



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

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

DEPARTMENT MEETING

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

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
OLIVER COPE

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING,
HOUSING AND
INFRASTRUCTURE:** ANNIE LEUNG
JAMES GROUNDWATER
ANTHONY WITHERDIN

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 1:15PM – 2:15PM
FRIDAY, 2ND AUGUST 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

DR SHERIDAN COAKES: Well, thank you everyone for joining us this afternoon. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge 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 and communal open space, associated landscaping works 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 full capture of the information today, the meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on our 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. It's important for us as commissioners to ask questions of attendees, to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate and if we do pose questions and you're not in a position to answer these, please feel free to take those questions on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

If all members here today could just introduce themselves before speaking and for us to ensure that we don't speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we'll now begin. So thanks everyone. We've obviously provided an agenda of some of the key issues that we would like to cover but I guess to kick off, if we can hand over to one of you to I guess do your introductions and an overview of the application. That would be fantastic. Thank you.

MS ANNIE LEUNG: Yes, I guess I will start.

MR RICHARD PEARSON: Yes, we couldn't hear you, Anthony. I saw you were talking but nothing was coming through.

MS LEUNG: Okay, Anthony, if you don't mind, I'll just quickly do our introduction for the Department.

DR COAKES: Thanks, Annie.

5 **MS LEUNG:** All right. Without further ado, I'm Annie Leung, I'm a team leader in Key Site Assessments. I've got with me today our director for Key Site Assessments, Anthony Witherdin, and James Groundwater, who's our project town planner, who will be taking through the Commission, covering the agenda item through a short presentation. We'll be happy to provide a presentation to the Commission after today's meeting.

DR COAKES: Thank you.

10 **MS LEUNG:** James.

MR JAMES GROUNDWATER: All right. I'll see if I can share my screen. Hopefully this works.

15 **DR COAKES:** Yes, we can see that. Thanks, James.

20 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Excellent. Okay. So today we're introducing you to the Redfern Co-Living Mixed Use Housing Development. So just a bit of an overview. So the proposal is to construct a six storey co-living mixed use sort of commercial co-living development, accommodating a mixture of single and double rooms to a total of 200 co-living rooms over ground floor commercial tenancies, a multipurpose space and basement carparking. Carparking for 15 vehicles, 235 bicycles and 13 motorcycles.

25 Just going into the proposal, so the proposal has a maximum gross floor area of FSR of 3.3:1. The proposal as a total gross floor area and FSR has a compliant 3.28:1 floor space ratio. The proposal also has a maximum residential floorspace ratio of 1.3:1 and the proposal comprises a total residential floorspace ratio of 2.91:1.

30 One of the reasons I guess the Department is supportive of the non-compliance is despite the departure in the maximum residential floorspace, the proposal is still achieving a mixed use employment generation development and also is consistent with the predominant residential character of the surrounding property, as
35 demonstrated in the image to the bottom right of the corner.

40 Moving on from the floorspace, we've got the – I guess the commercial component of the proposal, being the ground floor. There is quite a cross floor across the site, so the top left of the image, the larger image, is the high point of the site, which is actually almost an entire storey above the bottom of the image. So there's a commercial tenancy at the top corner of the site at ground level.

45 It's also then over some co-working space on the lower ground floor, which then is actually the ground level along Eveleigh Street to the south. The ground floor is being separated into I guess publicly accessible space, which is I guess predominantly a spill out space for the ground floor commercial and then also the private – a portion of the private open space for the residential component above. Some of the things on the ground floor include a multipurpose room, which is

captured under a plan of management to I guess promote the use for local Indigenous community groups and also incorporate some public artwork.

5 I'll move on to the next slide. The proposal seeks a six storey height limit. The maximum under the controls is a five storey height limit. However, the proposal has been predominantly designed to appear from the street as a five storey form with a recessive upper floor, which is also, as can see in the image on the bottom left, is compatible with the surrounding existing development. We've also done an analysis of that non-compliance and determined that the impacts associated with that upper floor don't materially impact on the bulk and scale or solar access of the adjoining development.

10 Then moving into residential amenity. One of the key things that was done throughout the assessment or during the assessment –

15 **MR PEARSON:** Sorry, James. Sorry, do you mind if we ask questions as we go along?

20 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Sure.

MR PEARSON: Because it's probably easier. Just on the – it was one slide back when you were talking about the through-site link and I think you were talking about Indigenous use and public art being in that space, is that – did I hear you right?

25 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Correct. I do have a slide further on for further questions but there are a number of proposed –

30 **MR PEARSON:** Okay. Well, maybe we can pick it up then.

MR GROUNDWATER: Okay then. So I'll just jump back into the residential amenity. So another reason for the additional storey was to accommodate the internal separation requirements to ensure that the residential rooms are achieving adequate privacy and amenity. So the internal separation between the rooms achieves the design criteria of the ADG.

35 There's also a number of privacy mitigation measures that have been included in the proposal such as landscaping, highlight windows and privacy screening. The rooms are also being acoustically treated, given the location near the railway corridor and Cleveland Street, which includes sort of acoustic windows and also the use of a hybrid mechanical ventilation system, which allows fresh air to be delivered to all the rooms where conditions require the windows to be shut for acoustic compliance.

40 **DR COAKES:** Just on that, James, obviously in meeting with Council, they have raised sort of issues of concern around some of those sort of tight corners on those proposed communal areas in some of those upper levels. I guess to what extent had other ventilation strategies been considered? So for example, they raised sort

of trickle ventilation strategies and they also talked about sort of from a privacy perspective I guess more the use of operable sort of external privacy treatments as well. So just interested in assessing what views on that.

5 **MR GROUNDWATER:** In regards to I guess the acoustic – I guess this is the solution that the Applicant proposed and based on the sort of information that they delivered to us, we considered that I guess an appropriate response to the context and location of the site.

10 There was also a number of I guess privacy mitigation measures that were explored throughout various versions of the proposal and one of the things that we looked for, which you can see in I guess some of the red hashing, is we opted for increase internal separation and a greater void in the middle to offset windows and dwellings to ensure that they maintained a compliant separation.

15 In regards to I guess those acute corners, the windows are obviously – they're offset and designed in such a way that they don't provide direct facing views into adjoining rooms and we just felt through those mitigation measures that there was an acceptable level of amenity being provided in the design.

20 **DR COAKES:** Thank you.

MR GROUNDWATER: Sorry, Annie.

25 **MS LEUNG:** Commissioner, if that's okay, just one thing to add in relation to the acoustic treatment. The selected hybrid mechanical ventilation system, as proposed by the Applicant, there's two key reasons they actually proposed that and why the Department considers that's appropriate. One is the acoustic report actually demonstrated that the noise impact to the individual rooms and the residential area do vary throughout day and night and different times.

30 The hybrid ventilation system does provide that additional user control to when they would be naturally ventilated versus mechanical. The other reason is that it is a commercially managed and wholly single ownership owned operation, being a co-living, which allows for the maintenance of a hybrid mechanical ventilation system to be properly done without the complication of things like strata and the like. I do understand that we have also recommended a condition that that system to be maintained as well.

40 **DR COAKES:** Thank you.

MR PEARSON: Can you just – sorry, I was just going to say, can you explain how a hybrid ventilation system works? Are you essentially saying sometimes it's fresh air, sometimes it's mechanically derived? Is that what you're saying?

45 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Correct. So I guess the easiest way to explain it would be like a central air conditioning unit, however it's not actually heating or cooling the air, it's just bringing in natural air into the unit where occupants of the room,

through as an external influence of whether or not they want to open their window. So they're still operable windows, so there is the opportunity to provide natural ventilation, however given the context of this site and maybe external impacts, there may be times where for acoustic reasons those windows would need to be closed, but the rooms are still receiving, I guess for all intents and purposes, natural ventilation through the mechanical. So the hybrid system is both can be used, where opportunities obviously for natural ventilation can occur.

DR BROWNYN EVANS: Okay. And I had a slightly separate question. Annie, you mentioned that this is intended to be a managed site. Do you know if it's the developer, the current developer will become that managed site owner or is there intention to sell it on as a final product?

MS LEUNG: Commissioner, I actually don't have that information.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR GROUNDWATER: Okay. Well, I'll quickly move on to the next slide. One of the other impacts that we looked at is in terms of the impact to the adjoining properties. So one of the main concerns was from residents in the terraces along Woodburn Street. As you can see from the images above, there is already I guess a substantial structure on the boundary.

It's currently a four storey converted warehouse building, which contains 22 units and therefore in terms of the external impacts, many of the – it just remains the status quo in terms of the terraces. There is also, as can see in the top left, 13–17 Eveleigh Street has residential on the top two floors and has a rooftop communal open space. There was careful consideration in ensuring that the additional storey did not impact materially on the solar access. So that rooftop space still exceeds three hours of solar access to more than 50% of that communal open space.

The image to the bottom left also shows due to an easement from the railway, excavation is actually quite set back from the adjoining terrace. We've also imposed a number of conditions, ensuring that during the demolition of the existing building, that all measures are maintained to protect the adjoining properties, including dilapidation reports and appropriate engineering requirements.

DR COAKES: James, just on that, I've just noticed, I read something about the report discussing the softening of interface with the private open spaces of the adjoining terraces. What's proposed there in that regard?

MR GROUNDWATER: In terms of the construction between the two spaces?

DR COAKES: Yes. It just talked about softening of that interface between the private open space in the back of the terraces and, sorry, and I was just really trying to understand what was proposed there.

5 **MR GROUNDWATER:** So this is – I guess the next image here, so whilst currently there is, for all intents and purposes, a nil – four storey nil setback, blank wall, the proposal actually incorporates a mix of face brick and then an indentation. It varies between I believe just over a metre down to half a metre, where I guess it includes sort of the painted finishes in the centre with the fire rated bricks. So it actually provides I guess a bit of a visual relief. It's not a six storey blank wall built on the boundary, there's actually the ground floor is built to the boundary where first all the way up to the upper floor, in that central portion there, is actually set back off the boundary.

10 **DR COAKES:** Okay, thank you.

15 **MR GROUNDWATER:** And then in terms of I guess Council's submissions, I've just sort of paraphrased their main topics, but essentially Council raised concerns about suitability of the site and non-compliance with the key development standards. I guess, as we've assessed in the report, we support the variation request to both the building height and the floorspace ratio based on the fact that we believe that the development is still achieving the adjectives of the zone. There's not –

20 **MR PEARSON:** James, just sorry, just on that, is there any proposal within the Department to revisit the controls in this area? Because it would appear that world's moved on since 2006 and perhaps the controls are not – this is an arguable point, I guess, perhaps the controls don't reflect the current direction for the area. Probably doesn't live in your part of the Department but do you know if there is any thought of revisiting the controls in this area through the Redfern-Waterloo plan or otherwise?

25 **MS LEUNG:** I'm happy to take that one on.

30 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, sure.

35 **MS LEUNG:** Look, I think, Commissioner, as you said, we're probably not in the position to speak around a general strategy direction, where the Department is heading, but in our consideration of the variation to the design standard, we did acknowledge the transformation of the area and noting the areas at this moment in time where the site is surrounded by various residential development since the making of the plan. So we have acknowledged that is the case and the context for which the development site actually sits.

40 **DR COAKES:** Annie and James, I also note in your assessment report, you did obviously comment on a number of the other developments that were in proximity and are we correct in understanding that a number of those actually also exceed the permissible resi FSR, yes?

45 **MS LEUNG:** That's correct.

MR GROUNDWATER: Correct.

5 **MS LEUNG:** So non-residential floorspace standard or the maximum residential floorspace limit applies to the locality. So [non-transcribable] Department identifying in the context of our assessment being residential would also would have exceeded that particular development control.

10 **MR GROUNDWATER:** So and then moving forward, in terms of design excellence and urban design, I guess putting that in context, that was council's concern about the additional storey height and bulk and scale. I guess, as previously shown in the slides, that we believe that the proposal is compatible with the scale of the adjoining properties and has been designed for the most part to appear as a five storey development from the street, with those recessed upper floors.

15 Again, we've touched base on council's concerns about residential amenity through the imposition of the hybrid solution, internal separation and the privacy mitigation measures, believe that it results in acceptable amenity. And then in regards to waste management, the concern raised by Council was the proposal, given I guess the constraints of the site and its I guess single ownership and commercial use, they've proposed to undertake all waste collection via private contractor.

20 Council raised concern that the waste management should be designed to accommodate council vehicles on site and through I guess investigation with the Applicant and working with the Applicant, they've come up with the solution that the most viable and I guess have the least impact on streetscape would be to go down the private route. So we've imposed conditions to ensure that that's appropriately managed. The concern raised about bicycle parking initially was the number, which was increased through the assessment and also just ensuring that they comply with appropriate standards. So we've imposed conditions to ensure that occurs, to address Council's comments.

25 Regarding public art, there were some concerns from Council that a number of design options for the public art included internal areas, in which Council had concern that if it's not publicly accessible 24 hours, it wasn't really ingenious calling it public art. There is appropriate conditions to ensure that their public art strategy, which is also connected with their Connecting with Country strategy, are implemented throughout the design and construction stage of the proposal.

30 Council then also included some conditions regarding public domain and landscaping that we've adopted to address those concerns. And then in addition, there are some additional conditions required for the co-living development, which includes no subdivision of those co-living rooms, so that they always remain in a single ownership. There's a detailed condition regarding the operational plan and management.

35 One of the I guess public benefits from the proposal is it includes a ground floor multipurpose room, which is designed to be rented out, I guess with particular

reference to local Indigenous communities. That's also where they propose to relocate the existing mural of Greg Inglis in that space.

5 There's also additional other things around the property, such as the public art strategy is designed for I guess taking into the Indigenous local community but also through the landscaping and an Indigenous farm, with the potential for site tours and the like being controlled through that operational plan and plan management.

10 That also talks to the through-site link. Whilst it doesn't necessarily provide a, I guess, true destination link, it is designed to provide activation of that ground floor and predominantly is there to service that ground floor commercial use and coworking spaces, rather than provide a clear, I guess, connection from one site to the other, but has been designed to be as open and as visually transparent as possible and will be controlled through the plan and management for controlling security. There's also – sorry.

15
20 **MR PEARSON:** Could you just bring that back up? You know, the plan that you had of the public space. So can you just describe what goes on in that publicly accessibly – you know, that little breakout area in the middle of the site? Yes.

25 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Yes, so essentially that is just I guess – it's a landscaped area which also includes some bicycle parking for the commercial component. But it's surrounded by a commercial tenancy, a coworking space and a café. So it will also have I guess spill out space from those three uses and therefore I guess security or control of that through-site link will depend on obviously the operational times of that commercial space.

30 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, because the commercial spaces are only accessible from the through-site link, is that correct?

35 **MR GROUNDWATER:** Two of the three are accessible from the public domain. The top left corner has I guess a first floor, ground floor, given the topography of the site. One of, yes, the commercial spaces is only accessible from that internal space, but the café is also accessible from the Eveleigh Street.

MR PEARSON: Right.

40 **DR COAKES:** Okay. And the purpose of that private area, James?

MR GROUNDWATER: It's for security reasons for the delineation between the commercial and the residential.

45 **DR COAKES:** Sure. Okay.

MR GROUNDWATER: So the residential has some – it's not all but there is some communal internal space on the ground floor. There's like a breakout space, there's a gym and a laundry on the ground floor. The majority of the communal

spaces are split between the floor, they have breakout spaces on each floor and then on the roof they have the majority of their commercial – sorry, I have some floorplans. They have the majority of their internal commercial space and outdoor space.

5

DR COAKES: Okay. With the rooftop farm, as you were saying, being –

MR GROUNDWATER: Correct.

10

DR COAKES: – accessible for public access potentially or tours or something?

MR GROUNDWATER: Through the operational – obviously it would be restricted but there’s –

15

DR COAKES: It would need to be restricted.

MR GROUNDWATER: – but there’s, as part of the operational management plan and part of that multipurpose space, I guess the intention is to design – is that this could be like some educational sort of components for that working with those local community groups.

20

DR COAKES: Okay. Because obviously one of the questions – some of the feedback from the State Design Review Panel was around that, how purposeful that through-site link was in terms of obviously lack of potentially pedestrian traffic through, given the proximity to the corner. And also I guess it was raised by Council around sort of the fortification of the gates on both sides. Just interested in your comments on how that creates greater activation to the street, given –

25

MS LEUNG: I’m happy to take the Commissioner through a bit more around how the design has evolved following the SDRP advice and feedback as well as Council’s comment. So the through-site link design, James, it may be worthwhile to flick back through to that plan, has gone through a few different iterations. Initially it was a lot narrower, it wasn’t integrated with the ground floor commercial and community spaces. It doesn’t have the visual connection that it does now.

30

35

So what we’ve seen through the different amendments to the plan is that it’s now a much, much wider area and also consequential to the redistribution of floorspace and the larger separation or atrium sort of space, it now receive a lot more natural light to it.

40

It has got a good transition of the public to the private and semi-private sort of space because, as you can see, now that we have all the commercial tenancy being on the street level and then it transits to a publicly accessible area that forms as an outdoor spill out space that complements the uses of the commercial floorspace and then in transition to the multipurpose room, which is more a community space, and then in transition to more private area, where you have the communal uses.

45

You will also see the similar amenity that is on one side, it now has good visual connection from Woodburn Street all the way through to Eveleigh Street. It does require to be obviously because from the mix of residential use and commercial use, it works a lot better as from a security perspective once the commercial tenancy are shut or outside of the hour of operation to actually close off that area.

DR COAKES: Okay.

MR PEARSON: And is that multipurpose room, that's the green shaded area?

MS LEUNG: That's correct.

MR PEARSON: Correct. Is that where you were saying there would be Indigenous group access to that? Is there also public art in – I know there's the mural in that space, but is the public art within the through-site link or is that not in the through-site link?

MS LEUNG: So just in answering your question, the proposal has a very detailed Connecting to Country strategy. It went through quite a substantive process in terms of consultation with the local Indigenous group as well as Elders. It looks at a couple of different aspects, it gone through a bit of codesign that influenced the location of the public art, which I think James has now shown.

There's the two external one, which is on facing Cleveland Street as well as Eveleigh Street and there's the location that's in kind of the publicly accessible space or the commercial outdoor space as well. In terms of the multipurpose room, the artwork that has been discussed in terms of as a potential option to locate within that multipurpose room is the relocation of the existing Greg Inglis mural into that room, subject to investigation obviously how to actually remove that brickwork and being located in there.

Because now the multipurpose room, through different amendments to the plans, has been located to have that active street frontage and direct street access as well. While the mural would be inside the room, it is perceived to be publicly visible from the street, from Eveleigh Street as well.

DR EVANS: So I had a question, is there some benefit for approval or compliance to nominate this through-site link as public? Because when you look at the plans, there's actually a very large gate at either side and it isn't inviting anyone to go in. It's not a straight line, so it's not a logical place to go through and you can also walk around the outside. So what is the benefit in nominating this through-site link as something that's a public through-site link?

MS LEUNG: I think there has been a fair bit of advice and discussion on whether this link should be dedicated as a public link but in considering, so one of the key considerations is whether it goes from somewhere to somewhere, as in that it's got a destination on purpose for people to be, like you say, to actually go in there. But

if you look at where we are, from Eveleigh Street to Woodburn, Woodburn is a very narrow type street, it comes to a laneway adjacent to a fairly hostile rail corridor retaining wall type situation.

5 There's not particularly a purpose for which why you would have a public laneway through, however the through-site link, after different design iteration, it still has that benefit, even it may not be a publicly through-site link 24/7, as you would imagine, it would have the benefit of improving ground floor permeability as well as the activation and safety of that ground floor space, which has
10 commercial spaces, street activation, it improve that site permeability across.

DR EVANS: So again, just from an approvability point of view, that's not a consideration how they nominate that link or even if they make that link limited access? It's sort of irrelevant, if you like, to their compliance requirements with
15 the planning instruments, is that right?

MS LEUNG: That's correct. There's no requirement to provide a through-site link or public laneway through this site. The design of the through-site link, as we discussed, is more a merits to the overall design, to make the ground floor plan to
20 be working and functioning with the different land uses complementing each other within that space.

DR EVANS: Okay. Thank you.

25 **DR COAKES:** And Annie, just one more question, just further to Bronwyn's, is in terms of that, the Woodburn Street exit, the closure of that obviously at a certain time, was that raised in the CPTED issues around safety, given what you said is the proximity on that side to the rail line?

30 **MS LEUNG:** One of the key consideration is that the through-site link, including Woodburn side or whether it's Eveleigh Street side, as well as some of the amenity that services the commercial. So therefore, they need to operate, depending on what those commercial ended up being, the uses, their operation hour, because they provide passive surveillance and the activities that make sure
35 that space is actually safe. So I think we have put recommended condition that those need to be considered as part of the plan of management.

DR COAKES: Okay. And was there any consideration – and sorry to just labour the point here a minute, was there any consideration of opening up to some extent
40 that public and private area? I recognise what James said about there's a gym and there's a laundry but in trying to create I guess greater interaction between residents, commercial users, community users of the space, just interested. You talked about the evolution of the design, so I'm just wondering was there any consideration of that being more open to create a much more open area, given
45 what Richard was saying about it seems quite restricted.

MS LEUNG: The area, as designed in this final version that we're looking at today, is based on more a transition between the public and private space. It is one

open area, so there are kind of more environmental and open fencing that doesn't necessarily allow you to kind of venture into the private area that are used for residents obviously. But it does allow to have that visual connection and the landscape design would have a visual kind of overall architectural statement to it.

5

DR COAKES: Okay. And as you said, the mural would be able to potentially be viewed from the street as well, given I think there was talk about sort of glass along the – is that correct?

10

MS LEUNG: That's what has been depicted in the submitted strategy.

DR COAKES: Okay. Thank you. Thanks. Okay, so sorry, James, we've sort of hijacked the agenda but could we potentially come back to the waste piece?

15

MR GROUNDWATER: Yes.

DR COAKES: If that's all right.

MR GROUNDWATER: Happy to answer any questions you have on the waste.

20

DR COAKES: So I guess again there was some discussion with Council around Council raising some inconsistency between the Department and the EPA's requirements for waste collection.

25

MS LEUNG: I guess there's a couple of things that we consider around waste collection. We definitely want to take on Council's feedback, Council generally has a role in collecting residential waste, so therefore we're kind of looking at how to accommodate their residential waste truck.

30

But I think in this case, one of the key considerations the Department have accepted the Applicant's proposition around a private based contractor is that we have spoken that co-living is going to be a dedicated rental single ownership, it's a semi-commercial operation or it's a commercially managed residential. So it will be – waste management can, based on the submitted waste strategy, can operate like a commercial venture and we find that that would be appropriate in this instance.

35

DR COAKES: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Annie.

40

MR PEARSON: So is the issue simply that Council's truck is too big to access the site? Is that the issue?

45

MS LEUNG: There's couple of exploration of whether be able to accommodate Council's waste collection vehicle down the ramp and basement. Obviously, that would require a much wider ramp and longer ramp as well. There's a couple of considerations. One is that would impact the street frontage and the number of commercial space that can be accommodated on the ground floor. And the other consideration is the basement excavation that we have earlier saw also would

restrict that basement design as well.

5 **DR COAKES:** So Annie, was there then consideration of – so Council put up I think a number of other options, the turntable to allow for collection or unloading and the inclusion of the loading dock, was that actually considered in – those options were actually assessed and considered?

10 **MS LEUNG:** Yes, so there's a couple of options that's concerned. I think one option we previously may have seen an iteration where the loading dock is on the ground floor, but that would actually require the taking out one of the commercial tenancy that we currently see on that floorplan. And similarly, turntable, if we're talking about the size of council's waste collection truck, that again would impact basement design and the like, which is in this case quite restricted.

15 Through the different iterations, we have reduced the number of car space, increased the number of bicycle, so fitting the number of different things in the basement has resulted in some sort of space or constraint, I will say, around accommodating Council's truck. But again, I think in this instance, one of the key considerations is we do feel that because it's a commercial managed residential development rather than one that can be strata or subdivided, a private waste truck would operate just the same as any other commercial development.

20 **DR COAKES:** And is that usual in buildings in this sort of locality, that there would be commercial collection of waste?

25 **MS LEUNG:** I probably wouldn't be able to speak on that.

DR COAKES: No, okay.

30 **MS LEUNG:** But I definitely have a build-to-rent development that was done before that would allow for commercial waste collection in the City of Sydney area due to basement restriction or spatial restriction to try to accommodate a large waste collection truck.

35 **DR COAKES:** All right. Any further questions there, Richard, Bronwyn?

MR PEARSON: No, thank you.

40 **DR EVANS:** No, thank you.

45 **DR COAKES:** Okay. All right, so I think – were there any others that we needed to cover? Just a quick question from me, the State Design Review Panel, did they have a second review? Obviously they raised a number of issues around the through-site link and so forth, did they have another round of comments on the final design?

MR GROUNDWATER: Not the final design. There was quite a few iterations and some of those comments may sort of seem a little bit out of context. Like, for

example, the original through-site link, I guess if you're looking at this image, the entry would be where some of that communal space is, almost not even in the dark orange, it would be to the far right. You'd come in and do a right-hand, a 90 degree turn and then walk even further north or to the left than what the current entry is. And the original design also had a central bridge component.

So it was a very small – it was almost like there was two internal voids with an internal link. So that was the first I guess proposal presented to the SDRP. Then that was followed by I guess a further refined form that went to the SDRP and then following that, I guess we've now resulted in this outcome that has been informed by those two previous reviews by the SD – so this has quite –

MS LEUNG: Yes, sorry, James. Just for the Commissioners' reference, there is the Department's detailed response and consideration of the SDRP, if I – it's in an appendix of the report. Some of the key topics that the SDRP provided advice on included things like a reduction of the FSR to comply with the maximum permissible, so the proposal definitely has fully responded to that. Other advice included residential amenity, which has been addressed through the various iteration of the plans.

And in terms of the through-site link, one of the key advice that the SDRP provided was about consideration around the actual role of the through-site link. I think as we have that earlier discussion around whether it is doing a destination to destination connection or whether it has a different role in this case to complement to the ground floor permeability and the ground floor commercial uses. So that has also been addressed through that as well. Other issues, residual issues are more likely to be around the Connecting with Country, which has since been taken on a much more detailed process by the Applicant and documented in the strategy.

DR COAKES: Yes, and appreciate – sorry. Yes, go, Richard.

MR PEARSON: No, you go.

DR COAKES: No, I was going to say and I appreciate that you're right, the connecting – the designing for country process has been quite extensive and obviously even some of the groups were also talking about sort of creating refuge from Cleveland Street, which is quite a busy environment and other things. So, sorry, Richard, over to you.

MR PEARSON: I was just going to ask, has the Department dealt with any Aboriginal groups on this or has that been the Applicant directly in terms of the through-site link in particular, perhaps public art? Have you dealt with them or has that been through the Applicant?

MS LEUNG: So that process has been handled by the Applicant and documented in that Connecting to Country strategy.

DR COAKES: And I think there was some initial work and then that was

extended, is that correct, Annie? I think WSP did that work, is that correct?

5 **MS LEUNG:** Yes. So we've discussed this particular matter with the Applicant on a number of occasions and they've undertaken further work, which resulted to the final outcome. As I said, it's quite extensive in that documentation.

DR COAKES: Yes, okay. And just in terms of the ESD piece, that they're obviously aiming to achieve a sort of five star green rating?

10 **MS LEUNG:** Yes, so there is an ESD report that's been submitted and it provides a kind of collective analysis around the basic sort of requirement but also the green star requirement. Again, it is due to the fact that it is a residential type, that is not generally typically cover by whether it's the residential or the commercial scheme. So the Department has also recommended a condition that requires them to meet
15 those ESD commitments, which is equivalent to five green star.

DR COAKES: Okay. Great. Thank you. Thanks, Annie. Any other questions, Richard, Bronwyn, before we close?

20 **MR PEARSON:** Not from me. No, both, thank you for that, that was covered what I wanted to cover. Thank you.

DR EVANS: Yes, thank you. That was very comprehensive and Annie, thank you for your detailed knowledge and answers to those questions.

25 **DR COAKES:** Terrific. All right. Well, thank you all for being online this afternoon. We do appreciate your input and the time taken to present on the project. So without further ado, I'll call the meeting closed. So thank you for your time.

30 **MS LEUNG:** Thank you all, Commissioners, and everyone else.

MR GROUNDWATER: Thank you, Commissioners.

35 **MR PEARSON:** Thanks, everyone. See you.

DR EVANS: Bye.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED