



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-1199010

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: DONCASTER AVE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

MATTER NUMBER: SSD 9649

PANEL: **ILONA MILLAR
DIANNE LEESON
CASEY JOSHUA
STEPHEN BARRY**

APPLICANT: **EDAN NORRIS
DAVID TORDOFF
ASHLEIGH RYAN
JANET VOGELS
STEPHEN WHITE**

LOCATION: **VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **9.33 AM, WEDNESDAY, 13 MAY 2020**

MS I. MILLAR: So good morning to – to you all, um, and thank you for – for joining us, um, through this – this medium today. Um, before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging.

5

Um, welcome to this video conference to discuss the proposed student accommodation at numbers 4 to 8 Doncaster Avenue, Kensington. Um, the proposal, as you know, is located in the Randwick Local Government area. Ah, so my name is Ilona Millar, and I am the chair of this IPC Panel, and joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Diane Leeson. Casey Joshua and Stephen Barry from the Office of the IPC are also in attendance.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure that we fully capture all of the – the information discussed, um, today's video-conference is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced, and made available on the Commission's website. Um, this video-conference is one part of the Commission's decision making process, and it's taking place at a very preliminary stage of the process, and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its decision.

20

Um, through this process it's important that the Commissioners ask questions of the attendees to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. Um, we've already provided some questions on notice but if you are asked other questions, um, during the course of this meeting, and are not in a position to answer, um, please feel free to take further question on notice, and provide any additional information in writing, um, and any information that is provided following on from this meeting will also then be put on the – the website.

25

Ah, to ensure the accuracy of the – the transcript, um, I would request that all members, um, and participants in today's call introduce themselves each time before speaking, um, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. Um, I would suggest that, um, everyone puts themselves on mute if they're not speaking, um, and then depending on how connectivity is it may be beneficial to mute your video as well if you're not speaking, um, just to ensure that the, um, the – the – the mech – the video mechanism, um, works effectively.

35

Um, so with that we will now begin, and in terms of the – the agenda for this meeting, um, what I – I would ask is for, um, the – the relevant, um, um, persons from – from the applicant's side to perhaps, um, provide their overview of the proposal. I understand that you've provided a – a presentation so thank you, very much, for that. Um, you know, we'll – we'll see how we work with sharing screens but, um, on the Commission side we – we also have a copy of that presentation which we can – we can look to as well if there's any issues with transmission.

40

Um, as I mentioned before we had provided questions on notice in our letter of the 8th of May. Ah, if it's appropriate to address those questions as you go through the

45

presentation that would be great. Um, if there are other things that haven't been covered during the presentation we might come back to them, um, at the end so with that I'll hand over to – to you, um, to – to lead the presentation.

5 MS A. RYAN: Thank you, Commissioner Millar, much appreciated. This is Ashleigh Ryan, ah, speaking from Urbis on behalf of the applicant. I'm going to share my screen now which, as you mentioned, ah, the host has disabled participant screen sharing; would you mind providing that access now? Thank you Um, as – as – as you say, Commissioner, we are – I am going to run through a brief
10 presentation.

Um, I will first start with some instructions, handing it over to Edan Norris to briefly introduce the, ah, project, um, before handing it over to Dave Tordoff from Hayball to take you through the way that the architects have approached the site, and the
15 design, and to take you through the scheme.

Ah, as you then said, ah, we will answer the questions that have been provided in advance, and thank you, for that, um, to provide us that opportunity to collect our thoughts. Um, we'll respond – respond to each of those questions, and then, ah,
20 follow up with some – any further questions that the panel may have we'll do our best to answer. So I'm going to try and share this screen now; here we are. Screen 2; there we are. Could everyone please confirm that they – they can see that screen?

MS D. LEESON: Yes, I can, thank you.
25

MS RYAN: Wonderful. So as I – as I just mentioned when I was getting the screen up, here is the agenda, ah, so I might, ah, throw it over first to Edan just to briefly introduce himself, um, the applicant entity, um, in the project. Edan?

30 MR E. NORRIS: Good morning all. Yes, Edan Norris here from Blue Sky. Um, firstly, thanks for your time to make the meeting today. Um, we're pretty excited to be at this, um, point in the development cycle, I guess, by, um, being here today. As far as the project goes, I mean when we first came across this site, and um, acquired it I think about 18 months ago now, as far as location goes with, um, it's
35 obviously a pretty interesting and attractive, ah, site with regards to doing student accommodation.

We've got the University of New South Wales, um, just under a kilometre away from the site, um, we've got the new light rail stops; we've got two stop – stops
40 actually within walking proximity to this area. Um, so essentially from a location perspective we saw this site, along with the absence of other, um, quality available off-site student accommodation opportunities, and so it was very attractive to us once again so hence, like, when we jump on this site from a, um, next layer of this.

45 I mean for us, ah, Hayball and Blue Sky, we've done now eight student accommodation developments, um, previously so we're looking for each project we do, we, um, further refine, ah, the outputs and the quality of spaces we're doing, and the way students engage with these areas so equally we were very excited to finally

get to a point of potentially we could actually deliver this, and provide a – a unique opportunity, ah, for students in the precinct.

5 MS RYAN: Excellent, thank you. Ah, I'd like to introduce Stephen White, um, from and myself, um we're the consulting town planners, and just to briefly, before I formally hand over to Hayball, just to mention that we have reviewed the department planning's assessment report, um, we find it to be a very, ah, comprehensive report. Um, we've had quite a good working relationship with the department throughout.

10 It's been, ah, a fairly, um, ah, long assessment period, um, there's been a number of changes, as you would see in the, ah, assessment report. We're – we're really happy with where we've landed on the design, um, and the changes that have been made, and we're quite comfortable with the way that it is characterised in the assessment
15 report.

Um, in addition, we've reviewed all of the conditions of consent, ah, that have been proposed by the Department of Planning, ah, and we confirm that the design changes that are recommended by the department, we have had the opportunity to review
20 those conditions, we've considered their implications on the design which we'll respond to your questions on the particular matters that you've raised, um, later in the presentation. But just as an overall we'd like to say that we've reviewed them all, and we're comfortable that it can all be accommodated with the design, um, so we're quite comfortable with the assessment report, and the conditions as they stand.

25 Ah, I'd like to throw it over now to Hayball so Dave Tordoff, ah, the director, as mentioned, and Janet Vogels, ah, to take you through, ah, their, um, presentation now. I'll just change this slide; please bear with me. There we are. Thank you

30 MR D. TORDOFF: Great. Thanks for that, Ashleigh. Just Dave Tordoff speaking now. Um, so just at a – just at a high level start – starting with the site in terms of general location; I'm sure we – we all know where it is but just at a – a quick high level as Edan mentioned, well-appointed with the, um, the light – the new light rail, um, um, stop to the – to the west, and – and Doncaster, um, Avenue to the east,
35 Centennial Park, Madison North, and – and transitioning to, ah, the – the residential precinct towards the – towards the south of the site.

Um, at – at a high level, um, the development proposes, um, 201 sole occupancy units, and – and 259 beds which are a mix of, ah, sole occupancy units, twin rooms,
40 and – and clusters to provide a level of diversity for the, um, for the population needs, and also, obviously, ah, associated with – with that are a series of, ah, communal outdoor spaces, communal indoor spaces, um, and basement parking.

Um, just looking at the – the site within its context, and I'll go through this fairly
45 quickly, ah, understanding that you – you've had a detailed look at – at all of this. So the key things that we noted from, um, the – the existing subdivision pattern were two things really. Firstly, the – the – the extent of subdivision seems to be around,

ah, dual lots; either, um, wide, um, sort of deep – deep lots that have, um, either been converted from Dulock Cottages or remain, um, as that, and that has resulted in this – this kind of fingers of development that you can see on the page there. Um, some of those are still one to two storeys but equally, some of those are three to four
5 storeys, and those – those heights are noted, um, just generally increasing in height from the, ah, from the south to the north.

Ah, just the next slide. Um, and there you can see just some analysis in terms of the difference of grain. Um, they key – ah, it is fairly varied, um, as I mentioned; some
10 of the – some of the, um, residential flat buildings are up to three and four storeys, but there is a strong of character, and – and a rhythm about some of the buildings that we – we thought was important to draw on, and, ah, within a contemporary way, and that's one of the things that I'll talk about in a second.

The next slide. Um, just jumping to how we've, um, built up the – the narrative of developing the place for the – for the future residents, we – we come at it from this perspective of – of building a home, and building a community, and – and they're core values that we – that we apply within, um, the thinking of our design work, um, in all of the Blue Sky properties that we – we create, um, and – and it's also thinking
20 – it's – it's really thinking of that macro and micro level in terms of design from inside out.

Um, the next slide. Um, so this is the – the ground floor. I think key to point out, um, on this slide are the, um, the – the series of communal spaces, um, that really
25 anchor, um, the sole occupancy, and cluster accommodation, um, which are accessed off the corridors. Entry to the site is – is towards the south in the red zone there, which is both a reception and large, ah, communal lounge, um, and then the other key, ah, lounge space is, um, the – shown in blue which is the family room which is a – a sort of shared dining, um, space with – with laundry, um, and gymnasium. I – I'll
30 go into that in a little – in a little bit more detail in some of the detailed plans to follow.

Um, the next slide. Um, and then on the upper floors, um, still a salt and peppering of some of those, ah, small communal spaces but predominantly that becomes, um,
35 the accommodation on the – on level 1 and 2. Um, this is just an example of, um, some of the thinking that we've put into some of the communal spaces. We know how important these communal spaces are within, um, these, um, these homes that we're creating. Whilst the – the sole occupancy units do have their own, ah, kitchen space and bathroom space, the ability to come together, and gather is really
40 important; as is gymnasiums, and as is laundries.

We – we know how important that is as a social hub, and there's a lot of thinking that we've shown, um, that – that we've put within – within those spaces as – as – places for social interaction, um, and they're just some images of – of – of how this
45 space – these spaces might start to feel. And then jumping into one of the typical sole occupancy units, you can see, um, they're – they're well appointed, um, had – offer a good level of, ah, independent living in terms of, um, kitchen space, study

space, and – and bathroom space behind, um, towards the entry of the apartment there, and that's the sort of fairly typical plan. There is obviously some variants, ah, in and around that you've seen, um, generally compliant with, um, affordable housing guidelines.

5

Just moving onto the exterior of the, ah, of the building. Um, the way that we approached the – the facade, as I mentioned, was starting to look at the form, um, from north to south, and also starting to look at the grain, um, of the subdivision pattern, um, across the, um, ah, across the context. Um, so the first thing that we wanted to achieve was this series of pavilions, ah, which had, um, which – which, um, were reminiscent of the original subdivision pattern, um, and then through the architectural expression the – this sort of secondary layer of – of stepping down, ah, from – from north to south; um, not necessarily in terms of the building heights but certainly in terms of the way that we were addressing the – the – the, um, materiality and expression.

15

And then this – this secondary vertical layer, um, which we were picking up from cues of the – the – the heritage building which has this, ah, sort of paired vertical language, and then this secondary, ah, alternating language through it which you can just see through some of those blue lines which is how we started to articulate some of the masonry, ah, components, um, on the building, and then this fourth layer of this, ah, um, horizontal layering.

20

Um, these are some of the precedents that we – we drew upon. Um, they're – they're all projects that we've – we've completed; most of them – sorry, most of them are completed. There's a couple there that – that were renderings, um, interested in this idea, and we thought it was appropriate for this context of, um, of expression of masonry fins, and using that as the articulation pattern so drawing on this – this idea of contemporary expression through articulated, ah, brickwork.

25

30

Um, and these are some of the views, um, that we have provided with you, obviously; this is the view from, ah, from the south looking towards the development, um, and you can see that – that alignment that we draw in horizontally with – with the heritage building, um, with the shifting materiality but also that – that vertical, ah, patterning that I was talking about, um, as, um, as a sort of staggered or through the facades.

35

Ah, looking back towards the entry there, that's slide, um, and then moving up towards, um, one of the communal court – courtyards to the left, moving to the north. Um, and then this – this is really to parts, and – and we put this in just to demonstrate the – the quality of thinking, and the quality of product that we're trying to achieve in terms of, ah, the – the facade approach. Um, it's important to get this layering of detail because it is, ah, a contemporary expression, and it does rely on – on good quality detailing, and – or good quality, ah, materiality to get, um, the expression, and – and that – that we're looking to achieve.

45

Um, the parts includes, um, um, alternating window positions but also with, um, a – a series of hoods that are applied to deal with, ah, privacy and sun shading, or orientations, um, and then this expression of a sort of, ah, either a top or a base, um, and then subtle shifts between the, um, the, ah, the types of, um, um, masonry that are proposed to be used.

Um, just jumping onto, um, some of the direct responses to the questions that you have raised, um, this first slide really talks to, um, the – some of the comments that were raised in discussion, um, with the government architects. Um, the – I – I have to admit it's not completely exhausted. There were – there were – there were a couple of other things that I might point out on this slide.

Um, generally, we, um, we – we thought that the – we – we agreed with the assessment that was provided, ah, from – from architects, um, and, ah, our sense was that – that the general massing of the site approach was supported by them. They did ask for us to look at some things in detail which we think we've – we've addressed successfully. Um, one of them was the relocation of the car park entry which, um, that happened at an early – at an early stage; we were showing the car park entry much closer to the – the heritage building, and we, um, we – we moved that, um, that away.

Um, within the, ah, within and around the heritage building there was commentary about making sure that we, um, firstly relocated some of the communal social spaces to the ground floor, within the – the heritage building. Um, they were previously bedrooms, um, and we saw the logic in that, ah, in terms of, ah, retaining its authenticity, um, as a – as a heritage dwelling, even though it's being, um, somewhat converted into, ah, well, a – a cluster type accommodation so making sure that they – we've got some of the living rooms on the front, and likewise some of the commentary from the government architect was around trying to make sure that we're getting active, ah, communal outdoor spaces around that. So at – at one point in time we relocated and enhanced the, um, the communal out – communal indoor and outdoor space around the reception.

In response to that, a few of the other points that are noted there, ah, the street fence, at – at one point in time was higher; we – we put some work into that, and – and have adopted those – those comments in terms of making sure that that's down at the 1.2 metres. And it's also a staggered, um, fence line to provide some buffer planting, ah, both on the public domain, and on the, um, on – on the private, ah, side of the fence.

Um, other I think that actually probably covers most of the comments on that slide. I might jump to the next one. Um, other comments that were made, ah, not directly by, um, ah, government architects but, um, ah, through consultation, ah, with, ah, the Department of Planning, and – and which we understand was partly filtering through from, ah, comments from, ah, that were being made by – by local council which – which are valid, and we think we've addressed. Um, one key change that was made was to pull the built form, ah, back, relative to the – to the

heritage scheme so that there was greater, um, visibility to the heritage scheme, ah, when viewed from the, ah, from the – from the south up the street so you can see that – that shifting alignment, ah, pulling that, ah, built form, ah, back.

5 Um, the other change that was made was, um, to, ah, – and – and we agreed with this to – to better accentuate those two, ah, built forms as pavilions, um, so, um, there was a small communal space, ah, within that slot, if you like, ah, between the buildings; um, that was – that was, ah, taken out, and, ah, we did some replanning there to make sure that those building felt like, um, two separate pavilions, and what
10 it does, actually quite successfully, I think, is, ah, enhance the, um, the sense of entry, um, into the precinct which – which works well. Um, the – the setback to the neighbour as well to the south was – was increased through – through consultation.

15 And then the next slide, and then to the – to the north of the site, one of the biggest, ah, changes that was made, um, even though, um, architecturally at the time we were trying to, ah, reflect three pavilions, um, through, um, through the original scheme, ah, around that courtyard to the north, ah, it was felt that that could be done, um, more successfully, ah, by – and – and further breakdown the – the built form to the street by, um, flipping the courtyard over, um, and – and reducing the – the – the
20 sense of built form, um, directly parallel to the street. So through consultation we've flipped that, um, that, ah, secondary, um, communal open space over, um, so that you – you get that further breaking down of built form when viewed from Doncaster Avenue.

25 I'll just hand over – back over to Ashleigh to talk to this slide.

MS RYAN: Hi there, this is Ashleigh Ryan from Urbis speaking. I – I wanted to respond to the IPC's question regarding the, ah, proposed variation to the floor space ratio standard that applies across the site under the Randwick LEP, um, and as the
30 Commission will be aware there is a, um, clause 4.6 variation proposed to vary the FSR standard. Um, by way of some background of how we approached the site, we didn't go out thinking, "Huh, we're going to – to vary the standard, you know, by – by 50 per cent essentially."

35 Um, as an experienced, ah, student accommodation provider, and, ah, as – as a consultant planner we're well aware of the incentives within the existing planning system to, um, support additional, ah, residential development that is, um, affordable rental housing, um, that is a different form of housing, ah, than typical build to sale, ah, and as the panel – I won't dwell on the point because I – I know you would be
40 very well familiar with it – the provisions, um, however there is an incentive of a 0.5 to 1 FSR bonus to – for the delivery of boarding houses of which student accommodation falls within.

45 Um, so it started with the provision of, okay, at a base level a 1.4 to 1 FSR would be permitted on the site. Now, there is, um, an exception to this whereas in a typical scenario 1.4 to 1 FSR would be the control, but couldn't be refused consent, um, if you complied with that on that – those single grounds. Um, that – that provision,

however, is not applied whenever there is a heritage item on the site which we understand that, you know, in certain circumstances that additional bonus may not be able to be accommodated on the site where there is a heritage item. So we really sought to focus on how have we – how have we interfaced with that heritage item,
5 and what is an appropriate interface with that.

As the – the Commission will be familiar, there was a previously approved scheme on the site, and we've increased the setbacks, um, of the new form from the heritage item, particularly in response to the government architect's comments as Dave
10 mentioned, to increase landscaping around the heritage item. We've actually pulled back the, um, front setback, particularly from the south, where if you're viewing from the conservation area, and looking to the north you can still see the heritage item has pride of place. Um, we've – we've actually incorporated the heritage item within the overall site which, I think, is a far better outcome than trying to, um,
15 subdivide it out or to isolate that particular site.

Um, so that was the kind of approach around the heritage item, um, but we also needed to consider, of course, the context and the compatibility of the development with the area. Um, I'm very comfortable, and notwithstanding the numeric, um,
20 exceedance, that we've really ticked – we've really satisfied all of the relevant provisions, um, the zone objectives and so forth.

To – to take you through some of those thinking, ah, we comply with the height limit, um, of 12 metres; we have a three storey form, as you would be aware, um, ah,
25 so we're – we're entirely consistent with the future design and character in terms of building height. You can, even and notwithstanding the numeric compliance, we also, um, are compatible with the adjacent, ah, residential flat buildings which as Dave mentioned again, ah, vary in scale, however there are quite a number of three to four storey, ah, residential buildings immediately opposite the site, um, so
30 we're quite consistent with that, um, character as well.

Not only for – for height, we're also consistent when it comes to, ah, site coverage, and landscape area. Ah, as you would be familiar, ah, the site coverage is 57 per cent but we have a 23 per cent of the site area as deep soil, and there's a substantial area
35 of sub-landscaping that exceeds 27 per cent of the site area. Just – but just to point out the residential flat buildings, as you would be familiar, are permissible within the R3 zone, um, and those figures of, um, deep soil and landscaping, um, exceed what would otherwise be required for an ADG, substantially so.

40 And we feel that that additional landscaping was quite important to bring the scheme back into the, um, surrounding context, and to provide, um, a transition in scale from the southern part of, ah, ANZAC Parade, where you can see there are some one – one to two storey dwellings along the eastern side of Doncaster Avenue transitioning up to the – to the scale of the residential flat buildings of the northern portion of
45 Doncaster Avenue, particularly in – in our, ah, location adjacent to the stabling yards, and those residential flats, and so it's a good transition scale, and we have that landscaping to soften – to soften that – that transition.

I'd also like to mention the rhythm and scale that Dave mentioned. We haven't tried to – to fit the side out with this, you know, as many beds as possible. You can see in the architecture that it's actually been, ah, substantially broken down, particularly along the Doncaster Avenue frontage to respond to the council and community
5 comments regarding scale, and to really take, well, three storeys is, um, efficient and compliant with the 12 storey, um, height control, the architecture has been broken down to present two storey forms, um, before a transition in materiality but also breaking down the scale into those, um, the, um, I've – I've forgotten the word that you used to adequately, Dave, but, um, the – the almost terrace scale pavilion –
10 pavilion scale, ah, forms the design as presented.

We also considered the, um, external impacts of proposing additional FSR on the site, and to – to be quite frank this is an amazing site for the development that we're proposing. We have, um, to the east stabling yards, um, that I would say are very
15 insensitive neighbour, um, which – which affords a great opportunity, ah, to provide where additional, um, FSR is proposed along that frontage.

We have, ah, no residential neighbouring property to the north. Um, to the – to the west, as mentioned, are residential flat buildings, and there's only one directly
20 adjacent, ah, residential neighbouring property to the south, um, which we've, ah, considered in a – a great deal, um, of detail in terms of, ah, pulling back the built form to be six metres, um, ah, from that site boundary, um, considering additional landscaping in that site boundary, pulling back the basement from that site boundary so that that landscaping isn't ensured to be successful.

Um, we've pulled back the levels 1 and 2 of that southern mid-face to provide additional views to the sky, and to reduce any shadowing for that, um, adjacent neighbouring property. Whilst we – we don't rely upon the previous approval in any way, we considered the impacts that could be, um, ah, could be resulting from a
30 compliant form, and as was approved by the Randwick to – to test, and ensure that the impacts that we're proposing are commiserate, if not better, um, or lesser I should say.

And so we're quite comfortable with the external impacts that are resulting from that FSR, and in fact we feel comfortable that we've pulled back, um, massing from that
35 southern boundary to the less sensitive areas of the site to the north. Um, and as those – so without going through it, and I'm not obviously, as you can tell, I haven't read through the clause 4.6 but we've prepared a – I believe a very robust clause 4.6 variation to tackle what I see as being more of a housekeeping amendment by the fact that by having a heritage item on the site, ah, we're not eligible for the
40 full 0.5 to 1 FSR, um, ah, standard that's afforded by rental housing set, however, we're entirely consistent with the provisions of that Affordable Rental Housing SEPP, with the minor exception of some room sizes which we'll – we'll talk to, and car parking, which I think we can all – I hope we can agree is a – is a good outcome
45 to propose the parking rate that we have proposed.

Um, entirely consistent with the objectives of that Affordable Rental Housing SEPP, we provide adequate communal open space, appropriate landscaping; we've spent a lot of effort in making sure that the, um, development is compatible with the local area by way of increased setbacks, landscape area, the rhythm and form that
5 we're proposing, um, as part of the architecture, um, and, and the street presentation, ah, so we're quite comfortable with that, notwithstanding the fact that the FSR bonus does not technically comply on this – does not technically apply for any item that, ah, any site that has a heritage item we are entirely consistent with the objectives of that onus, and, ah, and independently the impacts associated with the FSR have been
10 appropriately mitigated, and it is not, um, it is unreasonable or unnecessary in the instances of this case to comply with the local provision under Randwick LEP, and FSR.

So in, in response I'll just quickly move through the – the – the variation that we also
15 mentioned, um, just moments ago was the variation of maximum room size that is referencing for the rental housing set. I just want to quickly speak to, ah, when we first lodged this scheme, as Hayball mentioned, Hayball and Blue Sky have done a number of affordable – sorry, student accommodation developments around Australia, um, with a bit smaller room sizes throughout the whole facility.

20 Ah, we were really pushed by the department and the council to increase those room sizes to the 12 square metres referenced in the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP, and we've done that. Ah, we've done that throughout the development, um, so there was some re-planning that needed to occur to accommodate that change, um, which is all done, and we're all, um, happy and, um, except for that change.

There were a couple of – there is a few references to, um, room sizes which do not, um, they exceed the 12 square metres but now they've been pushed to exceed the 25, um, maximum square metre room size that is referenced in the Affordable Rental
30 Housing SEPP. You can see here, in the heritage item, um, in response to the government architect's comments, ah, we originally had, ah, the ground floor as a bedroom, um, and we had, with the, um, balcony on the upper level these two front rooms as the, um, kitchen and living area for these dwellings, um, being on the terrace, you know, on the balcony was quite a nice idea.

35 Um, however, ah, to ensure the, you know, to protect the heritage significance of the building, and also to provide that more active frontage at that ground level, ah, we were requested to amend that, um, which we've happily done. The resulting impact though is the – the two rooms, um, on the upper level, level 1, fronting the street, ah,
40 of – to Doncaster Avenue, ah, exceed the 25 square metre maximum, and they're proposed at 29 square metres, as you can see here.

There was a consideration about adding in petitions to – to, you know, achieving their compliance, however, given they are 12, you know, twin rooms, um,
45 affordability is addressed, and – and given it is a heritage item we felt it was more appropriate to, ah, maintain, ah, the room form as it – as it was. Dave, was there

anything further you wanted to mention on, ah, these rooms before we go into the rooms that are – as part of the new building that exceed - - -

5 MR TORDOFF: Ah, look, the – the only additional comment that I – I'd make is, um, the way that we approached the design of those rooms was very much around retention of, ah, an authenticity for the – the heritage built fabric so even that upper floor room, um, it's important to note that the intention is not that – that – that's a joinery piece that separates those – those two beds that would to the ceiling, and there would be the availability for pendant lights, and – and the like to, ah, to hang
10 from the ceiling so that – that room would feel, from a heritage context, a – as – as a single space.

And I'll, look, um, I'll – I'll keep going on the next slide which, um, there were some, ah, spaces which were, um, easier for us to potentially modify, and – and this
15 is coming directly from some of the, ah, the comments in around numerical compliance. There were – there were some space – some rooms again that were within the new build component that were – were creeping up above, um, the 25 square metres so what we've done is just, um, just demonstrated how those could be, um, adapted, ah, to, um, if – if strict numerical compliance was required.

20 MS RYAN: So in response to the – sorry, this is Ashleigh Ryan speaking again ah, this is in response to the Commission's question, ah, to provide details on the building design implications of reducing the two 26, ah, square metre rooms, and the one 35, ah, square metre room to the 25 square metre, um, area that's referenced in
25 the, um, Affordable Rental Housing SEPP to which numerical compliance.

Again, we propose these rooms slightly exceeding 25 square metres, um, with the, ah, justification in – in clause 4.6 but, um, achieving numeric compliance was not necessary for these rooms. Ah, the whole development is, ah, quite clearly a, um, a –
30 a built for purpose student accommodation facility; there is no risk that we're trying to, you know, skirt the rules and provide, um, essentially studio apartments, um, you know, that – that exceed the 25 square metres, and undermining affordability.

Each of the rooms that were exceeding 25 square metres were, ah, ah, dual
35 rooms, um, so affordability was addressed, and the fact that it's part of a student accommodation was, um, ah, overcoming any concern that these would be, ah, dressed up studio apartments that didn't comply with the department design guide, um, so we felt that it was appropriate, however, um, we understand the department has, ah, raised some concerns, and has suggested a condition to reduce the size of
40 these, ah, apartments so that they can comply numerically with the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP standard, um, in which case, ah, as, ah, Dave mentioned, ah, they've considered how to do that, and that can be done fairly readily, um, and we can accommodate that design change if requested.

45 MS MILLAR: It's – it's Ilona Millar here, just to – to jump in on this while we're talking about this subject, if, um, if those changes were – were made, would they, in

any way, sort of compromise the – you know, the integrity and the – the liveability of these particular spaces in units for the residents?

5 MR TORDOFF: Dave Tordoff, I'll jump in and answer that one. Look, the – the type – the type F, um, I – look, I – it's really just a numerical issue. I – I – I don't see the need to make, um, that change; really, it's – it's a – you're talking about one – one square metre or so. Um, ah, it's, um, on balance it's probably better if, um, if that one stayed, um, as it was but it does – it doesn't really impact too much; it's really just about shifting the threshold between inside and out, it's such a small
10 numerical, ah, compliance.

Look, I think, ah, to – the type H, which is at the bottom left of the page, H, look, to be honest I think that was possibly an improvement anyway. Um, it defines those as – as two more separate, um, and – and private spaces so, um, from a, ah, from an
15 amenity aspect you – you could argue that that's, um, an improvement, um, anyway so the – and that's a – really a very isolated case; there's only one of those.

MS LEESON: So it's Dianne Leeson here; can you just clarify that you're then comfortable with the conditions as proposed by the department on compliance with
20 the room sizes – maximum room sizes?

MS RYAN: Yes, that is correct; Ashleigh Ryan speaking.

MS LEESON: Thank you.
25

MS RYAN: We'll move onto the Commission's, ah, third question, ah, which was, ah, ah, also regarding, um, design change conditions. Ah, this one particularly the department recommends an additional communal toilet on the ground floor plan as the – communal space, and what are the implications of this so I will go to Dave
30 again to speak to this site.

MR TORDOFF: Look, yeah, I think this is, um, again, a fairly, ah, straightforward change to, ah, for us to – to adopt, um, and the – I – again, I think there's – there's benefit in, ah, in providing that, ah, communal WC in this area. The intention of this
35 area is it's a highly active, highly well used zone, um, and – and, yeah, proximity to, um, a communal toilet, ah, a DVA toilet, um, is – is a good thing, um, and we have the space to accommodate it so no problem with adopting that.

Um, the next, ah, slide across the same zone is just highlighting, um, the potential for
40 introduction of a waiting bay, ah, associated with the, um, the one-way driveway that's proposed. Um, we've worked this through with, ah, traffic engineer and checked turning circles, and we're confident that this can be, um, accommodated.

And this last slide was in relation to just highlighting, um, the potential methods of
45 access, ah, for, um, for cyclists, um, into both the – the bike store, um, and also into the lift so you can see highlighted in orange there that the path of travel, ah, that would be required to access, ah, both the – the visiting bike store, and the resident,

ah, um, ah, bike store is just in the basement. Um, the other thing to note which we haven't put on a, ah, a separate slide was that there was also a request for a – a basement service bay in – in – in the basement, and again, ah, we're confident that we can, um, we can address that request.

5

MS MILLAR: So it's Ilona Millar here again, just back on – on that plan with the – the waiting bay, um, has – has – have these plans been shared with the department and council to get their feedback on the proposed solutions, um, here?

10 MS RYAN: Hi, this is Ashleigh Ryan speaking. Ah, there – there – these plans have been, ah, circulated to our traffic consultant who had validated that it is, ah, that we can comply with the condition, um, and we've made that, um, known to the department that we're comfortable, um, with achieving the, um, recommended condition. Um, they have – these plans themselves have not been circulated to the
15 council or the department for their particular comment, um, regarding any other, um, implications of the – the amendment.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you.

20 MS RYAN: I'll move now to, um, the – the third questions from – from the panel, um, sorry, the Commission. The, ah, the question from the Commission was regarding the flooding levels. Um, the site, as we outlined in the application, um, does have some stormwater, um, overflow, ah, running throughout it. You'll also see that present, and in the design of the previously approved residential flat building
25 that was approved by the council on the site.

Um, essentially, ah, the proposed levels of the new building, and the levels of the landscaped areas have been designed to mimic the current over – overland flow modelling for the site, pre-development, and this has been based on the Kensington
30 Centennial Park Floodplain Risk Management Study, and the model, ah, which was provided by the council, um, on the 30th of October 2018.

Um, there was, um, back and forth with the council about making sure that that model was the most current and accurate given the, um, fairly recent, at that time,
35 development of the saddling yards, and, ah, so therefore, ah, given with a design to maintain these levels there's therefore no, um, the development will not compromise or exacerbate flooding of the heritage buildings, ah, compared to the existing condition.

40 We've also addressed the, ah, Local Development Control Plan in this regard, um, and it can be further said that the – the design does also comply with the relevant DCP provisions for flood impacts on adjacent properties, um, such that the development shall not increase the flood effects, um, elsewhere for floods, including up to the one in one hundred year flood event so that – that was, um, one of the
45 earliest design constraints that we considered, especially given the history of the previously approved development, and we made sure that, um, those levels were adopted, and, ah, that those levels were considered in all of the detail so we're quite

comfortable that no, the – the new levels do not compromise or exacerbate the flooding of the heritage item

5 The next, um, I'd – I'd like to throw over to, um, to Edan Norris to respond, um, given the – the detailed construction he's been, um with. The question was has there been any supplementary assessment of the potential for Aboriginal objects to be present on the site, ah, since, um, works have been undertaken under the previously approved council DA so, Edan?

10 MR NORRIS: Yeah, Edan Norris here. Um, so we did engage GML Heritage, ah, late last year, and so in August last year, to commence the investigatory work around the archaeological items – the Aboriginal archaeological items, um, for, sorry, potential, um, so that involved several layers of, ah, works. Initially they carried out, um, ground scanning or ground ultra-sounding, I think it might be called, across the
15 site, um, to investigate where the top of the dunes were, ah, etcetera, and that sort of identified potential areas that should be, um, further assessed.

Um, the second round of investigations was carrying out three metre bores at every – along a three metre grid across the entire site, um, and then following what was
20 extracted from those bores, and investigated by their scientists, um, and then went to do several, ah, areas of further investigations by way of doing a dig, ah, through the site doing quite extensive, ah, invasive work across the site. Um, that revealed where you would have noticed on the plans, um, a red area that was a protected area, as there had been some artefacts found in relation to the stabling
25 yards of native work.

Around that site they managed to, um, discover, ah, just five Aboriginal fireplaces, and which were Persith Ochre, um, and two pieces of Ironstone Ochre so those were then sent off, examined, dated, um, and were, yeah, actually dated back to around
30 8000 years ago. Um, that works then all being compiled into a final post excavate – post archaeological investigation report that has been sent off to, um, only two weeks ago to the Office of Environment Heritage as well as the relevant stakeholders.

35 MS RYAN: So I hope that that, ah, response clarifies the matter, and the additional investigation works that have been undertaken with regards to the potential for Aboriginal objects to be on – to be present on the site. Um so - - -

MS MILLAR: Um, so can I – it's Ilona Millar again, just to – just to jump in so to – to confirm, um, the – the investigation report has confirmed that the red zone on the
40 plan that has not sort of led to the need to – to change, expand or change that zone in – in any way?

MR NORRIS: Correct.

45 MS MILLAR: Right.

MS RYAN: So the next question was with regards to the geological, ah, sorry, geotechnical report, um, which references nearby structures, um, and I'll – I'll throw back again to – to Edan, um, with regards to this – this item, and we're – we're noting, ah, that the basement excavation line has actually been, um, back, pulled
5 back away from the southern boundary since the report was first drafted which provides additional buffering, ah, to that adjacent property at 20 Doncaster Avenue. I – I'll throw it over now to Edan to respond to this question specifically.

MR NORRIS: Yeah, Edan Norris here. So we have engaged Douglas Partners to
10 carry out a vibration management plan. Essentially, ah, notwithstanding the constraints that – well, the proximity of 20 Doncaster Avenue, in closer proximity we do have the stabling yards, and the, um, existing heritage premises at 10 to 12, ah, so they're carrying out a vibration management plan to ensure we – there are parameters around that.

15 Equally, our piling, um, design is using a pile that's essentially drilled in, not driven in, um, and also we have soft soils here so it means that it's less invasive around what we're – what we're doing capturing that all this it is quite a low risk item; it is very sensitive, yeah, particularly as I mentioned the stabling yard so acutely aware
20 of this constraint, and 20 Doncaster will be incorporated into the vibration management plan.

MS RYAN: the next question was with regards to, um, the geotechnical report which references the need for dilapidation surveys of surrounding structures, and
25 pavements, and the question from the Commission was, "Please advise whether this is to include 20 Doncaster Avenue?" And the answer to that question, um, is yes, a dilapidation report will be prepared for 20 Doncaster Avenue, Kensington.

30 So if there isn't any further questions, I just – I'd just like to comment – this is actually Ryan speaking again from Urbis, um, we're really happy with the design as – as it stands, and the changes that we've made, and the, um, contribution that this development will have to the local area, um, we – we think that it's a great transition from, you know, the busy, um, Alison Road to the north, providing a buffer from the, um, stabling yards, responding to the heritage – to the residential flat buildings, ah,
35 opposite the site, conditioning in scale to the, um, residential properties further south of the site, and, um, it has been really designed so that take into consideration compatibility of the development with the local area.

40 Um, so we're quite – we're really quite happy with the department's assessment report, and as mentioned throughout this presentation, we accept their conditions for the recommended design changes with regards to the, um, the – the room sizes, um, and some of the minor changes with respect to the driveway, and, ah, and, you know, an additional communal toilet, all reasonable and something that can be accommodated.

45 So I'd like to just – the next slide here was really just for any further questions that the Commission may have for us, and for us to discuss the next steps, particularly

with regards to the, um, ah, the situation we find ourselves in at the moment by virtue of, you know, Zoom – a Zoom briefing, um, and that this project has been one of the nominated fast-track projects so just wanted to understand steps that the Commission will be taking, um, on this point on in making a determination. I
5 understand that the Minister had stated that all fast-track projects were proposed to be determined within four weeks, which, um, I understand ends, ah, Friday next week so I – I just wanted to understand what the Commission’s program was, and next steps, and if you require any further information from us.

10 MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Thank – thanks, very much, for that, Ash, and, um, thank you for the – for the presentation, and the contributions from – from everyone, um, on your side. That’s been very, very helpful for – for us. Um, I’ll just ask Di whether she has any further questions, um, in respect of the presentation or other matters that were raised in the, um, the department’s report.

15 MS LEESON: I – I have three quick questions, if I might, Ilona. The first one is around the solar access analysis for number 20 Doncaster. It’s just a quick question about there’s a big tree in the back of number 20, whether that was assumed to be in
20 or out of your solar analysis, and if you don’t know the answer today, that’s fine, but if you could respond to that in due course that would be good; if you can today, terrific, if not, you can take it on notice?

MR TORDOFF: Dave Tordoff speaking. Um, look, generally speaking we don’t
25 take in, ah, into account, um, ah, trees as part of the solar, um, access, ah, modelling but, um, again, we’ll – we’ll come back, and, um, and – and take that on notice, and – and finally confirm that back to you.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Dave. My next question was really around the precedent
30 images; you did say that, um, I think the external ones were certainly, ah, precedents of your student accommodation developments in – in other places; does that also apply to the internal precedent images?

MR TORDOFF: No, the internal precedent images are not all ones of ours whereas
35 the external ones are.

MS LEESON: Okay. Thank you. And my last question, um, in terms of the
40 communal space exceeding the DCP, council has – there was a comment from council somewhere saying they still considered that to be inadequate; could – can you elaborate on that at all, and – and council’s reason for considering it to be inadequate?

MS RYAN: This is Ashleigh Ryan speaking. I was quite surprised by their
45 comment that they felt it was inadequate. Um, I – we – we noted that we complied with their DCP provisions in addition to the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP provisions, we exceed the required communal areas internally and externally, um, we provide, you know, a variety of facilities, for instance, break-out study areas, we provide, you know, more quiet, um, contemplation areas versus also the main

communal living room as mentioned by Dave in the presentation. There is also gym facilities, ah, so we're very comfortable that the communal open space and, um, the communal facilities generally, ah, will meet the requirements of the future occupants of the development.

5

Ah, we hope that it – it complies so with – with the local provision as well as the State provision, and it also exceeds the – the communal areas that would otherwise be designed for student accommodation as we understand from – from Blue Sky and Hayball who have done a number of these, um, applications so we were quite
10 confused by the council's assertion that it was insufficient. Um, I – I don't know where they're coming from in that regard to be completely frank.

MS LEESON: Well, we will follow up with council on that as well, thanks. Thank
15 you, anyway.

MS RYAN: Right. Thank you.

MS LEESON: That's all I had, thanks

20 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thanks, very much, Di. Um, Casey or Steve, do you have anything that you would like to raise, um, in respect of additional information from the applicant?

MS C. JOSHUA: Nothing from me, thanks.

25

MR S. BARRY: No.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. Um, and I didn't have any further – further questions. I think, um, you've comprehensively sort of covered the – the questions that we
30 raised in our letter. Um, sorry, excuse me. Um, so no, thank you – thank you, very much for that. Ah, in terms of the next steps, um, so so far we have undertaken a – a site inspection. Um, today is, um, a – a day where we are undertaking our standard meetings with the applicant council and the department.

35 Um, depending on whether or not there's additional information that's required, um, which, you know, will be, um, provided on notice, um, that may take a – a few days to receive and review that – that additional information. And, um, because of the – the nature of this project, um, being on the – the expedited list, you know, we are working towards the – the timeframe set by the Minister but, um, that is, of course,
40 subject to receiving the – the information that we need to – to be able to undertake, um, further determination.

So, um, you know, I think, Casey, is there anything else that you want to add in terms of the timeframes for orders?

45

MS JOSHUA: Not really. As Ilona mentioned we are working towards complying with the timeframes identified by the Minister, but if any further

information is needed the timeframe may be delayed, and also noting we've still got some stakeholder meetings to hold today.

MS RYAN: Understood, thank you, for that.

5

MS MILLAR: Okay. Ah, look, there's – I don't think there's anything – anything further from – from me at this stage so with – with that, um, I will formally close the – the meeting, um, and thank you, all, for – for your participation, and we'll look forward to receiving that additional information with respect to the solar access, and if that can be provided, you know, reasonably quickly then – then that will assist our – our processes. Um, um, if there – if there's anything else that we need to come back to you about with respect to our, ah, consideration of the matter we'll – we'll be in touch through the Office of the Secretariat the Commission, right.

10
15

ADJOURNED

[10.27 am]