sort of, public domain space and riparian corridor that we're going to be embellishing and turning into a nice pathway, and we really want that to be a place that feels open and vegetated and keeps that character of the location. Whereas if you've got, you know, very tall buildings overshadowing it a majority of the time, it really won't have that. You know, the vegetation might suffer. It just doesn't have the right urban design feel about it. So we find that some of those variations – none of them are really leading towards significant increase density or anything - - -

30

35

MR WOODHAMS: No, it's - - -

40 MS MUNARI: - - - like that. It's more - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Density's - - -

MR KEARY: Yes.

45 MS MUNARI: It's more built form, you know - - -

MR WOODHAMS: - - - in accordance with controls.

MR KEARY: Right. Right.

MS MUNARI: - - - massaging to get it to be right in the location.

5 MR WOODHAMS: It's all about how the floor space is located on each of the sites.

MR KEARY: Yes.

10 MR WOODHAMS: So what we're really after in this precinct is to have slender built form that creates better skyline - - -

MR KEARY: Yes.

15 MR WOODHAMS: - - - better distribution of floor space. It reduces the overshadowing impacts.

MR KEARY: Yes.

20 MR WOODHAMS: And that allows for greater landscaped open space at the ground level, ground floor common open space.

MR KEARY: Yes.

25 MS MUNARI: And those are key character considerations in this area, knowing that it's suburban area transitioning to sort of a - an urban hub around this new station, but being mindful that on the periphery of that, we still have suburban areas that are not going to change that still have their leafy streets and the feel of openness and trying to retain that through DCP controls. So it's important to allow some flexibility to get that to happen.

30

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

35 MS MUNARI: So, yes, that's essentially where we go to the - the council has, you know, obviously considered that report and felt that there wasn't sufficient merit in warranting a change, and that was the decision that was made, and then, yes, we went to the panel's rezoning review. Their decision, obviously, was favourable towards us in that it shouldn't proceed, but they did have their note on the end that they thought that the compromise position had merit. I suppose our thoughts on that are that, you know, we gave our councillors the option to consider that compromise position, and

40 they felt there wasn't merit to go with it.

45 So, you know, it was something that we put forward as officers to give them an avenue if they were of a mind to consider those public benefits and give them an option to say you don't have to go with - as much as the developer's asking for, potentially, to really consider those public benefits. Give them that halfway point, so that they - they're not put off by the substantial increase in density and not giving those public benefits a fair chance. And that's really what that recommendation is



about, you know. These things are legitimate public benefits. Do give them a fair chance, but, ultimately, what they're offering is not enough to warrant the change to those controls.

5 MR WOODHAMS: And, plus, with the outstanding regional infrastructure issues, that would still be an issue - - -

MS MUNARI: Yes, that's still - - -

10 MR WOODHAMS: - - - which would affect the compromise – the alternative planning proposal.

MS MUNARI: Yes.

15 MR WOODHAMS: So - - -

MS MUNARI: And as I say, we didn't do the urban design testing. You know, we came up with a number that we had used in another precinct. Basically, what you can get, we've got a key sites provision in another precinct where we're giving a 20  
20 per cent bonus to some sites where they amalgamate, deliver some public benefits, that sort of thing. We basically just applied that approach to this site, take what they can get under their current controls, and if we give them an extra 20 per cent, then that would be what we think could be an appropriate way to do it.

25 MR WOODHAMS: But even then, there's uncertainty.

MS MUNARI: Yes, but we didn't test heights, floor space ratios, built form – it's an extremely large site with a lot of options about how that built form could be arranged and designed. None of that was actually explored with that compromised  
30 position. So there was still, essentially, a whole new planning proposal preparation and justification - - -

MR DUNCAN: Right. If - - -

35 MS MUNARI: - - - required to – for that to really be a legitimate option. It was not something that we did the work for. It would have been something the applicant would have to have done. And as far as we're aware, they haven't - - -

MR DUNCAN: And if - - -

40

MS MUNARI: - - - done that – or they haven't presented it to council.

MR WOODHAMS: No, they haven't come back with that.

45 MS MUNARI: No.

MR WOODHAMS: But to go back to the planning proposal that was submitted, we do believe that the development standards that they are seeking would result in an overdevelopment of the site. The bulk and scale of the development is excessive. The tower floor plates are quite large – very large, especially at the 12<sup>th</sup> and above storeys. Poor separation between buildings, excessive overshadowing of common open space areas, excessive overshadowing of adjoining public open space, inadequate interface with the riparian corridor. In one of the urban design assessments, it showed built form within the riparian corridor.

10 MS MUNARI: Just obviously - - -

MR WOODHAMS: And what that indicates is that the development standards that are being sought are excessive and would result in an overdevelopment of that land, and that – it indicated to us that the development standards that the state government put in place as part of the plan precinct program were probably what was appropriate or what is - - -

MR DUNCAN: Right.

20 MR WOODHAMS: - - - appropriate for that particular location.

MS MUNARI: Since this proposal was considered by council in that rezoning review, we've completed the contributions plan and development control plan for the precinct. So that wasn't part of the plan precincts program; that was council's responsibility. So we have some controls that deal with the things that Brent was talking about, like, you know, setbacks to design those. You know, more slender tower floor plates and get those outcomes that we're talking about within the landscaping and the open field with vegetation. So I suppose the applicant didn't have the benefit of having that DCP in place to follow, but what it shows us is that what they were proposing wouldn't comply and would result in a lot of variations to that that would lead to, probably, a refusal of a DA if those were the development standards because they couldn't meet the more detailed design elements in the DCP.

MR KEARY: And does the contributions policy address affordable housing and community infrastructure - - -

MS MUNARI: No.

MR KEARY: - - - as proposed in the planning proposal?

40 MR WOODHAMS: It – the contribution plan addresses local infrastructure.

MR KEARY: Yes, yes.

45 MR WOODHAMS: Provision of infrastructure, that's on the essential works list.

MR KEARY: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: So it deals with local road improvements, local open space, active recreation, so the provision of playing fields, and pedestrian bridges to support future growth within the precinct. We are quite limited to it in terms of what we can include within the contribution plan.

5 MR KEARY: Did the DAs that you have – that are under assessment, do they have VPAs that deal with these kinds of contributions the - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Not that I'm aware of, no.

10 MS MUNARI: No.

MR WOODHAMS: No.

15 MS MUNARI: Well, the contributions plan is now in place. So as a condition of consent, when one is issued - - -

MR KEARY: Yes.

20 MS MUNARI: - - - they will have, you know, a payment under that contributions plan - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yes, they'll pay - - -

25 MS MUNARI: - - - as part of their conditions.

MR WOODHAMS: They'll pay in accordance with the - - -

MR KEARY: Yes. Yes.

30 MR WOODHAMS: - - - rates within contribution plan.

MR KEARY: But you're entering into VPAs for contributions above and beyond what's in the contributions plan?

35 MS MUNARI: No, not at this point.

MR WOODHAMS: No. No, that would be up to them to make an offer if they were to - - -

40 MR KEARY: Yes, yes.

MR WOODHAMS: With a development application, if they were to - - -

45 MR KEARY: So there's no VPA policy as such.

MR WOODHAMS: We are working on one.

MR KEARY: Right.

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

5 MS MUNARI: But not specifically for - - -

MR WOODHAMS: But not specifically - - -

MS MUNARI: - - - the Showground precinct.

10 MR KEARY: Right.

MR DUNCAN: For the whole area – the whole council area, is it?

15 MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MS MUNARI: Yes, so I mean – and it’s more administrative, I think, the way we deal with VPAs.

20 MR KEARY: Yes.

MS MUNARI: Because there is this plan precinct, you know, set of controls now and we have a contributions plan and we have a DCP, I don’t think we’ll get a lot of additional - - -

25 MR KEARY: Yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - voluntary planning agreement offers because we’ve dealt with what we can under the planning framework that’s available to us, and it would be –

30 yes, the option for a developer to put that forward if they wanted. We find in The Hills that, generally, we tend to get more voluntary planning agreement offers with planning proposals, rather than DAs where someone’s seeking to do something above and beyond what the current infrastructure framework deals with.

35 MR KEARY: Yes, yes.

MS MUNARI: That’s where we start saying, “Well, you’re now creating a shortfall in infrastructure. How are you going to resolve that?” And that’s where voluntary planning agreements tend to come in. A majority of our areas are covered either by

40 our section 7 – no, is it 712 now?

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MS MUNARI: Sorry.

45 MR KEARY: Yes, yes.

MS MUNARI: 94A plan.

MR WOODHAMS: 94A, yes.

5 MS MUNARI: So we have a 94A plan that covers - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

10 MS MUNARI: - - - the whole shire and then we have, I think, 19 – we're up to 19  
now - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

15 MS MUNARI: - - - contribution plans for - - -

MR DUNCAN: What - - -

MS MUNARI: - - - various areas including our release areas, growth centre  
precincts, that sort of thing. They all have contributions plans - - -

20

MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - that are specific for that development that's happening. So it's  
rare that we get a voluntary planning agreement offer just with a DA. There are a  
few around, but not very many.

25

MR DUNCAN: If – you mentioned before the – a number of proposals you have  
before you in this area and also pre-planning discussions. What would be the  
sequence and timing of that deliver, should all those be approved?

30

MR WOODHAMS: As far as development - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes, so they're - - -

35 MR WOODHAMS: Development horizon? We would have to get back to you - - -

MR DUNCAN: But that would be fairly immediate.

MR WOODHAMS: That would be fairly - - -

40

MR DUNCAN: If you've got them before council now.

MR WOODHAMS: One would think that they would want to get them onto the  
market reasonably quickly.

45

MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

MR WOODHAMS: Because we do have a precinct that has only recently been rezoned for 9000 dwellings. The market can only take up a certain - - -

MR DUNCAN: A certain - - -

5 MR WOODHAMS: - - - amount of yield - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

10 MR WOODHAMS: - - - per year.

MR DUNCAN: That's right.

MR WOODHAMS: So one would think that they would want to get - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: So I think the number you mentioned was broadly around 2000 by the time you added both.

MS MUNARI: Yeah.

20 MR WOODHAMS: Yeah, yeah.

MS MUNARI: Pre-DAs - - -

25 MR WOODHAMS: When you add the pre-DAs and the DAs that have been lodged, around about that mark.

MS MUNARI: And that's - so that's within about 12 months we've had discussions on those, and that's two-thirds of the cap - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - already.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes. That's right.

MR WOODHAMS: So the - - -

MS MUNARI: So - - -

40 MR WOODHAMS: When you count the Landcom land and - yes. We're going to get the cap pretty quickly.

MR KEARY: These are all on amalgamated sites?

45 MR WOODHAMS: Sorry?

MR KEARY: Are these DAs on the amalgamated sites?

MR WOODHAMS: Yes, yeah ..... larger sites and – half and half. So we have a couple applying to sites that are less than 10,000 and are only seeking the base and a couple on the – with larger amalgamated sites, which is relevant.

MR DUNCAN: And the cap – caps itself, when you talked about the infrastructure, you mentioned the school. Was there also open space in that, as well? Were there other – the transport, I assume, is generally there. If the rail - - -

MS MUNARI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - is delivered, the road's upgraded. That's within – so the caps then really around the school - - -

MR WOODHAMS: It's principally the school.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: Because - - -

MR DUNCAN: Not open space, okay.

MR WOODHAMS: No, not open space.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: We've resolved a lot of open space issues - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yeah.

MS MUNARI: - - - within the contribution's plan.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: So weren't necessarily part of the precinct planning process, but since making the contributions plan we've identified additional playing fields, local open space and funding mechanisms to deal with that. So it's - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: - - - primarily through that mechanism. So that's not really the reason - - -

MR DUNCAN: And the showground space itself: is that considered public open space in your plan?

5 MS MUNARI: I suppose it is, but it's not going to serve as an active recreation - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR WOODHAMS: No.

10 MS MUNARI: - - - space. It's more of a - - -

MR WOODHAMS: It's a recreation cultural facility. It's going to be subject to a separate master planning exercise.

15 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: Yeah. It's not, you know, fields for kids to play soccer and football - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: I understand.

MR WOODHAMS: Yeah.

MS MUNARI: - - - and everything. It's - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: I understand. Carol, have you got any questions on the proposal?

MS AUSTIN: No, I think I'm fine.

30 MR WOODHAMS: If I could also point out, with the public benefits, whilst they are good public benefits, they shouldn't be used to justify a built form and urban design outcome that is inadequate in terms of the issues which we discussed earlier. A poor built form - - -

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR WOODHAMS: - - - and urban design outcome.

MR DUNCAN: All right.

40 MS AUSTIN: Sorry, I just had one question. Could you talk me through how you think you'll resolve the schools issue. So if you don't have land for it now - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Yeah.

45 MS AUSTIN: - - - the more DAs that you approve, the less flexibility you have going forward - - -



MS MUNARI: Yes.

MS AUSTIN: - - - to address that schools issue.

5 MS MUNARI: I suppose the first thing to point out is, I guess, it's not actually  
council's responsibility to resolve the school. It is something that the State  
Government is doing. It was their plan precinct and their corridor strategy that led to  
this, so they're responsible, I suppose, for dealing with that. The State is also  
10 responsibility for education, so it is about the Department of Planning and the  
Department of Education working together to find an appropriate site and location  
and service the growth that has been put in place. But Brent does have more detail  
on the process, because we have had some involvement - - -

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

15

MS MUNARI: - - - in the discussions - - -

MR WOODHAMS: Have had some involvement and in – there's an opportunity in  
the deferred area to possibly investigate a site, but as we said before, that's an  
20 ongoing process.

MS MUNARI: So – sorry, can I just interrupt for one second? Sorry. The deferred  
area is a part of the Showground Station precinct that was deferred, funnily enough.  
A section that they didn't do rezoning or anything on. So it's actually on the  
25 opposite side of the creek.

MR DUNCAN: Can you just roughly show us where it is on this plan?

MS MUNARI: So roughly it would be over here.

30

MR DUNCAN: Looking at the figure in the – figure 1 in council's document, yes.

MS MUNARI: So it would be over here.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay. So it's to the sort of left of the showgrounds site in your  
diagram figure.

MS MUNARI: Yes. So it's down - - -

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: - - - over there. So when Brent's talking about that location, that's  
where he means. It's within the overall precinct, but not part of this planning  
proposal - - -

45

MR KEARY: So - - -

- MS MUNARI: - - - or part of the key residential - - -
- MR KEARY: - - - does it remain zoned - - -
- 5 MR WOODHAMS: Yes, existing.
- MR KEARY: Existing. What's the existing zoning?
- MR WOODHAMS: Light industrial.
- 10 MR KEARY: Yeah.
- MR WOODHAMS: Light industrial. But it was identified as a deferred area primarily as a way of doing further master planning work to get a better design outcome and have a better interface to the riparian corridor. So that – the ..... riparian
- 15 corridor, which basically is the open space that bisects the precinct, that will play – as the precinct develops, it will play a significant role in providing passive open space to the people within this precinct.
- 20 MS MUNARI: That's right. Sorry, I'm happy to table that for you, you know, after - - -
- MR DUNCAN: So we're looking – just for the record, we're - - -
- 25 MR WOODHAMS: So that's the - - -
- MR DUNCAN: - - - looking at a map here prepared on the zoning of the Hills area; is that right?
- 30 MS MUNARI: Yes, that's right.
- MR DUNCAN: Yeah.
- MS MUNARI: So this location is sort of where this – these planning proposals area.
- 35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.
- MS MUNARI: And this white area here - - -
- 40 MR DUNCAN: Is the deferred area.
- MS MUNARI: - - - is the deferred area with the red outline - - -
- 45 MR DUNCAN: For the very reason of what we're talking about, which is looking for provision of other things.

MR WOODHAMS: That's primarily – the idea is that with the riparian corridor that will need substantial embellishment in terms of earthworks, revegetation, provision of passive open space facilities, and that costs money, and as a way of enabling developers to do that work, that's why their – the master planning exercise is  
5 underway: to identify what additional development potential that that land needs in order to offset the cost of rehabilitating and revitalising the open space - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

10 MR WOODHAMS: - - - corridor. And it's also what we're trying to do is get some additional employment opportunities within the precinct, as well.

MR DUNCAN: So you said that the Department of Education and Planning are actively looking at it. It's in the process and that - - -

15 MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - you've had some involvement in that.

20 MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

MR WOODHAMS: But it is quite uncertain right now as to whether - - -  
25

MR DUNCAN: You haven't got an outcome.

MR WOODHAMS: - - - a school in that particular location will be the outcome of that particular process.  
30

MR DUNCAN:

MS MUNARI: I know we didn't answer it - - -

35 MS AUSTIN: No.

MS MUNARI: - - - which is, you know, when do you think you might resolve it, and I guess - - -

40 MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: Yes, timing. It - - -

MS MUNARI: We don't know - - -  
45

MR DUNCAN: It's out of your hands.

MR WOODHAMS: It's uncertain.

MS MUNARI: - - - is the answer. It is a bit.

5 MR WOODHAMS: And that uncertainty, as it is still uncertain, when we're looking at this planning proposal, which is seeking to further uplift density – I mean, it has already been rezoned – should we be doing that whilst there are those unresolved regional infrastructure issue, and our council's view is no, we shouldn't be doing that.

10 MS AUSTIN: So with these deferred sites, am I right in concluding that in addition to it being a potential location of a school, it is also a location for future job opportunities. So it's light industrial - - -

15 MS MUNARI: Yes, we're hoping.

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

20 MS MUNARI: We're hoping.

MS AUSTIN: Okay. So is the collocating of schools in an industrial area, is that something you would - - -

25 MS MUNARI: We don't believe it would necessarily be industrial in the future. That's just its current zoning - - -

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

30 MS MUNARI: - - - and that's what it's remained as because it's been deferred from this planning process. We envision that it will probably transition to a higher order.

MR DUNCAN: Employment - - -

35 MS MUNARI: You know, a B6 or B7, you know, a – commercial employment - - -

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS MUNARI: - - - rather than industrial.

40 MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MS MUNARI: I mean, I think that's a long-term goal. Probably not something that's going to happen in the immediate term.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Understand.

MS MUNARI: But, you know, with these substantial increases in residential that we've got in the station precincts and how fast we think they're going to come, we really need to match that with job opportunities, so we need to make sure that there's enough land around to development to occur that provides the jobs to match that.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR WOODHAMS: Yes. So within this precinct, there's – there'll be about 20 to 25,000 people, and if you – but go off our current age brackets, around 18 to 20 per cent of the population is of school age. So that's about 4000 school aged children just within this precinct. Now, I note some of them probably won't go to school within the precinct. They'll go outside, but a substantial portion will. And so we really need a new school, K to 12, within this precinct.

10

MS MUNARI: And we need to give the Department of Education the opportunity to provide that because, you know, their remit is to provide education for anyone within their catchment. So if that – you know, in 20 years, we're looking at that catchment being there, they need to make sure that they've got enough land and enough space to cater for the children that they think they're going to get.

15  
20

MR KEARY: Okay.

MS AUSTIN: Along the ..... rail line and sort of one or two stops away, are there education facilities that have got excess capacity that could accommodate all those additional - - -

25

MR WOODHAMS: That would be up to the Department of Education to look into where they have some additional capacity within existing schools, figure out how much they can accommodate there and where they require new schools, but the requirement for a school was – in this particular location, was identified as part of a plan precinct program. So they recognise that - - -

30

MR DUNCAN: It was in the - - -

MS MUNARI: Anecdotally, my understanding is, no, there's really not. The next closest station is Castle Hill which is sort of up the other end of Showground Road near Castle Tower Shopping Centre and that – there's quite a big residential catchment going in there and there is an existing primary school and it's at capacity without this development occurring.

35  
40

MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS MUNARI: Going in the other direction, you tend to get towards the business park, and there are some schools in that location, but they're not really on the train line. You know, it would be – you know, probably maybe a kilometre and a half away from the station, that sort of thing. Not really something that you would want

45

to see primary school aged children navigating on their own, that walk and train ride. Further than I think a typical catchment for a primary school particularly would be.

5 MR DUNCAN: All right. So we've covered the assessment for the proposal. What about your view that – you want to say something about your view of the planning panel's decision.

MS MUNARI: I think they made the right call.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MUNARI: They did their assessments against the strategic merit test and the site specific merit test and, you know, when you look at those requirements, the controls were less than five years old. Has anything changed to warrant something, you know? I don't think it has because this plan precinct process was done in response to the rail coming which is sort of the biggest change happening in the area, and that's done. That rail was there when they lodged it; it's there now. Nothing else has changed that really gives rise to increasing the density. You know, there are still the outstanding infrastructure issues that are unresolved at this point in time, and we don't have a, you know, clear date when that might be resolved. So it would be 15  
20  
unwise to proceed with that at this point.

MR DUNCAN: So as I understand, that was the council's position in April as well

25

MS MUNARI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - when they assessed that proposal.

30 MS MUNARI: Yes, that's correct.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS MUNARI: And that hasn't changed, you know. I think we – we would like to see the controls stay as they are for at least that five year period, give an opportunity for certain actual development to occur on the ground, to see what's happening, work through any issues that we have with the built form and design. I mean, this is, you know, a very large precinct with a long road of transition ahead, and I anticipate there will be revisions of these plans, you know, at least every five years.

40

MR WOODHAMS: Yes - - -

MS MUNARI: But I don't know that those are going to result in substantial increases in density. I think that they will be around, you know, improving design and making sure that we create a community that works. Not, you know, towers with no open space and no vegetation.

45

MR WOODHAMS: And excessive bulk.

MS AUSTIN: So once the school issue is resolved so that it ceases to be constrained in development and then go to 9000 units - - -

5 MS MUNARI: Yes.

MS AUSTIN: - - - you believe that 9000 units can be developed within the existing planning - - -

10 MS MUNARI: Yes. So we've calculated that based on the controls that - - -

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

15 MS MUNARI: - - - are in place now.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. Andrew, have you got any further questions?

MR McANESPIE: No.

20 MR DUNCAN: Carol?

MS AUSTIN: No, thank you.

25 MR DUNCAN: Well, I think unless you've got more to add, I don't think we've got further questions at this stage.

MS MUNARI: No, I mean, the report and our response to the rezoning review criteria was reasonably comprehensive. Obviously, if you have anything that comes up through your assessment to our discussion, please contact us. You know, we have no problem responding over the phone or coming in again if you need – council's closed from the 21<sup>st</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup>, but I'm back on the 2<sup>nd</sup>. I think you are too – no - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: Right.

35 MR WOODHAMS: Yes, yes, I'll be back.

MS MUNARI: You're back.

40 MR WOODHAMS: I'll be back. I'll be back.

MS MUNARI: So we're around.

MR DUNCAN: So we wait – January. We have until the end of January - - -

45 MR WOODHAMS: You'll get in touch with someone - - -

MS MUNARI: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - to complete this. So we may come back in January if - - -

5 MS MUNARI: Yes, and that's fine.

MR WOODHAMS: There'll be people there available to help you out.

MS MUNARI: Yes, absolutely.

10 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Well, that's been comprehensive. Thank you.

MS AUSTIN: Yes, thank you.

15 MS MUNARI: All right. No worries. I will arrange for just a little bit more detail on the development applications and the numbers of dwellings to be lodged as we discussed - - -

MR DUNCAN: That would be helpful.

20 MR WOODHAMS: Yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - and I will – we can leave that with you - - -

25 MS INGLIS: Look it up.

MS MUNARI: But I'll send you an electronic version.

MR DUNCAN: Well, maybe send the electronic version - - -

30 MS MUNARI: Yes – are you sure - - -

MS INGLIS: Yes, these are done in - - -

35 MS MUNARI: Yes, I can give you - - -

MS INGLIS: Yes, it's on an electronic version, yes.

MS MUNARI: - - - an electronic version, yes.

40 MR DUNCAN: Any – and what we're talking about there is the zoning - - -

MR WOODHAMS: That's the zoning - - -

45 MS MUNARI: Yes, the map we referred to.

MR WOODHAMS: That's the land zoning.



MR DUNCAN: So if there's anything like that you think that would assist us, please feel free to send it through.

MR KEARY: Well, we can readily obtain that. That's - - -

5 MS INGLIS: There are just the zoning maps - - -

MR KEARY: This is the zoning maps from the - - -

10 MR WOODHAMS: I can provide a zoning map.

MS INGLIS: - - - from the LEP and a copy of the Showground Precinct structure plan from the DCP - - -

15 MR KEARY: Yes.

MR WOODHAMS: Okay. I can provide a zoning map with all the DAs identified and - - -

20 MR KEARY: That would be handy. That would be handy.

MR WOODHAMS: - - - pre-lodgement locations.

MR KEARY: So we know the location of the DAs and that would be helpful.

25 MR WOODHAMS: That'd be helpful.

MR KEARY: Yes. Yes, that would be - - -

30 MS MUNARI: Yes, because this map does show that, but it was prepared a little while ago, so it's best - - -

MS INGLIS: Yes - - -

35 MS MUNARI: - - - if we update it.

MR WOODHAMS: I prepared an updated one yesterday.

MR KEARY: Right. Okay. In preparation for today.

40 MR DUNCAN: All right?

MS AUSTIN: Yes. Good.

45 MS MUNARI: Making sure you know.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Megan - - -

MS MUNARI: okay. Wonderful. Thank you so much.

MR DUNCAN: - - - Bronwyn, Brent, thanks very much.

5

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[10.30 am]**