



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-1026649

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH LANE COVE COUNCIL

**RE: PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR THE ST LEONARDS
SOUTH RESIDENTIAL PRECINCT**

PANEL: **ILONA MILLAR
RUSSELL MILLER
PETER COCHRANE**

ASSISTING PANEL: **MATTHEW TODD-JONES**

COUNCIL: **CHRISTOPHER PELCZ
MICHAEL MASON
MARTIN TERESCENKO
CRAIG WRIGHTSON**

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

DATE: **9.33 AM, THURSDAY, 23 MAY 2019**

MS I. MILLAR: Okay. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet today and pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on a request from the Minister for Planning – the then Minister for Planning, dated 20
5 December 2018 for advice on three things: firstly, the consistency of the St Leonards South Residential Precinct planning proposal initiated by Lane Cove Council with the overall vision, guiding design principles and specific design principles of the draft St Leonards and Crows Nest 2036 Plan relevant to the planning proposal; secondly, the scale of residential development contained in the planning proposal and
10 whether the whole site needs to be rezoned to meet the Greater Sydney Commission’s housing targets under the North District Plan; and thirdly, whether some staging of the proposal is appropriate.

My name is Ilona Millar, and I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the
15 panel today is Russell Miller on my left, and Peter Cochrane on my right, and the other attendee is Mathew Todd-Jones from the Commission Secretariat. In the interest of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today’s meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission’s website. Could I ask if all of the attendees from Lane
20 Cove Council could introduce themselves to the panel for the transcription purposes.

MR C. PELCZ: Christopher Pelcz, Lane Cove Council’s Coordinator, Strategic Planning.

25 MR C. WRIGHTSON: Craig Wrightson, General Manager, Lane Cove Council.

MR M. MASON: Michael Mason, Executive Manager, Planning.

MR M. TERESCENKO: Martin Terescenko, Executive Manager, Open Space and
30 Urban Services.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. So today’s meeting is part of the Commission’s process of providing advice to the Minister. It’s taking place at a preliminary stage in the process and will form one of several sources of information
35 upon which the Commission will base its advice. We’ve also met with the Department of Planning, and we held our public meeting on Monday this week, which you may have attended as well. During the course of today’s discussions, it’s important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate.

40 If you’re asked a question and you’re not in a position to answer at the moment, please feel free to take that on notice and provide any further follow-up information in writing to Mathew, and any follow-up information will be put on our website as well for transparency. Now, we circulated a provisional agenda, I think before the
45 meeting, which sets out some of the areas that we would be interested in hearing

from the council on, and I note that you've got a presentation ready to go, so with that, I will hand over to you to walk us through that.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: Okay. Thank you. Look, the presentation was prepared prior to us seeing the agenda, but essentially covers the issues, so if there is one or two things at the end that we don't cover, by all means, we will flick back. So, look, I guess in – just in terms of the context, planning in St Leonards is not new, and indeed, the last strategy council was involved before this one was the 2006 St
10 Leonards Strategy, and it had, you know, to be honest with you, reasonably similar outcomes to the current strategy, but it predominantly focused on employment back then, in particular, the preservation of the commercial core.

Council has, since that time, been looking to implement that strategy, and really what was identified is that the lack of amenity I guess on the Lane Cove side of St
15 Leonards, and so we introduced what we call these pilot projects, and they basically were designed to rejuvenate the public domain to then both encourage redevelopment, particularly of the commercial land, and also to deliver amenities, such things as – there's a library in the scheme, a full-line supermarket, a retail precinct, so – as well as open spaces. So, really, it was around trying to build
20 amenity for both workers and for residential. So St Leonards South was always in our thinking, and essentially it's the residential component that, you know, as part of the St Leonard's precinct from our perspective.

So I'm sure by now you've seen the plan, but I just wanted to highlight a couple of
25 the key issues, and I guess innovations. So in trying to be a liveable precinct, we've actually integrated a lot of particularly social infrastructure into the precinct, so we've got child care – two child care centres, two community centres. We've got a new local park. We've got new east-west connections to provide connections across the precinct to existing open space compared to the new open space.

30 And we've introduced this idea of green spines, which is really responding to the fact that in sort of urban living, the way built form normally comes through the system is as – let's just call it small parcels of green space around blocks of units, so we wanted to look at a way we could consolidate those spaces and actually then give the
35 residents of those buildings private communal open space, which is what those green spines are, so we will go through that in a bit of detail later, but essentially it's around, I guess, creating a variety of open spaces all the way from new parks through to private public – through to private communal open space.

40 MR PELCZ: And it's based on the principles of transit-orientated development as well, because the St Leonards Train Station is just on the north side of that image, so the densest buildings are concentrated within the first 200 metres, and then, of course, the remainder of the sites within 400 metres of the St Leonards Railway Station, so it's based on that idea of clustering the biggest densities closest to the
45 transport node, which is, in this case, St Leonards Train Station, and transitions down to the lower density residential on River Road.

MR WRIGHTSON: So I guess the thing about our particular precinct is that the planning for this has been going for a lot longer than St Leonards 2036. So, as you can see, about halfway through in 2015, 2036 came about, but, in fact, we've been doing work since 2012. Won't go through all the detail there, but I will just highlight the fact – and we've got a full brief of the consultation that has occurred over those many years, but I think we've used just about every consultation method there is over that period of time to build up a scheme that certainly the community have been aware of, and also to refine the scheme, having regard to what people are saying.

10 MR PELCZ: And so we've prepared that in a separate PowerPoint with a timeline, so we will submit this to the panel following the meeting.

MR WRIGHTSON: So what we thought we would do is just go through the various vision pieces that are within the 2036 and talk about how our particular scheme responds to them. So firstly is place, and in particular, heritage. So there are some heritage items on Park Road, and essentially the – those items are being really predominantly protected by use of the park as a buffer up against them, so the impact from our heritage study is there is minimal impact on them anyway, but we've also introduced this buffer to ensure that there's – you know, the majority of what's opposite the heritage is, in fact, a park, so there's – and there's minimal overshadowing.

Just in terms of surveillance and access, look, we've tried to – within the developments, we get passive surveillance of the private open space because the – obviously the units look in on it. They also look on to the east-west corridors, and also the parks, etcetera. So in terms of accessibility, it is a rather steep topography, obviously a south facing slope, also slopes east to west, and we will show you a – sort of a profile there how we've achieved the best outcome we can in terms of making the pathways accessible, and we've introduced – unlike a normal LEP, we actually have a landscape plan to drive how the whole public domain and private domain will come through.

So in terms of no additional overshadowing, the – again, just reflecting on the – that heritage items here, this is at 9 am in the morning. Essentially, the – as the sun sweeps around, it obviously goes in the other direction, the shadowing, so there's no real impact. And one of the key things that came through, particularly in the early days, was around overshadowing, not crossing River Road. We will show you in some more diagrams of that, but, basically, the shadowing pulls up to not impact on the load density to the south. The 2036 actual documents looked at our built form and analysed and said it had no impact on overshadowing, so basically confirmed our work that it didn't overshadow key public open spaces and didn't impact on views.

Similarly with wind impacts, the – that's just a standard thing we've obviously got in terms of high buildings, and that's in the DCP. So just in terms of shadowing, the shadows cross – our own shadow – these are our own shadow analysis compared to what's in St Leonards 2036. Again, you will see the real design feature of it is having these north-south perfect orientations. We even get solar access into these

green spines during mid-winter, but essentially, the shadowing itself really doesn't swing around to Newlands Park, which is the other open space, until the afternoon. And as you can see in Newlands Park, it actually has a tree line along its western boundary, so it self-shadows itself – the park itself, I should say.

5

So you can see here really it's probably not till about 3 o'clock that the shadows of the buildings are overcoming the shadows created by the own – by the trees within the park. And, obviously, it creates quite a buffer to the Duntroon and also the topography is – it's a lot higher this side than this side. So from the shadowing perspective, as I say, three key things achieved. One is to provide amenity to the buildings and to the private open space within the precinct; to not cross River Road and impact on the R2 zones; and to minimise the overshadowing to the park which is consistent with St Leonards 2036

10
15 MR PELCZ: And these have been tested against the Apartment Design Guidelines and they're compliant?

MR WRIGHTSON: The ADG?

20 MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So, look, we've just got a little summary at the end. I won't go through those, but if people want to look through those just to literally say what did St Leonards 2036 say and what did our scheme do. So just moving on to movement. And, again, our own vision, obviously, you know, recognises the transit-orientated development and it recognised the need for, I guess, encouraging activity other than motor vehicles. So we've obviously, as I mentioned, got the east-west paths. We've got cycleways along the roads to improve use by cyclists. We really have integrated all sorts of, I guess, separation opportunities between pedestrians and motor vehicles. In terms of accessing the various stations, well, clearly, the precinct's closest interface to St Leonards is here. Council's proposed plaza over the rail corridor will allow people to get up on top of that open space and then move onto the station through the existing tunnel or if a new tunnel actually eventuates, we've made provision for that.

35

In terms of going to Wollstonecraft Station, council has also proposed the idea of a set of traffic signals across River Road because people down the bottom of the precinct would probably find it easier to walk to Wollstonecraft rather than up the hill to St Leonards. And, essentially, the – yes. I think that's the main thing. The other thing is in the DCP we do require people to have a plan to utilise the various pieces of transport that are available. I mean, obviously, we've got two stations, what was a six-lane highway out the front when it was Sydney's main thoroughfare through to the city for the north shore. Now, it is actually – got good public and private transport options.

40
45

In terms of the east-west, as I said, the topography is challenging in that regard, as well, but what we've done is with this path we've included a requirement for some of

the buildings to include lifts to create – ensure that we get accessible access, and we've had to use switch-backs in some locations, but, essentially, we've achieved what is not there now, which is the ability to walk east-west mid-block and do so with it being accessible. And we see those connections between those two open spaces as being important because they will play a different role just basically because of the difference in scale of them, and they also link the social infrastructure. So the two child care centres and the two community centres are located in these buildings along the pathway. So what we end up with is a place for people, I guess, in the sense that it's – this movement corridor has got the services. And we also identified opportunities for cafes within the buildings that address those corners.

In terms of traffic impacts, so council has done its own modelling over the years. When I say we did it, we engaged consultants, and they determined the cumulative traffic impact as being moderate and only minor network changes are required. The DPE as part of St Leonards 2036 did do a strategic transport study which recommended a larger model be created. And, in fact, council itself has been lobbying for there to be a St Leonards-wide traffic model. It doesn't exist at the moment. My understanding is the RMS is still working on that. But since that report was released, the RMS have actually come back to us and said, "Look, we're satisfied that, you know, your particular development is not going to have a significant impact and raises no objections to the planning proposal proceeding" even before they finalised that study. All the other authorities have signed off on our particular plan.

In terms of land use and dwelling types, obviously, the scale is, you know, something that has been mentioned, and it does range from 19 to four storeys. It doesn't include townhouses per se, but it does have low-scale frontages in a number of locations, and so the photo there on the right is in Marshall Avenue where there has been recent development, and that sort of two-storey townhouse frontage to the elevation creates a nice effect in terms of the scale versus the human scale on the footpaths, etcetera. So we provided for that.

Council does have a sort of thing that's slightly unique compared to many others in that we do require a mix of apartments. So must be a minimum of 10 per cent of each and initially the market didn't like the idea of 10 per cent three beds, but obviously if you're going to create opportunities for families to live in these particular areas, you need to have that scale, and actually the market has now responded where a number of the – we've seen a number of developers swap over and put more three beds in because the market did like that particular – that mix. We have got key worker housing in the north-east quadrant where the higher buildings are and we will run through that if we need to just to explain that.

The Hill PDA economic assessment was done in the early days and essentially came out with a 2.5 to one FSR requirement to encourage development. Now, clearly, there has been a property boom since those reports. We did get it updated once, but essentially the properties did change hands at prices that were significantly over what that modelling was based on, but also some of the properties were exchanged hands

on the basis of – let’s just call it alternative FSRs that we would never have contemplated. So some of the prices that were paid don’t reflect an FSR of 2.5 or, as it turned out to be, 2.75 to one.

5 MR PELCZ: And they’re stated in our updated Hill PDA studies that were attached.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So, obviously, when you’ve got a 2.5 to one for economic viability, the idea of doing medium density starts to, you know, just fall to the wayside, essentially, because, you know, medium density’s typical point eight –
10 that sort of, you know, one is to one, not two and a half is to one. In terms of access, we’ve got 80 per cent must be visible, 20 per cent adaptable to ensure that older persons and people with disability may – can have access to these buildings. And, again, to cater for families, which obviously is an increasing trend in unit life, we’ve got the child care centres and community centres.

15 Built form. So in terms of encouraging a high standard of design, the detailed analysis that has been undertaken has really tried to address all the issues of building design, whether it be articulation, orientation, set-backs, solar access, all the things which St Leonards 2036 talks about at a high level, we’ve actually got down to a
20 more granular level of how would you configure these particular buildings to achieve those outcomes. And we recently also had a design review panel which actually took on board feedback from people who had suggested any changes to built form and looked at how we may modify things to achieve any of the points that they raised.

25 Essentially, though, the north-south configuration relies on everybody staying aligned with the layout. Otherwise, someone who juts out at the top of the hill either in height or footprint will just cast further shadows down the hills and make the whole solar access plains that have been developed difficult to achieve the outcomes that were intended. So we really do need compliance with those particular controls,
30 rigid – reasonably rigid compliance to achieve those things.

MR PELCZ: And that’s the purpose of the clause 4.6 exclusion, as well, to prevent those from going any higher.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: The question was raised around stormwater management, so Berry and Holdsworth at the top actually don’t have stormwater, so part of the plan is to install proper stormwater. Obviously, there’s on-site detention in developments these days which restrict peak flows, but there will be urban sensitive design built into the streetscapes as we narrow the road widths to increase the green space in the
40 road reserves. That will give us the opportunity to deal with water in a more environmentally sensitive way, and the existing network should be capable of – has been assessed as being capable of dealing with the stormwater run-off.

45 MR PELCZ: And we’ve also got other measures in our landscape master plan as well which deal with that in more detail, and a DCP, of course.

MR WRIGHTSON: So respecting, enhancing local character – we’ve – we really have tried to build transition, and we will talk about transition a bit later, so if we have a look at the whole precinct that has come about, so essentially, if we just look at the Lane Cove side at first, so our high buildings on – up here and then start to
5 drop all the way down through the precinct down to as low as four storeys. Along this edge is – actually got a two-storey frontage to basically transition as best we can.

You will recall that the original study that council looked at was all the way to Greenwich Road, which was actually what the St Leonards 2036 analysed, and we
10 certainly didn’t see that at this stage – so if we talk about staging for a second, we didn’t see that going all the way to Greenwich Road was warranted, and we’ve only concentrated closer to the 400 metre walkability distance for the increased density. But essentially, the – let’s just call it the sort of – the nice sort of bubble effect of having all the height in the middle and then gradual transition to the edges is what we
15 are also attempting to achieve with our height plans.

MR PELCZ: And this diagram is taken from the SJB urban design report. That’s from page 63, which has the recommended building heights for the precinct.

MR WRIGHTSON: So if we just look at those – let’s call it more granular transition along particular Park Road, so to the west, you will see that we’ve got a 10-metre setback to start with. Now, that’s from the existing road reserve, so what we’ve done there is we’ve moved the laneway, so Berry Lane, to the front of the property, and that has allowed greater setbacks at the front. So we’ve got a road
20 reserve plus 10 metres of – call it more road reserve by relocating the laneway, then we have the two-storey period for the first three metres, then, as you can see on the right, it steps up, so really, that was about trying to create the maximum separation between the R2 to the west and the precinct.

So realistically, it will be well over 40 metres separation between the front house – the front of a house on Park Road and the actual units. The interesting thing about that also is that you’ve got to understand the topography. Because it’s dropping all the time, it’s not like all the houses opposite are sitting dead flat on the land, either. They’re – a lot of them are, as they go down the hill, you know, a sawtooth down the
30 hill so they’ve got some elevation in them themselves. And then similarly to River Road to the south, we’ve also, at street level, introduced a 10-metre setback zone, and that’s not using public land; that’s on the development sites. Again, and then step up as you go – so three storeys, four, five.

So the transitions are built into the development sites on that edge, and I guess the – one of the reasons we’ve done it sort of like that over just, I guess, one edge rather than over a number of properties is that if the second stage of St Leonards occurs, then this provides the opportunity for, I guess, for want of a better word, a line break, but it would mean that you’re not going to end up – if you do decide to have a lower
40 scale on the other side of the road, it’s probably not going to be two storeys. It would be slightly higher than that, one would imagine, in the future. So this provides the opportunity going forward just to continue that transition. And, obviously, the

separations between buildings is as per the ADG, so the green spines – effectively, what they do is take the highest building required separation – is that 22 or 24?

MR PELCZ: 24.

5

MR WRIGHTSON: 24 metres and make sure that even the ground plain is 24 metres back. As we're typically a development – because, obviously, at the lower levels, you would only say you need a six-metre setback, but what we've done is just put the full 24 metres from the ground plain all the way up to the highest level, which is how we get, you know, basically the width – you know, quarter of the width of a football field available for private open space at the rear.

10

MR M. MASON: It's worth noting, also, that on that east face of Park Road that where the 10 metres is, that also is across from the heritage buildings as well, so that extends that separation.

15

MR PELCZ: And the two-storey street wall height is taken from those properties as well because they're mostly two-storey dwellings on the other side of Park Road, so it has taken its cues from there.

20

MR WRIGHTSON: Landscape. A lot of 2036 talked about green – making a greener space with high amenity, and certainly we've been focused on having a high amenity as well. So in terms of being consistent, well, both their plan and our work has always looked to easily achieve the 40 per cent canopy, and that's to be retained. In terms of new street trees, as I mentioned before, looking at works in road reserves to improve that, but a major improvement will be the undergrounding of power lines, too, so that will facilitate greater ability for trees, etcetera, to be established, and, you know, there will be proper infrastructure with, you know, underground pods that allow street trees to grow, etcetera, around infrastructure so that those trees can go through to mature heights.

25

30

So one of the things that we did do was actually a tree audit and identified all the significant trees and then looked at how the built form can try and attempt to keep the maximum number of trees. And, obviously, good thing about the north-south sort of alignment is that houses typically plant trees towards the back of their rear yards against fences, etcetera, so you can see the yellow dots a lot of the times aren't where the buildings are anyway, so they're either in their front yards or right up against their back fences. By us having, sort of, only 22-metre deep buildings running literally along where the houses were, what we've done is being – we're able to get the mature trees retained, so we've mapped those trees out.

35

40

Those trees now can obviously go on forever in the sense that they are now in the green spines, which is communal open space, and we want, obviously, tree canopy in those green spines, so that's going to find them a permanent home. We also have got a control around buildings not extending their car parks and – out into those green spines, so we don't want to see them, say, bench the whole site, put a building in and

45

then replace soil and trees because otherwise we will have got rid of the mature canopy.

5 The model is that the building footprint stays in the alignment of the built form so that, as I say, those mature trees are retained. And there's significant deep soil planting throughout the site. We've got, obviously, the pocket parks up the top here, as well as the east-west connection, so again, it has got a very mature tree canopy that will be retained. In terms of the open space, we looked at a topology matrix to look at the different roles of open space, so Newlands Park is the biggest at 10,000
10 square metres. The new local park is 3800 metres.

So the Department of Planning have got guidelines around rather than just being focused on all our – on quantity, what is the different roles of open space, and what's – segmenting the use of that space and then designing the spaces to fulfil specific
15 needs is more efficient than just saying we've got an open pasture area and, you know, people will come to that park. So we transition through the larger spaces into the pocket parks through to the green spines, and we've even got roof gardens, so they've all got a role to play in providing people with access to active and lifestyles.

20 MR PELCZ: Yes, and a variety. So this table is taken from our landscape master plan, and it plots all the characteristics that each of these open spaces should have, so the green is the required items that each of those spaces should have and the orange is the desirable ones, so that one is taken from our landscape master plan.

25 MR WRIGHTSON: So there has been much mentioned about quantity of open space. So here's a couple of key statistics. St Leonards South contributes 73 per cent of all the new open space within the St Leonards 2036 Plan, yet it's contributing around 35 per cent of the dwellings. So I'm talking only about new now, not existing Newlands Park or the other pocket parks. So if we go through and add up
30 all that space just from a quantity perspective, we – on day – sorry. Including the new spaces only, we would end up at .21 hectares per thousand. Now, there is no real standards that the department has set, but as a comparison, the Epping Plan or Priority Precinct, as it was then, achieved .12. Waterloo is .07. So at .21, even just with the new open space we've added, we're sort of almost double those other urban
35 precincts.

MR PELCZ: And the Forum development across the road has .19 hectares.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So if we then say but there are existing open spaces, and obviously some of those spaces are used by existing publication, but we actually get up to closer to .36 hectares per thousand, and really, if you add Gore Hill Oval – I know that's not in our area, but realistically, it's within a walkable distance – the number gets higher. But I think the key piece is too is that council has also, with its over-rail plaza, proposing another 5000 square metres, which is within that 400
45 metres walkability. So compared to the rest of the St Leonards 2036 precinct, which pretty much relies on Hume Street Park, which is existing, and I think they're adding a small – couple of small parcels to it, but far we – the most amount of open space

for residential purposes is being added by council, and then if you look at the transition of the open space over the rail, which will be used by workers as well as residence, there's another 5000 square metres.

5 MR PELCZ: And as you see in the table there, St Leonards South – just St Leonards South is a precinct area of about 7.48 hectares, and 14 per cent of that is open space – just open space, and that's brand new open space, not existing.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Sorry. So just going through the green spines again, and where – it is a – what's the word? It's reborn idea of trying to introduce this idea of shared communal private open space. So the idea is on title, people have reciprocal rights of way within their particular space, so this is the north-east – I will call it a pod, but it's where the – it's where the – this is the 19-storey building, just to give you some orientation. Here is the east-west connection. So all these buildings will have
15 reciprocal rights of way to this space. So the general public won't be able to get here, but it's like having a big backyard shared by the buildings. And what we've done is, so that we don't end up with 15 barbecue areas and nothing else, we've actually done a landscape plan for this whole area.

20 So the idea is the developer will be given a schedule of this is what you need to put on your 12 square metres of land. The developer who is behind them will have 12 square – not square metres – 12 metres to landscape. The two will come together as one, though, because it's being designed overall rather than each developer choosing their landscape. So rather than just being curtilage areas, they will be spaces that
25 really can be used, and then they will – well, they will even have, like, ground floor balcony type apartments where someone can walk out of their ground floor apartment into a backyard similar to the – how they would in a house.

30 MR PELCZ: And you saw what type of things would be in those communal green spines back in that matrix table which we showed earlier.

MR R. MILLER: How will they be maintained?

35 MR WRIGHTSON: So they will just have to maintain their own.

MR MILLER: So this will be - - -

MR PELCZ: Body corporate.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. The body corporate will have to just maintain their particular area of their house. Yes.

MR PELCZ: It will be done through a section 88E instrument.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. We will actually be encouraging them to come together and have a joint contract and maintain the whole thing, but essentially, cost wise, they are responsible for just their land. It is unfortunate when you just see all these

grassed or planted out buffer zones that are effectively wasted for the people who live there, and so this is about trying to mass it so that we can actually use it. And obviously, you know, these distances – how long would that be, Chris? Would that be - - -

5

MR PELCZ: How long? Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: How long? It's probably 60 or 80 metres long.

10 MR PELCZ: More than 60 metres, yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: You know, by 24 metres wide. It's getting up to almost football length and half-width of a football field. So, interestingly, the North Sydney Local Health District commended us on this idea, because it will create greater active lifestyles and really a great place for children still in a quite high urban environment. So, look, we will just run through submissions. So in 2015, we developed the master plan, so that was about after about three years of work, 545 submissions, and that was when council made the decision whether to go all the way to Greenwich Road, stop at that stage Berry Road or extend it to Park Road, and going to Park Road was ultimately selected.

The prime issues at the time were really around traffic, parking, open space, density. A lot of them, I guess, to be honest, around development issues in general, the fact that there's more people coming. The zone boundary, obviously, where it stopped was key to people in the precinct, probably less so to people outside the precinct, but council landed on Park Road. Now, one of the reasons that Park Road had some benefits was really around the ability to use Park – not Park Lane – Berry Lane to create a greater interface, and at that stage, there was no open space large park proposed in the scheme, and so when it was extended to Park Road, that's when I guess the further open space issue was addressed by the inclusion of a 3800 square metre park. So at that point, there wasn't a large park in the rest of the precinct.

MR PELCZ: And, of course, it was also within the 400 metres of the railway.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: And it's still within the 400 metres. Correct.

MS MILLAR: And can I ask why it wasn't extended further west to Greenwich Road?

40 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MS MILLAR: As part of the whole precinct?

MR WRIGHTSON: So, essentially, the Hill PDA economic analysis looked at the subdivision patterns as you went further away, and, essentially you would – they in the end you concluded you would actually probably need more density, not less, which is sort of kind of opposite to the – you know, the transition idea, and what we

saw was if there was a future scale to occur, you know, that could happen, but it would be, I guess, in a different – in – with a different mindset. So if there's going to be any other type of built form, that could be considered at that stage, but essentially, it did suggest that we had to have more scale, not less.

5

MR PELCZ: And also, too, the cumulative traffic study also said no matter what traffic measures put into it, if you went up to Greenwich Road, it would never work, so it concluded that as well at the time.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. The difficulty is, is the RMS typically don't like new signalised intersections. So, of course, the more we went up there, we needed a mid-block road to connect the various streets.

MR MILLER: I'm not sure we've seen your traffic – I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

15

MR WRIGHTSON: No, you're right.

MR MILLER: I don't think we've seen your traffic - - -

20

MR WRIGHTSON: Study?

MR MILLER: - - - study, and, particularly, the intersection effect on both River Road and on the Pacific Highway.

25

MR WRIGHTSON: Okay. Do you want the actual study as opposed to the slide, or - - -

MR MILLER: Well, I would be interested – is it the SIDRA - - -

30

MR WRIGHTSON: SIDRA model?

MR MILLER: I called it SIDRA first. Sorry.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes, yes. No. You're right. You're right. Yes.

MR MILLER: The SIDRA model effect would be – it would be very helpful to have.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: Okay.

MR MILLER: Both on River Road and on the west of Christie Street on the highway.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Okay. So – okay. We can give that to you.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR MILLER: Thank you.

MR WRIGHTSON: But its ultimate conclusion is it has a moderate impact.

5 MR MILLER: Right.

MR WRIGHTSON: Right. So the – we’re not talking about any increased
signalisation of Park – sorry – of Berry Road. But, essentially, the theory of these
precincts so close to the rail is that through the week, most people will be catching
10 public transport to and from work, and then on weekdays where, you know, the “road
network” is – these days, probably, weekends are becoming more like a peak day
because there’s just more people, but essentially the weekend would be when the
vehicles would come out, typically, in these precincts, as opposed to weekdays.

15 MR MILLER: It would be helpful to know sort of how many car parks and how
many cars you’re expecting in the – based on your standard modelling.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So we’ve used the St Leonards – this precinct was
adjusted to the RMS transit-orientated development standard.

20 MR MILLER: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So the State has already come out with what they think and
that’s what our parking rate is. It’s not less than theirs. It is what the State says
25 should occur in these situations – or the RMS guidelines, what they say.

MR MILLER: Sure.

MR WRIGHTSON: But we can certainly provide you the whole study.

30 MR MILLER: Thanks.

MR WRIGHTSON: Can I say to you it’s lots of diagrams that look like that with
lots of words and a model. So - - -

35 MR TERESCENKO: Yes. Just in regard to the traffic study, what we did – the
SIDRA model is more just intersection analysis, so it’s really confined - - -

MR MILLER: That was what I’m asking about.

40 MR TERESCENKO: - - - just to one intersection.

MR MILLER: Yes.

45 MR TERESCENKO: What we’ve also done is a more detailed model which is
Aimsun model which does a whole network analysis, so it actually looks into the

traffic that comes – you know, that’s already in the system and goes through multiple intersections, not just looking at the one individual intersection.

MR MILLER: I was – my question related to the SIDRA program.

5

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. We can get that to you.

MS MILLAR: Okay. And then in terms of the cumulative impact, how extensive does that go with other developments that are coming in and, you know, in either approved or constructed?

10

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. So the modelling that we did – basically, what we were trying to achieve was to work out what this precinct – what capacity it could handle. So we modelled to Greenwich Road, like, 5000 dwellings, and that – the system didn’t work without doing major upgrades on the Pacific Highway, which is obviously something the RMS doesn’t want to do. So then we modelled it down and we came back with the 2400 units was – could be accommodated in this area with having, as the report says, slight to moderate impacts on the network.

15

MR PELCZ: The rest.

20

MS MILLAR: But then did that model take into account, you know, the new developments that are going up.

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. So we’ve continually – as more developments have been – like, in our part of St Leonards when we’ve had those other – on the eastern side of the railway line, we’ve incorporated them into the model just to make sure that hasn’t had any - - -

25

MR PELCZ: And it takes into account Pacific Highway and Oxley Street and further up.

30

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. That’s what that Aimsun model is to do, so we can look at the whole precinct, not just the one individual intersection.

35

MR MASON: But that cumulative model that extends beyond our boundaries.

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. Correct. Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. It has some background calculations, but I’m not sure that our one took regard to St Leonards 2036 to the other side, and that’s what the strategic transport study said the RMS really should build that model to look at that, okay. But, as I say, even though that was an outcome, the RMS have – because we’ve obviously kept talking to them to say, “Well, you know, how big is ours compared to the rest?” They have subsequently said, “No. Look, we’re comfortable that yours is not going to be, you know, the bit that has a major impact,” and therefore they’ve raised no objections.

45

MR PELCZ: And this cumulative traffic study has been developed with the RMS since its inception.

MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.

5

MR PELCZ: So they - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: So just so you know how it works, you have to go and get your baselines, for want of a better word, approved by the RMS as being relevant for the model. So you go through that process. You do that. You then put in your impacts or your changes. It spews out an answer and - - -

10

MR TERESCENKO: Has to go back to the RMS for them to make sure that all the - - -

15

MR WRIGHTSON:

MR TERESCENKO: - - - coefficients and everything that they've used – so they have to approve every stage of the design – of the model.

20

MR PELCZ: Yes. Which they've done, haven't they?

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So that was 2015. 2018, the LEP exhibition itself – less submissions and really very few submissions actually now commented on the scheme itself. They were more just commenting on the fact that we think there's too much development or there's – the impacts of having development, I guess. So the – any comments that were made in relation to the actual documents, we did actually have a further, I think we mentioned earlier, design review panel that have considered those and ultimately council will consider any suggestions they've made. But it's really a further refinement of those issues.

30

So at that exhibition, we didn't get any issues raised by the infrastructure agencies that weren't basically incorporated already. And we then had in 2018 as part of St Leonards 2036 an independent workshop and essentially the main points that were raised were the same. And so that wasn't meant to be about this particular precinct but there were a number of comments passed. But essentially they were the same comments around the issues that are up there, open space, density, parking, traffic, etcetera.

35

40

MR MILLER: Just while you're on that item, you've particularly mentioned schools. Can you say anything about the impact on school infrastructure.

MR WRIGHTSON: Sure. So I will just actually - - -

45

MR MILLER: And you might add hospitals along with that, as well.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Well, okay.

MR PELCZ: Was someone from council at the public meeting that we held the other day? Okay.

5 MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR MILLER: All right. Okay. So you heard - - -

10 MR: So you're across the issues.

MR MILLER: - - - the range of views.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Yes. So in terms of the schools, so during – in 2012, we had an inquiry by design exercise invited all the government agencies. And, essentially, we were trying to engage with the Department of Ed to, you know, choose a location for a school in the precinct if they needed one.

15 MR PELCZ: Sorry, Craig. That was 2014.

20 MR WRIGHTSON: 2014. Sorry. And at that stage, they didn't select a site and so we progressed on the basis that we needed to continue to lobby for increased school capacity. So the priority for funding of schools essentially appears to be like a sort of just in time model rather than a, you know, build it way in advance. So we've seen that, for example, in the Mowbray precinct where, you know, probably 50 per cent of the units that were being built there were built before the school got upgraded, but it has been upgraded and it has got more capacity than, you know, what it needed for the particular moment it was built. So that – the Department of Ed responded appropriately.

25 30 So in this situation, the advice we have received is that the Department is fully aware of the scale of what is proposed at St Leonards, that their planning is in place to deal with that. They have obviously done some initial thoughts around expanding Greenwich Primary School, so there has been a DA recently approved and there's

35 - - -

MR PELCZ: It's currently under construction.

MR WRIGHTSON: Currently under construction a multi-level primary school building, so vertical building.

40 MR MILLER: We understand it's a pretty constrained site, though. They've got two campuses and they're both constrained.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes, but they are increasing – they've had a lot of demountables and they're basically bringing those to - - -

MR MILLER: Yes. I understand.

MR PELCZ: And they've increased the student capacity, as well, with that DA.

5 MR TERESCENKO: Student capacity and also teacher capacity, as well, at both sites. At both sites.

MR WRIGHTSON: So the reality of it is, though – is we would believe that another site is required. We've tried to offer to the Department in the early days, "Did you want it to be in our precinct?" They declined that opportunity. But the Department is saying that they support our plans and it's consistent with what they're doing, so we're not, obviously, privy to all the detailed planning that's going on in the Department of Ed, but they are supporting our scheme and they haven't raised an issue with density or access to education facilities.

15 MR MASON: Just on that, Craig, in our discussions with representatives of the Department of Education, they are exploring a number of their own options which include the TAFE on the other side of the Pacific Highway and options for upgrading and including other lands in that area, as well. So they're fully aware and they've –
20 of our issues.

MR MILLER: Speaking quietly is to be encouraged but not by the people who have to do the recording, so - - -

25 MR: Talk into the microphone.

MR MASON: Sorry.

MR PELCZ: So just in terms of the Royal North Shore, we did get comments from the Royal North Shore in 2015 when we were doing the master plan. Those comments are included in the actual planning proposal document. And, from memory, what they said was they had – they just wanted the master plan to take into account the traffic impacts and the impacts or potential impacts on their helicopter flight path. That was the comments that we received back in 2015 and we haven't
35 really heard any other comments back as of yet apart from health promotion.

MR WRIGHTSON: So the traffic modelling doesn't change the phasing on Berry Road, so the traffic impact is – there's no changes to what there is now. So if there's more background traffic, well, that could be an issue. That may cause whatever issue for the hospital, but the precinct coming out onto the highway is constrained by – there's no changes to the phasing. So basically because the RMS will always want the movement corridor to move and get prioritisation. So we're not expecting that they will change anything. It will just be the same, as where in Oxley Street at the other end, they've introduced what they call scats. I will just show you Oxley Street.
45 Where this precinct comes out here - - -

MR MILLER: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So again, you've got the rail line. It's totally constrained. Here there is an intersection upgrade to smarter responsive traffic signals to try and cope with the scale that's in the precinct, but that wasn't deemed necessary for this particular precinct.

5 MR MILLER: Thank you.

MR P. COCHRANE: Intuitively, it's hard to see no change to the Berry Road intersection when you're moving from essentially something like 500 residents to 10 5000, even if they mostly use rail. At some point people are going to – there's going to be an increase in cars – traffic.

MR WRIGHTSON: There may be an increase in queuing time - - -

15 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - for the locals.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

20 MR WRIGHTSON: And I think it was indicated a couple of minutes may be the increase in what that queuing time is likely to be.

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. There would definitely be queuing at the intersection of 25 Berry Road to get out of the precinct.

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Increased queuing.

MR TERESCENKO: Yes.

30 MR COCHRANE: Because people are complaining about queuing now.

MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.

35 MR TERESCENKO: But the effect on the overall RMS network is moderate – negligible, basically.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. I think the background levels of traffic in this precinct are slightly overstated sometimes.

40 MR COCHRANE: Right.

MR WRIGHTSON: The reality of it is, is that it is fairly low-scale development in there.

45 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

- MR WRIGHTSON: To have a set of traffic signals for what is basically three streets - - -
- MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- 5 MR WRIGHTSON: You know, that's unusual. It's really the opportunity to turn right that's – you know, that's available there, because it's not available in any of the other streets.
- 10 MR MASON: And one of the interesting points at the moment, because there is so much construction going on, and a lot of the parking – on-street parking that's happening at the moment isn't by locals.
- MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- 15 MR MASON: It's actually by workers.
- MR MILLER: Yes.
- 20 MR MASON: So – and we have issues about trying to control that.
- MR MILLER: And you've got timed parking in there now too, haven't you?
- MR WRIGHTSON: Correct. So they – also used by people visiting these medical centres. So this particular site here has a 300-space public car park going into it, so it will provide basically parking for that strip.
- 25 MR COCHRANE: That's the - - -
- 30 MR MILLER: Is that the big – sorry. Peter, you first.
- MR COCHRANE: That's the big excavation as - - -
- MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.
- 35 MR COCHRANE: At the north end of that, isn't it?
- MR MASON: Yes.
- 40 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So this site here – so we look at access to this precinct. You will be able to come up on to the plaza here. You will be able to walk here, go under the – sorry – under – through to the Forum and the railway station. This particular development also has a provision if it comes off where it can cross under the road here. It has the library down at that level, so as an attractor, and then
- 45 underneath that is a full-line supermarket, and then underneath that is a 300-space car park. So - - -

MR COCHRANE: For the transcript, we should say that's the Winten site.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Now known as the JQZ site.

MR PELCZ: And the - - -

MR COCHRANE: JQZ?

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. He's the developer that purchased it is actually doing the development.

MR MILLER: And while we're doing that, can we go to the building – the big square building that's being built at the moment. Is that the Leighton site?

15 MR WRIGHTSON: Leighton site, now Mirvac.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

20 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MILLER: Now, the - - -

25 MR WRIGHTSON: So these sites were selected because of what was Friedlander Place. So Friedlander Place was a closed road for many years ago. It only went to about probably 60 to 70 per cent of the depth of the site, and so the development that are underway at the moment are required to reconstruct at full length, so we end up with about 50 per cent more open space there, and it has playgrounds in it and things, so it – before it was a pebble creek sort of landscape piece. Now it's actually open space. And then the Leighton's/Mirvac site, if you've seen it, opens up the mouth of that space by having the front building offset to the south, and so we end up with more frontage of that open space, and then they have a plaza between their two buildings. So we've more than doubled the open space that's there. And we've also

30 – this building had a right of way over - - -

35 MR MILLER: You're talking about the Charter Hall building?

MS MILLAR: Charter Hall.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: The Charter Hall. Yes.

MR COCHRANE: Is that the – what's called Landmark?

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. That's not Charter Hall any more either.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: That had a right of way to pass back to this site. So essentially
what we've created is a – this is a – the existing laneway that's trafficable at the
moment will be turned into pedestrian only. You will be able to walk through here,
walk mid-block through here, pass this, fully accessible. There's a lift, stairs here, up
10 onto Friedlander, come through the gap between the two Mirvac buildings. There's a
gap there so that we can keep moving towards, ironically, the Crows Nest - - -

MS MILLAR: Metro.

15 MR WRIGHTSON: - - - Metro, which was never even in our minds when this was
designed. This was really trying to orientate future development away from the
Pacific Highway because it has got low amenity and it has very narrow footpaths,
and there's not a place for pedestrians, really.

20 MR PELCZ: Yes. And we should also point out that all of those sites were required
to provide commercial and retail floor space in their site. The Winten site, now the
JQZ site, is actually going to – or – and has been approved for construction of a
19,000 square metre A-grade office space, and that's a standalone commercial office
space, which is actually about 3000 square metres in excess of what it could have
25 under the planning controls, so where that will achieve the North District Plan's high
jobs target, and the same is true with the Charter Hall and the Leighton's site.
They're providing commercial and retail floor space in excess of what's allowed
under the current control, so the amount of commercial development that has been
stimulated because of this has gone far in excess of what we thought it would.

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. The original scheme.

MR MASON: Essentially, what you had, you had the commercial podium up to
about five or six levels, and then from there, the residential goes up above. But down
35 at the street level, in order to encourage pedestrian – easier pedestrian movement
along there, all the ground floors have been set back with a colonnade so that people
can stretch out a little bit more and the capacity of people who - - -

40 MR PELCZ: And just on that – sorry, Craig. Could we just speak to that for one
more?

MR WRIGHTSON: Sorry.

45 MR PELCZ: Just behind the Winten site is what is called the MasterCard site.
MasterCard moved into an existing commercial building. They didn't have to do any
upgrades, but that's the MasterCard tech hub, which, as we understand, is one of
only five in the world, so it has already attracted world class commercial tenants to
St Leonards.

MR MILLER: With the Winten site, JQZ, what's the overall height of that now, all stories?

MR TERESCENKO: 47.

5 MR MILLER: 47 storeys?

MR PELCZ: And it's tall.

10 MR MASON: There are three towers and the 47 would be the highest.

MR MILLER: Three towers?

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So the commercial I think is 13 or 14 stories.

15 MR MILLER: Yes.

MR TERESCENKO: It's 16.

20 MR PELCZ: 16.

MR WRIGHTSON: 16 storeys at the front, fronting the Pacific Highway. Then you've got sort of an eastern tower that's about 40-odd, and then the western tower is about 29, something like that.

25 MS MILLAR: And were those developments at that scale incorporated in the overshadowing modelling that you prepared?

MR PELCZ: Yes.

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: So if you look – you can see the grey shadow.

MS MILLAR: Okay. That's it.

MR WRIGHTSON: No, these ones, isn't it, Chris?

40 MR PELCZ: Yes, the big ones.

MS MILLAR: The big ones.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: The big blue ones.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

5 MR MILLER: That one two the north-west would be from the Embassy Tower, would it? Is that the Embassy Tower that's on the - - -

MS MILLAR: Corner?

10 MR MILLER: - - - east side of the - - -

MR PELCZ: The north-west – sorry; the north-east.

MR MILLER: North-east.

15

MR PELCZ: Yes. It would be the Embassy, yes.

MR MILLER: Which is purely residential I think, isn't it?

20 MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.

MR MILLER: Looks like a purely residential - - -

MR PELCZ: No. The Embassy Tower has got some commercial - - -

25

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. It has got a couple of - - -

MR MILLER: Has it?

30 MR PELCZ: The first three levels.

MR MILLER: Just the first level or two.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

35

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So interestingly, the planning scheme there didn't achieve the outcome it designed. It was originally envisaged for north-south developments, so
40 one, two, three, sort of thing, but, in fact, it turned out to be residential only at the back and the commercial left at the front.

45 So, to be honest with you, we more actively engaged here to control the outcomes, because we didn't want to see that result again, and we needed to – what – all our research shows that the A-grade office space in St Leonards goes well. It's just – the trouble is it has got a glut of low-quality office space that's "not viable" to be renewed. You know, that's what people tell you.

5 So what we've done is try to stimulate A-grade office space, because we know that works. That then generates jobs, and by fixing the amenity, we can obviously drive jobs in St Leonards, but also, in fixing the amenity, we create this opportunity for open – for the residents to utilise, and I guess the – we will talk about – it's probably a good segue now just to talk about the staging – sorry – the housing targets and all the rest of - - -

MS MILLAR: I was going to ask that next.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Because you mentioned - - -

15 MR WRIGHTSON: So, look, the thing is, is that the – Lane Cove, for whatever reason, is being targeted for significant growth in percentage terms, almost the same as Ryde. You hear about Ryde in the media all the time, but in actual fact, our – in percentage terms, ours is high as theirs, almost. So what we've done the first round, you know, the Mowbray – what we call the Mowbray precinct took a lot of the heavy lifting in terms of scale of developments, and, you know, after that one was going
20 through, council looked to the St Leonards precinct.

So in terms of meeting targets and things, obviously it's a 20-year target. You know, the recent property boom mean that targets got met quite quickly, but essentially, what we're doing is planning for that sort of 10 years plus period, and what we were
25 particular concerned about, though, is if we did deliver that kind of capacity, we wanted to make sure that we didn't get just our target extended because we had that capacity, so the GSC have written to us and confirmed, "Look, if you do, you know, your six to 10-year target and beyond, we will allow you to count that in your achievement of your target. It's not 'additional.'"
30

And so essentially, the work we're doing is our housing strategy. We're not planning to rezone any other R4 in our LGA in order to achieve our housing target. If we're – do a review of medium density, etcetera, that's fine, but obviously the
35 medium density doesn't deliver on numbers. You would have to do a lot of medium density in terms of land area to deliver on these significant targets that council has been faced with. So, essentially, the transit orientated development theme comes through in a lot of the documents that the government has put out, so Metropolis of Three Cities talks about we're required to have a housing supply beyond 10 years and it should be in proximity to transport interchanges and strategic and local
40 centres. Well, St Leonards meets all those things. Similarly, in the North District Plan, you know, provide access to jobs by creating residential within walking distance. So - - -

45 MR PELCZ: Strategic centres.

MR WRIGHTSON: Of strategic centres. So the location is 100 per cent as per, you know, the strategic documents. In terms of the scale, as I say, the reality of it is that

our targets are quite substantial and the – we see this as being, you know, as a minimum, our 10-year – meet our future 10-year target when it's finally announced, but – and even beyond.

5 MR PELCZ: And it's also consistent with a number of other different actions in the North District Plan, as well. That's just one we picked.

MR WRIGHTSON: So in terms of the potential for staging – so we did originally look at staging. The difficulty is the EP&A Act doesn't have a time release
10 mechanism in it, so when people say, well, they want to understand certainty, etcetera, as to when things will happen, the EP&A Act doesn't say you can have an LEP that says this is released - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes.
15

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - in years nought to five and then six to 10. So that makes it difficult to do staged development. The only thing you can do is have a master plan and then say as time goes on, we will do separate LEPs. In terms of staging, as mentioned before, we did look at the original 2015. There was a thought to stop it at
20 Berry. The council made the decision to extend it. The – as I say, since that has occurred, the new large park has been added which buffers the heritage items. We were able to use Berry Lane as – to increase setbacks. So it has actually got some merit in terms of the – that, particularly boundary.

25 But, of course, yes, because they're in a sort of – along Holdsworth or Berry, you could draw a line down those roads. I don't think it makes any sense to do it the other way and go – because if you put the height at the top of the hill, it's just going to overshadow everyone down the bottom, so that's not going to work, and it doesn't make sense to leave low scale closer to the station and go down the bottom of the hill
30 and start building development.

So it doesn't really work that way. It would have to be, you know, separating it from east to west, and essentially there's merit where it has landed at this point. The other thing about it is building a park doesn't – or get – acquiring a park doesn't come
35 cheap. I mean, under the Just Terms Compensation Act, we've got to pay as if it was R4 even though it was R2, so the park – just scrolling with our mouse. I will just – so the park is \$30 million of land acquisition.

MR PELCZ: Just land acquisition.
40

MR WRIGHTSON: So if you look at the ability of the precinct to generate that amount of money – and the fact is that we're looking at a precinct section 94 or section 7.11 plan that's with a contribution that's greater than the proposed SIC to generate that amount of open space, and obviously the smaller number of dwellings
45 that contribute to that acquisition, the more expensive that particular levy has got to get, bringing, you know, issues into play there. So the SIC is supposed to be district

grade spaces, and, of course, none of these meet that criteria. These are all precinct-focused - - -

MR PELCZ: Or local.

5

MR WRIGHTSON: Or local, yes, amenity issues. So I think the difficulty is when people say they want more open space in an urban space, that's quite a difficult outcome, which is why, you know, the largest acquisition of open space is this St Leonards 2036 is this, and that's because we're doing a specific section 7.11 plan for it. So that's the difficulty in staging it, is it puts at risk the park just from a funding perspective, and even in terms of the SIC, the SIC itself doesn't really help Lane Cove Local Government Area. Less than 10 per cent of the money is going to the Lane Cove Local Government Area, so hence we've sought an exemption from the SIC because we're saying, well, it doesn't actually contribute much to our area. Your own studies say you're not – don't need to do much in our area because our own scheme deals with the issues, hence we've sought an exemption from that SIC.

20 So – yes, so just getting back to the staging issue, I guess we've seen it in the Mowbray Precinct, the longer things take to happen, the more disruption there is, you know, with rock picking – all sorts of disruptions for those surrounding residents. And that's the other issue to consider, is, you know, if we – depending on how granular the staging, you, in theory, increase the impact to those around.

25 MR TERESCENKO: Sorry. Just on that, in the 2036 plan, the perimeter of the precinct extends back out to Greenwich Road, so once – this is what we would call our staging. If there was a need to consider staging between Park and Canberra, we would suggest that that would occur after, say, the 2026 plan is envisaged.

30 MR PELCZ: Sorry. So the 2026 is the 10-year period in the district - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

35 MR PELCZ: - - - plan, and 2024 is obviously when the Metro comes online in Crows Nest, so that's what Michael is saying.

MR WRIGHTSON: And we dealt with the SIC.

40 MR PELCZ: Sorry. Just before you move on to this, we also made another point with the SIC. We lodged our planning proposal - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

45 MR PELCZ: - - - in May of 2016, and, of course, it was announced that this area was going to be a strategic planning investigation area and consider a SIC in July of 2016.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes, so it's actually post, so it would be a retrospective application of the SIC is our position.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

5

MR WRIGHTSON: I'm not sure if you – to be honest with you, the main points addressing the agenda – we've got a couple of other points, if you would like us just to quickly take through, just to understand this incentive zoning concept we've got, which is really to focus everyone's attention onto the settlement pattern that's required. I think we saw in one of your transcripts trying to understand that two and a-half metre height restriction, for example. So, really, to – the way this works is every – the precinct would get its R4 zoning, but you get no – you don't get your FSR unless you comply with the requirements of council for the settlement pattern for the compliance with the landscape master plan or delivering the public infrastructure.

15

So, really, it's trying to provide – because we've done a lot of more granular planning than a typical rezoning, it's just a way of trying to enforce people complying with that and not dreaming up their own schemes, which may be slightly better for them but actually impact on the rest of the precinct. So yes, they are two and a-half metre high height controls, and essentially what that does is keep everybody focused on the building alignments that are required to achieve the outcomes.

20

MR PELCZ: And prevent development from things on our pocket parks you see up the top and our east-west connections in the middle. There's our road in Berry to Park Road and then the bottom east-west connection is here. They're also 2.5. And the main thing, as well – it protects the green spines from having any type of development in it at all, apart from what we specified in our landscape master plan.

30

MR WRIGHTSON: Which is also, as Chris mentioned earlier, the reason for the removal of the 4.6 clause, so you can't make an argument that you – your particular site ends up better off. You need to have regard to the outcomes that the whole precinct is trying to achieve.

35

MR PELCZ: And ensure - - -

MR MILLER: Just before you leave that slide, just to clarify, the A areas - - -

40

MR PELCZ: Sorry. Sorry.

MR MILLER: Areas that are designated A are – are they all private open space?

MR PELCZ: They're not all private open space.

45

MR MILLER: All right.

MR PELCZ: The communal green spines north-south will be the private ones.

MR MILLER: Yes.

5 MR PELCZ: The east-west ones are intended to be public as well as - - -

MR MILLER: Yes.

MR PELCZ: - - - the pocket parks.

10 MS MILLAR: In the corner.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So – so don't forget this is the height map, so it's - - -

15 MR MILLER: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: A is 2.5 is what I was trying to say.

MR MILLER: Yes.

20 MR WRIGHTSON: So imagine a line across here. This is public but this is communal private.

MR MILLER: Right.

25 MR WRIGHTSON: This is public. This is communal private. This is public.

MR MASON: And the 2.5 would allow ancillary-type uses, whether they be cabanas or, you know, that type of facility, as well.

30 MR MILLER: I see.

MS MILLAR: So that, you know, barbecue, shading - - -

35 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MASON: Correct. Exactly.

MR PELCZ: And also, too, the landscape master plan shows where the secure entry points will be for the green spines as well as for the other properties, as well. But the east-west connections are – well, are intended to be public.

40 MR MILLER: And are the unfenced? Is that the intention?

45 MR PELCZ: The - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: The private?

- MR MILLER: No. The east-west links.
- MR MASON: No, no. They would be accessible to the public 24/7.
- 5 MR TERESCENKO: The east - - -
- MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So there obviously is a fence here. There's a fence here to stop you getting into the private domain, but obviously you can walk all the way through there.
- 10 MR TERESCENKO: Yes. They're basically laneways to get access through the precinct.
- MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. They're 16 metres wide, so they're not - - -
- 15 MR PELCZ: 15.
- MR WRIGHTSON: 15 metres wide. Yes. So they're not trivial in terms of being, I guess, naturally feeling secure in them because they're not, you know, an old-school lane that's, what, three metres wide at best. This is a boulevard almost.
- 20 MS MILLAR: And then - - -
- MR COCHRANE: The lower ones, though, are pretty narrow.
- 25 MR WRIGHTSON: They are.
- MR PELCZ: Yes. They're six metres.
- 30 MR WRIGHTSON: They're six metres.
- MR PELCZ: Yes.
- MR WRIGHTSON: But, even so, that's wider than a traditional pedestrian lane.
- 35 MR MASON: We do have an example of one that has been constructed just recently in our CBD area where there is a right of way that extends, again, west to east where there's a public right of way for the public to use, but that's in a communal open space area, as well.
- 40 MS MILLAR: And then will this facilitate or permit active uses on the ground levels of those buildings across the – those transitways, for example, cafes or other facilities for - - -
- 45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So as you come across – so obviously the park is over here. So you will be able to walk through the park. The child care centres – I think that's one child care centre, isn't it, Chris?

MR PELCZ: That's one there. It is.

MR WRIGHTSON: If they want to have, you know, a coffee – coffee shops and things are in the plan, as well. I can't remember exactly the location of those, but
5 ---

MR PELCZ: DCP.

MR WRIGHTSON: The R4 permits a coffee shop. So, essentially, this will be, I
10 guess, a pedestrian-focused community, you know, focus point, really, because you've got a lot of amenity along there: access to two parks, access to two community centres, two child care centres, your café, etcetera. So – and, as I say, the scale of it is not small; it's 16 metres. It's basically the width of a road reserve, really, but it hasn't got cars.

15 MR MILLER: So while ---

MR PELCZ: And the supermarket will be in the JQZ site, as we mentioned earlier.

20 MR MILLER: So while we're on this, the park on the left-hand side ---

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MILLER: --- that has a laneway through the middle of it, doesn't it?
25

MR PELCZ: Currently, it does.

MR MILLER: And that's intended to be closed?

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MILLER: Because it didn't look as if it was intended to be closed on your other plans.

35 MS MILLAR: So is that – that then moves to the road frontage on Berry Road?

MR WRIGHTSON: Correct. Correct.

MS MILLAR: That's the ---
40

MR: Park Road.

MS MILLAR: Park Road. Sorry. Park Road.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Park Road. Yes. So if we just go back to ---

MR MILLER: Thank you for clarifying that.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So you can see the lane is there.

MR MILLER: Yes.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: But now it's not because it's part of the 24 metre separation. And that's because that width has been transferred to the front. See how there's a narrower set-back on the – on buildings typically, but that's extra-wide.

MR MILLER: Thank you.

10

MR WRIGHTSON: And that's because we make use of that laneway in that – for that set-back.

MR MILLER: Thanks.

15

MR COCHRANE: And the – below the large park, there's an east-west corridor there which isn't in sort of pale green park. What's - - -

MR PELCZ: That's the road.

20

MR WRIGHTSON: That is a road. So what that allows is the – obviously, this activity to get – come through and back and out.

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Yes.

25

MR PELCZ: That's 12 metres wide.

MR TERESCENKO: As part of the traffic modelling, one of the recommendations was that we needed to get an east-west link from Park Road to Berry Road.

30

MR COCHRANE: Okay. Yes.

MR TERESCENKO: And – yes, so that's what that - - -

35

MR PELCZ: Yes. A vehicular one.

MR COCHRANE: Okay.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: Look, the other thing is just information if you needed it. I'm not sure if you're key worker housing, but essentially the – it's towards the top of the precinct where the additional height has been provided so that in return they deliver key worker housing.

45 MR PELCZ: Yes. And that's consistent with action 29(d) of the District Plan where it states that in health and education precincts they will create residential development for students and workers within 30 minutes of the precinct, which – St Leonards is a health and education precinct, so - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: I think that's - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay. No. Thank you very much for that. That has been very helpful. Now, Russell, Peter, would you like to – one of you like to kick off with questions?
5

MR COCHRANE: After you.

MR MILLER: Well, I was actually going to go to the shadowing slides – not your slides; our slides, actually.
10

MR WRIGHTSON: Okay.

MR MILLER: Just to get your comment on the shadowing slides. I don't know that they're ours. I think they're - - -
15

MS MILLAR: I think it's the Department of Planning's model.

MR MILLER: - - - the department's. Yes.
20

MR WRIGHTSON: 2036.

MR PELCZ: Right. Okay.

MR MILLER: Just run through them and get your comment on them. As we go, can you tell us what time of day we're dealing with.
25

MR M. TODD-JONES: So that's 9 am.

MR MASON: Are they existing buildings or proposed?
30

MS MILLAR: So my understanding is that the legend is the purple was additional overshadowing coming from the St Leonards South precinct and then the grey – as the grey is existing or the lighter purple is existing.
35

MR WRIGHTSON: I should point out we haven't been ever provided with these.

MR PELCZ: No, we haven't.

MR WRIGHTSON: So - - -
40

MR MILLER: Well, it may be that it would be useful to provide them to you and for you to have a look at them and give us some comments.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. I mean, when I'm just looking at the built form that they've got there, I can see they're similar but they haven't got the fine-tuning. I'm just looking at some of the set-backs that are there. They're slightly different. So
45

I'm not sure how – how aligned that particular built form is, but – so they're saying it crosses River Road, obviously, is the main difference in that slide.

MR MILLER: Yes. And - - -

5

MR PELCZ: Okay. So they've included the overshadowing from the significant sites, as well.

MR WRIGHTSON: But they wouldn't stretch down that far.

10

MR MILLER: They're not in – they're not in blue.

MR PELCZ: Right. Okay.

15

MR WRIGHTSON: So can we see the next slide. Does it stop - - -

MR MILLER: For the sake of – run through them and just - - -

MR COCHRANE: Can you do it the way you were doing it.

20

MR TODD-JONES: Yes. I'm trying to find how I did that.

MS MILLAR: Perhaps if you go to full screen.

25

MR WRIGHTSON: The next slide sort of thing.

MS MILLAR: Is that a different view? It might be - - -

MR MILLER: Full screen mode.

30

MR TODD-JONES: Read mode – full screen mode down the bottom.

MR MILLER: Full screen mode down the bottom.

35

MS MILLAR: You're on two-page view. That's why. There we go.

MR WRIGHTSON: Okay.

MR TODD-JONES: There we go.

40

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MILLER: That's it.

45

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR MILLER: So just give us the times as you run through, Matt.

MR TODD-JONES: So 9 am, 9.30, 10, 10.30, 11, 11.30, 12, 12.30, 1, 1.30, 2, 2.30.

MR MILLER: You can see it's starting to come across – significantly across the park.

5

MR TODD-JONES: 3, 3.30, 4.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So – so the thing is that – well, the south side of River Road is just that early piece theirs is slightly different to ours, but theirs pulls back, I noticed, as it transitioned through the slides. So in terms of the solar access there, it's really only for one or two hours different. But, as I say, I'm not too sure the built form is identical to ours. It just looks different. But, yes, well, look, the overshadowing of – can we just go back to - - -

15 MR COCHRANE: 3.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - three. Yes. So that's 3. And then 2. Yes. So that's not that different to our shadow profile at 2. And that would be the tree line, you know, so, really, we're talking about whether up until 3 o'clock there was really – so that's at 2. So the difference seems to be between 2 and 3 that it has landed slightly different.

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Yes.

25 MR WRIGHTSON: They're saying the shadow is further.

MR: Do you know what contouring tools they were using?

MR COCHRANE: One of those design principles is no additional overshadowing.

30

MR: question to see what they've used.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. The length of the - - -

35 MR MILLER: Well, perhaps the best thing is to provide that, and then any further questions once you've had a look at it can be - - -

MS MILLAR: If you could perhaps provide some comments back on that.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: What's interesting - - -

MS MILLAR: And we will try and find out the profiles.

MR WRIGHTSON: Sure.

45

MS MILLAR: Just on that point, in terms of the modelling that you've done with the shadow diagrams, they're to the exact contours of the site?

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

5 MR PELCZ: Well, it does say in the urban design report with the solar amenity there that built form controls have considered overshadowing of critical open spaces and surrounding low density areas, ensuring future envelopes to not result in additional significant impact within the time periods identified below.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So I suppose the difference is whether it's talking about any or significant. Yes.

MR MILLER: Anyway, we could get your comments, that - - -

15 MR WRIGHTSON: Sure.

MR MASON: Yes. And we would be happy to give those. But the issue about south of River Road, council is very particular about that, and where you get a shadow that walks up a vertical wall, we use the fence line, which is 1.5 – it can get
20 up to 1.8, but I think we use 1.5 as the maximum, so it could crawl up that fence line a little, but - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: It's really only - - -

25 MR MASON: - - - that's as far as it goes.

MR WRIGHTSON: The main difference was – is the 9 o'clock on River Road and the 3 o'clock on the north. Anyway, happy with that.

30 MR MILLER: My second question went to the traffic and the SIDRA report. I've got some miscellaneous questions, but perhaps we could pass to others before we deal with them.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Peter?

35

MR MILLER: Peter?

MR COCHRANE: Okay. Well, one question on the shadowing was the extent to which any of these diagrams include the final heights of the buildings that are
40 currently being constructed. I'm assuming they do, but - - -

MR PELCZ: This model - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: And they do, yes.

45

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR COCHRANE: So particularly the Charter Hall and then at the loft - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: We can see that in Newlands Park - - -

5 MR MASON: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - at 9 am there, see?

MR PELCZ: Yes.

10 MR COCHRANE: Okay.

MR WRIGHTSON: See how it's over the word "park"?

15 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So - - -

20 MR COCHRANE: Okay.

MR MASON: One thing we hadn't modelled at the significant sites that have been identified by the department - - -

25 MR COCHRANE: Right.

MR MASON: - - - as well, because they - - -

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Their model might have it, though. I don't know.

MR PELCZ: Yes. That's why I said earlier it looks as though they've got it in where the Telstra site is and opposite Oxley Street where the Metro is.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: Need more colours in the shadows, don't we - - -

MR PELCZ: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: - - - to work out what building is doing what.

MR COCHRANE: Which is which. Yes. Okay. One issue that was raised a lot in the public meeting was the double counting in green space when you – for each

45 development, they seem to use the same green space to count towards the green space requirements.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Can we just walk back?

MR COCHRANE: And I think you've partly answered that by the overall total.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: I was going to say, that table – yes.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Well, I was going to say, the table we're showing
10 is greater than the other planned precincts.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: Then we add the – got the existing in.
15

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So it – we're not relying on space that's existing - - -

20 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - to achieve the outcome. As I say, the largest contribution to open space is us at 73 per cent of the new open space.

25 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MS MILLAR: But going back to the calculations of the open space and the – you know, open space per 1000 persons - - -

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Sure.

MS MILLAR: Are there any, you know, standard metrics that are used from a planning perspective before, you know, benchmarking how much open space there should be?
35

MR PELCZ: Well, we took our cues from the Department of Planning's Recreation and Open Space Planning Guidelines. That informed pretty much all of what you see there, so that's where we primarily took it from, and it's available on their website.

40 MR WRIGHTSON: I think you raised that question with the department as well and they referred - - -

MS MILLAR: We did, and they talked - - -

45 MR WRIGHTSON: - - - back to a very old standard, and said - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - talked about that standard.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - that standard is not applicable.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

5 MR WRIGHTSON: So – yes. Really, the hard quantity number standard doesn't really exist any more.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Those guidelines – we followed those guidelines and, as I say, we've ended up with a much higher scale.

MR COCHRANE: So the financial viability of this to developers does depend on those space ratios, and what's the likelihood of those being tested when you come to
15 each development?

MR WRIGHTSON: So by removing the clause 4.6 variation clause out of the LEP, there's very limited ability to do anything, because you can't say I'm getting a better
20 planning outcome by – even though I'm increasing density, for example.

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: So we've – the way the rest of St Leonards – let's call it St
25 Leonards East for a sec, which is obviously those pilot projects. The way they were controlled was using a VPA that related to the individual site, which traded various things in return for public benefits. Now, that's great doing it if you've got three or four sites, but if you've got multiple sites, it's just too hard to negotiate individually. So the idea of this scheme is – it's like the incentive map scheme is really designed to deliver the same outcome, though.
30

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: If you do what the plan requires of you, you get this bonus.

35 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: It's actually your base, really.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

40

MR WRIGHTSON: If you don't, you don't get anything.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

45 MR WRIGHTSON: So you've got a fairly heavy stick there to get compliance, and I think we don't want to see non-compliances, and we're aware that two planning proposals are floating around. We should point out that council has resolved now to

reject those two, because they were different schemes, and essentially, as I mentioned earlier, what may be good for one developer in their mind is going to have impacts on the rest of the scheme. So we – if you’ve got a master plan, we will stick to the master plan, is our first priority.

5

MR MASON: Also the point I would add is my understanding of the two proposals that were seeking amendments to footprints and things like that, they weren’t talking – or they weren’t asking for amendments to either height or the façade. They endorsed those, and I think that sort of indicates that from an economic viewpoint, they consider that it’s acceptable.

10

MR COCHRANE: The other thing – and I had raised this before and you’ve answered it – I think you’ve answered it – but there’s the drainage question, because obviously Newlands Park isn’t on a creek line. The land all – slopes on all sides to it, quite steeply, so in - - -

15

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR COCHRANE: - - - heavy rainfall events – and we saw pictures – someone showed us a picture of flooding on River Road, which was fairly substantial.

20

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. Just recently we had – earlier this year there was like a one in 10 year storm, so - - -

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

25

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. The drains blocked, and there was – there was some overland flow across the street there.

MR COCHRANE: Yes. Yes.

30

MR TERESCENKO: Yes. So we will be – we will be upgrading the stormwater system.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

35

MR TERESCENKO: Because, as Craig said earlier, there’s literally no stormwater in this precinct at all.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

40

MR TERESCENKO: So that will be all upgraded, but the – our main emphasis is to do the water sensitive urban design to try and clean - - -

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

45

- MR TERESCENKO: - - - the water as much as possible and to reduce it, trying to get – infiltrate it back into the ground.
- 5 MR COCHRANE: Yes. So the relative proportion of hard surfaces to kind of permeable surfaces will be important too, you say.
- MR TERESCENKO: Correct. Yes.
- 10 MR COCHRANE: Looking at some of the other developments around the area, it's certainly well on the Pacific Highway. Most of those open spaces are all hard surfaces.
- MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.
- 15 MR COCHRANE: Or sort of AstroTurf, which - - -
- MR PELCZ: Yes. We've got provision in our landscape master plan for a 40 per cent hard surfaces and 60 per cent soft. We also have permeable paving in there as another measure.
- 20 MR WRIGHTSON: Which is almost a residential scale of permeability.
- MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- 25 MR WRIGHTSON: But you're right. On the other side, that sort of – let's call it public domain – is very hard stand.
- MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- 30 MR WRIGHTSON: But the other thing too, of course, is on-site detention means that peak flows are smoothed out as well.
- MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- 35 MR WRIGHTSON: And, of course, these unit blocks will have large on-site detention.
- MR MASON: Not only on-site detention, they will also have a reuse of rainwater as well for their landscaping purposes as well.
- 40 MR COCHRANE: Yes. Okay. I think you've probably answered all the other questions I had, other than the road ones and whether the River Road intersection – whether or not the intersection – that curve – that bend is already quite a significant impediment, I guess, to free flow of traffic, isn't it? Why would RMS not use the
- 45 opportunity to try to make that more efficient, and people pay for it?

- MR WRIGHTSON: I – they did in the St Leonards 2036 talk about a crossing for their harbour to harbour link or whatever it was called, water to water link, so it is a bit of a tricky spot, I think. Obviously the camber is a bit unusual, and the ridge and everything else, but – yes.
- 5 MR COCHRANE: A number of people raised the issue of the school – the predominant primary school is on the other side of River Road, so the pedestrian traffic, at least parents with children, is actually across River Road, so - - -
- 10 MR MASON: Greenwich Public School.
- MR COCHRANE: Greenwich Public Primary School.
- MR TERESCENKO: Across Greenwich Road?
- 15 MR COCHRANE: Sorry. Across River Road to get to Greenwich Primary School.
- MR WRIGHTSON: Greenwich School.
- 20 MR TERESCENKO: The infant school.
- MR COCHRANE: That’s right
- MR TERESCENKO: Down the bottom.
- 25 MR COCHRANE: Yes.
- MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.
- 30 MR TERESCENKO: Yes.
- MR MILLER: Ilona, I had a couple of miscellaneous points.
- MS MILLAR: Please go ahead.
- 35 MR MILLER: Might I deal with that?
- MS MILLAR: Of course.
- 40 MR MILLER: The first one related to the over-rail plaza. Just what’s the current status of that?
- MR WRIGHTSON: So at this stage, Transport New South Wales and council are signing off on a term sheet, so that’s the first piece to – first milestone, I guess, that’s
- 45 required. So obviously until that term sheet is executed, the government hasn’t committed to the scheme, and so - - -

MR MILLER: So at present it has not committed, but it's heading in the right direction. Is that - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.

5

MR MILLER: - - - the way you would describe it?

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. So we've committed one-point-something million dollars this financial year. We've engaged the designer to design the bridge – plaza, but it's virtually bridge construction with landscaping on it. You've got to understand that not too many councils show up to Transport New South Wales and say, "We want to build a park over a rail corridor." So there's a bit of new ground for Transport to understand this. It's not a State Government project, for a start, which is what they're more used to dealing with. It's not a private sector proposal to build units over it – again, they're more used to dealing with.

A council showing up and saying you want to do this is new territory, so we've raised the capital through the VPAs for those pilot projects, so funding is not an issue, which, again, is unusual for a council to show up and say, "We've got the money; we just want the opportunity." But, yes, as far as we're concerned at this stage, it's full steam ahead. There's, you know, lawyers appointed both sides, you know, doing paperwork. We're designing. We, at this stage, are committed to the project.

MR MASON: And the other thing worthwhile saying is that it would form the linchpin of the CBD connecting to the residential area. It's vital, and it must go ahead, really, from our view.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. The difficulty with typical urban form is that they – lots of little spaces. You very rarely get a large open space, and this will have excellent solar access as well, so it's, as far as we're concerned, you know, essential, which is why we incentivise those other developments to deliver this big piece because it is – you know, we think it's essential to get St Leonards, to give it the amenity, to give it the – to put people wanting to work there and people wanting to live there.

35

MR MASON: Just on that, as well, the Locktechs building, which is on the corner, that building has been constructed and they have – we negotiated with them to ensure that there would be an access onto that plaza at level 3, is it?

MR PELCZ: 3

MR WRIGHTSON: 3.

MR MASON: That is in there mothballed, waiting for the delivery so they can open that, so their people - - -

45

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MASON: - - - and people coming up

MR WRIGHTSON: So if you talk about certainty, there's a developer who built
- - -

5 MR COCHRANE: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Built that.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: - - - commercial three storeys in the air waiting for this thing to
be there.

MR COCHRANE: Yes.

15 MR PELCZ: And the JQZs.

MR COCHRANE: And would that be public access to there or - - -

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

20 MR COCHRANE: - - - just for the tower and its residents?

MR WRIGHTSON: No, no, you will be able to go both ways.

25 MR COCHRANE: It's a public. Okay. Okay.

MR WRIGHTSON: And there – we're also looking there – one of the lifts in their
building, they built on the outside of the building so that the public can go up and get
30 over to the plaza, so it's fully integrated. Similarly with the JQZ, you will be able to go
to the library. You've got the connectivity to walk through to the rest of the precinct
to the – I suppose that's the – what's that - - -

MR PELCZ: That – yes.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: The south. Well no, not south. It's east.

MR PELCZ: East.

40 MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: And then you've also got the opportunity, if things go well, for
a further tunnel under the highway on the corner of Christie and – well, Christie and
45 the highway on both sides where the is currently.

MR MASON: And just adding on to that, there's an ability to go from the JQZ
building from the commercial to the residential, but also where the – that commercial

area is straight onto the plaza as well. So – and that would be a shared zone and have access.

5 MR: Yes, which effectively increases it by another third. So - - -

MR MILLER: Yes. My second point went to heritage, and just to clarify, as you know, there were a number of submissions – a number of speakers at the public meeting concerned about the heritage – the impact on the heritage houses. Two things. First of all, according to the plan you put up earlier, the heritage houses are not exactly opposite the park.

MR WRIGHTSON: Correct.

15 MR MILLER: I just wanted to clarify that that’s correct.

MR PELCZ: Yes. So two of the heritage items are directly opposite to the park. One is not. That’s - - -

20 MR MILLER: Number 3.

MR PELCZ: 3, yes.

MS MILLAR: Number 3.

25 MR MILLER: Yes 5 and 7 - - -

MR PELCZ: And so that faces the park diagonally. But the building is set far enough away so it’s – that kind of doesn’t show it very well, but there will be a six metre setback to the park and so that will allow the building number 3 to look at the park on a diagonal basis.

MR WRIGHTSON: Are you asking why the park doesn’t perfectly align?

35 MR MILLER: No, I was just clarifying whether the diagram was correct.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MR MILLER: That was all. I - - -

40 MR WRIGHTSON: It is a bit of an offset. Obviously, because your built form – you know, trying to get a building that has got the right scale meant that we couldn’t get the park exactly opposite.

45 MR MILLER: Thanks. That’s okay.

MR MASON: And the other - - -

- MR MILLER: The second was the – or the heritage report – Dorbin’s heritage report - - -
- MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Yes.
- 5 MR PELCZ: Yes.
- MR MILLER: - - - 3 September - - -
- 10 MR PELCZ: Yes.
- MR MILLER: - - - referred to the scale of development proposed having potential to impact on the heritage buildings and character of the streetscape and referred to issues relating to height and massing. What changes did you make to the plans in the
- 15 light of – referable to the heritage sites in the light of that report?
- MR PELCZ: Yes. So basically in that heritage report he recommended a series of changes to the built form along Park Road. He has included that in his report. They have been integrated into the DCP. And that’s right up the front of the DCP. It
- 20 mentions a series of measures. So you will see those measures are actually in the DCP. So - - -
- MR MASON: Not only that. The setback from the street at that northern end is 10 metres.
- 25 MR PELCZ: Yes.
- MR MASON: And then you hit a two-storey - - -
- 30 MR PELCZ: Street wall height.
- MR MASON: - - - street wall height, and then it only increases from there – from the back – that afterwards.
- 35 MR MILLER: Yes, but the question was what changes have been made since, just so we’re identifying - - -
- MS MILLAR: So you’re in - - -
- 40 MR MILLER: - - - how you’ve taken into account the - - -
- MS MILLAR: What was the response to the
- MR WRIGHTSON: Yes, so that’s the DCP.
- 45 MR PELCZ: Yes, the response was we incorporated it into the DCP.

MR MILLER: DCP. Thank you.

MR PELCZ: Yes.

5 MR MILLER: And my final point was that the developers made a number of
comments at the public meeting about the need for flexibility in a number of
respects. No doubt you've had a look at those, and it be useful – I don't think we're
going to get into the detail of it, but if there's anything you want to say about their
requests for flexibility, then perhaps you should tell us.

10 MR WRIGHTSON: Well - - -

MR MASON: Sorry. I can address that in two ways. The first way is there is an
opportunity to consider minor amendments that have a good planning outcome at a
15 later stage. And that later stage is at a development control and where they would
lodge an application. And we've highlighted that there may be an opportunity to
give some consideration to that. But that – but the strength of this plan is the
consistency and the rigidity of it as an LEP.

20 So that is – forms the footprint that people must comply with. We can certainly
move at the edges where we consider that there's going to be a benefit either to the
amenity of the individuals internally or minimising the external impacts as well. One
issue that was raised which we're looking at as well is the possibility that a part of
Canberra Avenue – we may delete that and extend the park to meet that. In other
25 words, turn that road interface into a park interface.

MR PELCZ: I think that was one of the public submissions from the meeting, I
think.

30 MR MASON: And that's some things that we will continue to look at.

MR WRIGHTSON: But I think the flexibility they're talking about is not what we
have in mind, and it's - - -

35 MS MILLAR: I think they were talking about potentially looking at different
amalgamations of lots.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

40 MR MASON: Yes. No.

MR WRIGHTSON: So can I say the - - -

MR MASON: One

45 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Which could interfere with the north-south and the east-west corridors.

MR WRIGHTSON: Yes. Look, the controls are purposefully restrictive. Why?
5 Because when you do a master plan, typically you've got one ownership. You develop a plan, and so dealing with multiple owners is not the issue. So, of course, if you're going to implement the master plan, it's slightly not what you thought, you would just adjust it because it's the one owner. They will make sure that don't impact on someone else. In this situation, we've got multiple owners. We can't
10 have one owner doing what they think is good for them to the detriment of others. Now, if, ultimately, our scheme has issues with it, well, we will have to work out how to deal with that, but the first premise can't be that soon as I see something different to what I want, I get flexibility from the council to change the scheme and I end up with a situation where someone else's scheme now - - -

15

MR MASON: Yes.

MR WRIGHTSON: - - - is compromised. That's just not going to work, and developers say these things all the time. This won't work and that won't work. It's
20 just different. And we will just see how we go with that, but we've been pleased to see most developers have pretty much consolidated as per our proposed subdivision plan, for want of a better word. And so whilst there's, you know, obviously a bit of tensions probably on that last site, that's quite common in the development industry of that last site problem. So, you know, time – no one expects this to all just go
25 overnight. Suddenly there's – they're all the scale there. It will take some time, and that will mean that people come in and out of interest in doing developments. People coming in and out of selling those last remaining sites. That's just time, and that's just part of this industry.

MR MASON: And, as I said, the strength of the plan itself is in that rigidity initially
30 in that master plan approach. If it was a – if a developer was allowed to have their fine tuning outside of that, it would only encourage other developers to do the same and then place the whole plan at risk – is the view we would have.

MR WRIGHTSON: All right

MS MILLAR: Okay. No, look, that has been very helpful. One thing that we were
40 keen to look at was the community planning consultation report that I think was done by Cred Consulting.

40

MR PELCZ: KJA.

MS MILLAR: KJA.

MR PELCZ: Yes, I've got that here if you want to see that.

45

MS MILLAR: Yes, if you're able to either leave a copy or - - -

- MR WRIGHTSON: Give the full report.
- MR PELCZ: Yes.
- 5 MS MILLAR: - - - email a copy to us, that would be very helpful to just see that summation. And then - - -
- MR MILLER: Is there a different one?
- 10 MS MILLAR: Is that different to the Cred community planning report that's referenced in the planning proposal?
- MR PELCZ: That's in the actual master plan document, what was found. So I think it's chapter 9, from memory, but it is in there what Cred community plan said.
- 15 MR MILLER: We're just looking at the – just looking for the - - -
- MS MILLAR: So this is - - -
- 20 MR MILLER: For their actual report.
- MS MILLAR: Report. Because they - - -
- MR MILLER: The Cred report.
- 25 MR PELCZ: Is that the – because there was two. So are we talking about the one that was done for stage 1 or is this the one that was for stage 2?
- MR MILLER: Well, they're your reports, so whatever there is - - -
- 30 MR PELCZ: Okay.
- MR MILLER: - - - we would like to see.
- 35 MR PELCZ: Okay.
- MR WRIGHTSON: We can provide – you want the detail of all the reports we did.
- MR PELCZ: Yes, I will have to have a look for that one.
- 40 MS MILLAR: Yes, I just think basically all of the - - -
- MR WRIGHTSON: Sure.
- 45 MS MILLAR: - - - summaries of the community consultation would be - - -
- MR WRIGHTSON: Sure.

MS MILLAR: - - - useful to see.

MR PELCZ: Okay. We will have to have a look for that.

5 MR MASON: And my understanding is the Cred one was – pre-dated the most recent one, and that’s fine to provide that as well.

MR MILLER: Thanks.

10 MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR MILLER: Thanks very much.

MR MASON: That was very useful for us.

15 MR PELCZ: That’s the KJA.

MR MILLER: Thank you.

20 MR PELCZ: And that’s the fact sheet with it.

MS MILLAR: Great. No, look, okay. Anything else, Peter?

MR MILLER: No. You’re obviously going to leave us - - -

25 MS MILLAR: Nothing.

MR MILLER: - - - a copy of the presentation - - -

30 MR WRIGHTSON: Yes, sure.

MR MILLER: - - - which is - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes.

35 MR WRIGHTSON: They’ve already got it. Yes.

MR MILLER: great. Thank you very much.

40 MS MILLAR: Okay. And, Matthew, anything else that you would like to follow up on?

MR TODD-JONES: No, I think we’ve – just gone through the agenda

45 MS MILLAR: I think we’ve pretty much covered everything that we had there. So thanks you very much for your time and, sort of, such a comprehensive discussion. And with that, I will close the meeting. Great. Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.16 am]