



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: DORAN DRIVE PLAZA PRECINCT PROJECT (SSD-15882721)

DEPARTMENT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: ANNELISE TUOR (CHAIR)
 DR PETER WILLIAMS

OFFICE OF THE IPC: STEPHEN BARRY
 CASEY JOSHUA
 JANE ANDERSON

DPE: ANTHONY WITHERDIN
 ANNIE LEUNG
 JAMES GROUNDWATER

GOVERNMENT DARLENE VAN DER BREGGEN
ARCHITECT NSW:

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 12.30PM, FRIDAY, 29 JULY 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

MS TUOR: So good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners on the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Doran Drive Plaza Precinct Project currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant Deicorp - is that - I'm not sure if that's exactly how we pronounce it - Deicorp Constructions Pty Ltd is seeking approval for the first stage of the previously approved Hills Showground Station Concept Approval known as the Doran Drive Plaza Precinct. The project includes the construction of a mixed-use development comprising four residential towers up to 20 storeys, 430 residential units, a two- to four-storey retail and commercial podium, community spaces and a public plaza.

My name is Annelise Tuor and I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner Dr Peter Williams. We are also joined by Casey Joshua and Jane Anderson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one of part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

So now we'll begin. I understand that you have a presentation that you wanted to take us through, so maybe that's - and that covers the discussion points in the agenda, but that's maybe the best way, just if we start with that presentation.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes, thanks, Annelise. My name is Anthony Witherdin, and I'm the Director of Key Sites in the Department of Planning, and my team was responsible for assessing the application, and I'm here today with Annie Leung, who's a team leader in my team. James Groundwater is the senior planner, and we've also got Darlene van der Breggen, from - and she's a representative from the GA. And, yes, we have got a presentation that we'd like to run through this afternoon, and Annie and James will be doing that - they will give you a brief overview of the proposal, and we'll run through those key items in the agenda.

MS TUOR: Okay, great. Let's start on that.

MS LEUNG: Okay. Thank you, Anthony, and thank you, Commissioner Tuor as well. I will try to share screen. I've got to say, the Commission's agenda that has been issued to us has a fairly long list of items to be covered, so the presentation, it has been put together with the intention to cover it all, but obviously, Commissioners, or any of the officers, if you want to interrupt at any point in time for a question, please, do so, but also if you want me to skip through certain sections for the sake of time, or
10 if you already have an answer to your question and want us to move on, please do so as well.

MS TUOR: Okay. So your preference is that we interrupt you as you go with the questions that we might have?

MS LEUNG: I think that would be the best, just because of the number of items that has been mentioned on the agenda.

MS TUOR: Sure.
20

MS LEUNG: So I'm happy for the Commissioner to ask us to focus on particular section as well, if needs, maybe, so that we can actually cover all the agenda items.

MS TUOR: Okay. Probably just the introduction about the proposal itself, that's something that you can probably be fairly brief on, because we have obviously read your assessment report.

MS LEUNG: Yes, understand. Okay. So I will try to share screen. Hopefully everything works. So just so an indication that everyone can actually see my screen.
30

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS LEUNG: Yes, thank you. So as directed by the Commissioner, I will skip through the front end of the preso, which is relating to what the proposal is about. I also understand that the agenda item, as requested by the Commission, asked for a brief introduction on the concept approval that relates to this site as well, so we will go through that as well.

MS TUOR: Okay.
40

MS LEUNG: So just so a brief understanding of where we are. So we are at Castle Hill. This is the Hill Showground Station, not the Castle Hill Station, which is kind of one stop towards the Tallawang direction of the Northwest Sydney Metro line. The line has been in operation since 2019 so it is an operational station at least.

10 The Commissioner already introduced the - what the proposal or what the application is seeking approval for, so I won't repeat that, but just to the kind of top right-hand corner of this slide, which identifies where the concept approval, which is near the - around the metro station, relative to the wider Hills Showground precinct, which has also been rezoned.

20 And at the bottom right-hand corner, which identified the three precincts within the concept master plan, and the Doran Drive Precinct is the one that is in the middle. To the north of the Doran Drive Precinct is the Hills Showground. To the south of it is the metro station, as you can see, they're kind of the bone-shaped diagram there, and behind the metro station too is East - is a station plaza, and at both ends of the station, you can see this kind of square or rectangular boxes. They are the service boxes relating to the station operation. And in the west precinct here or behind the west precinct here, there's also the commuter car park as well.

So this is looking at the site, the concept plan, being the blue outline, relative to some of the ongoing development in the surrounding rezoning area as well, so there is a number of approvals that is currently under construction in the site.

30 On the left is the approved building envelope from the concept approval, and to the right is the layout of the proposal. So the proposal, as earlier mentioned, involving the four towers, they are labelled with alphabets, A, B, C and D, and to the western side, that is the proposed Doran Drive Plaza. We're obviously also looking at the podium landscape area between the towers here as well.

These are the elevation of the towers. If we need, maybe we can come back for reference to these drawings.

We briefly look at the submissions. We've obviously exhibited in accordance as required. We have only received two public submissions, one of which is an objection from QIC, which is writing on behalf of the owners of Castle Towers, which is the major shopping centre at Castle Hill.

40 We also have an objection from Council, and following the LTS, Council advised us that it maintains its objection to the proposal, primarily around the dwelling mix, which is a topic we will cover later in this presentation. Council otherwise have

provided comments, feedback, on all the other items, as well as we have consulted Council on the conditions that we have recommended as well.

So this is the agenda item we have received from the Commission. There is quite a number of topics, so I will briefly start off with the concept approval, and then I will move on to most of the build-form related items, including communal open space, and then we will move on the public domain, and in the presentation itself, where I can, I will make reference to any specific recommendation from the SDRP and how the proposal may have addressed those.

10

And in addition to that, there will be a number of the other items that are mostly relating to the submission issue, but also in terms of an ongoing maintenance of the public domain, we will cover that as part of the public domain session when we discuss the build-form, particularly in respect to the Doran Drive Plaza.

So the concept proposal, we've seen the diagram before, for which there are the three precinct. The central precinct is what we're looking at for the Doran Drive Plaza. The other two precincts are the East Precinct and the West Precinct. The West Precinct is a smaller precinct surrounding the communal carpark, but in totality, the three precincts together will have up to 1,620 dwellings, and it has specified minimum of 5 per cent of resident dwelling, as affordable housing. It also establishes things like open space, and a range of requirements as well.

20

So the determination document of the concept approval is on the Department's website. I would, at this stage, point out specifically to the Hills Showground Urban Design Guideline, which is a design guideline document that provides a lot of the finer detail controls of the concept approval, together with any approved concept planning building envelope plan as part of the approval. As part of this presentation, as well of the Department's assessment report, makes several references to this Urban Design Guide in respect to how the proposal is complying with the concept approval.

30

MS TUOR: So just on that last point, as I understand, the urban design guidelines were a condition or a requirement of the concept approval.

MS LEUNG: That's correct, so it's a detailed document that pretty much provides a lot of the detailed parameters of how to use licensed approval. It is a document that's comparable to a DCP control document, but obviously it is - has a different statute function. It's a document that is attached to the concept approval itself.

40

MS TUOR: And also, as I - I hadn't seen the conditions of the concept approval, but presumably they imposed a condition that required that each of the later stages put in a

development application, and that that development application be consistent with the concept approval. Is that - - -

MS LEUNG: That's correct, and as part of the EIS, as well as ITA submission, the applicant has also a wider document outlining how the proposal addresses the Urban Design Guide as well.

10 So in terms of modification to the concept approval, there has been two instances of modification application. Modification 1 is the one that also relates to the Doran Drive Plaza Precinct, because it deals with carparking specifically, and carparking rates for non-residential uses, and that's something that is related to the Doran Drive Precinct. Modification number 2 is a matter that relates to a road widening and changes to alignment of open space. That is not related to the Doran Drive Precinct.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Annie, sorry, could I just ask a question. Sorry to interrupt. Just conceptually, then, just that point about the concept approval and this application and the Urban Design Guide, so conceptually, the idea is that this current application is consistent with both the concept plan and also consistent with the Urban Design Guide. Is that what - - -

MS LEUNG: That's correct. So the Urban Design Guide is one of the documents of the concept approval, and the application that we're dealing with the concept approval, which is inclusive of the Urban Design Guide.

DR WILLIAMS: All right, great. Thanks for that clarification.

30 MS LEUNG: Okay. I will move to the next slide. So I will quickly run through some of the key approved plans of the concept approval, which give the Commission an idea what the concept approval actually controls in terms of what is allowed on the site to be consistent. So the concept approval has specific dwelling yield, as well as maximum gross floor area for each of the precincts, including Doran Drive Precinct, which has the maximum of 440, and 51,000 also metres squared.

It also has conceptually identified the land uses, so you can see that the Doran Drive Plaza Precinct and Precinct West are the mixed-use precinct, whereas Precinct East, which is the larger precinct out of all, is the actual residential precinct. You can also see that the concept plan identified the open spaces, including Doran Drive Plaza, which is part of this current proposal.

40 The concept plan includes building envelope, as well as specific heights, as well as number of storeys that has been specified to control the scale of the building, in

addition to any building heights. The darker blue are the kind of the tower building envelope, and your lighter blues are more the podium building envelope, so you can see that Doran Drive has a kind of two to four - up to four-storey podium, and you have a 21-storey - two 21-storey building envelope, and there's also a slightly lower podium to the north, which is relevant - I'll just point it now, as we will talk about it a bit more later in the presentation.

10 The concept approval also, as we say, identified open space, but also the amount of solar access that is required for each of the open space. That's Doran Drive Precinct. The full court of the metro station, the station plaza at the rear of the metro station, and also a proposed park in Precinct East.

This is again relating to the amount of open space. This is the setback control that applies to both street setback, as well as tower. We will go through a bit more details around the kind of - the consideration of this setback control under the concept a bit later when we go into the build-form discussion.

20 Then that's the detailed building envelope, as well as building separation distance between the building envelopes. So you can see that the building envelopes, there's two of them, and obviously we are looking at four towers within those building envelopes at the moment.

So if no other questions about the concept approval at this stage, I will move on to build-form. So - - -

30 MS TUOR: There was just a general question about, you know, the degree of - what consistency with the concept plan means, so I suppose it's things like the GFA that's been put forward, is that something that could have been - we, in our role, could reduce, or could increase, and things like the 5 per cent affordable housing or the 20 per cent of unit mix, which Council has brought up in their concerns, is that something where there is discretion to actually make the changes to that, or is it essentially those things have been predetermined by the concept approval and therefore in terms of this DA, we're sort of bound by them? If you understand what I mean.

40 MS LEUNG: Sure. We're probably on a fairly appropriate slide to answer some of that question. We obviously, for GFA as well as for building heights, there are also control and development standard contained within the LEP, so the LEP set a maximum height control of 68 metres. The building envelope is consistent with that, and so is the proposal. The LEP also stipulates an FSR of 4:1 for the site. The

proposal is actually a bit lower than that, so the proposal is actually about 20 per cent lower at 3.2:1.

So obviously the concept approval has considered a number of indicative designs in how the distribution of - and layout of building heights, as well building mass and density were considered, and we have also mentioned the urban design guideline, which is a key document, also deals with the bulk and scale of the Doran Drive development to make sure it's compatible.

10 On top of the building envelope that we - drawing that we've seen earlier, which allows for a podium building environment and two-tower building environment, the urban design guideline actually have other restriction or additional requirement on those building envelope, which sets out - we've seen the detailed drawing of the minimum building separation, but also it sets out maximum building length, as well as maximum façade length, and floor plates above the eight storey. And the last dot point on here, which probably is a key requirement which stipulated that the two-building envelope would end up with four towers, including building separation between the towers themselves.

20 I will move on to the next drawing, which also identifies some of the changes to the build-form when the applicant submitted LTS, which relates to some of the control on the urban design guideline we just discussed. This is a diagram that is in the report. I should have mentioned earlier that as we've seen with the report, I have maintained a bigger number on there, so the presentation is - actually relates to the Department's report.

But the amendments to the build-form, as we can see, the number 1 is a lowering of the - kind of the eastern end of building A, which is a higher podium directly north of the communal open space, and secondly is the removal of levels between buildings C and D to ensure compliance with the maximum façade length control, but also the
30 floor plate control that we mentioned earlier in the - contained in the urban design guideline. So you can see the building separation between A and B and C and D, they are responses to compliance to the urban design guideline that then fits into the two-building envelope stipulated under the concept.

The Department's assessment or the Department's assessment report really only find that the proposal fully complies with the LEP (not transcribable) for heights and FSR, and as I mentioned, that we do have a much lower FSR, or roughly about 20 per cent lower FSR than what is the maximum permissible under the LEP. The concept
40 approval obviously tested out the GFA and set a maximum GFA that's at the 3.2:1, and the proposal fully complies with that.

The proposal accommodated 430 dwellings. The consent approval actually allows for 440, so we are also within that as well, and the Department, following the amendments to the proposal, we are satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the concept approval, as well as the urban design guideline, particularly in relation to the build-form requirements.

10 Building separations, well, I earlier already slightly touched on that, so you can see that across the - kind of the middle is the podium communal open space, for which are fairly defined by the concept building envelope, which are also consistent with the ADG requirements.

20 All the towers are orientated either out to the street frontages or towards the communal open space, which gives an amenity outlook, ventilation and a light. But obviously the separation, kind of the internal elevation that is between building A and B and D and C, as we have identified on this diagram, they don't strictly comply. They do have a slightly reduced separation, but as we have identified earlier, the internal elevation of the separation, they were not intended to provide kind of light and ventilation, but they are a requirement to break up the bulk and scale of the building envelopes, as stipulated by the urban design guidelines.

MS TUOR: So, sorry, just on that, clarifying, so the urban design guidelines, did they have the five-metre and 11-metre and the six-metre and the nine-metre - is that what they've specified?

30 MS LEUNG: No. The specification is controlling the length of the buildings, so therefore, as you can see, because of the length of the two building envelopes, as approved under the consent approval, they won't comply with the urban design guidelines maximum length, so it will be essential when they actually develop up the proposal to actually break up the towers. The urban design guidelines also had control over the floor plates of the towers above eight storeys, so therefore it will possibly restrict the tower to be smaller, and therefore result in separation of the towers.

The urban design guideline does not stipulate the actual numerical separation. As we can see, the internal elevation varies between the towers, and they are mostly internal elevation that allows for the walls to be facing west, and the rooms are actually oriented out to the communal open space, or those street frontages.

40 MS TUOR: Okay. But in terms of building B and D, as I understand it, those - building D would be facing north, wouldn't it? That that - and that's what's shown as a solid wall, except that - - -

MS LEUNG: So - yes, understand. So the proposed apartments, they all would achieve - or the overall proposal would achieve the required solar access, consistent with ADG, and that has been set out in the Department report as well. So you can see that the building envelope is specially angled, so the angle or those buildings angle are specifically allow to maximum solar access between the buildings as well as solar access between the building to surrounding plan, as well as existing open space.

10 MS TUOR: Okay. And just in terms of the building length, the maximum building length that's specified in the design guidelines, that's - what is that? Is that different for the different buildings, or is that somewhere?

MS LEUNG: Whoops, sorry. I'll just roll back the slide a bit, hopefully that's okay. So the maximum building length between podium and the seventh floor is 40 metres. Maximum façade length above the eighth storey of 40 metres.

MS TUOR: So 50 and 40 metres, yes.

20 MS LEUNG: Yes. And also in addition to a maximum floor plan is for 800 metres square.

MS TUOR: And did you say that the buildings comply with those maximum dimensions?

MS LEUNG: So that's correct. So as - following the amendments of the plans at the LGA stage, the Department confirms that the proposal now complies with those.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you. Peter, did you have any questions on that?

30 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Look, if - thanks, Annelise. Annie, just one point of clarification, just on the building separations that - if I may, I'm just looking at the - you know, the Department's assessment report, and at paragraph 119 of the assessment report - I'll just read it out, it might be easier - it says, "Despite the noncompliance with the minimal building separation distances, the Department considers the proposed building separations acceptable, as it would reduce the overall visual bulk of the buildings, compared to the concept envelopes, and would successfully maintain acceptable levels of amenity between the buildings."

40 So I was a bit - I wasn't quite sure what was meant - noncompliance with what, and you're saying it's noncompliance with the urban design guideline? Is that correct? Is that where the noncompliance occurs, or the concept plan, or both?

MS LEUNG: Okay. So the Department's report in there, prior to the 119 paragraph, made references to the ADG, which the Department identifies that it's set out numeric control for different rooms facing each other. In this case, it's hard to have a direct relation between the ADG, which identifies kind of privacy and overlooking as the main objectives, because in these instances, the main objective of having those separation or the internal separation between the buildings while it's less than 12 metres that you would normally have for non-habitable room, we are here more dealing with a situation of blank wall to blank walls.

10

So while it doesn't strictly comply with ADG for non-habitable to non-habitable room - I'm talking about ADG, not the urban design guideline itself - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MS LEUNG: - - - the Department is satisfied separation is acceptable, because they are intended to - more to deal with the original bulk and scale of the building, breaking up the length of the building envelope as intended by the urban design guideline. They are internal elevation, with mostly (not transcribable) wall, and the dwellings or the apartments relating to those are facing the podium and the street where they will actually get acceptable outlook, natural light and daylight access.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Right, right. And, just to extend that point a bit further, but thanks for that clarification, the buildings themselves are within the envelopes contained in the concept approval?

MS LEUNG: That's correct.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, okay.

30

MS TUOR: So the separations in the concept approval were the same? They were the five and 11 and six and nine?

MS LEUNG: Concept approval only have two building envelopes.

MS TUOR: Okay. It didn't break up into the four buildings. Yes.

MS LEUNG: Yes. So the urban design guidelines stipulated the separation to assist with the bulk and scale.

40

MS TUOR: But the urban design guidelines didn't actually have any separation between - had it - not in the north-south direction, between building A and B and C and D?

MS LEUNG: So I will just quickly go to the building envelope drawings again so that I can actually point to it. Sorry, I have to roll back the slides again. So this one is probably easier to have a look at, because it's got side-by-side comparison of the building envelope and the proposal. So we can see - oops, sorry - the approved concept building outlook plan has the two building envelopes, but because of the
10 concept approval also have urban design guidelines, but limits floor plans, and limits building length. For the applicants to actually utilise just the building envelope and comply with the urban design guideline, they will have to break up the building into different towers, rather than have a single tower filling up each of the two building envelopes.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS LEUNG: And the internal separation is the one that is - doesn't really correlate with an ADG kind of non-habitable room to non-habitable more than 12 metres,
20 because they are more blank wall to blank walls, and they are intended to break up the bulk and scale of the building and not to provide amenity between.

MS TUOR: Yes. So that internal one isn't specified, but it's determined by the length of the building.

MS LEUNG: That's correct.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you.

MS LEUNG: Okay. So I will quickly move on the communal open space. It's just
30 that it's easier to understand when we move on, looking at the building separation over the same area. So the communal open space has been amended several times, and it's mostly in response to the SDRP feedback around the layout of the communal open space, and it's mostly to actually relocate the function of the communal open space and getting the circulation space to the edges, so that the more usable area are more consolidated, and also they coincide to area overlapping with where they would actually get solar access.

So if we recall our earlier discussion around amendment that has been made to the
40 build-form, you will recall that the podium on build-form 2, the eastern tip of building A, which is where I'm pointing it out - hopefully that can be seen, or where

my cursor is - that has been reduced. That would also have a possible impact to the solar access to the communal open space, as this part of the build-form is directly north of the communal open space.

10 There has also been question around soil depth of the communal open space. The SDRP recommendation ensuring that the planting of the communal open space must allow - be supported by appropriate soil there. The application is supported by a soil specification report, which not only deal with minimum soil depth, but also looking at the various soil requirement in terms of soil volume as well as soil type that will support growth of the specified species.

So I will just move to the next one. I want to move to a slightly different topic on setback, as earlier we have seen that the approved plans for the concept proposal would stipulate and set out the actual setback requirement, both for the tower as well as the podium.

20 I understand at the time when we considered the consent proposal, Council raised some issue about the departure of the proposal compared to the control that is contained in the ECP. So what they've got for you on the slide at the moment, to the left is the concept approval requirement for setback, which we have seen earlier, and to the right is a snippet of Council DCP requirement for setback.

Stage 2, area of difference between the concept approval requirement and the DCP control requirement, one is to deal with number - you can see the - hopefully see the number 1 on the Council DCP diagram. That's along the Doran Drive. Council's DCP asked for a setback at the street level for three metres, whereas the consent approval allowed for zero setback, and as long as any outdoor dining would be accommodated with a three-metre setback in addition.

30 And the second - yes?

MS ANDERSON: Can I just interrupt. Apologies. Just for the transcript, can I please confirm that you were referring to De Clambe Drive rather than Doran Drive?

MS LEUNG: Yes. Yes, sorry.

MS ANDERSON: No problem. Thank you.

40 MS LEUNG: So - yes. So hopefully you can see my cursor. Apologies for the kind of error.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS LEUNG: So that's the first one, is to deal with De Clambe Drive. You can also see that Council DCP control does not take into consideration of where Doran Drive Plaza is, so Council's DCP control for setback relates to the street alignment there, whereas the consent approval takes into consideration of the interface between the proposal and the proposed Doran Drive Plaza. The second difference is to do with - - -

10 MS TUOR: So, sorry, just on that one, so as I understand it, the yellow is the sort of podium setback, and then the dotted line above would be the tower setback, is it?

MS LEUNG: Yes. The podium setback is the black line.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS LEUNG: So the black line is several metres as primary setback, this code here, and the dotted line is the secondary setback, which is the tower setback.

20 MS TUOR: Okay.

MS LEUNG: So the yellow line is what we refer to where outdoor dining is to become - or is proposed or intended to be accommodated, then further setback would be required at three metres. We will talk about that a bit more, especially we will also cover items such as street activation in the - - -

MS TUOR: Okay. So in terms of the proposed plaza, it's envisaged that the tower setback and the podium setback would be in the same line? The tower is not set back from the podium?

30 MS LEUNG: The tower is three metres along the Doran Drive Plaza site, so the pink dotted line there - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS LEUNG: - - - so that's three-metre tower setback.

MS TUOR: Okay.

40 MS LEUNG: Yes. It is a fairly difficult diagram. Apologies, but it's not showing up very well on the screen.

MS TUOR: So in terms of - in all of those elevations, it's not - in that plan, it's not envisaged that the tower - there would not be zero setback of the tower from the podium?

MS LEUNG: That's correct.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MS LEUNG: I also need to say, in terms of the tower setback, which is what we're
10 going to now, so you can see that Council diagram requires five metres, and the
concept approval asks for a three-metre setback. I've got to note here, it's not a - the
concept approval reduced a five-metre setback to a three-metre setback, because keep
in mind that the setback requirement for the concept approval needs to be read in
conjunction with the building envelopes. So I will just flick to the next page.

You may recall earlier, when we looked at the building envelope plans, so they are all
in - the building envelopes are not in alignment on the street, like Council's controls
envisage. So Council control envisaged that the tower would be set back five metre
from the street, but obviously in the case of a concept approval, the tower would firstly
20 set back from the street by the nature of the proposed Doran Drive Plaza, and then it
would have a further three-metre setback from the podium from that point.

Similarly, on the Andalusian Way site, where the towers is set back three metres
behind the podium, the building envelopes for the concept approvals stipulate that it's
actually angled further away from the corner of Andalusian Way and Mandala Parade.
So the slides that we're looking at now are actually extracted from the Department's
report for the original concept proposal, including the diagram we're looking at.

So you can see that despite a three-metre setback, that tower setback that we're
30 referring to, the building separation from the future development in the other precinct
is actually quite generous, looking at anything from 36 to 60 metres as the nature of
the building envelopes. So if we don't have further questions around the secondary or
the tower setback, I will then move back onto the primary setback or the podium
setback on the street.

So in the Department's report for the concept approval, the key objective that has been
identified around the podium setback is to deal with street planning, as well as
potential for outdoor dining or street activation. So this is a matter that has been
considered as part of concept approval. I think the SDRP also had a look at it and
40 supported the proposal in its current form.

There is a couple of reasons around this. Firstly the landscaping outcome for along the street frontage is not actually affected by the proposed build-form. The street trees, as well as the footpath and roads, were all built as is, as part of the station, so they are existing street trees which are not affected by the proposal, and they have been identified to be retained as part of the landscaping plan. The only trees that have been identified to be removed along the street is associated with essential vehicle access or any future road opening necessary for the proposal.

10 So the second part we'll be looking into is around accommodation or the dining activation, and I will start then to move onto the next topic, which is street activation, to allow us to look at some of the diagrams and plans that are associated with the activation around the street frontage.

There is worthy to mention that there is street activation or active frontages requirement in the Hills LEP. They are probably a bit more limited compared to the approach that the proposal has undertaken, or the concept approval and urban design guideline, as well as proposal, encourages the activation pretty much along all of the street frontage if necessary, or can be done, but obviously the street activation or map on the Hills LEP is just along Doran Drive itself, and Mandala Parade.

20 I apologise, the plan is a bit small on this slide, but one of the key things that I want to show by putting all the kind of lower floor plans on this is to identify the actual gradient along both De Clambe Drive and Mandala Parade. So there's roughly about almost 9 to 10 metres kind of fall from Andalusian Way to the east, back down to Doran Drive Plaza, near the metro station. So you can see that on the Doran Drive Plaza Precinct, or the Doran Drive Plaza, there's plenty of street activation with tenancy. The proposed supermarket is mostly underground, with limited frontage, is actually internal to at the back of the actual retail precinct.

30 And as we move up the street, going up in gradients, there are further tenancy being proposed, as well as building entrances, to try to activate the street frontages. Vehicular access from the De Clambe Drive, while it has a ramp, it's actually hidden behind additional tenancy that is proposed to activate the street frontages. So you can see that this is some terrain here, the driveway hide behind as it goes in, but that's the community space, with outdoor area that is set back from the site boundary, as well as more tenancy and building entrances. Similarly, along Mandala Parade, there are tenancies being proposed to activate the street frontages, as well as additional tenancy near the corner of Mandala and Andalusian Way.

40 MS TUOR: So in relation to Andalusian Way, the activation is limited to the two blue areas on either end, and the rest is the servicing - loading dock for the supermarket and

sort of other servicing-type activities, is that - and there's an entrance foyer, I think, as well. Is that - - -

MS LEUNG: So Andalusian Way, we can have a look at this diagram here. So I'll see if I can actually make it slightly bigger, sorry. So you can see the building entrances, mainly, as well as the tenancies that are closer to the corner. The service loading is limited to the driveway entry here. A reminder that Andalusian Way also have those townhouses facing Andalusian Way as well, and there is also an additional non-residential use with outdoor space on the kind of upper ground sort of level just there.

MS TUOR: And the limitations on getting some further active use - I suppose just why was Andalusian Way chose as being essentially the service area, given that it does, as I understand, future development adjoining it on the other side of Andalusian Way would be the residential development.

MS LEUNG: That's right. So the surface area is mainly just the driveway as shown. Mostly they are residential lobby entry, so the pink and the kind of beige colour, as well as the two blue area, being the tenancy, so as we understand that, we have got the mixed-use precinct at the west, Doran Drive, and then it slowly transitions to the residential area, facing precinct east.

MS TUOR: But just when we were looking at the plans onsite, it looked as if there was just the two blue at either end, and then there was the entry to the foyer, but the other areas seemed - like the pink, I can't remember what that was, but it didn't seem as if there was any other active uses along that façade.

MS LEUNG: So I will just quickly go to the next slides which give us kind of more the elevation of those podiums.

MS TUOR: Yes, that will be good.

MS LEUNG: So on the diagram here, you've got the ones that are facing Doran Drive Plaza, the Mandala Drive. You can also - that's actually De Clambe, I'm sorry. You can actually see that - the finer grain detail of the podium, taking into account of the gradient of the land, stepping up, and then the bottom one is where you have the integration of the services and any essential access into the buildings at both Andalusian Way and De Clambe, being integrated into the finer patterns of the podium there.

MS TUOR: Yes, but I suppose my question, just clarifying it on the plan, was the active uses that face Andalusian Way are those two blue areas and the entry lobby.

MS LEUNG: That's correct, so it's the kind of beige pink area, plus the blue areas there.

MS TUOR: Yes. And was there any exploration undertaken to see if there could be more active uses done, such as, you know, setting back the servicing - the loading dock, whether that could have been sort of set back so that the entrance was potentially
10 - you know, the ability to provide some sort of active use to the site of that, or I don't know what the white box is to the - below the blue, on that corner, to - at the top of the page. So just - it just seemed as if there - if there was any opportunity to provide more active uses, was that looked at or is that something we should just ask the applicant about?

MS LEUNG: It was definitely something that has looked at, and especially in the Department report, we explore more so whether there is - can be a reduction on the width of the services, particularly the loading dock industry market, which as always is a fairly big item, and has fairly kind of restrictive kind of requirement around it to
20 ensure its safe operation. So we've explored that, and it is the location of the vehicle access is something that were previously identified as part of the concept approval, but we obviously explore it with the applicant to really limit the width of those vehicular access, and also ensuring those services in any essential for - pretty much is for the entire block, is kind of concentrated on behind this, kind of - so my - and the ground area, to be as minimal as possible, and we are satisfied that the - especially with the vehicle access and the loading dock, they have achieved the objectives on - to make sure that they are well integrated and at their minimal.

MS TUOR: Okay, great. Look, I'm just conscious that we're actually at the - it's
30 running out of time, so - yes.

MS LEUNG: I'll - yes.

MS TUOR: You're right, we did have too many things on our agenda.

MS LEUNG: So I will quickly go through. I will start skipping things. If I'm talking a bit faster, please let me know if you want to ask anything. I will skip through the street activation, that we've already had an exploration of it. I will quickly look at the podium - retail podium and the connectivity, which is something that has been - gone
40 through extensive investigation and exploration with the SDRP. One of the key things that the applicant has amended is in relation to providing a through-site link. We

already looked at earlier, when we look at the street activation diagram, the challenges of the gradient along both Mandala and De Clambe. So there is no kind of level access kind of straight through on the same level, because De Clambe is actually a street level higher than when you enter from Mandala near the metro station entrance.

10 But with the support and advice of the SDRP, the applicant has substantively amended the layout of this podium area to make sure not only that you can actually travel through to be outside with the through-site link, but also the introduction of a lot more natural light, as well as visual connection with the introduction of a much bigger atrium, as well as a skylight into the atrium.

So in the assessment report we have identified some analysis the applicant has done which looked at the distance of the midpoint of the retail podium area to ensure that natural light can actually be sufficiently penetrating into the atrium area on the surrounding glazing from all sides, including the skylight over.

20 I will go to the next part, which is Doran Drive Plaza. So we were earlier looking at the retail podium. Doran Drive Plaza obviously is directly next door to the retail podium, and the design of Doran Drive Plaza has been also again an area that has been gone through, received a fair bit of advice from the SDRP, and has substantially developed through the assessment process as well.

30 So some of the key areas that has now been amended, is not only just the layout of the Doran Drive Plaza, the functionality, the sittings, the area that allows for good pedestrian access, which is a six minutes to the thoroughfare. It also deals with the extension of the awning, which now is extended to four metres, which should sufficiently cover both or any proposed outdoor dining, as well as provide weather protection for pedestrians going through as well, and we can see some of the patterning on the diagram here which relates to some of the consideration of artwork as well as connecting to country with the landscaping design that goes through from the retail podium out onto the Doran Drive Plaza. There is also showcasing a relationship with the reference to Cattai Creek as well.

So this is a diagram that has been submitted around solar access to the various open space, this one specifically relating to midwinter for Doran Drive Plaza. So we have already explored the requirements of the concept approval, which specified amount solar access, each of those open space, proposed and plan on the concept plan. So the Department is satisfied that the proposal will be consistent with those.

40 I will quickly also touch on landscaping, which is also in the area that has been receiving feedback from the SDRP, but also the RTA submitted by the applicants also

has a fairly substantive landscaping package, which I have kind of a bit of - it's a fairly heavy package, but I kind of snipped a content page. The landscaping plan only looked at the specification of the planting, but also looked at the programming function that can be laid out - that can be used for those spaces, planting indicative, typical section, soil depth, and it can be read in conjunction with the soil specification report, as well as an ongoing maintenance of the landscaping plan as well, so that's a separate plan that has been submitted by the applicant in relation to the ongoing maintenance.

10 MS TUOR: I might just interrupt you there, because I think given that we're running out of time, it might be that we need to just perhaps focus a bit more on the questions that the Commission would like answered, and I suppose initially the first question would be, our understanding is that the first version of this application was referred to the SDRP, and they made comments, and then the applicant did the response to submissions and amended the plans, and that's what we're looking at now, but that set of plans wasn't referred back to the SDRP. So I suppose what the panel would be interested in is just hearing comments in relation to whether there are any further comments that essentially the government architect would like to make.

20 As I understand, there's a summary of the SDRP's recommendations on page 32 and 33 of the assessment report, so maybe the quickest way is just to very quickly go through the SDRP's original comments and just see if there's any further comments that are to be made.

MS LEUNG: Yes. I will quickly take you through, and Darlene, please jump in if necessary to supplement any feedback.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Sure.

30 MS TUOR: Yes - no, I'd prefer if just Darlene answers, just in the interests of time, so it's basically the first one was develop an overall strategy for the start, including revisions to the far side of tower A. Is that something, Darlene, that you had any comments to make in addition to what the report has said, or - - -

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. The panel saw this project four times, and the last time was during the SDRP phase, and there were definitely adjustments made. The panel was very keen for all of the huge pallet of materials that was being applied to this development, for there to be a kind of a logic around what was being applied where, and also encouraged the proponent to sort of go back to previous versions of
40 some tower designs.

So in the final project that has now been submitted, we've had a quick look through, and by and large most of the panel's questions have been answered, so the final proposal did include a logic around why certain materials and certain details were used on different frontages, and they also came back with a revision to tower A, which was much more in line with what the panel had seen previously. So, on balance, those issues have been addressed.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then the other was increase natural light to the retail podium, and weather protection along the interface of the Doran Drive Plaza, which - - -

10

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Light, yes.

MS TUOR: - - - we've just briefly explained there.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Sure.

MS TUOR: So any comments on that?

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. So the natural light into the through-site link, the
20 proponent wasn't able to expand on what they'd already done. They cited BCA restrictions and building types under the BCA that prevents them from enlarging the skylight that was already there, but they had kind of undertaken to increase the amount of light coming in from De Clambe Drive and from the Mandala Parade frontage. And I think they've also made adjustments to the ceiling, so that whatever does come in through the skylight does - is kind of spread further, so I guess they're kind of just doing their best to kind of make the - leverage the amount of light that can come in. So I would say that that's kind of satisfied what the panel was after.

In terms of the weather protection on the Doran Drive Plaza frontage, that was
30 addressed. I think it's been widened to four metres now, and that's specifically undertaken to provide three metres of clear pedestrian circulation along the store fronts themselves, and then the outdoor seating just takes up that fourth metre along the edge, and goes beyond that. So that was one of the panel's concerns, was that that covered frontage be prioritised for pedestrian use, and that was achieved.

MS TUOR: Good. And then, "Revised layout, opinion on open space to ensure usability, amenity and suitable planting and soil depth"?

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. So the proponent's landscape architect kind of
40 defended the existing locations. They said they understood, you know, why they would prefer to have put barbecues and child - the play areas in the sunny spots, but

they argued that it's better to have these things in shade, from a duty of care perspective, and so they elected not to shift the childcare into the sunny spots, and the barbecue area for supervision purposes needs to be near the playground. What they did do instead was to increase the amount of lawn space that gets the full natural northern light, and we consider that to be an acceptable alternative, given that they defended their reasons for placing the playground quite strongly, I thought.

MS TUOR: Okay. And you're happy with the planting and soil depth that's been achieved?

10

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. It's compliant. It's not optimal. One of the things that we did recommend that they choose tree species that are suitable for those soil depths, and in one area I think they've elected to change the species to suit the conditions, but we're not sure whether the final species that were selected are suitable for those depths. But, if anything, the species should be suited to the depth. I think that's an easier thing to achieve.

MS TUOR: Okay. Because the depth is predetermined but the species can be varied.

20 MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. That can be changed, yes.

MS TUOR: Yes, okay. And then, "Review treatment of vehicular access and services along Andalusian Way," which we were sort of touching on before.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. So we - so the panel was very keen for the quality of that frontage to be the best that it could, because it understood that there has to be on back of house - there has to be one back of house frontage, and it looks like Andalusian Way is it, but irrespective of that, the panel was keen for the highest quality finishes possible. So it looks like - we haven't been able to find a lot more
30 detail, but it looks like they have chosen pretty high-quality material, so very textured brickwork. I can't find information that kind of assures that, but we understand that there will be more detailed finishes schedule being made available to us, so that's where we would be able to make sure that we do get the highest quality roller shutters and grills and so on. So that's - as long as we - - -

MS TUOR: So - but I suppose in terms of the panel, the Commission's role, it's probably worthwhile us asking the applicant just in terms of whether there is any scope to increase active uses along that - not just to rely on materials. Anyway, that's
40 up to the Commission to work out.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. I mean, we did understand that the uses that are there are difficult to move away - the electrical substation, for example.

MS TUOR: Yes, they've got to go somewhere, and there are big constraints on the development, I understand.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes.

10 MS TUOR: "Incorporate the relationship of the site to Cattai Creek as part of the overall connection with country" design response?

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: I think that's still a work in progress. I think the panel was very encouraged with how much progress the proponent made, engaging with local knowledge holders, and kind of taking the artwork strategy further. And that was actually a huge step forward for that project, because it was completely silent on that issue to begin with. So it's still in progress. The artworks are - there's a commitment to the artworks, there's a commitment to working with the artists, and the scope and extent of the work is much more substantial than it was previously, so it's just an assurance that this will continue - I think that's the most important thing.

20

MS TUOR: Potentially conditions going into any approval.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes, and Cattai Creek is the critical issue, because it's so close to the site, and the connection is really not evident, but there's opportunity for that to be revealed through which artworks and interpretative material.

MS TUOR: And then the last one was, "Further studies to confirm on wind comfort, plant selection and soil depth." So in that in terms of wind comfort, the proximity of the tower to the podium and whether there would be wind effects?

30

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: It was more to do with the proposition that wind comfort conditions could be managed through a tree canopy, and the panel was concerned that tree canopy won't achieve its - that canopy can't be achieved if it's in the high wind condition, so they asked if that be explored a bit further, and the final response to that was, there's really only one instance where wind conditions are so poor that tree canopy can't mature, and in that instance, they've reverted to an awning to deal with the problem, so - - -

MS TUOR: So where was that?

40

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: That was on the podium, actually.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Yes. So the wind report assured us that there was no condition background level that are going to disrupt the tree canopy from maturing properly.

MS TUOR: Okay. So is there anything further you wish to add, just from what you've heard today, or - - -

10

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: No, I think that the proposal has been really well explained, and the panel has been watching this project quite closely, and we're very pleased with some of the improvements that have been made through the course of seeing the (not transcribable) session, and the attention that's been paid to trying to detail this quite large development into something that looks quite articulated and suitable for its place, its location.

MS TUOR: All right. Thank you very much.

20 MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Thanks.

MS TUOR: Okay. So the other items on the agenda were more, you know, dwelling mix, et cetera, et cetera, so I think particularly what we would like to hear is the concern of the Council is about that it - not achieving 20 per cent, three-bedroom apartments, so if we can just probably jump to that, and, you know, if you can explain, as I understand what's been approved in the concept approval, if the three different buildings have different percentages, and this one had the 10 per cent, so just the logic behind it, and - - -

30 MS LEUNG: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. I will go as quickly as I can.

MS TUOR: Yes, sorry to be rushing you. Sorry.

MS LEUNG: No, that's okay. I guess the benefit of the concept plan with the 20 per cent requirement overall, and the ability to distribute it, is because the concept plan actually works not only just with the 20 per cent requirement, it also works with specific building envelope and different land-use mix and different density for each of those precincts.

So the requirement for the dwelling mix, as we have identified in the report, obviously distribute unevenly across the precinct, but that is reflective of the other requirement in causing land-use density and building envelope apply to each of those precinct.

So the details of the dwelling mix requirement is set out in the Urban Design Guide. It also contains specific controls such as townhouses, apartment to be provided at a minimum along the new internal street to the east precincts. So if we remember the - kind of the concept plan that stipulated different land uses as well as the drilling numbers, we will report that precinct is the residence or precinct, and would
10 accommodate the majority of the dwelling that is approved under the concept plan as well as the proposed 20 per cent or more than 20 per cent - I think 24 per cent in the east precinct.

The building envelope for the east precinct is here, and you can see that this is the internal street for which the Urban Design Guide actually refers to, and it has a number of three-storey building envelopes which townhouses are identified actually occupied, to provide a different housing choice, as well as housing mix.

So I guess instead of a flat 20 per cent for each of those dwelling, the distribution of
20 the dwelling mix will consider with the other control, so that they would actually work, and can be feasibly delivered with the dwelling cap, the building envelope, and the land-use mix with each of those precincts.

MS TUOR: Yes. Peter, did you have any questions on that?

DR WILLIAMS: So, Annie, that means obviously that the - sorry, not obviously, but my - what's that saying, is that the proportion - the distribution of the three-bedroom units across the three precincts was something determined by the concept plan itself?

30 MS LEUNG: That's correct. So the proposal obviously fully complies with those requirements, but I think it's just the underlying why we distribute them unevenly across the precinct, across the concept plan.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, great. Thanks, Annie.

MS LEUNG: So any other topic that the Commissioner would like us to cover?

MS TUOR: Well, I think there's the affordable housing, but as I understand, that's been, again, approved by the concept plan at 5 per cent, and for 10 years, and there's
40 not really any scope to look at that, that's just - essentially that's what the concept plan has already predetermined. And then the other topic was traffic and transport. Are

there any - but, again, I think it's fairly clear in your report, but is there anything you wish to add about traffic and transport?

MS LEUNG: I think on the traffic and transport fund, that's something that Council actually looked at in a fair bit of detail. I understand the applicant actually spent a fair bit of out-of-session liaison with Council, and I understand that Council is really satisfied with the additional information that has been submitted as part of the LTAS package, including turning path, maintenance plan for the turntable and the like. We obviously also received advice from Transport NSW as well, and they have raised no objection against the proposal.

MS TUOR: All right. So I think we've covered it all, but I'll just make sure - Peter, any questions? Anything we haven't covered?

DR WILLIAMS: No - I mean, no, I think - there's other questions, obviously, I think for the applicant, but I think the Department has covered all the questions that we need to ask, so that's great. Thanks for that Annie, Darlene. That was very helpful.

MS TUOR: So Casey, Jane, anything? Casey or Jane, anything that you wish to - think that we've missed?

MS JOSHUA: No, thank you.

MS ANDERSON: Nothing from me, thank you.

MS TUOR: All right. Well, we sped up. So, yes, thank you very much for the presentation, that was very, very helpful, and thank you all for coming. That's it.

MR WITHERDIN: Great. Thank you, Commissioners.

MS LEUNG: Thank you, all.

MS VAN DER BREGGEN: Thank you, Commissioners.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Annie, Darlene, Anthony and James. Thanks very much.

MS TUOR: Yes. Thank you, all.

MEETING CONCLUDED

[1.45pm]