

MR D. LLOYD: With that, the panel can proceed on to the agenda; the first of which is item 5.1, we've got opposed to Chemist Warehouse at 458 Church Street, Parramatta. We have notice of one objector who wishes to have their objection recorded. It is an objection by Lyly Tran, ah, and, ah, I should read her objection and
5 we will then consider it. She says, ah:

*My name is Lyly Tran and I act on behalf of myself and my two partners, Mandy Wong and Trinh Yu. We are the owners of Priceline Pharmacy North Parramatta, currently located at 460 Church Street, North Parramatta. We are
10 a small business and have been proudly serving our local community for over 16 years. Ah, I sincerely hope that each one of you have read our submission of why we are not in support of this DA, along with the other We have clearly outlined the various reasons why we object to this DA, and it is not just merely a fact that it is small businesses like ours by operating literally next
15 door to us, as we know how powerful this entity can be. We have read through Assessment Officer John Martinez's report and would like to follow – highlight the following two key points.*

Firstly, we would like to highlight that the proposed building is of heritage significance, ah, attachment 1.3 - site history. Council sent correspondence to the applicant on 9th March 2020 raising concerns with the proposed signage, external colour scheme and an existing entry door not being sympathetic to the existing architectural features of the heritage building. It appears that the applicant provided an amended proposal to council and a separate DA for signage will be submitted to council at a later date. To date we have not seen the amended proposal, and I believe the public has a right to see the amended proposal before this DA's approved.

*Secondly, I would like to point out that in attachment 1.11 – public consultation, the issue raised under vehicle and traffic generation, which consisted of traffic congestion and, more importantly, lack of car parking facility, has definitely not been adequately addressed. Response to this issue in attachment 1 states "Council's local environmental plan and development control plan adopted the maximum car parking for developments located
35 within the Parramatta CBD in order to facilitate – facilitate a mode shift to public transport and active transport, such as pedestrian and cycling, in the long-term development of the CBD". Over the years we have had many customers complain that there is insufficient parking space in our surrounding streets.*

*The issue has been further compounded due to the following factors: (1) the parking within the Regency Medical Centre on 470 Church Street closed down two years ago and patients no longer able to access that car park had to park on the streets; (2) events held at the Bankwest Stadium on O'Connell Street, Parramatta would make it virtually impossible for our customers to find
45 parking, as all the space are usually taken by spectators; (3) Parramatta Light*

5 *Rail Project, since the initiation of the project we have seen the closure of retail businesses in the area and their associated parking, such as Pizza Hut, Cheesecake Shop, KFC located on the corner of Church and Harold Street, also the closure of BP petrol station on Church street across the road from the pharmacy, which many customers utilised as a quick solution for temporary parking.*

10 *More recently, as part of the project, it also acquired the parking station, Fennell Street car park, directly opposite our pharmacy for use as a depot, which in turn meant a reduction of over 100 car spaces. You can imagine the impact that this would have on parking availability. Unfortunately attempt to address the issue clearly has not been sufficient. Currently one side of Harold Street has no parking and our customers complain to us that people park there for the entire day and then take public transport to work. Many of the surrounding also allow parking for permit holders. Additionally, Transport for NSW has advised that during the construction and operation phases of the Parramatta Light Rail Project there short and long-term road closures which may impact to the area and street parking.*

20 *We hope that once the light rail is complete it may encourage public transport, but currently you can ask any customer who enters the pharmacy, who foot, that they were – would have had trouble finding parking at some point. However, pharmacy is a service destination, so patients are travelling from outside the area on the proposed public transport. This means the parking availability is integral, not only to our business, but also other local businesses. As a matter of fact, I have had customers tell me that they have circled the block a couple of times and have simply given up when they couldn't find parking. How disappointing it was for me to hear that.*

30 *The lack of parking is by far the worst at the moment; by allowing Chemist Warehouse to operate, that parking nightmare will be compounded. In their application they have not provided any parking spaces. Their employees will need to find parking, four pharmacists and six assistants, and not to mention all the tradesmen coming and going during the renovation period. Their*
35 *customers will also need to find parking. In an area with such limited parking already, this would create further frustration and discontentment I urge the members of the panel to take into consideration all of these factors. Thank you.*

40 *Ah, that is the submission. Ah, the – I have to say that the first point, ah, about, ah – about, ah, the, ah, competition from Chemist – Chemist Warehouse is not a relevant planning consideration. Ah, it seems to me that the only real issue of substance raised by this objection ah, we have been told that the public car park opposite, which is to be used by the – for the construction of the, ah, Light Rail Project, will revert to a public car park – car park, ah, once that project is completed, which will*
45 *free up 100 car spaces. That's what we have just been told. What – what is the panel's views? That's all. Mr Lester?*

MR A. LESTER: Um, on balance, I would support the council office's recommendation, particularly given the recent advice about the car parking position and the, um, reinstatement of the substantial car park virtually diagonally opposite the site.

5

MR LLOYD: Ah, Mr Ryan?

MR D. RYAN: Chairman, I support the, ah, council recommendations.

10 MR LLOYD: Ah, Ms Turner? Have we lost Ms Turner? I think we might have lost Ms Turner.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: She appears to be online – she appears to be online, but, um, isn't responding.

15

MR LLOYD: Okay. Um, we have the views of two of the panel members. I'm asking Ms Turner what her view is.

MS M. TURNER: You've got me now. Okay. I'm back on. Yes. I - - -

20

MR LLOYD: Ah, ah, ah, I'm not hearing you. Can you – can you repeat that?

MS TURNER: Yes. I support - - -

25 MR LLOYD: You – you support the recommendation?

MS TURNER: Yes.

30 MR LLOYD: All right. Well, I – I also support the recommendation, so the formal decision of the panel is, ah, to adopt the recommendation; ah, we have to add reasons for the decision. Ah, the reasons for the decision are – ah, the panel is – is unanimous, yes. The reasons for the decision: the panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and it endorses the reasons for the approval contained in that report.

35

Secondly, ah, there are additional reasons which appear on page 21 of the assessment report. Ah, so if you go to page 21 of the assessment report, towards the bottom of the page there are four additional reasons; they should be incorporated into the reasons. They are – and I'll read them: the development is permissible in the B4 mixed use zone and satisfies the requirements of the applicable planning controls, (2) the development will not detract the heritage significance of the building, (3) the development will be compatible with the emerging and planned future character of the area, and (4) – (4) for the reasons given above, approval of the application is in the public interest.

45

All right. So we can move on to item 2. Item 2 is the section 8.2 review on the refusal of an application for the demolition of an existing structure and construction

of a two-storey dwelling with a – with a garage at 38 Junction Road, Winston Hills. Ah, we have, I think, online, ah, Lance Paneras. Do we have Lance Paneras on – online, the applicant?

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: David, we don't. I have tried to contact Lance while you were talking about 5.1 and he hasn't responded. Um, did you want me to try and contact him again while you're talking about 5.3 or did you wanna continue? You're just on mute, David; I can't hear you. David?

10 MR LLOYD: You have him?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Ah, yes. He's just come online. Give me just one minute to enable his microphone.

15 MR LLOYD: Is he able to hear us?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, he should be able to hear you. Lance, can you please confirm you can hear us? Mr Paneras, can you hear us? Mr Paneras? Lance? Lance, can you hear us? Do you wanna move on to 5.3, David, while I call Lance to try - - -

20

MR LLOYD: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: - - - troubleshoot?

25

MR LLOYD: Okay. I think we'll do that. Ah, item 5.3 is the, ah, proposed use of shop 1 at number 1 Baywater Drive, Wentworth Point for the purpose of a real estate office and associated business identification signage. Ah, all right. Panel – ah, Mr Lester, your opinion?

30

MR LESTER: Um, I support the recommendation, um clarification about whether the removal of the flagpoles is committed as part of the approval, because it seems to be referred to in the various recommendations but not in the final statement.

35 MR LLOYD: Thank you. Mr Ryan?

MR RYAN: I support the recommendation.

MR LLOYD: Ah, Ms Turner?

40

MS TURNER: Yes. I support. I think that, yes, they should make it clear that the – how the flagpoles are going to be removed.

MR LLOYD: All right. Well, then the determination of the panel is to support the recommendation, ah, subject to the removal of the flagpoles, ah, at the front of the premises; ah, that should be expressly stated in the consent. So if you can bring up

45

the determination, ah, add – add paragraph – add paragraph (c) – so you have to add paragraph (c)

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, David, can you – can you go – can you do that – say that again for me?

MR LLOYD: Ah, in the recommendation there is an additional paragraph.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yep.

MR LLOYD: Ah, and a – it's subject to an additional condition, requiring the removal of the flagpoles at the front of the premises. All right. Reasons for the decision are - - -

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

MR LLOYD: That's ground 1. Ground 2, ah, the development will be compatible with the emerging and planned future character of the area. 3 - - -

20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

MR LLOYD: - - - approval of the application will be in the public interest. Do the panel members want to add anything to those?

25 MR LESTER: No.

MR LLOYD: Okay.

30 MS TURNER: No.

MR LLOYD: All right. Are we ready to move back to item 5.2?

35 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Just give me one moment. We're unfortunately going to have to play Lance off of my speakers, so just let me change my speaker to – um, off my headphone for just one second. Lance, can you speak so we can check that they can hear you now?

MR L. PANERAS: Yep.

40 MR LLOYD: Ah, can – can - - -

MR PANERAS: Hello.

45 MR LLOYD: Mr Paneras, can you hear us? Okay.

MR PANERAS: Yes, I can.

MR LLOYD: Ah, we've looked – I can tell you the panel has looked at the site and we have, ah, looked at the council's assessment report and we have looked at the later material that you submitted. Ah, now is your opportunity to say anything. Over to you.

5

MR PANERAS: Ah, so I guess from – ah, so from, um, our perspective, um, we, um – we really – we've been – we've been told on several occasions, um, previously that, ah, this, um – the submission, basically, that we've put forward approved. Um, we have gone to a meeting previously, as of December last year, where we were with, um, Roberto, who was the planner at the time that was in charge of the application – we met with him, ah, his boss Stephen, and also an engineer, and they provided their feedback on, um, the development. We came to an agreement and we, ah, were subsequently given a list of items which we needed to amend the plans and documentation to, um, include. We did that. We were then advised at that meeting as well that if we did all those, um, things which were agreed at the meeting, which we then subsequently obviously amended, um, and put forward, that we would be given an approval recommendation to this panel, um, for our development.

10

15

Now, ah, obviously that did not happen. Um, the minutes were also, um, delayed. They weren't, ah, provided 10 business days prior to this meeting. And, um, you know, subsequently, we've been discussing this further with Michael, um, ah, who's the planner that's, um, our point of contact, and he's since sent through a draft conditions of consent and also, um, stated in that email, which I've got and I think I've submitted, ah, to you as well yesterday as part of my transcript, um, which states that, ah, the only outstanding, um, issue was the FSR, um, ah, not complying. And we've, um – 4.6 requests we, ah – we have actually, um, adjusted or we basically, um, justify that, ah – basically, that non-compliance. Ah, it was a very minor non-compliance, um, on the FSR ratio.

20

25

30 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You'll just have to unmute, David.

MR LLOYD: Ah, ah, I have to say that your – to vary the floor space ratio standard, ah, doesn't really do the trick. Ah, to comply with the legislation you have to, ah – in your written request to vary the standard, demonstrate that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances in the case and, secondly, you have to – you have to demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard. The fact that the, ah, variation from the standard is relatively minor is not on its own sufficient. We don't have the power to vary the standard unless your written request satisfies those two requirements. Ah, you have to demonstrate that it's – the variation is, nevertheless, consistent with the objectives of the standard and the object – and, ah, the objectives for development within the zone.

35

40

So your request for variation, ah, it is – is not one that we can accept at this stage. Ah, that's one problem, ah, as I see it. Ah, I'll just ask the other panel members what their views are, ah, or whether they wish to adjourn for a private discussion. Mr Lester?

45

MR LESTER: Um, I – I would support the proposal, um, subject to being able to resolve the 4.6 issue.

MR LLOYD: Mr Ryan?

5

MR RYAN: I concur with that, ah, Mr Chair.

MR LLOYD: All right. Ms Turner, your view?

10 MS TURNER: Yes. I concur.

MR LLOYD: All right. We can overcome the problem by, ah, dealing with this, ah, electronically, ah, but the panel is, ah, disposed to, ah, approve the application, ah, in accordance with the set of conditions that have been supplied to us, but in order to
15 formally do so we need to have a, ah – a proper written request to vary the – vary the standard. Once that is forthcoming then we can, ah – we can, ah, vary the standard in accordance with the, ah, supplementary material that we have received and grant formal consent electronically. So, ah, the determination of the panel is, ah, that we are prepared to, ah, adopt the latest recommendation to approve, subject to the
20 recommended conditions, ah, provided that the applicant furnishes a section 4.6 request to vary the floor space ratio standard which complies with that clause, and upon receipt of that the panel will be prepared to, ah, grant consent electronically comments?

MR RYAN: Mr Chair, can I just, um, ah to the applicant, just suggest that he, ah, speaks to the council, um, just to, um, ask what needs to be done, just in order to rectify that technicality, and to be just reminded of, ah, the – the very fast turnaround time he'll need to meet in order for us to do this because there is a – a, ah – a, ah – a deadline that we need to be meet – met. So I suggest to – he speaks to the
30 council staff as soon as possible.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: David, did you wanna, um, add – add a timeframe in the determination

MR LLOYD: Well, ah, it should be done promptly, ah, ah, otherwise, ah, we're out of time. Ah, I'd say by the end of this week certainly, at the latest. All right.

MR PANERAS: Um, can I ask, sorry

MR LLOYD: Yes. Go ahead.

MR PANERAS: Ah, so, um, I was, um, told to submit the, ah – submit the clause 4.6, um, as per, ah, our planner's response, basically, um, only two or three days ago. So we weren't told of the – the issue, ah, until then. They actually told us that that
45 was justification enough for - - -

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just one second. Just a minute, David. Um, I've just lost connection. Give me one minute and I'll get back on the other computer. Sorry, Lance, connection's terrible.

5 MR PANERAS:

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Won't be a moment, David.

MR PANERAS:

10

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's just connecting okay. Can you confirm you can hear?

MR PANERAS: Hello.

15

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Lance, the phone back and I'm just confirming the panel can hear me.

MR RYAN: Yeah. I can hear you.

20

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Great.

MS TURNER: Okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Lance, you can continue to talk. Sorry about that.

MR PANERAS: Yeah. No, that's fine. Sorry about that, but, um, yeah, I want to obtain these, ah, basically, the – the minor justification, um, was already told – I was told by a planner, um, himself that that would be, um, sufficient, ah, the one that was provided. However, we are happy to, um, reduce the dwelling, ah, on the ground floor some way to, um, ensure that the FSR, ah, limit is reached. Um, if, ah, if it was to be through the pantry and laundry wall, for example, um, then we could, um, we would need to reduce that by, say, 60 to 70 mil to achieve, ah, whole FSR compliance. So we are prepared to do that, um, if that can be a condition of the consent then we'd be happy to, ah, accept that.

30

35

MR LLOYD: It won't be necessary for us to do that. All we need is a document from you which complies with the requirements of clause 4.6. It's a piece of paper – that's all we need – referring to the - - -

40

MR PANERAS: Right.

MR LLOYD: Referring to the things that clause 4.6 refers to. You may need some assistance in preparing this document, but that's all we need. You don't have to change anything on the plan.

45

MR PANERAS: Okay. Perfect. All right. We'll do.

MR LLOYD: And can you do it before the end of the week?

MR PANERAS: Yes, we can do that.

5 MR LLOYD: All right.

MR PANERAS: Yes, we can.

10 MR LLOYD: All right. Well, once you've done that, you will get your consent.

MR PANERAS: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much.

MR LLOYD: All right?

15 MR PANERAS: Perfect.

MR LLOYD: Thank you very much. With that, we're going to move onto the next item. Thank you very much. All right. The next item is the planning proposal at 85 to 91 Thomas Street, Parramatta. Is Mr Adam Byrnes on the line, of Think Planners?
20 Or does he not propose to – to address us?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Adam, can you hear us?

25 MR LLOYD: I – well, we don't have notice that – that he wishes to speak as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No. He was only here for questions.

MR LLOYD: He's only here for the questions. All right. Okay. Thanks a lot. Do the panel members have any questions of Mr Byrnes of Think Planners who are the
30 proponents here? Any questions?

MR RYAN: I might make a comment and, um, if, ah, Mr Byrnes would like to respond, by all means. Um, look, I'm – I'm quite comfortable with, ah, this of, um, of what you're doing. It makes – makes sense in a – in a planning sense to
35 the, um, the open space in the development as you have. Um, and the way that it seemed to be – been formulated is that the amount of development potential that you can get is equivalent to what you would have been able to get previously, ah, if the whole of the site was developable and, in this case, as the report tells us, the site is constrained and there are areas of it that aren't developable which means that
40 achieving the, ah, maximum floor space ratio is, I suspect – and you may want to comment – ah, not able to be done, ah, as is found in the previous controls.

But under this scheme, you're – you're given a clean run when you've got a good development site where you are able to reach the development notional
45 development potential of the site only at the site. And what that leads to is a rather large – sorry, there's a lot of feedback on the line. Is everyone else getting that? I don't know whether someone can Um, thank you. That's much better. Um, and

so what that leads to is a building or buildings on the site that are, um, notably higher than, ah, buildings in – within that context. That's three the building is three but, you know, appears almost as a two-storey building. This – these buildings have all been, um, to six storeys in that context and the only justification seems to be that, you know, because you – you're gifting the council, um, the, um, a big open space.

Um, I'd just be interested in hearing your - your – your response to that and whether, um, you're, you know, effectively getting a – a reasonable deal out of getting the full context – the full, um, ah, development yield from your – your site when pre – under the previous controls, you wouldn't have been able to do that.

MR A. BYRNES: Thanks, David.

15 MR LLOYD: Mr Byrnes.

MR BYRNES: Can the panel hear me?

MR LLOYD: Mr Byrnes, speak up. We can't quite hear you.

MR BYRNES: Okay. Can you hear me now? Is that better?

MR LLOYD: Yes, I can.

25 MR RYAN: I can.

MR BYRNES: Thank you. Thanks, David. Thanks for the question. Yeah, ah, good question. And, I guess, our starting point with this planning proposal was, um, shall I say, more robust in seeking a greater yield than where we've ended up landing, ah, and where we're comfortable with – with you supporting today. We took a view that the context actually is an interesting context along the river and that the river has an environment that extends between Parramatta CBD and James Ruse Drive, ah, Bridge where you're seeing the development of a series of wharf or finger-style buildings with quite significant densities happening to the west of this site that front the river. And, of course, there's the one across – the three buildings across.

MR LLOYD: Sorry, we've lost you. We've lost you, Adam.

MR BYRNES: And I'm paraphrasing on their behalf. I'm sure they can respond. They accept that there is a – a – an involving character along that river but that we were overstepping it in terms of height and FSR. And so while, yes, the immediate context to our east is a three-storey RFB and, over time, to our west there will need to be an amalgamation of those townhouses and, I suspect, their own individual planning proposals. We took a broader context and took the view that this was actually appropriate for what's happening along that river edge. At the end of the day, we have been content with, ah, the – the – the reporting and the resolution that we've got to which is, as you've well put it, is on balance.

We've essentially ended up with a very similar FSR or GFA that comes out of the – out of the site, but we've adjusted the height controls to ensure it could be delivered on that site. And I'm – yeah, for the reasons I've just stated, I'm comfortable that contextually it works, ah, along the river and there's, of course, the – those benefits
5 in – in the dedication of the land, um, along the edges of the river. Thank you.

MR RYAN: Thanks, Mr Byrnes.

MR LLOYD: Mr Lester, do you have any questions? You – you'll have to turn on
10 the mic. Alf, you'll have to turn on your mic.

MR LESTER: Mic's on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.
15

MR LLOYD: That's better.

MR LESTER: Mic's on.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can speak now.
20

MR LESTER: Yeah. Um, was there any attempt to work toward a transition from both the existing development and the potential future development which won't, I presume, reach a six-storey limit, given that they will be curtailed? Um, it seems that
25 there is basically a six-storey wall, albeit with the two – um, two level – the upper level setback and most of the development has been pushed to the edges of the site, um, leaving quite a large space in the middle of the site. Is there any attempt to look for some form of transition to both the existing development to the east and future development to the west?

MR BYRNES: Okay. Thanks, Alf. First of all, the – the – a lot of consideration and time was spent with council's inhouse design team particularly, ah, Harry Levine, in relation to the transition to the north. And I know that's not your question but there was a lot of discussion about what's the right, ah, set – setbacks and, ah,
30 35 heights along Thomas Street.

MR LESTER: Yeah.

MR BYRNES: In terms of your question about, ah, setbacks to the east and west, I
40 guess there's two ways in which you can deal with that – three ways you can deal with that transition. You can just have a hard transition, um, and there's some advocates for that kind of approach. The other approach is to step the buildings or the approach that we – we took which is to provide quite generous setbacks at the eastern and western sides of the site that provides for significant landscaping in deep
45 soil. And the significant separation between the two buildings kind of reflects where the starting point in our strategic analysis of the finger-style buildings wharf-style buildings that were emerging along the riverfront.

So, hence, you've got, essentially, two buildings that are, sort of, north face – north – north-south direc – direction. Obviously, you can get morning and evening – afternoon sun and good separation and good landscaping – um, good separation between the buildings, good landscaping at the edges of the buildings. And that was
5 the way in which we dealt with the transition and height.

MR LESTER: I appreciate that. Apparently, land use pattern is – is similar on the – both sides of this development but, in effect, you've really got a higher density yield in the middle and if you took part of the ADG philosophy, you would look for a
10 transition to lower – what appears to be a lower density if you equate it over the whole – sorry, over each of the individual sites that you're actually working with because you've got a higher density on a limited site, given that part of your site is going to be transferred to council under the planning agreement. So I was just wondering whether you'd looked at any effective transition because at the moment,
15 um, looking at the material or the development on the western side, in particular, it's only two storey. It – it is three storeys as it moves down the hill but only two storey at Thomas Street and, yet, you've got a six-storey building adjacent to it.

MR BYRNES: So thanks again. So the ADG sets out that the transition needs to be
20 undertaken between zones. So we've got an interesting case here in which we're not doing – we don't have necessarily a change of zones between an R4 – R4 context and as we know, I've got the benefits – ah, the ADG in front of me and the boundary between changing zone from apartment buildings to a lower density area, increase the building setback from the boundary by three metres. So we've essentially taken
25 that principle and applied it here. We've got a, ah, greater site setback than would ordinarily be required. At the five to six-storey height, we're at 12 metre setback, whereas we would only, ah, normally require a nine metre setback in that point. So we have actually, ah, grabbed hold of the principle and applied it here though it's not necessarily applicable because it's not a change in zone.
30

MR LESTER: No, but basically it's a change in – de facto change in zoning because of the concentration on – on the, um, reduced site. Otherwise you would have a development that matched the developments of the western and the future development to the wes – to the east.
35

MR BYRNES: Oh, I'm not sure if I quite understand. The - - -

MR LESTER: No, what – what I'm saying is - - -

40 MR BYRNES: Sorry.

MR LESTER: Okay. If you – if you took the development density on the actual site that you're finishing up with, it will be higher than the development density to either the east or to the west even though it's within an R4 zone because you've actually
45 had granted to you under the proposal, subject to the of land, additional development that equates to the balance of that land that you're going to hand over –

or the client is going to hand over to council. In that sense, you do have a higher density on the residual site that's been

MR BYRNES: I'm - - -

5

MR LESTER: But I agree the de facto - - -

MR BYRNES: Sorry.

10 MR LESTER: De facto change of use – sorry. De facto increase in – in density subject to that agreement to hand over the land as a consequence of the

MR BYRNES: So I just think if we look at the numerics – they're set out there on page 175 of the report – the - - -

15

MR LESTER: Yeah.

MR BYRNES: The numerics are pretty clear that if you take the parent parcel, we get a GFA that is very similar – like, the difference is, like, 20 square metres – to the net parcel. So the density, calculated across the parent versus the net parcel, is unchanged. Well, the difference is 20 square metres. So, um, the before and after scenario is the same GFA, essentially, and therefore I – I say the same density and I guess, well, what – what could be debatable in that is does it look like the same density. It may well not look like the same density but, ah, we've dealt with that from an urban design point of view where we believe that this is an appropriate height scale setback landscaping and that – that delivers a good outcome for the site and, indeed, addresses the river well.

20

25

MR LESTER: Okay. David.

30

MR LLOYD: Any other questions, Mr Lester?

MR LESTER: No, not at this stage.

35

MR LLOYD: All right. Ms Turner, do you have any questions?

MS TURNER: No, I don't.

MR LLOYD: Okay. David, any further comments?

40

MR RYAN:

MR LLOYD: I'm sorry. I had my mic turned off. Ah, I don't think the panel has any further questions. Ah, I'll just get a – a view from each panel member as to whether they've – to adjourn to discuss this further or whether they – they are happy to determine it now. Mr Lester, your view.

45

MR LESTER: Um, I'm comfortable to support the council officer's recommendation.

MR LLOYD: Mr Ryan.

5

MR RYAN: Um, I'm comfortable with the recommendation.

MR LLOYD: Ah, Ms Turner.

10 MS TURNER: I support.

MR LLOYD: All right. So do I. So the determination of the panel, which is unanimous, is to support the recommendation in its entirety as set out in the assessment report. The reasons – we'll get this down. The reasons for the
15 determination, the panel supports the findings in the report and endorses the reasons for the recommendation contained in the report. The reasons for the recommendation. It's only a recommendation to the council. And, thank you, Mr Byrnes, for your attendance. With that, we can move onto - - -

20 MR BYRNES: Thanks.

MR LLOYD: Move onto the next item, the planning proposal at 8 to 14 Great Western Highway, Parramatta. Again, we don't have notice of anyone wishing to address the panel on this matter, ah, unless we have any, ah, anyone coming in late.
25 Ah, so I think we can move straight onto consideration of the item. Ah, all right. Ah, we've had a preliminary discussion. Ah, can I canvass the views of the panel. First of all, Mr – this is the Great Western Highway, Parramatta. Can we canvass the views of the panel? Firstly, Mr Lester.

30 MR LESTER: I, again, support the, um, the council officer's recommendations.

MR LLOYD: Mr Ryan.

MR RYAN: I support the recommendation.

35

MR LLOYD: And Ms Turner.

MS TURNER: I support the recommendations.

40 MR LLOYD: Ah, as do I. So, again, the panel is in support of the recommendation and the decision is unanimous. All right. We can now move onto the final item, 6.3. This is the post-exhibition of the planning proposal at 55 Aird Street. Ah, we can excuse Mr Ryan.

45 MR RYAN: Thank you, Mr Chair.

MR LLOYD: Thank you very much, David.

MR RYAN: Thank you.

MR LLOYD: We will – you will get the, ah, get the material in the deferred matter later this week. So that leaves three of us. Ah, all right. Mr Lester, do you – what's
5 your view here?

MR LESTER: I support the recommendation, but I still have concerns about the nature of the site and the very limited potential ability to, again, to access the site and to gain natural light to the site in the future. But with those reservations, would
10 support the application – would support the, um, proposal to, um, go forward.

MR LLOYD: Ms Turner.

MS TURNER: I also support.
15

MR LLOYD: Well, I – I also support it and I share the reservations expressed by Alf. It will all boil down to the actual design at the development application stage. The reasons for the recommendation, ah, the panel decision is unanimous. Ah, I think we can add a second ground here. The – the second ground is that the panel
20 notes that the planning proposal is consistent with the Parramatta CBD planning proposal. And, ah, we could add that second ground to the previous matter, the one on the Great Western Highway. If you go back to that, correct. You've got it. Well, I think that concludes the agenda. We have one matter to determine electronically and, hopefully, we can do that, ah, before the end of the week. So, with that, I can
25 formally close the – the meeting and thank you for the – for your input.

MR LESTER: Thank you, David.

30 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[4.27 pm]