



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-H-1246787

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

APPLICANT MEETING

RE: 26 & 32 MANN STREET, GOSFORD

PROJECT No. SSD 11014

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON (Chair)**
WENDY LEWIN
HEATHER WARTON

APPLICANT: **NICK BYRNE**
PETER PENG
FRANK KATSANEVAS
EDWARD GREEN
JUSTYN NG
ANDREW HARVEY

LOCATION: **SYDNEY**

DATE: **10.03 AM, TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2020**

THIS PROCEEDING WAS CONDUCTED BY VIDEO CONFERENCE

5 MR WILSON: Okay. Shall we just do a quick introduction before we get into the formal side of things? Over to you, DKO.

MR BYRNE: I am Nick Byrne from DKO Architecture.

10 MR PENG: So I'm Peter Peng from DKO Architecture.

MR KATSANEVAS: Frank Katsanevas from St Hilliers.

MR GREEN: Ed Green from Urbis Planning.

15 MR NG: Justyn Ng, St Hilliers.

MR HARVEY: Andrew Harvey from Urbis Planning.

20 MR WILSON: Okay. Chris Wilson, Wendy Lewin and Heather – Heather Byrne from the Commission.

MR BYRNE: Warton.

25 MR WILSON: Sorry. Heather Warton. Excuse me. So before we begin, I would acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet and pay my respects to the Elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today. SH Gosford Residential Proprietary Limited, the applicant, is proposing a concept application for – for building envelopes within three towers for residential, hotel and commercial uses, an associated landscape masterplan, design guidelines and design excellence
30 for the site at 26 and 30 Mann Street, Gosford. This is SSD10114, known as the Central Coast Quarter Development.

35 My name is Chris Wilson and I am the chair of this panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner, Wendy Lewin, as well as Heather Warton and, from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. Representing the applicant are Justyn Ng and Frank Katsanevas from St Hilliers, Nick Byrne and Peter Peng from DKO and Andrew Harvey and Ed Green from Urbis. In the interests of – did I miss someone there?

40 MR BYRNE: That's everybody.

45 MR WILSON: In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process and it is being conducted by electronic means in line with current COVID-19 rules around social distancing and public

It's taking place at a preliminary stage of this determination process 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 meeting attendees to clarify issues as we've considered appropriate.

5

If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer straightaway, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information which we will subsequently put on our website. I would ask that all participants state their name before speaking each time and please be mindful not to talk over the top of one another so that we can ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now work through the agenda. So I am going to throw over to DKO for a presentation from the applicant.

10

MR BYRNE: We aren't allowed to share screen for some reason. You have to allow us to – you're the host.

15

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR WILSON: Have we got to, Heather?

20

MS WARTON: I should have checked that but I don't know how to do it. Can you email it to me?

MR BYRNE: No. It's too large.

25

MS WARTON: Does anyone know how to – sorry.

MR BYRNE:

MS WARTON: Let me just - - -

30

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That little arrow thing, isn't that where you click it? The share screen there. No. No, the participants, next to that.

MR BYRNE: So, Heather, if you click on – if you click on the – if you click on the participants,, you – and you will probably see us at the top there somewhere.

35

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR BYRNE: Can you do – can you click on anything there?

40

MS WARTON: Yes. There's make host, allow record, rename, putting one in room, remove report.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we send it through to them in - - -

45

MS WARTON: Sorry. I should have – I should have checked this beforehand.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: we can Dropbox it.

MS WARTON: Make host, allow record. Make host. If I make you the host temporarily.

5

MR BYRNE: Okay.

MS WARTON: We will see what happens. Yes. I've made you the host.

10 MR BYRNE: Done.

MS WARTON: It's right now.

MR BYRNE: Done.

15

MS WARTON: Okay. Good.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well done.

20 MS WARTON: So easy.

MR BYRNE: Well done. It usually takes a couple of goes. So I'm Nick Byrne from DKO Architecture. So just in terms of the timeline, it's obviously a – a long period that we've been working on the project. So since the site was acquired, effectively, in mid-2017, we undertook a design competition with three reputable firms. We were awarded the winning design competition design and, since then, we worked to 2018 where we worked through, with Council, a series of times – probably saw council three or four times, at which point we got to – we got to, effectively, a position where we were ready to lodge the first stage of the development and a concept or envelope DA in there as well. So with – that was – that was back in pre-
30 – pre-SEPP days.

So from that period on, we've undertaken a pretty exhaustive design review session with effectively seeing them, you know, four or times prior to the lodgment of the submission and once or twice after. And we've also consulted with Council a number of times. Post this slide here, we've obviously seen Council on 22 December last year and we've also seen them and – and – and gone through their objection on 25 February this year. So a fairly exhaustive stakeholder engagement that we've undertaken as part of the application that's before you.

40

So just in terms of the site, obviously we've been to site last week and gone through a lot of – a lot of this as well. The site sits at the – the southern side of Mann Street and it's a key site in relation to the way you would see it when you come into Gosford. You know, you could argue that it's actually the beginning of Mann Street, albeit that it's obviously the furthest distance from the train station, but it's a very visible site and it's a very important site as a catalyst for the rest of – the rest of Gosford.

45

Just a little bit more in terms of the context and, again, we've added in the – the Leagues Club site, and you see there's – there's a – there's a vast amount of change that's going to happen in the next five or 10 years as a result of the SEPP and also pre-existing approvals – actually working our way through and, in terms of scale, the
5 scale – and this is just indicative for the Leagues Club, but we believe there's a 30-storey building that will sit sort of somewhere in the back of the – back of the site through here. We have this approval here at 33 and we have a series of other approvals that are of significant scale, and we sit down the bottom of the – well, in the southern end of Mann Street that – that sits through here as well. So in terms of
10 the character of the area, it's going to change pretty significantly in a relatively short period of time.

The site itself has got an eight-metre fall that sits across it from Mann Street down to, effectively, the Leagues Club park. It – it has a favourable orientation in some
15 respects but it's a little bit difficult with this particular back Baker Street orientation through here, that that's about 1 o'clock, shadow angle in mid-winter so – and we've obviously got the benefit of making sure that we face as many apartments to the amenity, which is the Brisbane Water's as well. There are a series of large trees that sit through here. Some of these ones on the southern side of Vaughan Street have
20 tree preservation orders and we're – we're intending to retain the main Moreton Bay Fig that sits on the corner of Vaughan Street and Mann Street in the south-eastern corner of the site.

MR HARVEY: Thanks, Nick. Andrew Harvey from Urbis. So we're – we're
25 representing the applicant from a – a planning perspective. So I wanted to just provide a fairly quick overview of – of some of the strategic planning framework and drivers that – that have been quite important to the – I guess, the work with Gosford. As – as Nick said, we – the site was purchased in 2017 and, I guess, from that point
30 in time, it's – it has been interestingly coincided with quite a comprehensive review of – of the work – the strategic planning work for – for Gosford City Centre. Nick, if you could just go to the next slide. Yes.

I think part of – an important part of that was a really comprehensive review of Gosford that was undertaken by the Department of Planning in 2017. So this is not
35 long after the – the applicant had purchased the site, and that was – that was a really interesting process where the Department, with the assistance of the New South Wales Government Architect looked at Gosford at a – at a – at both a macro and a micro level and tried to understand that, obviously, at a regional level it was very important that something happen at Gosford and that – that, really, to – to maintain
40 and – and meet the – the vision of the – the regional plan up there, there needed to be further work around how Gosford could really deliver the priorities at a regional level.

So Go Gosford, which was also assisted by the Central Coast Governor-General at
45 the time to really look at what are some of the key moves that Gosford needs to – to get to the level of status that it needs original setup. So the work that the Government Architect did with Crowfe, which was their consultant, was looking at,

you know, what are all the themes that are emerging in Gosford from a design perspective and movement, pedestrian, opportunities but, also, how – how does the – the real drivers around employment, tourism, activation, design excellence, public access, sustainability going to be – to be arrived at. And I guess as part of that – that
5 formulated consultation with the – the local community, St Hilliers, the applicant, were part of that as well and fed into that, and what – what then emerged from that was the creation of the – the SEPP for Gosford as well as quite a comprehensive DCP.

10 And what the SEPP really sought to do is take a lot of those – those aspects from the Go Gosford work and enshrine that in policy and, importantly, the site was noted as a key site and – and quite specific key moves that were identified within that were particularly of relevance to our site. So it was – it was to be the subject of a
15 masterplan, this key site. It was really to explore visual connections and link Mann Street down to the – to the park and the – the waterfront. It was also about looking at publicly accessible space and how to really work that through a number of these key sites. And then with – in relation to height, there was very specific comments around height to be determined through a masterplan process and also with oversight from the Government Architect in an advisory role. And, also, Baker Street was – was
20 noted as – as a priority given that it was going to interface with the park where there was significant investment being put into that. And, look, in many ways, we saw this as – this is a real opportunity for Gosford to – to – to really deliver broader public benefits for a number of these key sites. So if we just go to the next slide.

25 Yes. So this slide just really indicates, I think, in many ways, what the opportunity with the – the state policy has been with these key sites and what's particular in relation to what this site can deliver. We – we're obviously at a point with Council where we're very close to lodging a – a DA that, you know, aligned with the – the – the previous LEP. But I think when we reflect, I think there's a number of really
30 interesting public benefits that have come through this quite intuitive process with the – the government architect and the DRP and, also, Council and the Department and, when we kind of reflect, I think some of these benefits are really a big boost to employment both – both jobs within the construction stage and then operationally.

35 Retail, we – we made a really big, you know, somewhat bold move in – in really enlarging the amount of retail and – and – and non-residential space in the development, which is going to add to expenditure which – which Gosford really needs. Tourism, we're providing – you know, we're obviously committing to a – a fairly significant hotel with conference facilities, which has been identified. You
40 know, a lot of the Go Gosford work is really something that Gosford needs. Housing choice and affordability, we're obviously providing quite a large number of apartments but also a variety. A lot of work we've picked up in – from the affordable housing policy that the – the – the Council looked at was really, you know, trying to provide a diversity and – and different sizes of apartments.

45 And I think through the DRP, we've also been able to deliver a number of really significant onsite benefits, so the through-site links, established embellishment and –

and maintenance of those links, equitable access linking us from Mann Street to the park, commitment to public art and also work with Indigenous interpretation through the site, public lighting, weather protection, wayfinding, and I think there's a real opportunity still and a commitment to work with the park and find ways to enhance what's being delivered at the moment and further embellish that.

And I think, lastly, just another last comment before I hand over to Nick, is, you know, Gosford has some pretty – in terms of New South Wales regionally, it has some of the highest contributions. So there's state and local infrastructure contributions. So, based on the value of this development, which will fluctuate, that, in addition to all the other things, is still, you know, not far off four and a half million dollars. So we still think, through the – the detailed stages, there's real opportunities to deliver a pretty comprehensive list of public benefits. I will just pass over to Nick to now go through some of the design - - -

MR BYRNE: So just – Nick Byrne from DKO again. So just in terms of the way we've approached the site, obviously these are just in broad principles that we've – we've used to actually determine how we place the buildings and how we address the context of the site. Obviously there's a – there's a – there's a large natural – natural character that surrounds the site. We've got a – a park development that sits on the western side that actually is changing rapidly, as you saw on site last week. So that's probably just trying to retain as much of the natural character as possible and that particularly involves the retention of the Moreton Bay Fig in the – fig in the south-eastern corner of the site, which is obviously a very difficult thing to do on this, but we've sought to retain it.

Understanding Mann Street – as I sort of alluded to before, it – you know, it is a distance from the train station but it is a publicly visible site, particularly from the region from the train line. So it's just making sure that anything we do here is sensible, and is stageable and – and will happen. Connecting the grid – so, again, one of the – always one of the key principles that we sought, even before the park was envisaged, was making sure that Baker Street ran through. A city of streets and – and a street network is important. So it – it's making sure that – that we actually do address Baker Street and we do subsequently address the park.

And probably the last one was, there has always been the overarching determination to have a – a three-site link and site permeability. We've obviously taken that to the next step and – and provided two three-site links. But, effectively, what really changed from the original proposal to now was the park and the fact that the nexus or the – the central node of the park is this tidal terrace and we've sought to maintain a visual through-site link from Mann Street through to the park and the tidal terrace and the Brisbane Waters beyond.

So just a quick look at – at the park itself. So you can kind of see that this is the – the zone through here that does include the tidal terrace and, effectively, two-way of Baker Street to this point through here and then one-way down to Vaughan Street through here. It's effectively – it's not a curved street, so it will feel like a shared

zone and there are a series of other street – sorry, there are a series of other walking paths that – that sit around the site as well.

5 In terms of the way we've actually determined the building mass, so you take the original SEPP building mass. You break into three envelopes. We're always keen to adopt a sort of an urban approach to this such that our thinking is that, you know, that the – the buildings are different, the bases are different and it does have a little bit of a brickiness about it as well. You take the buildings, you break them into three. You start to actually make them more slender so you get glimpses of the Rumbalara Reserve and the – the natural character that sits – sits beyond. And then, from there, again, just reinforcing the fact that we want these buildings to – they will be a family of buildings in terms of the way they're treated but there – there is a diversification in terms of the way that the site has delivered as well.

15 Similarly with the base of the buildings, we want this to feel like an urban laneway. We want these to have different edges to them so that they – there is that diversity and that urban approach to it. The three site links, they're obviously of different character as well. One way is a laneway that's six metres wide and one is a sort of slightly more open space that – that opens out to a – a large group of steps that takes you down to the – the park itself. And just some precedent images of the way these spaces could feel, and you can kind of start to see the character of it. I mean, through our community consultation, what we did find is the public were after – want an urban approach to – to the – to the site so that it wasn't just necessarily that coastal feel, it was actually something a little bit different as well. And, again, that by virtue of the fact that we've got different podium treatments, we were actually after different retail experiences as well, so that you actually have fine dining/café down on the park effectively and, you know, we've got, you know, different exposures to – to solar access as you take the retail experience from the site.

20
25
30 And just a quick overview, and this sort of starts to show that, you know, you've got communal open space that sits on top of these podiums to – for each of the residential buildings. You have the – you have the hotel building that sits on Mann Street through here. It also has a swimming pool and a – and a deck that sits through here, so it starts to address the site and – and capture the views of Brisbane Waters as well.

35
40 In terms of the edge treatment, so there was a little bit of discussion about that. Effectively, it's a 12 – 12-metre high podium. The retail levels, you will see on the plans, actually skip a level. So you've got a three-metre, you skip a level, you get another three metre and skip a level. This section is actually taken through the southern building and you can start to see that these are actually large, flexible spaces that sit in – in the podium zone. Eventually, there will probably be some – some protection through here that we deal with in terms of a shading because obviously we've got a situation where there's one side of retail, so we just need to pay particular attention to that.

And just a quick image of the way that has been received. Ignore the curve through there. This is supposed to feel a little bit more seamless and you can see from site they've actually poured the – the concrete through there and it is quite a – a flat – a flat surface and the hotel that sits into the background that actually does get views out to this park through here and then Mann Street right through – through there as well.

Just a quick synopsis of – of where we sort of come from. So presented on 26 March last year. Effectively, we've always had two three-site links. We were just keen to deal with the – the tree, retain the tree and, by retaining the tree, it actually provides us a more accessible solution down to the mid-landing through there. From 26 March to 28 May, all we really did was open it up so that you could actually get that full view that went down to the park and the Brisbane Waters, and then it was a situation from these iterations here, from the submitted masterplan to where we are now, is really talking about the southern – the southern building and actually stepping that down, so just providing a little bit more articulation on that corner through there and the way those were perceived as we went through. You can kind of start to see they were larger towers and, really, what we've ended up with is something that starts to step down and deal with the topography as well.

Obviously, each of these stages, when we undertake them, we have to go through, again, a design review panel process and – and achieve design excellence on each of these stages. So it – it's – the applicant is fully aware of the fact that we need to go through that process every time. In terms of the staging, the way they work is this is the – this is the hotel component through here. We can utilise the existing access that – that accesses – to Mann Street through here on that stage. And then, as the stages build up, you've got an access through here and an access of Vaughan – Vaughan Street as well. And then the final is the northern tower, and the northern tower can effectively be accessed either through Vaughan or through the rear access through there. So it just provides us a flexible way to actually stage the building and – and build it as – as each of the stages come up.

We've taken a responsible approach to the staging to make sure that we haven't got huge stages in terms of presales so that they don't take a huge amount of time to get delivered and, really, a lot of the yield is determined by the bulk amassing of the car parking. Car parking going below ground here is a difficulty and we've taken the approach that we want to get above ground car parking but use it – use the sites fall to actually deal with it and sleeve the remainder around the perimeter of the site.

Shadow analysis on the parks – the DCP requires that 70 per cent of the park is – achieves four hours of sunlight between 9 am and 3 pm, and just in terms of if we just simplify these – these drawings to show these a little bit more clearly but the left-hand side is the proposed scheme and the right-hand side is – if we were to do a 3.5 to one scheme, there was three buildings and a smaller building, that gets to 3.5. Obviously, we want to get as much development facing the park as possible. And just a quick analysis of it. So in the existing – sorry, in the proposed situation, we're talking about 3800 and, if we were to do this scheme through here as a hypothetical,

closer to 4800, and that's at 9 am. And then, at 10 am, it's a little bit – we're a little bit more through here, but as you get to 11 o'clock, as we sort of saw on site last week, get to 11 o'clock, it runs pretty much parallel to Baker Street, or the first part of Baker Street through there. So there's not a huge effect on the park at all from 11 o'clock really onwards, or 10 – 10.45 onwards, and then obviously it starts to swing around as we go through the day.

And, in terms of just a quick summary table of that, so, in the status quo, 63.3 per cent of the park is overshadowed at 9 o'clock and you can kind of start to see from 11 o'clock onwards all of these are the same because, really, none of the development that we're proposing here has the effect on it and, you know, there are slight differences in these two timeframes through here whereby a compliant or a set RL 48 compliance standard is 91 and we're at 85, and vice versa in – at 10 o'clock. A lot of information to take on but, basically, the summary is that from 11 o'clock to 3 o'clock there's really no effect on the park in terms of overshadowing.

There has been a bit of discussion about visual impact as well, and just some – just something to actually start to show how those buildings start to cascade through and the fact that we've really worked hard to try to thin up the towers as much as possible to get these views of the – the reserve that sits behind and, I mean, this is quite low down on the bridge. Obviously, when you come right up the top through here, you actually can see more of the landscape as it goes through and some of the development that is happening over time. And then just the – the same sort of situation if we work to an RL 48 scheme that runs through and three buildings that sit on a park and, again, from Point Clare, it's a little bit more obvious that you get these sites that we talked about last week through here. They are actually significantly taller than what we're talking to the tune of five to six storeys, but you're still trying to maintain that – that ridgeline that runs through the top through there. And, again, a similar situation in terms of the RL 48 scheme.

There has been a bit of discussion about the volumetric feel of the envelope. So to – to paint the picture, we – we, effectively, approached this site in – insofar as we were designing the buildings and we were sort of asked to – by the design review panel to – to, effectively, wrap that. So what has – what – what has effectively happened from there is we've – we've got a scheme that – or a – a reference scheme that hugs the – with an envelope that hugs it to the tune of 95 to 98 per cent. But I suppose the point is with this is that what we're – what we're seeking is to make sure that that numeric number gets removed but we have to go through the process with the government architects again in terms of design review panel. Like any stage 1 or any envelope DA, there are always tweaks to it that occur as a result of the detailed design process. So we're – we're assuming that, as we go through that, there will be changes to it as well, or slight adjustments to it, like any sort of process.

There was a comment about the – the – the northern tower and probably just to bring it closer to alignment to the DCP, it does make things a little bit difficult structurally, but we're happy to – to look at that. So what we're basically sort of saying is a 5.7 and an 8.7 setback through there as opposed to a 2.7 and a 5.7. So we're happy to

look at that. There has also been discussions about the solar access to the southern laneway, if you like, and I suppose the point is with that, is that we're trying to reverse-engineer what we sort of see as quite an urban experience to the southern laneway when we actually do have a whole heap of variety of retail offering through here that does have different solar access profiles as well. So we've got three hours, obviously, on – on Baker Street as such and then you actually get additional solar access on the podium levels through here. So we're probably questioning why that requirement has come in.

10 Obviously getting more solar access to a – to any space is fantastic, but we sort of feel that it's probably going to come at the detriment of a few other things that – like the – like the hotel podium, so we question whether that's a real – whether there's a real need to do that and just in terms of the way that actually works through the site and you can see that there's plenty of solar access through there. It's just down through here and the southern link through here. It was never envisaged that that would be a fully sun field light – sun field space. It's six metres wide and it has got nine-metre high walls on either side, so it's obviously very difficult to get that to work.

20 And you can start to see some of the – some of the queries that have come up as a result of that is slicing bits of this envelope through here off. This is the – the is the – the hotel podium with the terraces and the pool that sits on the top level through there. So we sort of question whether that needs – needs to be retained, full stop.

25 MR HARVEY: And sorry, Nick, just to add to that. I guess that space you see on the corner with the balconies would be still publicly accessible spaces.

MR BYRNE: Yes. So the intention with the – the hotel is that we do invite the public in there as well. It has obviously got the aspect. So the hotel, the bar, the pool – all those sorts of things, we're – we're assuming that they are publicly accessible spaces and we're working hard on the design to make sure that they – it doesn't feel like there's a private – private slash public domain line at the entrance to the building. And that's really it. I mean, then we get into the plans as such, but that – that – that sort of was the presentation and I don't know whether you have any – any queries on any of that at all.

MR WILSON: Well, you've answered some of our questions in part, so that's – that's a good start, and thanks for that. Just in terms of the hotel and the – and the Department's envelope efficiency condition, the Department's – the Department's assessment report also quoted that you were in negotiations with a – with a potential operator. How is – how is that going to pan out, I mean, if you're already in discussions and there's a potential condition that may – may affect you in that respect?

45 MR NG: So Justyn from St Hilliers. I – I can take that question because I've run the operator select process over the last 12 months. Basically, just in terms of a snapshot of what has happened to date is we went out and did an international

operator select for the site. That involved going to all the major hotel brands globally. We had 16 responses out of a total of 20 that we went to, so a very good reception. Since that took place, we've been negotiating and we actually do have an operator on board. It's not publicly available information so I'm not going to
5 nominate who it is but - - -

MR WILSON: No. That's okay.

MR NG: - - - the actual design has evolved with operator input to ensure that it's
10 catering for what they see as the key supply drivers for the market up there. That involves, obviously, the - the adjoining commercial precinct. That's critical. The hotel precinct is another room supply driver, and then conferencing to try and switch it from not only a business hotel but to a hybrid of business and tourism. So that's why the envelope is so dense and tight on that building, because we've actually gone
15 through a lot of feedback from different operators and gone through an operator select process to actually have someone on board, and that's why it's fairly developed.

MR WILSON: The challenge is going to be, I guess, to demonstrate design
20 excellence with - with that condition in - if that condition remains in place.

MR NG: Yes. It - it's definitely a big handbrake in terms of, you know, the process that we've undertaken and collaboration that we've had with the design review panel.

MR HARVEY: Just Andrew Harvey here. I guess the only comment we would add
25 to that is that we were - we became aware of that draft condition about solar access to the link, I guess, as a response to the part that we said we were willing to set back the - the northern tower, you know, and that - as Nick said, that isn't simple structurally and, you know, changes - it has effects on the basement and other things,
30 but we're willing to do that. I think the other point was we also agreed and suggested to the department chamfering the podium where that tower sits as well, and that does provide some benefit in terms of solar access.

So we - we kind of looked at this overall and took a view that, yes, if you isolate it to
35 the - to the through-site link, there are some areas where the - the link isn't getting quite as much solar access but, overall, it's actually quite a - you know, in terms of the - the diversity of retail spaces, it is quite - quite a sun-filled area along the park, on the podium and throughout the development. So I think they were our two kind of suggested amendments. We were just concerned about that podium edge of the
40 hotel for the reasons, I guess, Justyn has just indicated. And we thought the condition was a little bit - it was quite open-ended and we just weren't sure what that meant at the next stage. So we were just a bit concerned about that.

MR WILSON: Okay. Just - just, also, I guess, as a courtesy, we've asked the
45 Department to - to seek - well, determine whether they have any additional information. I guess what we're having a bit of trouble with - and I note that you did offer additional information in your response to submissions in relation to the - a

compliance scheme and the proposed scheme. So we've asked the Department if there's any more detailed information in relation to, you know, items like FSR and the SEPP control RLs, open space, the like. So we had a question of the Department for that, so that may – that may – I'm not quite sure what detail they
5 haven't provided us and what detail – what detail you've provided them, but we've asked them for that information. I guess we're just trying to understand in more detail the – the differences between a compliance scheme and – and the proposed scheme. So we've asked the Department that question. Wendy, I think - - -

10 MS LEWIN; Could I just ask on the matter of the hotel operator and the discussion and – and not – not to do with anything that's commercial-in-confidence. But, Nick, you were saying that the – the private areas of the proposed hotel might – there may be some way that the public also has access to – to those areas. How is that
15 agreement going to be reached, or have you started to negotiate that with the – the proposed operator?

MR BYRNE: I'm not sure whether it has been negotiated with the - - -

20 MR NG: Do you want me to take this?

MR BYRNE: - - - operator but in terms of the design, really what we're sort of saying is we're trying to actually bring the stairs and make this part of the site and you feel public as well. It's always the – the issue of walking into a hotel and then feeling quite a private zone. So it's just working our way through that, but Justyn.

25 MR NG: Yes, I can take this one. So Justyn from St Hilliers. Basically, in terms of hotel trends over the last 24 months, there has been a big push to try and make a lot of the common areas publicly accessible and that's – that's based on trying to increase their F&B trading. One of the things that hotel operators are good at are
30 generally their food and beverage operations. So that's where the current trend has shifted, towards trying to invite people in, make it more easy to access. And that's where, with direct feedback from the operators, we sought to make all the podium levels here publicly accessible. So from the entry level, there's a tavern or slash restaurant on ground floor. You know, that's – that's meant to be operated
35 independently of the hotel. So it's in the same building but it would be a different operator. As you move up, the conferencing would obviously fall in the – the realm of what's typically operated by a hotel. It's And then, as you go up, you've got a flexible pool deck, which is meant to be publicly accessible and have a food and beverage operation but also really just try and invite people up to take in the scenery.
40 So bringing outside guests into the hotel is critical to the hotel actually being a success.

MS LEWIN: Right. Okay. You mentioned also, Nick, that in the Eat Street through-link on the south, that there would be nine-metre high walls.

45 MR BYRNE: So it's – it's – it's actually - - -

MS LEWIN Sorry. On the north side of Eat Street where the hotel is, it's really not nine metres. It goes through to the - - -

MR BYRNE: Yes.

5

MS LEWIN: Yes, it's - - -

MR BYRNE: Yes. That's - - -

10 MS LEWIN: It's full height. It's the full height of the – the - - -

MR BYRNE: Yes. So – so you're talking about the difference between the height of this wall and the - - -

15 MS LEWIN: And to the - - -

MR BYRNE: And the right-hand side, yes. So that does change.

MS LEWIN: The east and – and south-east, yes.

20

MR BYRNE: Yes. So, yes, it does. So there's a – there's a level difference between there and that's probably to deal with some of the podium actually in the way that form works on that side through there as well. So, yes, there is a – there is a – I think there's a nine-metre high side on this side and I think it's 12 on this side or – or 13 on this side.

25

MS LEWIN: Right. Yes.

MR BYRNE: So, yes, it is. Yes.

30

MS LEWIN: Yes. Okay.

MR BYRNE: It's a little bit different. But, I mean, I suppose the psychology is a laneway. That's – that's the sort of view we were looking for. And then these – all of these individual, you know, elements through here are actually broken vertically so it does start to feel like – like a laneway as such, and not like so homogenous podiums.

35

MS LEWIN: Okay. So could I – I will just bring forward a question that we had that comes into Eat Street. You've got a fall of eight metres roughly across the site from the fig tree through to – to Baker Street. For the Eat Street area, this southern link, how are you proposing to offer all access – all abilities access through there and – and being six metres with food concessions or – or other – how is that going to operate?

45

MR BYRNE: There will be lifts that are installed at the transitional levels as well so that you will be able to access both – all of the levels because, effectively, there's a –

there's a top landing through here. There's a mid-landing and then there's obviously Baker Street. This link through here avoids that mid-landing, so it starts to come in and be slightly raked as it goes down to that mid-landing, and then there will be lift access that takes you down onto Baker Street as such. And, you know, to be honest
5 with you, the way it will work is that, because we will have retail car parking in here, there will be some publicly accessible retail lifts that take you to each of these zones in any circumstance from the car park.

MS LEWIN: Yes. I'm – I'm really interested in the on-grade accessibility. I'm –
10 I'm certain that you would have satisfied vertical accessibility in – in – in terms of mechanical lifts or – or other devices, but it's just the on-grade amenity that we're – we're really interested in at this point.

MR BYRNE: Sorry. Sorry, Wendy, I might – might be misunderstanding you. Are
15 you saying - - -

MS LEWIN: Eat Street.

MR BYRNE: So from down through here, it – it's all flat. Is that what your
20 question is?

MS LEWIN: No. I'm saying that the – it doesn't appear to be at all flat.

MR BYRNE: No.
25

MS LEWIN: There's a fall of eight metres, and I'm just wondering how the treatment through there, being a so-called Eat Street, will allow for on-grade equitable access.

MR BYRNE: Yes. So, sorry, I misunderstood. There is a mid-landing through
30 here. So that – that sits about six metres above Baker Street through here in the first place. So this joins up to that mid-landing and then there's lift access that takes you from there down to Baker Street. So this is all relatively – you know, there is a slight
35 fall through here.

MR HARVEY: It's step-free.

MR BYRNE: But – but it's basically all step-free. You can come straight into the
40 shops through there.

MS LEWIN: Right. Okay. Thank you very much.

MR BYRNE: There's a slight – yes, there's a slight level difference but - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes. Probably, what, roughly two – two metres max across there.
45

MR BYRNE: Yes. So it's something like that. So there will be a slight fall across it but, in essence, this mid-landing that sits through here is – is above Baker Street.

MS LEWIN: Good. Thanks, Nick. Good. All right.

5

MR WILSON: So, Wendy, I think we've – have we discussed sufficiently the 85 per cent? You had a number of questions.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

10

MR WILSON: So we've dealt with that? Are you happy with where we are with the 85 per cent?

MS LEWIN: Yes, I think so. Other than we're' – we're curious to understand how, in the submission, the proposal was described as a "loose fit", given that there is a great degree of - - -

15

MR BYRNE: It's very tight, Wendy.

20

MS LEWIN: - - - concern about how tight it is. So it's a curious sort of concept.

MR BYRNE: Yes. It's done in reverse.

MR HARVEY: Wendy. Wendy, it's Andrew Harvey here. Just - - -

25

MS LEWIN: Right.

MR HARVEY: Just to be clear, we're – we're comfortable with the condition. We didn't like the numeric percentage in there. Everything else in that condition we're comfortable with.

30

MR BYRNE: Yes.

MR HARVEY: And we're accepting. I think it was simply the additional numeric component on top of that that was our concern.

35

MS LEWIN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR WILSON: Can we go back to the slide you had on public benefits, please? Just – just quickly. What's the – what's the difference in GFA between the northern tower compliant and – and proposed? I haven't got the figure off my head to - - -

40

MR BYRNE: How much additional - - -

45

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR BYRNE: How much additional floor space you're getting from RL 48 to what the top is through there?

MR WILSON: Yes.

5

MS LEWIN: Nick, you have a table there, don't you?

MR BYRNE: Yes, we do. Just trying to add it up.

10 MS LEWIN: Sorry, Nick.

MR BYRNE: North. You're talking northern, Chris, aren't you?

MR WILSON: Yes.

15

MR BYRNE: It's about – the – the – each of the floor plates is – is 724 and then it actually – the top four levels cuts in half again.

MR WILSON: Okay.

20

MR BYRNE: So if that was 371, let's – let's call it 700. And then a RL 48 building would be - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It would have - - -

25

MR BYRNE: - - - 14 storeys.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. It would have a bigger - - -

30 MR BYRNE: Plate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - plate.

MR BYRNE: Yes. It would probably have a bigger plate.

35

MR WILSON: But there is a difference. Yes. There's a - - -

MR BYRNE: It's about – it's about 4200 square metres

40 MR WILSON: All right.

MR BYRNE: That's 45 or 50 apartments, something like that.

45 MR WILSON: So, looking at a lot of these public benefits that – a lot of these public benefits would accrue from a compliance scheme. I guess what we're – what we're wondering is that we understand the rationale behind revitalisation of – and how important revitalisation of Gosford CBD is. I guess what we're asking is, is

there any real opportunity for additional public benefit? You know, obviously affordable housing is the obvious one. We understand there might be a childcare centre. But is there any intention to enter into a VPA with either the Minister or Council in relation to delivering additional public benefit?

5

MR BYRNE: Yes. We - - -

MR WILSON: Making reference to affordable housing first up. I mean, a lot of these benefits down the bottom, like local and state infrastructure, that's offsetting your impacts regardless. They're not really public benefits in a sense, although they – they might facilitate upgrades to – to roadworks and business and so forth.

10

MR NG: Look, Chris, Justyn here. Just specifically relating to affordable housing, you know, there – there is opportunities to explore future things through VPA. That – that's actually in the conditions, I believe, that the Department put forward. But as Andrew mentioned during the initial presentation, Gosford Council actually released a affordable housing policy and a couple of the key things that they put forward is generally deemed affordable in comparison to Sydney. They've got five sites where they're targeting social and affordable housing and, you know, we – we – one of the other key things that the report mentioned was diversity or smaller strata opportunities to be pursued by the private sector, and I think, from our perspective, we're doing that in terms of providing a lot of new supply, which is smaller strata scheme which is targeted at that lower end of the market, and that's where the current thought is.

15

20

MR BYRNE: I suppose, Chris, Nick – Nick Byrne here. I suppose the thing that this current scheme allows us to do is to deliver 33 per cent of the floorspace as non-residential as well. The – the additional density in terms of residential means that the hotel and the retail can take a hit as we – we – when we originally looked at this site, we know that the area can sustain about 1400 square metres of retail in its current situation. We're providing 4000-ish square metres of retail and then we're also providing a 182-room hotel as well. So I think it's not – it's a difficult planning argument, but what it does allow us to do is ensure that there is viability of the hotel and additional retail, and really trying to future-proof the retail as well.

25

30

MR HARVEY: Chris, Andrew here. Just to add to what Justyn and Nick said. We – following our site visit, we had another look at that – that housing policy that the Council has released. It has about 27 strategies that they put forward to Council and I think it's fair to say that – that, from a private market perspective, it seemed to be that their focus is on the – the scale and size of apartments, which creates issue, I think, more generally for the private market. They – as Justyn said, they've identified a number of Council-owed sites that they want to deliver very low cost housing. They – one of the specific questions they've raised is whether they should explore policy leaders in terms of SEPP 70 and they -that hasn't been recommended as something they – they want to pursue.

35

40

45

So it seems to me that what Council have raised, if all housing is an issue, I think, to be fair, for the three years that we've been engaging with Council, I don't think once the issue of affordable housing has really been identified as being an issue that they've raised. And while I appreciate the push for – for why we – for why it has
5 been raised, I think it – it's difficult from an applicant perspective when there's no clear policy position to actually encourage it. So I guess from our perspective, we're just a little bit surprised that – that those comments kind of really came after the response to submissions, you know, when we're very advanced with, you know, where – I guess where the applicants explored the feasibility of the scheme. But I
10 think, to be fair, Gosford is still quite a volatile market and we're – we're trying to work through that.

MR WILSON: Okay. So, assuming there's a – assuming there's a rational argument as to why affordable housing shouldn't be pursued on the site - - -
15

MR HARVEY: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - I mean, have you thought about any other public benefits that might – that may accrue from the development. Have you discussed with Council
20 any other public benefits that may accrue?

MR HARVEY: Yes. So we – we actually provided to the Department of Planning a list of things that – and I don't know if it's part of your package of information that we submitted, I think, at the time we lodged our EIS and we're happy to provide that
25 to you. It didn't include affordable housing on it, Chris, but it – it talked about a number of opportunities, particularly with the park, because the park was, you know, obviously one opportunity and – and what has been costed is a base scheme, but I believe there's still other opportunities with the park that seem to be available.

MR NG: Yes. They were omitted because of budgetary pressure. So there are some key things in the park that they have to take away. We have ongoing conversations with HCCDC regarding those and they've provided us a letter of support back when we submitted a letter to the Department.
30

MR WILSON: Okay. No. That's sufficient. Thank you.
35

MS LEWIN: Just – just on that list before we leave it. Public art and Indigenous interpretation, could you expand on that and let us understand where public art is proposed and whether you've had any conversations or engagements with
40 Indigenous groups – relevant Indigenous groups and what that might lead to.

MR KATSANEVAS: Hi. Frank Katsanevas, St Hilliers. I believe as part of the landscape plan there was some allocation of art location, but, look, I'm happy to get back to you on that, if I can take it on notice – dig up the relevant sections and supply
45 it to, Wendy, if that's okay.

MS LEWIN: Yes. Thank you.

MR HARVEY: I think it's fair to say, Wendy, that, you know, I think that's a really great opportunity that we – we're happy - - -

MR KATSANEVAS: Yes.

5

MR HARVEY: To commit to, and St Hilliers, as a company, are very, very – you know, got a very strong track record in, you know, working with local Indigenous groups on a number of our projects.

10 MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR WILSON: Yes. Heather.

15 MS WARTON: You've touched on it already in the presentation, but we're interested in the impacts on the public domain, for example, the impacts on views from, say, Mann Street through the public domain. I think you showed a slide regarding the view corridors. Because when we were there on site, we noticed that you do get a greater view from Mann Street across to the water. Could you just go over that again?

20

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, the one - - -

MR BYRNE: The last one.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, I can bring it up.

30 MR BYRNE: Yes. So the way – and we can provide this as well, Heather. So as – as I sort of previously mentioned, we worked our way through the view corridors from Mann Street and it was really important to the design review panel and us to make sure that that view line was – was struck through. We've got a full analysis of that and if you need those views, we can supply all of that as well. So the intention is from Mann Street you can see the water.

35 MS WARTON: So you do have an image that shows from Mann Street?

MR BYRNE: Yes, we do.

40 MS WARTON: Okay. And the other view from, like, the bridge, Brian McGowan Bridge, is it?

MR BYRNE: Yes. Through – through here?

45 MS WARTON: Yes. Do you have a view like that showing the compliant scheme with RL 48?

MR WILSON: I think they do. That's - - -

MS WARTON: You do. Okay. Is that in the package?

MR BYRNE: Yes, it should. It should be in the package as well.

5 MS WARTON: Okay. Because I saw – I definitely saw the first one but I would have to go hunt for the second one.

MS LEWIN: Is that a complaint floorspace as well? If that's compliant height, is that also a compliant - - -

10

MR BYRNE: That's compliant floorspace as well but there is actually – we've got three buildings through here and you've actually got another building that sits on Mann Street as well to get the 3.5 to one. So that was – if you see here, Wendy, you've got one, two, three buildings and you've got the additional building at the
15 back there as well.

MS LEWIN: And do you have one that shows your tower configurations but with a compliant height?

20 MR BYRNE: No.

MS LEWIN: Would that be a lesser than compliant floorspace?

MR BYRNE: Yes.

25

MS LEWIN: Right.

MR BYRNE: Because, obviously, we've made made the buildings. particularly the hotel building, really quite slim – slender. So, you know, you start cutting the height
30 of all of these off and it will be less than the 3.5 to one.

MS LEWIN: I guess we were interested in, or the Panel was interested in a compliant, like, a tower form that had a – a compliant height and, I guess, whatever the FSR would fall out of that. But you haven't - - -

35

MR BYRNE: Yes.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

40 MR BYRNE: Yes. No, I mean it's basically – it's effectively slicing the – the yield table off at level 14 or 13 and saying - - -

MS LEWIN: Right.

45 MR BYRNE: - - - all of that there is – is the additional from RL 48 onwards. And, I mean, we just worked out that that was about 4300 square metres through there. So you go and do that across each of the towers, it will be significant.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS WARTON: We're good with that. Thanks.

5 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR KATSANEVAS: The wind impacts, we've read the Windtech report and it talks about needing, for example, densely foliated trees to ameliorate the impacts of wind and to make a suitable pedestrian environment, but we were interested to know
10 how that would work given there's – like it's hard surfaces and there's not like deep – there's not deep soil plating and so on. How will that work?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. The

15 MR BYRNE: So we will probably – we probably will have to get back to you on – on that, Heather, but our experience is notwithstanding you do have a hard deck and we haven't got folded set-downs, you can actually get trees within planters to actually, you know, achieve a 11-metre high foliage zone as well, but we will get
20 back to you with details on that.

MS WARTON: And so you think that that's shown on your existing landscape plan?

MR BYRNE: Yes.

25

MS WARTON: Okay. We have to look at that more closely then, but, yes, if you could confirm that, that would be great. And they talk about the trees on Vaughan Street ameliorating the impacts as well, but they're mostly on the other side of Vaughan Street. I suppose they won't be affected by the development, because
30 there's one – one big fig that has quite a large canopy that overhangs the street.

MR BYRNE: That's the one - - -

MS WARTON: Practically to your side.

35

MR BYRNE: Yes. So that is – that was that is the tree – yes, that – that's, effectively, the tree that sits on this corner right through here.

MS WARTON: Yes, yes.

40

MR BYRNE: And then we're obviously retaining the tree on this – you know, on this corner of the site through here.

MS WARTON: And your building won't affect the canopy of that large tree?

45

MR BYRNE: We've – we've – the tree that we're retaining, there's a full arborist report and assessment of that in our application. So because it's actually not the

canopy that's the real issue. It's the – the – everything below ground. You sort of saw that the tree is sort of hanging in a retained area in the first place, so we want to make sure we don't affect it at all when we go and build our basements.

5 MS WARTON: Right.

MR BYRNE: Our car parking levels.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's fully detailed in the landscape report you don't have that?

MS WARTON: We should have it on our – in our information. I think that's all from me. Will we talk about the staging, Chris?

15 MR WILSON: Yes. Just in terms of the staging, it's unlikely to change. Is that – is that correct?

MR NG: Do you want me to talk to that?

20 MR BYRNE: Yes.

MR NG: Justyn here. So in terms of staging, we've always taken the approach that any of the stages could commence depending on market conditions. So at this point there's no current thinking to re-order the staging. They're still as drawn.

25

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR NG: But we're – we're not caught by having to do it a certain way and there's flexibility in the site which is one of the benefits that we worked hard to get.

30

MR WILSON: Okay. Just in terms, we understand there's a – there's a design excellence process built into the SEPP and the so forth in relation to what would be the State Design Review Panel. What is the opportunity, or the appetite for future design competitions for the various stages, particularly the latter stages of the project?

35

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, there's no – there's no Chris.

MR WILSON: Okay.

40

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Look, Chris, I can – from the applicant's point of view, I can speak to that. We've always – and Nick mentioned this earlier, that there was a diversity of architecture that we were looking at across the site. So, you know, we – we may look at future status to revisit that with – with potentially other firms but given Nick's and Pete's background on the site and long history, definitely, yes, the incumbents - - -

45

MR WILSON: Yes. Please don't take that as any sleight in any way to any – any of the participants. It's more about, I guess, you know – I guess ensuring – because there's still a number of issues that – you know, there seem to be a number of residual issues that need to be resolved moving forward from the concept plan to the
5 – the DA. So it's just – it was just – yes, just a question we had.

MR HARVEY: Chris, Andrew here. Just – just on that point. I guess, in our experience, the DRP, even at a concept level, was – yes, I think it was about five or six meetings. So we – look, Urbis, we run a lot of design competitions but I think
10 it's fair to say that – I think the process we went through with the DRP was pretty intuitive and quite – three different members and quite a lot of progression through that, and I think it was quite unique to most DRPs in – insofar as how many sessions we had.

MR BYRNE: Yes, and – and the feedback. And the feedback that we took as well. I mean, we – we went and presented the first scheme, which obviously didn't have the park interface and we've pretty much started again, and then every single time we listened and – and worked our way through each of their comments. So I think it's
15 fair to say that, you know, it has been a pretty good experience from our point of
20 view.

MR WILSON: But I think Council mentioned that first scheme. We haven't really got much information on that first scheme. Council did mention that there were some positive attributes to that first scheme that haven't been taken through to the
25 second scheme. Is that - - -

MR BYRNE: I think – in hindsight, I think what we've ended up with is probably better. I mean, really, the fundamental difference was that because we didn't have this access that ran through the site that – that focused on the tidal terrace and the –
30 and the water, we were actually brining people through the site more and sort of discharging them down through here. So we had a courtyard in that – in that scenario, but it was by virtue of the fact that we really had to try to figure out how to activate the retail as much as possible. I think probably part of the problem with the process that we did go through is that notwithstanding Council were invited to the –
35 the sessions that we had with the Government Architects and their panel, they didn't often come. So we got to the end of the process and then they – it was a surprise to them notwithstanding we had gone through it in detail with them.

MR KATSANEVAS: Let me just add – it's Frank from St Hilliers – that when we
40 first ran the initial competition, there was no design – no concept of what was happening in the park. It was just a flat football field basically with weeds growing through it – nice area though – and that's what drove the first design. When we met with the DRP, that scheme was underway in the park. We got a snapshot of it and it probably changed the thinking.

45 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR KATSANEVAS: How we should address the park. And hence the – the vista from the Mann Street down to Baker Street.

5 MR NG: And I think just – it's Justyn here – further to Frank's point, like it – it was a point in time where the – the landscape was very different up there. The old scheme that we were pursuing under the former controls prior to the SEPP was definitely just shop top housing. So we've substantially increased the public domain and the – the retail offering as part of this retail masterplan.

10 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: So – it's Wendy here – back to this initial competition process, Frank. Did it follow any endorsed competition process?

15 MR KATSANEVAS: Nick ran – sorry, Andrew ran this for us.

MR HARVEY: Yes. Wendy, Andrew here. Urbis assisted St Hilliers with the process but it wasn't in – in accordance with a – obviously, a guidance from Council because Council don't have a policy or a requirement at the time we – we submitted
20 – we – we undertook that. I think it was done in recognition of the fact that this is a pretty significant site and that St Hilliers really wanted to ensure that the brief they sent to the architects was to really encourage diversity, to think about what was the best team to really take on board this process. It wasn't, in any sense, a locked-in scheme, but it was trying to get an understanding of, you know, who is the team that
25 we can work with that can think about design excellence and think about the things that are important to them. So in answer to your question, no, it wasn't a mandated – or, you know, in accordance with council's guidelines, like City of Sydney and other ones, but I think it was a recognition of design excellence being important to the applicant at a very early stage.

30 MS LEWIN: Okay. And if it was a competition, there was a jury.

MR HARVEY: It was simple. To – to be honest, it was a jury that comprised of senior people from St Hilliers, Urbis and – I think that was probably it.

35 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, that was it.

MR HARVEY: So we kind of – but it was not – it was not other independent people as part of that process.

40 MS LEWIN: And would – in hindsight, would you consider it more like a tender rather than a proper competition or - - -

45 MR HARVEY: I would say like a design ideas type competition and to select the right team and partner would be a fair way to describe it.

MR KATSANEVAS: So we have three notable architects, obviously, in DKO. We have GSA and we had Greg Crone – Crone’s Architect, that we - - -

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And they were all significantly different schemes as well, Wendy, I suppose, so we all had a very different take on how to, you know, put this project together.

MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you very much.

10 MR WILSON: Just – look, just a couple of things on Baker Street. We understand now how the iteration or the – the changing nature of the interface with – with Baker Street. There’s mention of a public space interface and a shared services agreement. Who would that be with?

15 MR BYRNE: So shared services agreement, is that what you said, Chris?

MR WILSON: Yes.

20 MR BYRNE: I’m not sure.

MR WILSON: Might just want to confirm that and how that – how that shared services agreement might be – might be maintained into the future, I guess we’re - - -

25 MR BYRNE: Who is that with?

MR HARVEY: Chris, sorry – Andrew – who was raised by? Was that raised by the Council or the Department, or - - -

30 MR WILSON: I think it was mentioned in the Department’s assessment report.

MR HARVEY: Okay. We can have a look at that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. We will – we will come back to you on that one.

35 MS LEWIN: Just a quick question on the car park. Is it intended that some or all of the proposed basement car parking areas are designed to be sacrificial or part of a mitigation strategy or sea level or flood rise events?

40 MR BYRNE: I suppose that the way the car parking has been designed is probably more on a cost basis that, obviously, we’re, you know, at water level, effectively. So we have taken a view of minimum amount of car parking possibly on the site and fully pretty much is the approach we’ve taken.

45 MR KATSANEVAS: Frank again. Just – you specifically asked about whether it’s sacrificial. The answer is no. Councils raise the RL 3 as being a sea level rise over 80 years with some freeboard as well. So we have gone down the path of making sure that the lowest entry point into the car park is at a minimum RL 3. So this has

got a floodgate going. So we're mitigating against any future sea level rise. So, no, it's not meant to fill up and, you know, flood out and then, yes, making it sacrificial. It's meant to stay dry.

5 MR BYRNE: And that's – Wendy, that's why you could see the crest on this side of the roadway here when we stood on that corner last week. So that has actually got a crest that takes up that deals with that sea level rise for the – the office – the existing office building as well.

10 MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS WARTON: Just on the car parking. It's Heather. The Council, I think, in their objection was concerned about the car parking not complying with the DCP. What's your basis for your car parking provision?

15

MR GREEN: Ed Green here from Urbis. So we've – we've – our car parking provision is based on complying, firstly, with the SEPP control, which is in legislation. So that applies to the commercial components of the development. The residue car parking for the residential components is seeking to comply with the RMS guidelines, which is in accordance with the New South Wales Apartment Design Guide. So we – we've adopted that provision on the basis that we think it's – it's correct, and also on the basis of the – the traffic generation in the area and density of the development.

20

25 MR HARVEY: It's Andrew here. I think – I think to add to that, I think there's a – there's a question around providing more or less parking and – and I think Gosford, if it's going to change and be a strategic centre and it's close to public transport, I think there needs to be – you know, key sites need to lead by example and actually show the – that – that, you know, this is not just going to be people who live in Gosford and work in Gosford. It's going to be a variety of different people that – that will commute and use Gosford as a – as a – as a strategic centre, and I think that's probably the – one of the – the issues that – that – that we're trying to deal with. We're – we're compliant, I believe, with the RMS and the ADG, which is the State and – and regional guidance on what – what those – those parking rates should be. I think, interestingly, going back to the affordability issue, one of the key actions in Council's affordable housing strategy is that adding additional parking then adds more cost to – to the price of apartments. And that's one of their specific recommendations that they need to think about, you know, rethinking the way their rates work.

30

35

40

MS WARTON: So are you going for the minimum under the RMS guideline, because I think in the – in the RMS guideline it's expressed as a minimum.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I believe – sorry, yes.

45

MR GREEN: Yes. So that's – that will be worked through, yes, the next stage as well.

MS WARTON: Also, I notice that there's no set car parking numbers, or you haven't requested any car parking numbers in the scheme, although there's – some of the slides you just showed us had car parking numbers. So how – how did the traffic generation get assumed? What – what was the basis of the traffic generation?

5

MR BYRNE: Yes. So, Heather, it's Nick Byrne here. So I think the traffic generation has been determined on the reference scheme. So we've worked – so just getting – getting there eventually. So we've gone and worked out a reference scheme on how the car parking, the loading and all that sort of stuff works, and it has been based on that, and that has been concurrently determined by the RMS rates as – as Andrew and Ed have just alluded to.

10

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR HARVEY: Heather, Andrew. Andrew here. I mean, I guess our specific apartments and our retail mix and all that will still need to go through a further stage, but I guess we've tried to provide the right amount based on the reference scheme at this stage, but that may change through the different stages.

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR WILSON: So I don't have – I don't have any further questions. Wendy.

MS LEWIN: No. I'm – I'm fine. Thank you.

25

MR WILSON: The only – only question I have is, I mean, do you have anything further to add on the Department's recommended conditions? Yes.

MR HARVEY: Andrew here. Look, I think – and, sorry, we should have probably said at the start it has been a very – you know, it has been a very lengthy level of engagement with the Department, and I think it's fair to say we thought the report was very comprehensive and we generally agree with the – the thrust of the report and the draft conditions. It's really only those two that I think we talked about earlier in the – the presentation that we thought just needed refining – not just some refinement and it's probably fair to say we've – you know, we've been through a pretty long journey and – and we also acknowledge the – the council's issues and we – I think, for the record, it's fair to say, well, it reads like there's an objection from the council, and there is.

30

35

I think we've had a pretty good relationship with them over the last few years and it's a bit of tension, I feel, between what the State are trying to achieve and – and – and – you know, which has led to the resolution by the Council laws around all these projects having to go through the IPC because I think, to be fair, we had some submission from the public which – we did a lot of work with – through our engagement strategy and we really quite happy that the submissions were really low, and I think that kind of demonstrated I think they want to see change here and we're really keen to get – get it happening.

40

45

MR WILSON: Okay. That has been good. I don't have anything – I don't have anything further to add. Do you, Heather?

5 MS WARTON: Before – before you go, can you just take your presentation off the screen so I can make me owner again?

MR WILSON: Can we get a copy of that, too, as well? That will be put up on our website as well.

10 MS WARTON: Yes, it does need to go on the website.

MR BYRNE: So we will send that through to you, Heather. Correct?

15 MS WARTON: Yes, please. Wait. Before you – don't go anywhere. I've got to fix this up. You might have to make me host. Sorry, DKO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How do I do that?

20 MS WARTON: Because I can't do it because you're the host. We clicked on the - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So click on Heather and it should say "More". Yeah.

25 MS WARTON: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you very much. I think there was one or two questions that you took on notice. Heather, what were they relating to? It's all right.

30 MS WARTON: Well - - -

MR BYRNE: There was the landscaping - - -

MS WARTON: I think – no. Just with the landscaping, yes.

35 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Indigenous art, shared services agreement as well.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40 MS WARTON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And I think – I think that was really it.

MR WILSON: Well, we might send you an email just to – just to remind you.

45 MS WARTON: Yes, they're the ones I had. Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS WARTON: I noticed you put up in your presentation your response to the Department on the conditions. I don't know if we have that, or maybe we can ask the Department for that.

5 MR BYRNE: We can send that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can provide that. Sorry. We weren't sure if the Department had - - -

10 MR WILSON: No. They didn't provide that to us.

MS WARTON: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. All right.

15

MR WILSON: Okay. Really appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much.

20 MR WILSON: We have to get going because we've got a meeting with Council in 15 minutes. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS WARTON: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Thank you. Bye.

30 **ADJOURNED**

[11.18 am]