



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

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

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: DR SHERIDAN COAKES (CHAIR)

DR BRONWYN EVANS AM

MR RICHARD PEARSON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE

OLIVER COPE

**CITY OF SYDNEY
COUNCIL:**

MIA MUSIC

ERIN COLGRAVE

ELLENA MANGAVOULAKIS

LOCATION:

ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE:

9:00AM – 10:00AM

FRIDAY, 2ND AUGUST 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

DR SHERIDAN COAKES: So good morning. Before we begin, I would acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Worimi country and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet today and pay my 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.

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 work and extension and augmentation of services and infrastructure.

My name is Dr Sheridan Coakes, I'm the chair of the Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Dr Bronwyn Evans 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 that we fully capture the information today, the meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

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

So we'll now commence the meeting. So thank you very much for joining us this morning. I think we've provided an agenda for today just this morning, just to go through and obviously have highlighted some of the key issues that we'd obviously like to hear from Council in relation to this particular project. So if I could now just hand over to – who's sort of leading the discussion from Council's side –

MS MIA MUSIC: I will be. So thank you for that.

DR COAKES: Okay. Thanks.

MS MUSIC: Good morning, everyone. My name is Mia Music and I'm a senior planner in the major projects team at the City of Sydney Council. Today I'm accompanied by my colleagues, Erin Colgrave, the City's urban designer, and Ellena

Mangavoulakis, the City's waste management officer. Is it right to kick things off?

DR COAKES: Yes, please. Thank you, Mia. That would be great.

5 **MS MUSIC:** Great. So I'd just like to begin with an overview of Council's
position on the co-living development proposal recommended for approval by the
Department. The current proposal is the same scheme that was submitted at the
revised response to submissions stage in February/March this year. No changes
10 have been made to the design and the Department's assessment report states that
all concerns have adequately been addressed, which the City does not agree with.

The current proposal has not adequately addressed key concerns that we have
regarding the significant departure from the land use mix controls resulting in a
predominantly residential scheme, which has key amenity concerns. We consider
15 that to reconsider the mix, the controls should be formally adjusted by the
Department after appropriate study and in the absence of this, we maintain our
objection that we have with the proposal. We also maintain our concerns regarding
design excellence, transitions to the adjoining developments, waste management
and collection and the link that runs through the site. Other matters raised
20 previously by Council have been or can be addressed by permission.

I'll now go through our key issues, mostly in order of how they're set out in the
agenda. So the first one, suitability of the site and non-compliance with the key
development standards. The FSR one. So the City encourages the provision of
25 diverse and more affordable housing type options in accessible locations, however
this specific site is envisaged to accommodate more productive development with
enterprise and employment enhancing uses under the strategic plans and as per the
applicable controls.

30 We believe that no genuine effort has been made by the Proponent through the
assessment to rebalance the residential component of the overall development with
an FSR of 2.91 proposed, which far exceeds the maximum of 1.3 for the site,
which includes the Housing SEPP bonus. This excessive exceedance results in
amenity issues for future residents.

35 The commercial component of the development has an FSR of only 0.38:1 which
is a reduction from what they had originally proposed. The small commercial
spaces are limited to the ground level and at some points below ground level. The
eastern most commercial tenancy is only accessed through the link which runs
40 through the site from Eveleigh Street to Woodburn Street and is not always open
to the public. And there's really no activation of the ground level other than
Eveleigh Street, we consider.

45 The reduction in commercial floorspace quantum overall has the effect of reducing
employment capacity as envisaged for the site and area forever. Finding well
located spaces will be the next major issue after the current housing focus, which
is an affordability issue for low and moderate income workers.

Moving to the Department's acceptance of the non-compliance for the FSR development standard and the Proponent's variation request. To justify the contravention, they rely on the Wehbe test in establishing that the development standard is unreasonable or necessary to demonstrating compliance with the land use and design concerns of the Redfern Waterloo Built Environmental Plan. I'll refer to this plan as the BEP.

We consider that the key objective of the FSR standard through the BEP is to encourage commercial and business uses and to limit the proportion of residential development due to residential amenity issues associated with the railway corridor and Cleveland Street and we don't consider that this objective has been achieved with the development.

The Proponent also states that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify this, saying that there are no amenity impacts. This disregards the City's concerns raised throughout regarding insufficient internal separations that have resultant acoustic and visual privacy impacts as well as natural ventilation concerns and we'll discuss these matters in detail shortly.

And then the second environmental planning ground that they use, they say that the proportion of residential floor space is appropriate for the zoning by looking at the applicable zoning objectives and that is the business and mixed use zone. We don't agree that these objectives have been met with a limited mix of uses provided on site and a heavy delivery of residential uses over business and commercial uses and also that the development doesn't achieve design excellence.

I'd also just like to raise that we don't agree with the Department's approach for justifying the significant FSR resi non-compliance through examples of sites in nearby locations which comprise residential uses such as the Scape Student Housing that's located to the west on Cleveland Street, Hudson Studios on Hudson Street, which is a bit south of the site and the Pemulwuy mixed use development to the south.

These examples were either strictly not supported by Council with their FSR non-compliances at the time of assessment or differ from the subject proposal in that they were well-designed developments, which had a more balanced approach to providing a wider range of uses on site that also had good residential amenity outcomes.

Now, moving on to the second key issue that we had, we've joined together residential amenity with design excellence, as we think they're related. While the design has been amended during the assessment to make improvements to address some design excellence matters, the City maintains its concerns regarding residential amenity.

We don't consider that the proposal meets key planning controls, including clause 22(2)(c) of the Eastern Harbour City SEPP, which relates to design excellence and specifically this clause states that the building meets sustainable

design principles in terms of natural ventilation and visual and acoustic privacy.

5 Clause 69(2(b)(iii) of the Housing SEPP, which relates to standards for co-living housing and states that buildings of at least three storeys are to comply with the minimum building separation distances specified in the Apartment Design Guide. And part 4.4 of the BEP, which relates to the land use and design concepts for the Redfern Waterloo Authorities Strategic Sites, this section seeks to facilitate the development of quality housing for existing and new residents that is designed and located to respond to external factors, including the railway corridor and
10 Cleveland Street to maximise amenity.

15 I'll now hand over to my colleague, Erin, to discuss our visual, privacy and ventilation concerns that we have in more detail and note that we have plan extracts and design examples that we can share on the screen if you think that will be of assistance. Thank you, Erin.

20 **MS ERIN COLGRAVE:** Good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak to the IPC. So with regard to visual privacy, we maintain the following of particular concern. So the particular concerns remain regarding the amenity of the internal courtyard rooms and the reason we maintain this concern is because – and sorry, it's a bit verbose to quote a little bit of the ADG, but section 2F of the ADG provides relevant guidance on building separation and separation between buildings contributes to the urban form of an area and the amenity within
25 apartments and open space areas.

Amenities improve through establishing minimum distance. I'm going to emphasis on this, between apartments within the site, between apartments and non-residential uses and with boundaries to neighbours. So we're of most concern between apartments within the site. And in addition, the ADG provides this
30 guidance, gallery access circulation areas should be treated as habitable space with separation measured from the exterior edge of the circulation space.

35 So for the City, the physical separation is essential for – delivers essential amenity and it is of most concern in the application at the internal corners of the courtyard because the separation distances are as low as 1.7 metres from a circulation corridor to a Juliet balcony and window. And now we do have plan snips, if you would like us to show you that in context because sometimes it's just a bit words and no pictures, but we're happy to just keep on rolling with the windows if you –

40 **MR RICHARD PEARSON:** I personally think it'd be good, yes.

MS COLGRAVE: Yes, just to have us share – okay, fantastic. We weren't 100% sure about the forum, how that rolls.

45 **DR COAKES:** No, that's helpful. Yes.

MS COLGRAVE: Yes, that's good. Okay. So please let me know if that is working. Can you see –

DR COAKES: Yes, we can. Thanks, Erin.

5 **MS COLGRAVE:** You can see that. Okay. That's great. Okay. So because the plans are a little bit memory intensive in a PDF, we've just had to take select snips of things, so where we're talking about the common circulation, where the ADG considers this is a habitable space, this is the most tightest point and that's that 1.7 metres, looking from this into this type C room. And anything with a pink dimension is under that 12 metre minimum building separation of the ADG for one to four storeys to be habitable. So I guess the tightest points are probably areas of most concern.

15 The other areas are still non-compliances but it's the really – it's those tight internal corners and which I'll show you in section – please bear with while I find that. What that effectively means from that circulation corridor into that unit type and some of it is really quite close and as you can kind of see in here, the landscaping proposed is relatively low and then that was the southern end of the courtyards and there is still, on the northern end of the courtyard, a similar – all those internal corners are tricky, are tricky in relation to building separation.

20 Okay, so if I go back to my notes, if that's okay. So I'll check the section for this guy as well. That one, that's the section for this. So landscape plan is proposed to the courtyard perimeter, low planting height from what we can ascertain and any reliance on landscaping typically for visual privacy cannot be certain for the life of the building.

25 So planning offers limited reliable visual screening and obviously does not address any acoustic privacy concerns where there's a really close – where those connections are really close. And from our estimation and from these drawings, you can see that no privacy screening to rooms in the courtyard is proposed and that's based on the plans and sections. So that's in relation to that issue.

30 With regard to ventilation, so visual privacy and acoustic privacy is one issue from the courtyard but with regard to ventilation, in a broader sense we maintain – and sorry, I don't have a slide for this, I'll just leave that slide there for the moment. We maintain the following: the proposal still relies on a hybrid natural and mechanical ventilation system to address acoustic impacts from Cleveland and Woodburn Streets and the layout of rooms surrounding an internal courtyard. So this reaffirms, from our perspective, how a predominantly residential use on the site delivers compromised amenity outcomes.

35 In the submitted appendix I, ESD strategy, the primary source of ventilation is stated to residential units as mechanical ventilation delivered to each unit via ducted reticulation system and this is supported by the acoustic – the submitted acoustic statement, appendix N2, which states all facades facing Cleveland Street and Woodburn Street will require alternative ventilation strategies. That means they cannot achieve required internal noise levels with any windows open.

So for the City this represents compromised amenity outcomes where residents to those two frontages on Cleveland and Woodburn specifically must choose between natural ventilation or acoustic comfort and that's equivalent to 88 rooms or 44% of the total 200 rooms. So it's a substantial portion of the development.

5

DR COAKES: So just – Ellena, just a question, if you don't – are you happy for us to ask questions as we go through because I think it might be useful as we go through.

10

MS COLGRAVE: Yes, yes.

DR COAKES: And obviously we'll come back to you, Mia, around some of these suitability aspects. But just in terms of – so Council noted that there was an absence, I guess, of a natural ventilation assessment. What would you be expecting in that regard?

15

MS COLGRAVE: I think perhaps that was a layover from the original proposal.

DR COAKES: Original proposal?

20

MS COLGRAVE: Yes. Because originally the Applicant had proposed to utilise highlight windows and natural cross-ventilation through some of these open corridors but then I think that through the assessment period, that feature had been removed. So I think we weren't aware what the hybrid system meant until you're looking at and going okay, it means you have the option – for noise affected rooms, you can open your window or you can close your window and achieve acoustic comfort and rely on air conditioning. So that was our – I don't think there's a ventilation assessment required for that if that makes sense.

25

30

DR COAKES: No, no, okay.

MS COLGRAVE: I think that's quite – that's the strategy that's proposed before the IPC, yes.

35

DR COAKES: Okay. And obviously the Department has put forward a condition really that just relates to appropriate maintenance of the ventilation system.

MS COLGRAVE: Yes.

40

DR COAKES: And in Council's view, you obviously believe broadly that the ventilation system, particularly for those rooms, as you said, that are facing Cleveland and Woodburn Streets, is really not appropriate?

45

MS COLGRAVE: Yes. When there are alternatives that can be investigated where you can say have trickle ventilation, so some level of fresh air. It's not necessarily equivalent to being able to open a window but it always ensures some level of fresh air. I guess when there's alternative strategies are required, that's an alternative strategy that other applicants have used on other sites.

DR COAKES: Okay.

5 **MS COLGRAVE:** That are noise affected. For this type of use, the City is much more rigorous for residential apartments under the ADG because we want to ensure natural ventilation. But for this type of use where there's more flexibility, alternatives will be considered like that, like trickle ventilation and those sorts of things to help improve amenity outcomes for noise affected apartments.

10 **DR COAKES:** Okay, great. Richard and Bronwyn, please just jump in if you –

MR PEARSON: Sure. Nothing at the moment. Yes.

DR COAKES: Yes, yes.

15 **MS COLGRAVE:** Okay. Thank you. That concludes my section, so I'll stop sharing if that's okay just for now. Thank you.

20 **MR PEARSON:** Sorry, if we are concluding your section, Erin, just - so obviously the City's number one request is that the land use mix be rebalanced, so there's less residential, more commercial, but in the event that it wasn't, what would you see as potential mitigations for those amenity impacts you've described? You've talked about the ventilation option but what about in terms of visual privacy, is there things like improved landscaping or screening that –

25 **MS COLGRAVE:** Yes, yes. That's a really good question. It's a little bit of jumping to the end but if the IPC are of a mind to approve the application before them, could additional conditions to those previously provided be contemplated to assist addressing those amenity concerns and primarily that could involve operable external privacy treatments for courtyard facing rooms. And this is to enable user controlled visual privacy and sole access to those rooms that can receive it.

30
35 So for us – I know this is a little bit of a different scale but the principle of having the resident be able to control that privacy perhaps is more effective than any reliance on landscaping and maintenance that may or may not be in perpetuity. And because something like this, this is Altair at Kings Cross if anyone – that's coming up the hill, there's a high level of amenity and control. A bit of both, if that makes sense. So that there's views out and there's not that choice between having to roll down a block out blind and have visual privacy. There's a choice
40 between some level of daylight and visual privacy and user control.

45 So I think that that – if the IPC were of a mind to consider that, that would be amazing really. And so operable external privacy treatments for courtyard rooms and some consideration potentially for a – and this wasn't highlighted in our presentation today but the low level rooms facing the external perimeter of the site similarly have a high level of visual permeability from very hostile interfaces. So it could be something that could be contemplated for the lower levels externally as well for that same reason. Not having to choose between daylight and privacy.

DR COAKES: Okay, yes.

MR PEARSON: Thank you. Yes.

5

DR COAKES: Okay. Back to you then, Mia, if you're –

MS MUSIC: Yes, great. Thank you. I'll move on to waste management because that's a key matter that we would like resolved with this proposal as well. It is understood that the development proposes waste collection within the basement by a private waste contractor multiple times a week and the proposed design limits itself by servicing only a 6.4 m SRV vehicle, with a low head height entering into the basement with only 2.6 m provided.

10

15 So we maintain that the proposal should meet Council's requirement for onsite collection by the City's residential waste collection service with a 9.25 m long truck. That's because the proposed development, it is for co-living housing, which is explicitly defined in the standard instrument as a type of residential accommodation and the City requires that all resi accommodation is to be designed to accommodate our waste collection service.

20

25 By not doing this, this development will set an unfavourable precedent for future co-living developments within our local government area and possibly for other councils. We'd just like to let the IPC know that we've had meetings with the Proponent to discuss several options. We looked at the possibility of providing waste collection and loading on the ground floor with the use of a turntable and then also in our latest advice, we recommended a design modification condition to ensure that the current loading dock can accommodate a Council collection vehicle and neither of these options have been sufficiently explored by the Applicant, we consider.

30

35 We have noted to the Proponent and the Department that if either of these arrangements slightly impacts the amount of commercial floorspace on the ground floor, then additional commercial spaces could be provided in the upper levels and this has not been considered at all. If the proposal is to proceed with private collection, it should be clear that Council does not support this approach.

35

40 However, if it is to proceed and Ellena, feel free to jump in at any point, we consider that the Australian standards for SRV should be met, including the clearance height of 3.5 m and ramp grades and if possible, extension to a 7.5 m length vehicle. This would assist in increasing the pool of vehicles able to service as waste vehicles tend to be longer than the Australian standards class that they fit in.

40

45 Just on waste collection, we'd also like to note the following to the IPC. The cost of private collection for an SRV with a low clearance is expensive and likely to result in bins and bulky waste being presented on the kerb for collection, which causes traffic noise and amenity impacts. Council must levy a charge per dwelling

45

for residential waste collection regardless of whether the development uses Council or private waste collection services.

5 By not designing the building to accommodate a Council waste truck, this will lock out future owners of the site from using the City's waste collection service because those trucks won't be able to enter in. And yes, the current design does not provide adequate waste holding space in the basement adjacent to the loading area to allow for the presentation and safe collection of all bins required for the site.

10 If the IPC is to proceed with approving the development in its current form, we do have minor amendments to the conditions that the Department have recommended and we can put forward this for your review following the morning. Ellena, is there anything that I haven't covered there?

15 **MS ELLENA MANGAVOULAKIS:** Yes, I just think, as Mia touched on, the points about the expense. I think it's important for the Applicant to actually assess the ongoing cost of designing as it is at the moment with a three times a week collection by a mini. Despite increasing the size, it will have better impacts in the long run for ongoing costs and it'll just open it up to more service providers and it will take away any opportunity or any decision to wheel the bins up on to the street, which is what we really don't want, apart from the fact that our preference is to collect.

25 And the other important thing to take in mind is that there's inconsistencies with the Department here approving private collection and then the EPA having expectations for Council to collect and those expectations come up because there's an expectation for Council to report back to the EPA on residential waste collection, generation rates and recycling rates, so the EPA knows how councils are going as far as meeting landfill targets and reducing waste to landfill. So it is important for Council to be able to collect and report back to Council.

30 And the EPA also has guidelines on designing – set of practice guidelines for designing for Council collection and that's the expectation that Council collects. So I just think there's a bit of inconsistency between state government departments, whether it should be taken account.

35 **DR COAKES:** Okay. Thanks, Ellena. So just a quick question from me there, just in terms of then there really is no – you know, private waste collection is not standard in these sort of buildings within this particular locality?

MS MANGAVOULAKIS: No, it's residential, so Council likes to collect.

40 **DR COAKES:** Yes, likes to collect. Okay, thanks.

45 **MS MUSIC:** Thanks, Ellena. I think next on the agenda we have traffic, parking. We have no outstanding concerns with that. We think the conditions sufficiently address our previous concerns. Landscaping, we did have a detailed condition that

the Department has not adopted. We're happy to resend that through to you for consideration.

5 Moving on to public domain and through-site linkages, Erin will talk to you guys about the proposed through-site link and then I will finish off that section. Over to you, Erin.

10 **MS COLGRAVE:** Thank you, Mia. So we maintain some concerns regarding I guess the public nature of the through-site link. From the City's position, the proposed through-site link and what I'm sharing is just that ground floor plan, so where we're talking is the Eveleigh to Woodburn via this route.

15 So the proposed through-site link is not considered by the City to be I guess a genuine public through-site link. Instead, it really reads – like these are the two elevations, it really reads as an additional access point to the building courtyard for residents, more so. And because there aren't really any cues in the architecture that that's a public through-site link, it's heavily fortified, it's got a 1.8 m high fence with sliding gate with small open sections. It's got buildings over, all the cues that indicate something's public aren't really there.

20 So and it also has a restricted time between – I think I checked the timing, it's between 9 pm and 7 am. It wouldn't be open to the public. So the State Design Review Panel advised the Applicant that the link should be purposeful and provide a clear route between destinations that feels public and safe and from our perspective, this has still not yet been achieved.

25 Due to that fortified street edge, the angled path, there's a lot of level changes through that path as well, narrow sections and blind spots are provided through that link, which is not really considered welcoming nor safe from our perspective. The City maintains that a more direct route, so just a straight line with clear width and clear height between Eveleigh and Woodburn Street should be provided if this is the intent of a public – the intent is a genuine public link.

30 If the design of the link is not amended, however, there could potentially be further CPTED management and mitigation measures proposed potentially or I think perhaps the link's inclusion as a noted public benefit be reconsidered and it's more its nature of providing additional access to the site predominantly for residents is more the nature of it. So that's kind of our concerns primarily about that through-site link.

35 **DR COAKES:** Erin, just a quick question there.

MS COLGRAVE: Yes, of course.

40 **DR COAKES:** So in terms of that through-site link between – you know, from the reading we've done so far, it appears that there isn't a lot of traffic, potentially public traffic through from Eveleigh through to Woodburn anyway.

5 **MS COLGRAVE:** Yes. Yes. So I think that's probably reasonable. Because you're so close to the intersection on both sides, I think that's a fair point. I think the route came about after – this is more the Applicant's explanation of it, after community consultation and what the community would like in that area in relation to I guess porosity of sites and not having blocked off from the public and those sorts of things. So I think that this is where it was introduced as a public benefit but our concerns primarily is if it is a public link, it should be well-designed and safe. That's the primary concern.

10 **DR COAKES:** Okay.

DR BRONWYN EVANS: So I had one question, if I may, Erin.

15 **MS COLGRAVE:** Yes, of course.

DR EVANS: So as you've described it, this isn't a requirement of sites in the council region, it was their way of getting some other benefit, the public benefit.

20 **MS COLGRAVE:** Yes, I think so.

DR EVANS: And is public benefit a required element of their design and design principles?

25 **MS COLGRAVE:** I think – and Mia, maybe if there's anything, you can jump on this. Our understanding is the state review design review process, there's a lot of consultation required and so I think it was part of the application's merits is to offer some strategic benefit of this type of nature. But I'm not 100% because it was the Applicant's proposal, it's not a requirement of Council or anything like that. It's really just if something like this is proposed, that it be as safe and usable, I suppose, as is practically achievable to ensure that it actually delivers on those promises, I suppose, if that –

30 **DR EVANS:** Thank you.

35 **MR PEARSON:** They're not getting any discounts on contributions for this, are they?

MS MUSIC: No, they're not.

40 **MR PEARSON:** No.

MS MUSIC: Not to my understanding.

45 **DR COAKES:** And Erin, just in terms of the CPTED recommendations, I guess, or strategy, so Council really doesn't feel that the current design meets those requirements for privacy, safety, those aspects?

MS COLGRAVE: I think yes, there are concerns. If you're a member of the

public, do you feel like you can actually enter the site? Really from that just really fundamental point of view and I guess and if you do, what do you actually see? You're just seeing into a courtyard and a building from both vantage points, you're not seeing that you can make it to the other side, just in that basic panic planning, can you make it safely out to the street? So that's really, that's the most essential primary concern. I don't think –

MR PEARSON: Sorry, Erin. Is it similar fortification at Woodburn Street as Eveleigh? Is it the same sort of 1.8 m high fence, gate situation or –

MS COLGRAVE: Yes. Yes, so that's Woodburn and this is – Eveleigh is recessed a little bit, so that's why it's a little bit very light, I think. But in plan, go back to the plan, sorry, so the fortification line at Eveleigh Street is set in a little bit whereas Woodburn is quite close to the street edge.

MR PEARSON: Yes.

DR COAKES: Okay yes.

DR EVANS: Okay that helps.

MS COLGRAVE: Thank you. Thank you.

MS MUSIC: Thanks, Erin. Just on that, I'd like to talk to the public art locations they've nominated as well, just because there are several that are within that internal courtyard area, which we have flagged to the Department and the Proponent, which we would not be supportive of because they are not always publicly accessible locations. So yes, just wanted to let you guys know that we would only be supportive of the 24/7 publicly accessible locations for public art, which I think they proposed on Cleveland Street and Eveleigh Street. That hasn't been captured in the recommended condition, so that's something that we would like to put forward also.

DR COAKES: And just on that, Mia, just in terms of then those other – obviously they proposed the locations 3, 4, 5, which appear to be largely internal from –

MS MUSIC: Yes.

DR COAKES: Where would Council like to see the proposed public art placed?

MS MUSIC: As I just said, I think they've nominated –

DR COAKES: So just the two? Just the one and the two?

MS MUSIC: Yes, yes.

DR COAKES: Okay, right.

MS MUSIC: I think they had also – they wanted to do something with the Greg Inglis mural inside the multipurpose community space and we’re fine with that but it should be outside of the scope of the public art budget just because that location as well will not always be open to the public.

5

DR COAKES: Okay. So you don’t see any additional opportunities for public art outside of the locations 1 and 2?

MS MUSIC: We were just working within the public art strategy that they had provided.

10

DR COAKES: Okay, yes. Okay, great.

MS MUSIC: Thank you. And then also just future public domain works, we were fine with the public domain conditions, it’s just that we wanted to communicate to the Proponent exactly what we had envisaged or our public art team – sorry, public domain team had planned for the areas, the streets surrounding and so we hope for those works to be reflected in the future public art concept plan and we’re happy to provide more detail on that with the recommended condition. Moving on, I think, to other matters on the agenda, again I’ll be handing it across to Erin just to talk to the impacts on adjoining properties, if that’s okay, Erin.

15

20

MS COLGRAVE: Yes. Okay. So this is – so during the course of the assessment, the bulk was reduced from a seven storey to a six storey building. So whilst the proposed six storey has been set back from Cleveland Street to present as a more compliant five storey height to that presentation, the six storey built form sits quite close to our adjoining southeast and southwest neighbouring properties.

25

So the City would recommend reduced bulk and scale to these neighbouring interfaces to better relate to this existing built form pattern and the streetscape and this can be achieved by a combination of upper level setbacks which relate to the neighbours and modulated building masses. Ideally to both interfaces but I think this one is probably the most critical. Similar to but increased by what is proposed from this west elevation.

30

35

So this, properties of particular interest, we’re just looking at a Nearmaps version of the existing site and this is from the view impact analysis of the proposed development. So this site is 13-31 Eveleigh Street. It is a four storey with a setback fifth storey and it’s in a mixed use adaptive reuse develop which was approved by the City in 2016. So it’s quite recent and it includes two floors of residential apartments and it has an FSR, it’s already maximised its FSR of 3.14:1, which includes a 1:1 residential component.

40

So it is therefore in our opinion unlikely this is to be redeveloped further in the future, based on the current planning controls. So modifying the bulk of the subject proposal at this interface to knit in, at least in part, to this four storey street wall, with then the setback fifth and sixth storey, even for a small section of the façade, would be more respectful and contextually fit into the existing streetscape.

45

And we've just included – this is SJB's Crown Street development, which has some similar I guess interfaces with adjoining buildings but here you can kind of see that they've just reduced the bulk for a portion.

5 So we're not asking for a carte blanche setback for the entire façade or anything like that. It's really just an acknowledgment of knitting into a streetscape to be neighbourly and this for us would align with the part 4.4 of the BEP, the built environment plan. Sorry, it's a very longwinded – the Redfern-Waterloo Built Environment Plan, which seeks to respect the existing residential industrial character and built form of the site and provide an appropriate interface to the surrounding development by ensuring development responds to the scale, form and design of surrounding development.

10
15 So that – and what would that mean in a yield sense? It's a couple of rooms. It's not massive. It's a modest snip. But of our priority of order of issues, the amenity concerns are the elevated ones and this, you know, just to be strategic with our objection, that this is a secondary order consideration if that's okay, thank you. If there's any questions on that.

20 **DR COAKES:** Just one quick question, I guess. Other than obviously their building height, in terms of how the building's materials I guess reflect the neighbourhood character, Council's quite comfortable with what's been done in regard to – yes, sorry, I know I'm [non-transcribable].

25 **MS COLGRAVE:** Yes, it's okay. Yes, it's a good question. I think there's been a lot of work done by the Applicant on the material palette and to be more sympathetic to the character of the area in that material palette sense. Sorry, I will – only comment on that for consideration of the IPC would be if there can be a consent condition to require clear or neutral glazing because as with something like this, I don't think we'd want – to comply with basics, you can have such a broad range of glass to meet that and sometimes it can be very dark. And so that would be the only material comment that we'd have as a condition to assist in ensuring the development presents well in the streetscape.

30
35 **DR COAKES:** Okay, lovely. And thanks, Ellena, using the correct technical terms. Material palettes.

MS COLGRAVE: No, that's all right. Okay. That's okay. Thank you, thank you.

40 **DR COAKES:** No, thanks.

MS MUSIC: I think the next section's – the IPC wanted to discuss the Redfern-Waterloo BEP and we have no further comments on that. I think we have considered that plan previously but if you have any further questions on that, we're happy to answer.

45 **DR COAKES:** Anything from Richard or Bronwyn?

MR PEARSON: No, I think we're pretty across that issue. Thank you.

MS MUSIC: And then moving to contributions and affordable housing. What the Department has recommended is correct, as the Redfern-Waterloo Authority Contribution Plan has been appealed, the City's 7.11 Development Contributions Plan applies. For affordable housing, the Redfern-Waterloo Affordable Housing Contribution Plan is still in force, so the City of Sydney's affordable housing program does not apply.

DR COAKES: Okay.

MS MUSIC: Yes.

MR PEARSON: Do you view co-living as affordable housing? What's the City's view?

MS MUSIC: As in are you saying whether it would be excluded from –

MR PEARSON: No, no, no. Not saying that it should be excluded from contributions but do you generally look – does the City generally look at co-living as a desirable housing typology from an affordability point of view? What do you have -

MS MUSIC: It certainly is an affordable housing – more affordable housing option that yes, we would like to see in developments.

MR PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

MS MUSIC: That's okay. And then I think the final thing that we had noted down was response to the Department's recommended conditions and I think we have addressed that through the sections. We can forward on to you some amendments that we require to the Department's recommended conditions with regard to waste, landscaping, public art and public domain and then also what Erin discussed with the privacy treatments and the clear glazing in terms of the materials. We can send that through to you following this meeting.

DR COAKES: Yes, we'd be appreciative of that. Thank you, Mia. So just coming back, so I think we've touched off on most of the main issues and matters that we want to discuss. I think the only other one is just coming back to maybe the opening issue around suitability of the site and the non-compliance with the development standards. I guess just a question from me in terms of what amount of commercial floorspace and uses would Council consider to be appropriate for the project site.

MS MUSIC: Yes, it's hard to nominate a number or a specific area. We just have had concern with this SSD and then also the previous SSDs for this site. There's been no genuine effort to move towards achieving compliance or providing those commercial spaces that we do want on the site. This particular SSD, we saw a

reduction in commercial floorspace with every set of events that we saw, so yes, we - just we're not comfortable with saying that the non-compliance was appropriate, the resi non-compliance was appropriate, given those amenity issues. But yes, there's been no real effort to improve the commercial offerings on site.

5

DR COAKES: Okay. Anything – I think and then just one point you made, Mia, at the beginning around the other developments. So you made a point that in those – has the appropriate ratios been met in relation to those previous developments, that obviously the Department has raised as –

10

MS MUSIC: Yes. So if I could just look to those examples. The Scape Student Housing I believe – so that's to the west of the site and they exceeded the 1:1 resi, well over, and the City strongly objected to that proposal. Similar issues to this site, it has the frontage to Cleveland Street as well. Hudson House, that is a smaller development. That's located just southwest of the site. It did exceed the resi FSR a lot. I think it was over 2:1, I think it was closer to 2.5:1, similar to this scheme.

15

DR COAKES: Yes.

20

MS MUSIC: It differed from this. It did not have those noise issues associated with Cleveland Street and it did not propose the sole mechanical ventilation system that this application is proposing. So that's what I was saying, that was a different case as well. And then I think the third one that the Department referred to in their assessment report was the Pemulwuy mixed use development. That went through years of planning with the concept plan and then also the detailed design applications.

25

That development offers affordable housing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, a childcare centre, retail, office space, student accommodation as well. My understanding is that the student accommodation component of that development is much smaller in comparison to all those other uses that I had just mentioned before. So what have I noted down here? Sorry, one second.

30

DR COAKES: No, this is helpful. Thanks, Mia.

35

MS MUSIC: That's okay. So yes, at that time we considered that that large scale project accommodated generous commercial and communal offerings throughout the site, at ground level particularly and had no significant residential amenity impacts that we consider this development to have.

40

DR COAKES: And I did notice, and it may have been in some of the earlier materials, that there was some discussion – I think it might've been in the design report around a percentage of actually – of units or housing within the development for Indigenous housing. Anyway.

45

MS MUSIC: For this project?

DR COAKES: Yes, for this project.

MS MUSIC: Yes, and I don't think that has been –

5 **DR COAKES:** No, no.

MS MUSIC: Kept - yes.

10 **DR COAKES:** No, okay. Thank you. Any further questions, Richard, Bronwyn, around the site suitability and the land use piece?

15 **MR PEARSON:** No. And I think your point, Mia, about if the Department's genuinely going in a different direction for this area, they need to relook at the controls is definitely correct. Anyway, that's something we'll think about in our consideration of this.

MS MUSIC: Thank you.

20 **DR EVANS:** Yes, really found it helpful the way you brought to life the issues rather than just reading them on paper, but those illustrations that you were able to share, that was very helpful. Thank you.

MS MUSIC: Thank you.

25 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, agreed.

30 **DR COAKES:** So, obviously that will bring the meeting to a close. If you could provide us with the – we would be appreciative of seeing your additional draft conditions that you spoke about and any other changes that you would propose and obviously we'll take those into consideration. But agree with Bronwyn, it's been very helpful, it's very good to see the visuals because obviously the plans are quite detailed and being able to zoom in and have a look at those in more detail is terrific. So thank you to Mia, Ellena and Erin for that comprehensive briefing and thank you very much for your time.

35 **DR EVANS:** Yes, thank you.

MS MUSIC: Thank you for the opportunity.

40 **MS COLGRAVE:** Thank you so much.

MR PEARSON: Thank you. Thanks, everyone.

45 **DR EVANS:** Bye.

MS COLGRAVE: Goodbye.

MS MUSIC: Have a good day.

MS MANGAVOULAKIS: Yes, thank you. Bye bye.

MR PEARSON: You too. Bye.

5

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED