



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-1199012

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCIL

RE: DONCASTER AVE STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

MATTER NUMBER: SSD 9649

PANEL:
ILONA MILLAR
DIANNE LEESON
CASEY JOSHUA
STEPHEN BARRY

COUNCIL:
LOUIS COOREY
JOHN FLANIGAN
FRANK KO
LORRAINE SIMPSON

LOCATION: VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 11.09 AM, WEDNESDAY, 13 MAY 2020

MS I. MILLAR: So good morning to – to everyone, and 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. Welcome to the video conference today to discuss the proposed student accommodation at 4-18 Doncaster Avenue, Kensington. As you know, this is a proposal located in the Randwick Local Government Area. My name is Ilona Millar and I am the Chair of this IPC panel, and joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Dianne Leeson. We also have Casey Joshua and Stephen Barry from the office of the IPC, who are also in attendance. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's video conference is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This video conference is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It's taking place at the preliminary stage of our determination and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of participants in the meeting and to clarify issues when we consider it appropriate. Um, we have provided a list of questions on notice, um, but other issues may arise during the course of the discussion and if you are asked a question that you're not in a position to answer, um, on this video conference, um, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing. Um, any further information provided in writing will then be put up on our website.

Um, now to ensure the accuracy of the transcript, um, I would request that, um, all participants today introduce themselves each time before speaking and for members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. Um, it would be useful if, um, if you're not speaking, to put yourself on mute, um, and if there are any issues with the – the video transmission, then it may be necessary to – to mute the video, um, transmission as well. Um, so we'll see how we go, um, but I'd now like to begin the meeting. Um, and I understand that the Council has provided a presentation, which responds to the questions that were provided, um, by the office last week. Um, so if I could hand over to the Council to introduce yourselves and to, um, begin your presentation. Thank you.

MR F. KO: Thank you, Chair and thank you Commissioner. Um, the – my name's Frank Ko. I am the manager, uh, development assistant and today with me I have Louis Coorey. He's a senior planning officer and, um, and I have John Flanigan. He is the co-ordinator development engineers. Um, so, ah, we've had, ah, as you mentioned, we have prepared a presentation today. So, um, is it best that, you know, we, um, share the screen, um, and we can go through the, um, the presentations, um, together? Would that be the, um, preferred options, Chair?

MS MILLAR: Ah, yes. If you – if you are able to share the screen, I think Casey will enable that – that function and if you can share your screen and work through the presentation. If there are any technical issues, we do have a copy of that, um, that we can refer to separately, if necessary.

MR KO: Okay. Well, let's give it a try. All right. Can everyone see the – the presentations?

MS D. LEESON: Thank you, yes.

5

MR KO: Yep. Yep. Okay. So the presentation has been, um, formulated, um, in response to the questions that was provided to Council a week ago. Um, so there's seven questions, um, so we'll go through them one by one. And during the – the discussions, um, my team would be able to jump in, you know, and – and respond, um, to any things that, um, the Commissioners may have. So the first question is about, you know, does the Council have res issues or concerns based on the Department's assessment report and recommendations? So we reviewed the report, um, so we've, um – have concerns about the, um – firstly, the, um, how the clause 4.6 for boarding room size has been formulated. Um, so our view is the – is that the – the clause 4.6, um, you know, sets out the, um, preconditions, right?

So in the, ah, Chief Justice's, you know, for instance, initial action cases, he stated, you know, the clause 4.6, you know, assesses preconditions that must be satisfied before consent authority can exercise the power to grant development consent. And then at, you know, paragraph 25 in the – the consent authority of the Court on appeal must form the positive opinions of satisfactions that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed both the matters required to be demonstrated by clause 4.6 (3A) and (B), right? So as such, the failure to satisfy clause 4.6, as the preconditions, means that the development must be refused. So the situation we have here is, you know, um, the Department's, you know, ah, indicated in their report that they're not satisfied with, you know, ah, three of the rooms within the new built form being oversized.

So as a result, you know, they've imposed eight conditions, to address that. So um, in – in – and our view is, you know, we think that, you know, it is not appropriate, you know, to make a finding that the consent authority is not satisfied and then to address that dissatisfactions by imposing a condition of consent. Ah, so therefore, you know, we – we, in our view, that – we think that, you know, that issue needs to be, um, addressed, um, ah and looked at, you know, by the – by the Commission. Um, was it just me, or was it someone else that time?

MS C. JOSHUA: No, that wasn't you. That – I think it was Auscript.

MR KO: Oh, okay. All right. So moving on to that. So ah, yeah. So – so basically, what our saying is, you know, it seems, you know, to us that, you know, it – it fails to satisfy the requirements under the precondition of the 4.6, so therefore, you know, the development must be refused. So moving on to the – the, ah, the other issues, which in relation to the height of buildings, um, we have noticed that the, um – in the assessment report, um, the, ah – it indicated that the development complies with the building height. Ah, so as you can see from the, um, the images that we've provided, there's three roof plants, you know, shown on the buildings and these three parts of the buildings, um, exceed the 12 metres building height standard, um, and

that, well, triggered the need for clause 4.6 and there was no clause 4.6 submitted. So therefore that would need to be addressed as well.

5 Um, moving on to the – the floorspace ratio. Um, you know, Council's view is, you know, it is a significant variations on our standards. The, um – the clause 4.6 that, um, justifications that are provided by the applicant, right, seems to suggest that, you know, um – they're talking about the benefit of the whole development and once again, going back to the, um, the Chief Justice Preston's, um, case, you know, initial actions, um, he essentially set out, you know, the procedures and how the clause 4.6
10 should be looked at. So, you know, the – the focus should be, you know, the element of that contravenes the development standards, not on the development as a whole, you know.

15 And – and we're – we're thinking the ORB justification provided by the applicants certainly promotes, you know, um, the benefit of having, you know, this development, you know. If you may turn to page 66 of the, ah, the Department's assessment report. It's – it talks about, you know, the – the development being an affordable rental housing, you know, and the, ah, it talks about the, ah, the building height is less than the – the REP height standards. Ah, it talks about the, um, the –
20 the, you know, how it complies with the landscaped and deep soiled area, right? So it – it's lacking of the, um, the essence of what the clause 4.6, you know, relates, you know, in this case, it's the floorspace ratio – the fact that, you know, it is 52.2 per cent over the, ah, the maximum floorspace ratio for this particular site.

25 So, um, so that's, ah, a significant concern for us and, um, and it – as a result, it, you know, it creates all these, um, additional impact, which related to the character of the area, etcetera. You know, and the other thing that we like to point out is, um, the applicant essentially tapping on the bonus FSR without any regards to the – the heritage items, um, as pointed out in clause 29(1)(c), you know, the bonus FSR – it's
30 only applicable to a site that doesn't contend heritage items, ah. So they essentially ignore the, um, the fact that this particular site contends a heritage item and that bonus FSR should not be applied. And – and that – that, in our Council – in Council's opinion, that is the, ah, intents of that particular clause, that restrict the – the bonus FSR to be applicable to certain circumstances, but certainly not a site that
35 contends a heritage item.

Um, so that leads us to the – the, ah – the character test. You know, we believe that the, ah – a very important part of, ah, the assessment that is missing in the, ah, Department's assessment report, is the, ah, the character test. And as we all know,
40 that clause 30A of the, ah, Affordable Housing SEPP relates to the character consideration. Essentially, that – that's a preconditions, you know, to a consent authority, you know, exercising their power to grant consent. So there are multiple court cases, you know, about this particular matter and the Commission has always held the view that, you know, the local area includes both sides of the street and that
45 the visual catchment was the minimum area to be considered in determining the compatibility, you know, of the development.

Um, the – there are a lot of focus, in the assessment report, on the development across the road. Um, they are the older housing stocks, you know. I looked at them, they're about eight blocks and they're, um, four residential flat buildings. Four storey residential flat buildings. They were all approved in the, um – in the 60s. So they're – they don't – you know, they're not development that, you know, Council's OEP and DCP, um, anticipated. Um, they were approved under the previous planning regimes. They're not the desired future character for the area, so there are still multiple sites that are under development at the moment, you know, and they will be the one that should be looked at, you know. And, you know, as we all know, the – the case that the cases that talks about, you know, the visual characters.

You know, you look at the context, look at the compatibility and then you look at the impact, you know. In our view, that, you know, we feel that the, um – this is lacking in the assessment report, um, and therefore, that, you know, the Commission – you know, would like to bring this to the Commission as tensions, that, you know, ah, the entire character tests, you know, ah, hasn't been done properly and that should be looked at, you know, ah, closely, um, as well. You know, yeah. Please let know if you want me to go into the details of it, because I'm mindful of the time – timing, you know. We're still on, you know, the first questions and we're almost halfway. You know, or should I just leave it and you guys can, ah – can read it afterwards?

MS MILLAR: Um, we're – we're happy for you to – to just proceed with your response and we – we can look at that ourselves, I – I think.

MR KO: Now, moving on to their second questions, ah, which is in relation to the communal open space inadequacy. Ah, the – this development doesn't comply with the landscaped area and the deep soil area, ah, controls on the RBCP. And again, you know, ah, when you consider the character tests, you know, this is crucial, that, you know ah, that the DCP drives the future desired character for the area, so therefore these, ah, controls, you know, are equally important. That shapes, you know, what the desired future character of the area should be. And this development, ah, certainly fails to, um, address any of that. Um, so, you know, in our view, that we believe that, you know, if the development could provide, you know, greater setback, you know, at the – currently, they're 4.21. If that could be increased to six metres and that opens up the opportunity for greater, you know, deep soil or a proper urban space – sorry, a communal open space for the occupants.

So on the hindsight, looking at – the applicant's, you know, proposing a 50.2 per cent increase in the – the FSR, ah, and they're at the same time seeking for a, you know, oversized boarding rooms, um, and no doubt that, you know, that would generate greater demand, ah, for the needs of the communal open space. At the same time, you know, the only open space that they're providing is, you know, a small area towards the northern block. And part of that area, technically and strictly speaking, ah, the circulation pathway that wouldn't be functional when you try to, you know, use those space – use those area, you know. And when you look at it from the urban design perspectives, you know, they're certainly lacking design and there's no other way – no other places, you know, elsewhere in this complex, that would, um, cater

for the needs, you know, or the recreational needs of the, ah, the dwelling occupants. Sorry, the boarding house occupants.

5 So, ah, the next one is relation to the, ah, the floor level. Ah, so our view, we – you know, we think it's insufficient modelling and perhaps this part I will direct you to our co-ordinator development engineers, John Flanigan, to respond.

10 MR J. FLANIGAN: Go for it. I guess with the – the levels, we're looking at, um, the provision of, ah, levels that provide the suitable, ah, flood-free board that we've requested. Um, the concept allows for, um, areas to be sort of left as voids, as well, to transfer overland flow. So those levels are required to give the necessary free board to the flood planning and to provide for the overland flow paths. So I – I mentioned that's where the levels have been set. My conditions of consent, which are included in the draft conditions, will allow for an assessment of the overland flow paths and the intent of those conditions is not to increase flood levels over and above existing levels, external to site. So that in assessing their modelling, when it comes in with the, um, the next stage of the development, the idea of the conditions will be to ensure that we don't raise flood levels near the heritage item.

20 MS MILLAR: Okay, thank you. So it's – just to clarify, um, on the basis that the proposed conditions of consent from the Council are incorporated into, um, the instrument, those conditions adequately address your concerns about the, um, the flood levels and the, um, ability to ensure that that free board is available?

25 MR FLANIGAN: Yes, so the free board will definitely be – with the conditions for consent, will be available for the proposed redeveloped portion of the site, the – for the new development. We just have to check their modelling, to see what comes through, to make sure that we're not raising the flood level anywhere near the heritage item itself, because we can't obviously change the four levels of the heritage item and, um, we don't want to make – we want to make sure that we're not increasing flood levels around the heritage item, as part – and that's what the intent of the conditions are.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you. Um, Di, just a quick question for you. Is – is that, ah, do you have any further questions on this point while we're here? You're just on mute.

40 MS LEESON: Sorry. Um, that – that answers it for me. Thank you. I will have a look at – another look at the draft conditions, to see how they're phrased, because it is that issue around the heritage building that we need to be comfortable with in – in continuing our assessment. Thanks.

45 MR FLANIGAN: Could I add – I just apologise, could I just have one more comment there, that, um, we could certainly then make specific reference to the heritage item in the conditions for consent, if – if that was required.

MS MILLAR: Okay. And I think that's, um, sufficient for now. Should we continue with the – the next slide?

MR KO: Okay. Um, thank you, Chair. The – so the – the next question is about
5 the, um, with respect to the impact on the approved versus the proposed. So the, um,
the – I suppose the main impact is the, um – in terms of the residential amenity, is the
impact to the southern neighbour at 20 Doncaster Avenue. Um, the, um, it seems
like, you know, the – the assessment report, or the applicants, you know, have
10 indicated the – they've done the comparison, but that comparison appears to be
referring to a confined scheme as being the 12 metres in the building height and
extending four metres the site's set back, which, you know, in our view, ah, should
be based on the six metre set back, you know, what – that's the ADG requirements
and also, ah, a 10.5 metre wall height, because the wall is the, um, the part that
15 would, um – creates the impact as well.

So that – that's something that we've identified and the – the difference between the
two. In addition to that, the – we feel the approved development has a much lesser
bulk in scale, um, when compared to the approved. Sorry, the – the proposed, ah,
certainly with the buildings, um, to the north of the heritage item, you know. That
20 contains, you know, balconies fronting the Doncaster Avenue, whereas the proposed
are essentially a three storey vertical mass, you know, that is only broken up by a
mixture of materials, um, and – and if we, in looking at the development across the
road, those older housing stock, you know, the blocks built in the 60s, they all have
balconies, you know, fronting the street as well. So they're certainly, you know, not
25 picking up that characteristics, you know, in the area, if they're going to be relying
on the, ah – the building across the road.

So – and then into the south, you know, the approved development, you know, was
only a two storey built form. You know, it's certainly for the portion of the building
30 fronting Doncaster Avenue. You know, with an attic, whereas the, um, the proposed
has a three storey vertical mass again and also a continuous block along the southern
elevation. So this – this, ah – so this slide shows the difference between the two.
The top one is the approved, um, development. You can see that gap in the and
there's a, ah, the sloping portion so it presents as two stories to the street, with the
35 sloping attic roof behind, um, you know, and followed by a gap in the middle,
whereas the bottom image shows the proposed development, you know, with the
solid mass.

Yes, you know, they're providing a, ah, you know, a recess area, you know, along
40 the south-eastern corner of the building, but the overall mass is, you know, is there
and, um, the benefit of the approved scheme is, you know, it allows the, um, solar
access, you know, through the middle to the southern side and that is essentially what
the BCP encourage. You know, a break-up of the, ah, the built form and given that
the area's all in the R3 zone, they all have the potential to be redeveloped, you know,
45 and that'll be the – a continuous corridors, you know, along the southern blocks, you
know, um, and that's one of the, um, key highlights of the approved development.
Um, where this proposed development and in terms of the street, you know,

elevation, the – certainly, the, um, the breaking up into sections, you know, that has greater separation between the buildings and the building, as mentioned before, ah, consists of balconies fronting the street, you know, for the blocks to the north of heritage item.

5

These ones and also for the blocks to the south of the heritage items, they are representing two historic built form that is much more sympathetic, you know, to the heritage items, being the proposed development, you know, on – showing on the image below, that, you know, it's essentially dominating the, um, the local – the, um, 10 the heritage item, which you can see from this image here. This – where anything that's above these blue lines, essentially shows that, you know, the additional element that's protruding above the heritage item and that, you know, in Council's view, is the dominating element that, um, should be so this is another image that shows the, ah, the comparison. You know, the blue is the, ah, the – the blue shows 15 the additional bulk, um, that the proposed development provides, you know, and the red is the, um, the reductions.

So yes, so certainly, that the, ah, that part, where – south of, um, heritage items, you know. They're now proposing those three storey scale, which we think it's, um – 20 yeah, it's not ideal. Um, so moving on to the, um, the next questions. This is in relation to the – sorry, that's the still the same questions, you know, um, so that – ah, we talk about the privacy impact, um, so the, um, the approved development has conditions regarding those fixed – windows to be fixed and provided with privacy measures, whereas the proposed, um, the Department's assessment report, they've, 25 um, conceded that there's angled windows, so therefore, um, it wouldn't create any privacy concerns. But the fact remains, that, you know, um, they're not – yes, they're angled windows, but they're – they're – and all these louvres, these vertical louvres, you know, they have clear glazing behind it, right? So in the absence of knowing what the, um, those louvres – the specification of those louvres, we are 30 concerned that you know, there's still that opportunity for, ah, the occupants to be able to look out, you know.

So it essentially defeats the purpose of having a, um, an angled window. So, you know, that should be, you know, looked at by, you know – having the – the louvres, 35 you know, specified, you know, to ensure that you know, privacies can be maintained. Um, and the other things are the – the approved development complies with the FSR and the building height standards and also complies with the landscaped area, which is 59 per cent and – and the maximum building depth. So, um – so they're the main differences, um, you know, comparing between the two. 40 So just – so moving onto the next question, um, Council still have concerns about the single-lane driveway for vehicle access. We are aware of the condition imposed by the, um, the Department, which is copied, you know, on the screen.

We're uncertain as to how these conditions can be achieved without altering the built 45 form, um, which could have an impact on the amenity and also the heritage items. And leading onto that, as well, it would also, you know, effects the something that should have been, you know, consider, you know, at this stage. You know,

again, you know, it shouldn't be a condition that ought to alter the GFA calculations, you know, considering that clause 4.6 is a matter for considerations, you know, in this case. So that's something the Commissioner's attention, as well. Ah, question 6, um, so this is to do with the, um, the dedicated servicing bay. Um, 5 having regards to the – the recommendations, um, look, I – again, you know, I will, ah, direct this questions to Council's co-ordinator development engineer, John Flanigan, for response.

10 MR FLANIGAN: Council takes note of the, um, the desirability of having a service bay. Um, in terms of our waste management, though, we wouldn't typically go into the site to deal with waste collection and my understanding this site will still be serviced by Council waste management vehicle, so the service area's desirable for other reasons within the site, but it won't be utilised heavily for any waste management purpose.

15 MS LEESON: Sorry, it's Dianne Leeson here. Can I just clarify what John said, in terms of Council servicing the site with waste removal? I didn't quite catch what you said, John. Could you repeat that, please?

20 MR FLANIGAN: I said Council typically, in collection of waste from a – a development of this nature, wouldn't enter the site or go into an area within any of the carpark area, to deal with the waste management or waste collection.

25 MS LEESON: Yes, I understand that. But do you – would you still collect from the street? Is that what you mean?

30 MR FLANIGAN: Yep. Yeah, we'd have to collect from the street and you know, we can vary other things, such as, you know, rates of collection, ah, compaction, other things to minimise the number of bins presented to the street, but we wouldn't go within the property to collect waste bins or to move them around.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

35 MS MILLAR: It's Ilona Millar here, just to – to confirm that the proposed conditions that are, um, included in the draft instrument, Council has no further comments about those?

MR FLANIGAN: No, that's right.

40 MR KO: Sorry, Chair, should I continue?

MS MILLAR: Yes please.

45 MR KO: Thank you. So that brings us to the last questions, um, so the expected impact from the approved development compared with the proposed student accommodation. So no doubt the, ah, with the increase in the GFA, there would be greater numbers of, um, boarding rooms than expected and, um, the impact

associated with that, you know, are the greater demand for on-street parking, you know, considering that the, um – that the – you know, insufficient parking provided, you know, for this development. And one thing that, you know, we need to for New South Wales, is there's no – there's no such thing as student accommodations.
5 You know, there's – you know, it's not defined land use in any of the planning instruments, um, and you know, so they all exist against, you know the Affordable Housing SEPP.

10 MS LEESON: Sorry, Frank. It's Dianne Leeson here. I – I'm sometimes having trouble hearing you. I don't know whether you're too close to your microphone or you get muffled, I'm sorry.

15 MR KO: Sorry about that, you know um, yeah, thank you for letting me know. I'll, ah, can you hear me better now?

MS LEESON: Yes, thank you.

20 MR KO: Okay. Now – so the, ah – so the student accommodation is not a defined use, so we have been getting a lot of these applications for student accommodations and they all seem to – hinges on the – the students, you know, not needing to use the – the motor vehicles, or doesn't have the ownership of the motor vehicles. But, um, one things that I'm here to point out is the, ah – these development are being assessed as a boarding house, um, and as far as I'm aware, that, you know, there is no, ah, conditions that restricting the use of this development to student
25 accommodations only. Um, the – there's no definition of student accommodations, so technically, you know, if this development is approved, it's approved as a boarding house and therefore, ah, if the, ah – if the development, um, change hands, you know, others may wish to use it as a boarding house, and then the, ah, the basis of the, ah, assessment, you know, would be then questionable.

30 You know, so I just like to point that out, you know, at the stage that, you know, yeah. So it might be okay, you know, um, that might be the case. You know, even though there's no one who has any to demonstrate that, you know, student accommodations would generate lesser demand for parking. You know, there's no, ah, physical evidence, you know, on that particular regards. So, you know, ah, there's a risk that, you know, accepting, you know, the justifications that, um, parking is not needed or is likely to be less needed, you know, in the student accommodation scenarios. Um, the you know, with the, ah, 52.2 per cent increase in GFA, the, um, this site would now contend or be capable of
40 accommodating a greater number of, ah, students or boarders than what's anticipated, um, in a R3 environment and therefore, um, it will have a greater impact, you know, to the – to the neighbours, you know, and to the neigh – into the community, you know, and noise would be a – a significant factor would have an impact on the other residential development nearby.

45 Um, and the other thing is the – the boarding rooms, you know. Some of the boarding rooms have – with less than three metres um, to be, um, less ideal, you

know. Considering these rooms are all self-contained rooms, or most of them, um, self-contained rooms. You know, and having a room size that is three metres, while we appreciate that these are not strictly applicable to the boarding house development, but we believe that, you know, these rooms, you know, most likely the
5 boarder will be occupying the room for a long period of time and in the absence of a, you know, a generous, ah, community amenity provided for the boarders, you know, such as the internal communal area, or the other communal area, we anticipated that occupants likely to spend a lot more time in the, ah, their own room. Therefore,
10 that, you know, the room size should be adequate, you know, and – and using ADG as a guide, in our view, is a consid – reasonable approach.

And this has been noted in, you know, other cases, such as, you know, Arthur Wong v Randwick, where Commissioner Dixon stated that, you know, there's no reason
15 why affordable housing should not provide a high level of amenity. And this is a provision in our DCP, as well, that we encourage the, ah, affordable housing, you know, such as boarding houses, to provide high level of amenity for their occupants. so we feel that, you know, this is something that's equally important, that needs to be, you know, addressed at this stage. And um, that – that's probably related to what
20 they're seeking of – they, ah – it seems to be the overall summary, that this whole development, you know, it's all about, you know, um, packing as much, you know, floor space as possible, to get the – the yield. At the same time, pushing for the oversized room, where they can and, um, and not providing additional amenity to cater for that additional needs, you know, that they're seeking. So, um, that's pretty
25 much the end of our presentation, so I'm happy to answer any questions, um, that you may have.

MS MILLAR: No, thank you. Thank you very much for that presentation. I think that has very comprehensively addressed the, um, initial questions that we had with
30 respect to the Council's submission. Um, Di, do you have any follow up questions that you want to raise with the Council at this stage?

MS LEESON: Not right at the moment, thanks Ilona. There's a – there's a lot there, as you suggest, to absorb and I'd like the opportunity to go through the slides and compare some of those to both the DCP and the proposal as presented. I might
35 have some more questions later on, but at this stage, no thank you.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Di. And I think from my side, um, I think there are some points that were raised, particularly with respect to the, um, clause
40 4.6, um, variations, that I think we will look at ourselves and may come back with – with further points for clarification on those and possibly other issues. Um, in terms of next steps, as I mentioned in the introduction and opening remarks, this is, um, the beginning of our process, in assess – um, considering this, um, this application, and we are having meeting with the applicant, with Council, um, and reviewing any other submissions received. We have also inspected the site ourselves, um, and as part of
45 that – that process, as we hear from other stakeholders, we may have other questions that we would like to put to the Council, um, and if we do have those questions,

Casey or Steve from the office will, ah, come back to you in writing with those requests.

5 Um, as you're aware, this has been identified as a priority project by the Minister, for
– for expedition and so, we are working to quite a tight – tight timeframe, to consider
the material and the Department's assessment report. So if we do seek further
information, we will put quite tight timeframes on that for responses, um, in order to
try and, um, address the timeframes that we have been set. However, as this is
10 obviously is an important determination, you know, we want to make sure that we
get as comprehensible as information and inputs as we can from all stakeholders.
Ah, so I think that's it from my side. Ah, Casey or Steve, do you have anything else
you want to add at this stage?

15 MS JOSHUA: No, thank you.

MS MILLAR: Okay. In that case, I'll – oh, actually, I – I do see that we – we have
Lorraine, um, on the call as well. So thank you for joining. Just very quickly, since
we do have your expertise. I understand you're from the Council's heritage unit.
20 Um, is there anything that you wanted to raise, um, in terms of Council's views on
the impact on the heritage items and the heritage conservation area, while we have
you with us? Um, and you're just on mute at the moment, so if you could unmute
yourself.

MS L. SIMPSON: Okay. Hear me now? Okay. I guess the main point I'd like to
25 make in relation to heritage and design is that it is quite a large site and on a site of
that size, it's, I guess, quite possible to, um, come up with a design that has different
responses on different parts of the site to the surrounding context. And we can see
with the approved scheme, that – that that scheme did that by providing those two
intermediate buildings between the heritage items and the, um, adjoining
30 development in the conservation area. Um, it provided two buildings which
responded to the scale of the heritage items and provided a transition from those
heritage items to the conservation area and this scheme doesn't do that.

35 Um, it provides a very monolithic form over the entire site, which is not, you know,
articulated or – or, you know, has no depth of site, other than really changes of
material. So that's, um, I guess my – my key point. The – the only one was there's –
there's a very high fence in front of, um, sorry, I can't see you now. Um, there's a
very high fence in front of those buildings, um, between the heritage item and the
rest of the conservation area, which seems to be about – higher than the eaves of the
40 single storey buildings to the south. Um, it is an open fence, but it does seem very
high – unnecessarily high. That's me.

MS MILLAR: Okay, great. No, thank – thank you for those comments. Um, okay.
Well, I think on that basis, um, there – if there's nothing further arising from that,
45 Dianne or Casey or Steve?

MS LEESON: No thanks Ilona.

MS MILLAR: Okay, great. Look, in that case, I'd just like to – to thank you all for your time this morning. Um, we really appreciate, um, the time and consideration that's gone into preparing a detailed response to our questions, um, and if there are further points that we need to come back to you for clarification, we will – we will
5 do that as soon as possible. Okay. And with that, I will close the meeting. Thank you very much.

MR FLANIGAN: Thank you.

10 MS LEESON: Thank you, everybody. Thank you.

ADJOURNED

[11.57 am]