



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: REDFERN MIXED USE CO-LIVING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
(SSD 32275057)**

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL: DR SHERIDAN COAKES (CHAIR)
DR BRONWYN EVANS AM
MR RICHARD PEARSON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
OLIVER COPE

**APPLICANT
REPRESENTATIVES:** DAVID WORKMAN
BEN HENDRIKS
TOM COOK
STEPHANIE WU
MARK SHAPIRO
ROHAN DICKSON

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:30AM – 11:30AM
WEDNESDAY, 7TH AUGUST 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **DR COAKES:** Terrific. Okay. Well, let's kick off. Good morning. Welcome everyone. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet today and pay respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Redfern Mixed Use Co-Living Housing Development, currently before the Commission for determination.

10 The applicant, EG Funds Management Pty Ltd, is seeking approval for the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a six storey mixed use co-living housing development comprising 200 co-living rooms, ground floor commercial uses, communal areas, communal open space, associated landscaping works and extension and augmentation of services and infrastructure. My name is 15 Dr Sheridan Coakes, I'm the chair of the Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Dr Bronwyn Evans –

20 **DR EVANS:** Morning.

25 **DR COAKES:** – and Mr Richard Pearson. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Oliver Cope 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 part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

30 It is important for us, the commissioners, to ask questions of attendees, to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate and if you are asked a question and you're not in a position to respond to that question or answer, please feel free to take that question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request all members today, please, before 35 they start to speak, introduce themselves for the first time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

40 We will now begin. So thank you for joining us this morning. I understand that you're going to be taking us through a presentation. We've obviously provided you with an agenda of some of the key issues that we'd like to explore today and if you're open to that, I think as we move through the presentation, what we've found useful in our other meetings is potentially if we can just jump in and ask questions as we progress through. So if you're comfortable with that, then over to 45 you. Thank you.

MR COOK: Thank you. Did you want us to do a few quick introductions from our end or just as we go through?

DR COAKES: Yes, that would be – yes, thank you.

5 **MR COOK:** Fantastic. We'll just, yes, share the screen with our presentation while we do that. But Tom Cook from Mecone Planning. I'm joined here by Ben Hendriks.

MR BEN HENDRIKS: Hi.

10 **MR COOK:** Stephanie Wu, also from Mecone Planning, and David Workman, from EG Funds, the applicant. We've also got our architect, Mark Shapiro, as well as our urban designer, Rohan Dickson, joining us.

DR COAKES: Okay. Thank you.

15

MS STEPHANIE WU: Can everyone see the screen?

MR COOK: Yes.

20

DR COAKES: Yes, we can.

MR COOK: Great. So if we agree, we'll go through the presentation we've pulled together, which closely follows that agenda which has been set out, but please, feel free to jump in at any point. We're happy to take questions as we go.

25

DR COAKES: Okay, lovely. Thank you.

30 **MR COOK:** So just a bit of an overview of the project, the background and also David will touch on EG, the applicant, and how they intend to carry this project forward. I guess going back to the start, this project commenced in 2021.

35 At that time, it only included the front portion of the site fronting Cleveland Street, which EG lodged a development application for back then for a co-living development shortly after EG acquired the site to the rear, 6–8 Woodburn Street, which we intended to also lodge an application on and through consultation with the Department of Planning in the early stages of that particular project, it was strongly advised by them for us to lodge the one application across the site as one.

40 So we proceeded down that path and we found that through that, by stitching the two sites together and two developments together, there were some inherent opportunities within the project, which we'll take you through a bit more closely later on. But that kind of slowly evolved and then there was some extensive consultation with the Department, Council, the SDRP as well as local community groups, where we found that there was further evolvment of the project, particularly through consultation and working with community groups and
45 Indigenous groups in responding to the Connecting with Country framework.

Through the actual assessment process itself, there was also quite a lot of

5 movement and concessions made through the project, both from feedback from those agencies and authorities but also internally, working with the likes of Cox Inall Ridgeway and WSP and those Indigenous community groups, we found there was significant opportunity to provide a space and then respond to the Connecting with Country framework. I might just hand over to David to give you a little run down of EG and a little bit.

10 **MR DAVID WORKMAN:** Yes, thanks, Tom. Look, in short, EG is very passionate about this renewal opportunity and we're certainly committed to its construction and ongoing management, likely with the assistance of an onsite co-living manager. The proposal for us is drawn from the ethos of the Little BIG Foundation.

15 If you're not aware, it's a not for profit organisation founded by EG, which seeks to create places, programs and events to foster social connection, in effect tackle loneliness and create a genuine sense of community, not only for onsite residents but it's also open to surrounding residents in the community. And that's in operation at a number of EG development assets, including its Flour Mill development at Summer Hill. And we certainly intend to operate Little BIG from the Redfern co-living development.

20 **MR PEARSON:** David, can I just – it's Richard Pearson. Could I just ask a question on that dot point that says you're going to manage the project with assistance from a co-living manager. So does that mean this development will remain in EG's portfolio and what do you mean by a co-living manager? Is that just a person or is that an entity?

25 **MR WORKMAN:** Yes, Commissioner, it will likely be an onsite entity that assists in the day to day operation and management of the development but at this stage we intend to retain ownership and manage, if you like, at a global level, the overall development. But we would likely rely on the assistance of an onsite co-living manager.

30 **MR PEARSON:** Got it. Okay, thank you.

35 **DR EVANS:** And Bronwyn Evans here, if I can follow up on another point that you raised, which was engagement of WSP in consultation with the local community and it may come up later but just how that report by WSP has informed the way that you intend to have the site work with those local communities. And can I see in one of your dot points here that you're talking about a multi-purpose communal space for use by external community groups. So if you could just explain that link from the WSP work and consultation and how that will become actual.

40 **MR COOK:** Yes, so the multipurpose communal space, we had intended it from the very outset to provide a space for the community, one way or another. Through that consultation process, we met with the likes of Tribal Warrior and other groups, who advised that they'd love to take up that opportunity.

5 We also learnt that they probably didn't require it full-time and they made that very clear that it would be very ad hoc, once, twice, three times a month was kind of what they were looking at. And we took guidance from them in terms of the dimensions and space, location for what would suit their needs. So what we decided was to provide a space which served kind of dual purposes. First and foremost, the priority would be given to those community groups and that would be on kind of a booking system through the onsite manager.

10 So their role would not just be to manage the co-living residents but also that space. And so the priority would be given to those groups. When it's not booked by those groups, then there would be opportunity for it to serve another purpose, i.e. maybe activities for residents or just a breakout space for residents. But if it was booked for one of those groups, then they would absolutely get priority over that.

15 **DR COAKES:** Just Sheri Coakes here, and just adding to that question by Bronwyn, I guess how hard – and we may be jumping, so if we're jumping, if we're coming to that, then please let me know. How I guess have the views of those groups and the outcomes of the Connecting to Country were being incorporated in the design of the community space and I guess other aspects of the development?

20 **MR COOK:** Yes, so I guess, as I said before, there was some input from them in terms of the location, making sure it's in a prominent location, down Eveleigh Street, which is kind of a main thoroughfare, it's open, the dimensions themselves in terms of the activities in which those groups partake in. They provided some feedback on that. They also provided some feedback in terms of what they would like to see in there. I mean, there was a lot of discussion around the Greg Inglis mural and so we worked to look at ways in which we could reproduce that somewhere within the site.

25 **MR COOK:** Yes, so I guess, as I said before, there was some input from them in terms of the location, making sure it's in a prominent location, down Eveleigh Street, which is kind of a main thoroughfare, it's open, the dimensions themselves in terms of the activities in which those groups partake in. They provided some feedback on that. They also provided some feedback in terms of what they would like to see in there. I mean, there was a lot of discussion around the Greg Inglis mural and so we worked to look at ways in which we could reproduce that somewhere within the site.

30 And given the purpose and function of that community space, we thought that that was probably the best fit for it and they provided some feedback and guidance around that as well. Moving kind of through the multipurpose space and more broadly through the communal courtyard area, there was also a lot of feedback in terms of what themes they would like to see in there, type of Indigenous learnings, wayfinding and things like that. So there was a lot of feedback, not just for that community space, but also more broadly throughout the development itself, which we've got a slide on later which we can take you through in a bit more detail.

35 **DR COAKES:** No, thank you. And just one last question, so those groups have been involved in – you know, they're obviously aware of the revised design and I guess how their input is being incorporated? Has there been any consultation around that post?

40 **MR COOK:** Yes, so as the design evolved, there was ongoing consultation through WSP with those groups. They may not have seen the absolute final

because there has been quite a lot of changes as we've worked through and whether or not the actual final design as we see here today has reached them, I'm not entirely sure but something very close to that has absolutely been shown to them.

5

DR COAKES: Thank you.

MR COOK: So just quickly, I'm sure you're very familiar with the site and have got a site visit later this afternoon so you can get a bit more familiar with where we are. But as you can see, it's very strategically located in close proximity to the CBD. I believe it's just over 250 metres from Redfern Station and a little bit further on to Central Station. There's a lot of transport around the area and it's very close to universities and what have you, so an ideal location for housing.

10

Just a bit of an overview of the project itself, I'm not going to labour on these points because I know you've probably been presented on these before and you've read through documentation but probably just something unique about this development and wanted to point it out, which it's probably been a real – you know, the catalyst of which has been appreciation for the site's location and context is providing that.

15

20

It's not like a normal boarding house or co-living development. It really leans into that kind of co-living and co-working model and that's kind of evolved through not only the stitching of the two sites together to provide a larger offering as one but also hearing back from the community, Indigenous elders, and looking at ways in which we can make the space open and provide that activation.

25

But also the co-working spaces, which are quite generous on the ground floor as well, it kind of feeds into that courtyard space and there's real synergies between the co-living housing and those spaces as well. So it's not looking to just shut off one element from another, it's looking to really stitch those together and find those synergies. So yes, I think – yes, keep going.

30

In terms of the site suitability and the residential FSR variation, so I think, as you can see here in this slide, it shows the residential development within the area. I think it can probably – it's reasonable to say that the area since the introduction of that standard from the Redfern Waterloo Built Environment Plan in 2006, it has gone through quite a transition.

35

So with the prevailing, I guess, residential development but also the residential development which has been approved since and more recently, not only for the site itself but also surrounding sites, it's probably fair to say that that standard has, to a degree, been abandoned and that's probably in response to market conditions and the need for housing in those locations.

40

45

And whilst we still believe that the provision of residential accommodation in this area responds to the objectives of the built environment plan, we also want to respond to the principles of the Housing SEPP, which we effectively lodged this

application under as co-living. And so encouraging housing types which meet the needs of vulnerable members of the community and housing location which makes good use of existing infrastructure.

5 This was also supported by an economic impact assessment, which was done by Atlas. And so through that process, it was found by Atlas and this is consistent with findings on previous approvals for the site, that it's quite unviable to deliver substantial commercial or non-residential floorspace in this location. It has been tried before in the past but it just hasn't worked.

10 Atlas also found that there's a significant need for this type of housing or diverse housing within the area, particularly in consideration of those commercial precincts in close proximity in the CBD, Botany Road precinct and what have you, which will be delivering significant commercial floorspace over time.

15 **DR COAKES:** Just a quick question on that, in our discussion, in our meeting with council, they just noted that there had been a reduction in the commercial space since the original proposal. Would you just mind commenting why that's been the case?

20 **MR COOK:** Yes, so that occurred I guess following the initial response to submissions where we also removed one storey of the development. But it was previously a part six part seven storey proposal. Through that process, it was pared back to be a part five part six storey. Through that process, we needed to augment the amenities for the co-living. So that did somewhat remove some of the non-residential components to make way for that residential amenity, which was required under the Housing SEPP. So there was a slight reduction, but that was largely as a result of reduction of the building height and FSR as a whole.

30 **DR COAKES:** And just in relation to the Atlas Economics work, just wondered, what would be that sort of approximate rental cost of rooms in this particular development? I guess, who's our target that we're –

35 **MR COOK:** I don't have those exact figures. In terms of the –

MR WORKMAN: Is that the residential –

MR COOK: – rental costs, yes.

40 **MR WORKMAN:** Probably runs just from 550 to 600, up to 7 or 800.

MR COOK: Yes, so starting at around 550, 600 per week.

45 **DR COAKES:** Thank you.

MR PEARSON: Did I hear you say up to 800 as well?

MR WORKMAN: For some of the larger [unintelligible 00:22:28].

MR COOK: Up to 800 for the larger ones, the doubles.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, okay. And do you envisage this being primarily student accommodation or not?

10 **MR WORKMAN:** Given the proximity of Sydney University and University of Technology Sydney, that's certainly – we expect there will be some demand for, if you like, students to reside within the development. Equally, it hasn't been designed as a student specific all-purpose accommodation. So yes, Commissioner, probably in the order of, you know, 20 or 30% students but the other would be available to the wider tenants, residential tenants.

15 **MR PEARSON:** Thanks.

20 **MR COOK:** Probably important to note as well that whilst technically this is residential accommodation, we don't deny that at all, it does come with a commercial element. So not just the commercial tenancies on the ground floor but the co-living housing itself does somewhat function as a commercial use and we've found across the site, the actual jobs on site would increase from 30 to 45.

25 Also the benefit of co-living is that it will never be strataed. It remains under one ownership and what that does in the future, it doesn't compromise the use of the development or the site for non-residential purposes in the future, so it's not locking it up for under strata ownership, where it would remain residential in perpetuity. That's actually a similar position that the City themselves have taken on their recent planning proposal to encourage diverse housing such as build to rent and co-living very close to this site as well, whereby you wouldn't be compromised in those future commercial outcomes, should the market demand that as well.

30
35 So just in terms of the building, as I said before, from when the application was first lodged, it came with a maximum height of seven storeys. Through consultation with both Council and the Department of Planning, we did seek to reduce that and bring it back and also provide quite a bit of relief at that upper level of that six storey, recessing it back, particularly from Cleveland Street and provided a lighter materiality, so it wouldn't be viewed too easily.

40 And we'll get to some slides on those view lines but viewing it from I guess the corner of Cleveland Street and Woodburn, it does present as effectively a four storey building. Obviously as you work your way down the site, it does step down, the topography of that, which then it raises up a bit and you do get to that kind of six storeys, albeit kind of more of a centralised recessed area. Same as you move down Eveleigh, from that corner it's very difficult to see the upper level and it does kind of increase to that six storey as we work through.

45 So that's just the elevation of Cleveland. You can see, as it gradually slopes up towards that Woodburn corner, it does present as four storeys and then drops down

as you work your way through to Eveleigh. And that's just looking along Eveleigh Street as well. You can see that upper level is what was originally proposed and it's come down quite a bit from that and you can see how it kind of marries up to that development adjoining to the south, where I believe our height is about half a metre higher than that adjoining building.

This just shows the roof and those elements which are at that upper six storey. As you can see, it's quite well recessed in, particularly from Cleveland Street and as you do go down Eveleigh and Woodburn, it's very difficult, given the narrowness of those streets, to actually view the upper levels from the public domain. We also did quite a bit of solar analysis, obviously in consideration of those surrounding residences. We found that there would be really no material impact or difference between what has been proposed here and a compliant building height.

So I think we do go into that a bit further in further detail a bit later but yes, probably also important to note is that we've provided – I guess going back to what was envisaged for the site, a commercial development. We've provided a predominantly residential outcome, which has a lower floor to ceiling height. So if this was to be delivered as predominantly a commercial development, that would increase the floor ceiling levels and bring the building up quite a bit higher, probably close to what you see here today at that five storey maximum.

So the accessible courtyard, I know there's probably been a bit of conjecture around this and probably also a little bit of confusion. I guess to take you back to the very start, this link, I guess, as you could call it, it was introduced at the very start of the project through the advice of the State Design Review Panel. It was strongly felt by us and I think also the Department of Planning and probably Council as well to a degree that a through-site link in this location is really not required.

It's not required under any statutory control and given its proximity to both Cleveland Street as well as there's another pedestrian link at the end of Woodburn, linking up to Eveleigh. It would be unlikely that it would need to be used by just passers-by say coming from the station or from Redfern and what have you. So the intention of this base and this kind of also evolved through our consultation early on with those community groups, that it would have a function in opening up the space, finding those synergies between the co-working areas and feeding from that in the commercial space as well and providing a welcoming environment for I guess locals to come in, work, explore, seek refuge.

It was never intended to be a true through-site link and I guess a lot of the confusion's probably come from calling it that initially. But it is really more so just a publicly accessible space, rather than being something which – you know, you see other through-site links which are probably more obvious and are used to get from point A to point B. That's never really been so much the intention around this space. It was really just to provide I guess a public and community benefit, which fed into that model of the coworking, co-living. Yes.

DR COAKES: No, go Richard.

5 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, just on the public space, if we call it – or publicly accessible space, I think it’s the Council raised issues regarding what they saw as the fortification, I think was their word, of the entry from Eveleigh and Woodburn Streets, like quite a high, I think 1.8 metre high fence slash gate at either end, because the proposal is I think to shut this off at certain hours of the day. Can you comment on that because I think this is trying to get the balance right between making it warm and accessible versus dealing with CPTED issues, I suppose.

10 **MR COOK:** Absolutely. It’s a good question and look, in terms of your comment on the balance, it was something we went back and forth on quite a bit. Originally there wasn’t those security measures in place, I guess separating off in terms of the fencing and the gates. Through I guess the process with the State Design Review Panel, as well as with Council and the Department of Planning, we had to kind of find a balance in terms of providing that safety to residents and a clear delineation between what is private, what is public and when that space is made public.

20 And so as a result of that, we introduced the fencing through the courtyard itself as well as came up with a management plan around the gates at either end and how they would operate. And so for that reason we put in the timeframes of when they would be kind of shut off to the community to ensure that those CPTED principles were met. And so the intent is through the day when that space is open to the public, that those gates would be open and it would be a welcome environment for them to access that.

25 **MR PEARSON:** And what are the hours of opening proposed?

30 **MS WU:** I think it would be closed between 9 pm to 7 am and yes, the remaining hours would be open.

35 **DR COAKES:** And just a quick question, given what you said just then about that link not being greatly purposeful or required, so what are the advantages of opening it to Woodburn Street?

40 **MR COOK:** Well, I guess it just provides a – as I said, it’s probably something that would be used more by the local community and so they would be people that would frequent the site and use say the café or the coworking space would be familiar with access being provided from Woodburn. And it just provides another I guess point of entry for them to access that space itself but also those internal areas on the ground floor as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Shall we move on to –

45 **MR COOK:** Were there any more questions on the link or are you –

MR PEARSON: Not at this stage.

DR COAKES: No, no, thank you.

5 **MR COOK:** Okay. Cool, we'll move on. So we touched on the community space earlier on. As we said, it's to be used as a multipurpose space for community groups as well as residents but, as we said, the priority would always be given to those groups and that would be encouraged and managed through a booking system with the onsite manager. Yes.

10 **MR PEARSON:** Sorry, just on the community space, is it envisaged or are you proposing that that would be freely accessible? You talked about a booking system but there's no charge for the use of that facility?

MR COOK: Yes, that's correct. There'd be no charge for that.

15 **MR PEARSON:** Okay. Thank you.

20 **DR EVANS:** And if I can also ask about another area of community space that's referenced in the application is the rooftop garden. Just interested to know what that actually [unintelligible 00:35:02].

25 **MR COOK:** Yes, I'm not sure if it would – it might say communal space. We had intended originally for that to potentially be open to the community but given some CPTED and safety issues around that, we focused the community or publicly accessible space to be dedicated on the ground floor. So the rooftop garden itself and those amenities up there are the communal spaces for the residents only.

DR EVANS: Thank you for that clarification.

30 **MR COOK:** So we've touched on the Connecting with Country and some of the, I guess, not only did WSP, were they responsible for the engagement and consultation with those groups and elders but also they provided codesign services with our design team.

35 And through that they've incorporated numerous elements throughout the building such as the wood carvings on the brick on the corner of Eveleigh and Cleveland Street as well as contributions to areas of public art dedicated throughout. And some of those are located internally but there's also a number of opportunities externally and that's provided in our public art strategy. And moving forward, there will be a process which will be run by WSP in commissioning local
40 Indigenous artists to provide artworks for those locations.

MR PEARSON: Is there a figure of how much you're spending on public art? Is that as per the City's policy presumably?

45 **MR COOK:** It would be per the City's policy, yes.

DR COAKES: And just a quick question, what was then the intent with the Greg Inglis – the mural? Is that to be relocated or [unintelligible 00:37:06] in the

community space?

MR COOK: Yes, so that's to be reproduced in the multipurpose space.

5 **DR COAKES:** Okay, yes.

MR COOK: Yes.

MR PEARSON: What's "reproduced" mean?

10

MR COOK: Repainted, I guess.

MR PEARSON: Right. So you're going to get the original artist back to redo it?
Is that the –

15

MR WORKMAN: It's certainly an option. We have to utilise some of the
brickwork.

MR COOK: Yes, I mean it is an option and we can look to also use some of the
existing brickwork, if possible.

20

MR PEARSON: Right. Great.

MR COOK: So one of the issues raised as well was just in terms of the residential
amenity and particularly the internal separation areas. So in terms of – there were
some significant changes to the configuration and layout of these internal rooms
moving up through the building, the courtyard itself was widened and some of
those rooms on each level removed. You can see in the red hatched areas where
that was done to provide increased separation where the cursor is there and that
green arrow is the terrace breakout room, which provides additional internal
communal space for the residents.

25

30

And so what we've tried to achieve through that is achieve compliance,
[unintelligible 00:38:33] compliance with the ADG separation requirements.
There are obvious areas on the corners of the building where that might not
necessarily be the case but the introduction of privacy louvres as well as there
being no direct line of sight into those rooms means that it's very unlikely there
will be any privacy issues arising from that.

35

DR EVANS: Just on that, Council did – obviously the tight corners in those
particular areas obviously were raised by Council in relation to internal privacy.
Was there any consideration of other types of strategies to address that? I mean,
Council spoke of sort of operable external treatments that the resident themselves
can operate.

40

45

MR COOK: Yes. I mean, we did look at numerous privacy treatments including
landscaping, screens. I mean, if the operable kind of louvres was an option that
was also tabled, I don't think we'd be completely against that, if that was a

preference. But we kind of thought that given the orientation of those and it would be very likely that you'd need those but yes, I think there's probably other treatments which we could be open to as well.

5 **DR EVANS:** And no, if I can continue on that line of question, in addition to visual privacy, there were also concerns raised about noise privacy, acoustic privacy. Can you talk to how you're addressing that individual [unintelligible 00:40:16]?

10 **MR COOK:** Yes. So in terms of those internal rooms and ones facing the courtyard, that was a big consideration from our acoustic consultant, Acoustic Logic. They have tested those rigorously as well as with other external factors such as Cleveland Street and the rail corridor and how that stitched into I guess also our ventilation strategy, which we'll touch on a bit later. But that was a big
15 consideration from them and they have adopted mitigation measures to ensure that there would be no adverse acoustic impact to those rooms.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

20 **MR COOK:** So like we said before, there has been quite rigorous solar analysis undertaken. These were the three sites which we had focused on the most points. So 2–8 Eveleigh Street, which is directly behind. There is a communal open space at the top, which would receive some shadowing from the development, however that would still achieve full compliance with the ADG in terms of sunlight into
25 communal open space areas.

There was also the terraces to the rear, which face Woodburn Street. The solar impact on those would not be increased whatsoever from what's currently there to what's proposed. And then also the residential development directly to the west,
30 13–17 Eveleigh Street, we found that there would be negligible impacts in terms of the compliance scheme compared to what we are proposing, so that would also – as a whole, that building would still receive compliance with the ADG.

35 **DR COAKES:** Just in terms of I guess the visual amenity piece there, the report I think discussed some sort of softening of the interfaces with those private open spaces of the adjoining terraces. What was proposed in that regard?

40 **MR COOK:** Mark, I might hand over to you, if you don't mind, to maybe speak to that.

MR SHAPIRO: Sure. At this stage it was mostly just in terms of the materiality, that it's not just a blank façade that we've got – we proposed [fire rated(?)
00:42:52] glass bricks, which is probably an improvement on the current existing blank façade, and then it's slightly set back. We did look at planters and planting
45 there but I think in terms of the maintenance aspects, it was just going to be impossible. So at the moment it's just that change in materials.

MR PEARSON: You said there's a setback as well on that?

MR SHAPIRO: Slightly set back, yes. I think it ranges from a few hundred millimetres to about a metre along that edge, yes, where that corridor is.

5 **MR PEARSON:** It's built to the boundary at the ground interface though, is it not?

MR SHAPIRO: Yes, correct. Yes, sorry, yes, yes.

10 **MR PEARSON:** Yes.

DR COAKES: And just a question around engagement with those residents, proximal residents, what level of engagement has been undertaken with those residents through the [unintelligible 00:43:56] process?

15 **MR COOK:** Yes, so from the very start there was engagement with them from the project team. We did receive some feedback, which we responded to as well as through the response to submissions process after the application had been lodged. And I believe there were submissions made by those residents from the terraces. I don't believe there were from the residences at 13–17 Eveleigh Street or
20 2–8 Eveleigh Street.

MS WU: It was the terraces.

25 **MR COOK:** It was just the terraces. So I mean we assume that they were largely satisfied with what was being proposed. Obviously with every iteration or amend the scheme, that was shared with them as well through the process.

DR EVANS: Just continuing on the discussion around the submission from the
30 terrace owner, one of the concerns raised was damage and impacts to her site during demolition and I'd just be keen to understand what provisions you would make during demolition to ensure there were appropriate measures to look at things like damage to trees on site, roof flashing were some of the issues that were raised.

35 **MR COOK:** Yes, yes. So there are conditions of consent which require the preparation of an approval from the City or the Department, I believe it might've been, for a construction management plan with the likes of a dilapidation report and what have you to ensure that through the construction process there would be
40 no damage to those properties. The details of which I couldn't really speak to today, I'm afraid, but there will be those measures put in place to ensure that there would be no damage to those terraces.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

45 **MR COOK:** So in terms of the ventilation strategy, Mark, I might hand over to you to speak to this.

MR SHAPIRO: Sure. Thank you, Tom. So in terms of ventilation, we looked at various options in detail with our numerous consultants, obviously taking into account the very particular acoustic constraints with primarily the railway and Cleveland Street.

5

So in terms of the natural ventilation, we looked at cross-ventilation and trickle ventilation louvers and they were quite problematic and that cross-ventilation would really only be open to some of those units that were adjacent to the open corridors and would rely on openable windows, which presented their own acoustic issues, [openable(?) 00:46:59] windows to the corridors.

10

And once we took into account the ventilation requirements to the other units and the other services, there just wasn't space for those windows either above the doors. Trickle ventilation, we've been advised that in the experience of our consultants, once the acoustic compliance is achieved, they're really just not at all functional or wouldn't provide the adequate levels of supply air.

15

So the preferred solution was this hybrid solution, which relies on primarily both the natural ventilation, when favourable, to open the windows to those units, depending on when it's more or less noisy. And also through supply air through a ducted reticulation system, which is mechanically assisted but provides sort of filtered and cleaned and filtered air both for the make up air for the exhaust and to provide that flow of air for the internal air quality.

20

So that both provided optionality, so that user optionality in terms of their own individual preferences and we all felt it was the best outcome both acoustically and for the air quality in terms of the units, so that's what's been adopted.

25

MR PEARSON: Mark, is that essentially air conditioning you're talking about?

30

MR SHAPIRO: No, it's separate, completely separate to the air conditioning system. So it's a separate – it's mechanically assisted with fans but it provides sort of quite a low, slow rate of air intake that just really just replaces that air quality.

MR PEARSON: How does it enter the rooms?

35

MR SHAPIRO: So at this stage the design is through a centralised system that goes in fans and plenums above the corridors, so through the internal courtyard space in various points and it goes sort of above – through the ceiling, above the doors of the units, essentially, and then out in sort of vents in the room. So it's just quite a low, pleasant flow of air that really just provides that quality. So it's completely separate to the air conditioning.

40

MR PEARSON: And when you say that sometimes residents would rely on natural ventilation, are you thinking that would be at certain times of the day when traffic noise is reduced, for example?

45

MR SHAPIRO: Yes, correct. I think depends on which – Eveleigh Street, for

example, is a lot more quiet than the Cleveland Street. You know, maybe when there aren't trains running on Woodburn Street and some people just have a different tolerance for noise as well. So just it's very variable and we think this just provides that operability as well as ensuring that there's always that constant air quality as well.

MR PEARSON: Thanks.

MR COOK: Yes. So just quickly on the traffic and parking, we won't labour this one too much but effectively the basement itself and also the ground planning went through quite a bit of design change to ensure we met Council's requirements for both carparking and bicycle, motorbike parking. So we are now fully compliant with Council's DCP, providing those spaces.

On the loading and servicing, so there was quite a bit of work done and consultation with the City of Sydney around the waste collection options. We went through some pretty rigorous testing on a number of options. Firstly, trying to get Council's waste truck into the basement just proved to be too problematic. The site is quite constrained in terms of its size, its topography. It's also got a rail tunnel cutting through parts of the site.

So trying to get access for Council's waste truck would've meant I guess eating into that ground floor plan and yes, it just would've been very, very difficult. So we looked at options in terms of a turntable provided at ground floor, that would've effectively cut out a really big portion of Eveleigh Street in terms of activation and providing more non-residential floorspace in that location. We looked at a reverse entry. Obviously with that comes some safety concerns and Council advised against that as well.

So failing all those, we moved to a private waste collection option, something that has been adopted in the Sydney LGA for similar types of developments. It's often used for hotels, used for a number of boarding house and co-living developments. Most recently there was a co-living development approved on 90–116 Regent Street in Redfern for 800 beds and that adopted a private waste collection arrangement as well. So yes, Mark, did you want to add anything else to that in terms of the design around that space?

MR SHAPIRO: Yes, just building on what you've said in terms of the constraints, obviously the basement is very constrained in terms of our ability to have a ramp and a useable basement because of that railway easement. So the [ungreat(?) 00:53:18] options really knocked out too much of that – either the one wasn't safe or knocked out too much of the Eveleigh Street activation, which is a principal street activation. And then basement collection also, once you look at trucks with a 4 metre or three and a half metre headroom, it really just knocked out too much of that ground floor podium level, which is really an essential part of the amenity for the building.

So the best outcome was a reduced height SRV, which at 2.6 metres allowed still

5 for quite a wide range of potential private contractors. You know, some of them are 2.2 metres, quite a lot of them at the moment, and that also, we've been advised by potential operators that that's their preferred mode operationally and financially as well in terms of getting onboard private contractors. It just works a lot better for them.

MR PEARSON: Sorry, Mark, will the bins be collected on the site, as in down the basement or will they be –

10 **MR SHAPIRO:** In the basement. In the basement, yes. So it's been designed – the ramp has been designed for a reduced height and a small rigid vehicle of 2.6 metres and that's – yes, the loading bay, as Tom's pointing out, is sort of in that location there. So they'll effectively park in the loading bay and then wheel in the bins from the various rooms sort of as required and I think that's three times a
15 week it was calculated to –

DR EVANS: Because that was one of Council's concerns, having the bins wheeled up at street level for collection.

20 **MR SHAPIRO:** Yes, correct. So the advantage of this scenario is that it keeps the bins completely off the street.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, I mean the Council's pretty hostile on this one and I think they intend to charge you waste collection whether they collect it or not. Are you aware of that?

30 **MR COOK:** Yes, we are aware of that. That's been worked into the feasibility of the project and that's been accepted by EG from the very start. Yes, so very familiar with that.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

35 **MR COOK:** Probably just important to note there, interestingly Council's own DCP or for their DCP in 2004, which still applies, it's not been repealed, it does provide that boarding house development, which at the time of its adoption included private boarding houses, which is effectively co-living, that private
40 contracting arrangements should be adopted for garbage disposal. So yes, they do have a policy around residential development or waste policy and encouraging the use of Council's waste trucks but just important to note out, their own DCP does speak to the use of private contracting for boarding houses.

45 **DR EVANS:** And a further question on that, how will you ensure your waste collector is using some of those principles of circular economy and recycling and reducing the amount of waste going into landfill?

MR COOK: Yes, I mean there is I guess a contract between the operator and the

private waste contractor. That would also be fed into the waste management plan itself. So there obviously would be that requirement and we'd be using very reputable waste contractors who are familiar with those requirements and they undertake those activities and yes, I guess are required to do that. It's quite common.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR COOK: Just touching on briefly the landscaping, so as you can see here, there's the internal courtyard itself, we tried to introduce as much landscaping as possible and feeding off the Connecting with Country framework and consultation we had, drawing on those Indigenous themes of the waterways, et cetera, we've really tried to bring that into the development and provide a real meaningful response to that. That extends up to the rooftop, the communal rooftop, which is effectively an oasis for residents and yes, provides that landscaping treatment as well and Indigenous garden.

DR COAKES: Just on that, you said obviously a more native or Indigenous garden, did you consider in terms of landscaping, we're seeing obviously across Sydney further development of sort of residential community gardens on these upper floors. Was that the sort of intent for residents? Obviously you're saying it's not open to public use, general public use but –

MR COOK: Yes, we did explore that option. It was originally – we played with the idea of having this open to the community. I guess for the development itself, it's probably a little bit constrained in allowing that opportunity. As well as – as I said earlier on, in terms of the safety and CPTED requirements, feeding the community use up to the rooftop probably somewhat conflicted with the primary use of the development for residential purposes.

So we did toy with that idea for quite some time but we had to find that balance of where we kind of delineate the public and private and so we kind of focused more so on the ground plan to provide that community space instead.

DR COAKES: Right. And given that you're sort of calling it an Indigenous native garden, I guess there's probably room for, in terms of development of that garden and landscaping, using Indigenous businesses in terms of design and even ongoing management of the garden.

MR COOK: Yes, absolutely. And as I said, that's always been the intent and as this evolves, I mean there will be opportunities to do more of that as well.

DR COAKES: And just in terms of I think you may have addressed it but obviously Council made some comments of concerns regarding landscaping from its submission in the response to submission phase. They've obviously been addressed as part of the revised design?

MR COOK: Yes, that's right. I mean, we have, where possible, tried to respond

to those concerns and providing adequate landscaped area, deep soil where it could be provided. Obviously being a very urban harsh environment, there are somewhat limited opportunities to do that but we have tried to respond to, as best we can, to those concerns by the City.

5

DR COAKES: Yes, because I think in that ground floor area, there was some concern, wasn't there, about access to light for certain planting?

MR COOK: Yes, there has been. I guess we're not reliant on that courtyard space to achieve our compliance with solar access requirements under the Housing SEPP for communal open space. That is achieved elsewhere within the development. We looked at options to open that space up a bit more to let more light in, however we had to kind of find that balance between allowing light in and making that a harsh environment, which if we were to do that, it wouldn't be a very pleasant place to be with Cleveland Street.

15

So we sought to kind of leave that and keep it as a place of refuge and that was something that was brought up by those community groups and Indigenous elders as well, that they wanted – their preference was to make that a place of refuge and keep that amenity from Cleveland Street.

20

DR COAKES: Thank you.

MR COOK: So public domain, there is a requirement under condition B11 of the consent for those public domain upgrades. There will also be a public domain plan developed in consultation with the City of Sydney to ensure they're all done properly. And just touching on the – as we mentioned before, the community consultations we went through with obviously all state agencies as well as the community in terms of surrounding landowners, Indigenous community groups and stakeholders, Aboriginal elders as well as non-Indigenous groups such as Youth Action and Homelessness New South Wales. And that's it, happy to take any other questions that the commissioners might have.

25

30

DR COAKES: I think the only one I had was I noticed in some of the early documentation there was some original consideration of a percentage of housing for Indigenous Australians that was considered. I was just interested in obviously that is no longer the case but what was the original thinking there and obviously we've ended up in a different place. Can you just talk us through that, please?

35

MR COOK: So I'm not sure if that was an element which was ever proposed in terms of dedicating a percentage of housing to Indigenous –

40

MR WORKMAN: Not initially, I don't think –

MR COOK: No. I mean, I think it could've been a suggestion, I believe, by perhaps the State Design Review Panel or but no, we don't recall that being –

45

MR PEARSON: You are paying affordable housing contributions, I think it's

about 600,000, from memory.

MR COOK: That's right, yes. Under the City's contributions plan, we would be paying those contributions for affordable housing, yes.

5

MR PEARSON: Would you be an open to an alternative to dedicate a couple of rooms instead of paying that, for example?

MR WORKMAN: We'd certainly welcome and seek to accommodate local Indigenous residents, youth, et cetera, to reside within the development and give priority to those tenants, Commissioner. We'd certainly look at some sort of provision in lieu of that monetary contribution.

10

MR PEARSON: Okay. Not saying that that's what we'll do but it's just open for – just checking if you're open to consideration.

15

MR WORKMAN: Yes. We're not ignorant to that issue and the need to house local Indigenous youth and residents and we'd welcome that and encourage that opportunity and we'd be open to it.

20

DR COAKES: And I guess given just building on what Richard's said, given that you're saying a proportion of residents may be students, that might be Indigenous students –

25

MR WORKMAN: Agreed.

DR COAKES: – and so forth and given the context of the development and the community surrounding.

30

MR WORKMAN: Agreed. We'd welcome and give priority to those tenants.

DR COAKES: Yes. And I mean obviously early in the presentation you spoke about the community aspect with the Little BIG Foundation.

35

MR WORKMAN: Agreed.

DR COAKES: So it sort of comes together quite nicely.

MR WORKMAN: Yes, no objection at all.

40

DR COAKES: Thank you. All right. Thank you very much, that was a great – very good, thorough presentation, so really appreciate that. Any other questions, Richard, Bronwyn?

45

MR PEARSON: No, not from me.

DR EVANS: No, not at –

DR COAKES: Olly or Kendall, no?

MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: Nothing from us.

5 **DR COAKES:** All good. Lovely. So thank you very much for your time. I'll call the meeting to a close and we look forward to meeting you on site I think at 1 o'clock.

MR COOK: 1 o'clock.

10

MR WORKMAN: Very good.

MR COOK: Likewise.

15

DR COAKES: Okay, thank you very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

20

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED