



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1094010

CITY OF PARRAMATTA COUNCIL

LOCAL PLANNING PANEL

RECORD OF COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL MEMBERS: **STEPHEN O'CONNOR (CHAIR)**
 DAVID JOHNSON
 DEBORAH SUTHERLAND
 MAREE TURNER

LOCATION: **RYDALMERE OPERATIONS CENTRE, CIVIC ROOM**
 316 VICTORIA ROAD, RYDALMERE

DATE: **3.58 PM, TUESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2019**

MR S. O'CONNOR: So, um, welcome, everyone, ah, to this meeting of the local, um, Parramatta planning panel this afternoon. Um, I – my name is Steve O'Connor. I am the chair of the panel this afternoon. Joining me I have, ah, Maree Turner on my left - - -

5

MS M. TURNER: Hi.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - ah, David Johnson, also on my left, and Deborah Sutherland on my right. Um, I'll just begin with, ah, acknowledgement of the traditional
10 owners. The City of Parramatta council acknowledges the Burramattagal clan of the Darug, the traditional landowners of Parramatta, and pays its respect to the elders both past and present. I just need to let everyone know that this meeting is being recorded. Um, the recording will be archived and available on council's website. All care is taken to maintain your privacy; however, if you are in attendance in the
15 public gallery, you should be aware that your presence may be recorded. I don't believe we have any apologies to note. Ah, declarations of interest, ah, have been completed. Um, I'll just check with the panel. Are there any declarations, Deborah?

MS D. SUTHERLAND: No.
20

MR O'CONNOR: No. Ah, David?

MR D. JOHNSON: No.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Maree?

MS TURNER: No.

MR O'CONNOR: And I don't have any declarations. Ah, our first item, 5.1, is a
30 pre-Gateway. It's a planning proposal for land at 195 Church Street, 65 to 79 Macquarie Street, 38 to 45 Hunter Street, ah, in Parramatta, and it, ah, relates to the St John's Anglican Church. We do have, um, ah, one person who's indicated they'd like to speak to this matter. It's a Tina Tang. Would you mind taking a seat over
35 there, please, Tina?

35

MS T. TANG: Sure.

MR O'CONNOR: When you're ready.

40 MS TANG: Okay. Is this working? Do I have to lean forward? No. Okay. Thank you very much for your time today. Ah, my name, as you know, is Tina Tang. I'm a director at Jattca, and we've been engaged by the St John's parish of Parramatta to provide a framework for a 100-year masterplan for the property. And, ah, the intention is that it retains St John's ownership of the land and responds to the new
45 vision for Parramatta. Our client, St John's, is represented here today by the Reverend Canon Bruce Morrison, who's just here. We have also assembled a first-

class team of consultants and provided a comprehensive merit and evidence-based assessment of the site that provides a strategic justification for the proposal, in our view. We've engaged with a broad range of our key stakeholders, including our parishioners, in two full-day presentation workshops with them, and we undertook
5 extensive consultations and held three pre-lodgement workshops with council officers.

The main objective of the proposed development is to provide modern consolidated facilities for the operation and ongoing sustainability of the St John's parish and a
10 sustainable public domain outcome that will benefit the local Parramatta community. Our planning, architecture and urban design team is led by Jane Freeman and Oscar Stanish from Architectus. They're sitting right here behind me. Our landscape consultant is Kate Luckraft from ASPECT Studios, sitting there. Our traffic planners are Traffix, and Tom Wheatley leads – leads that team. Over there. Thank you, Tom.
15 And our specialist, ah, heritage architect is Paul Davies, who has extensive experience with church facilities and Parramatta in general. Finally, Sam Haddad, the former director-general of what is now the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, is our strategic advisor, who has provided a sanity check and valuable advice on our approach to this, ah, very important site. Sam's over there. So we're
20 all here to answer any questions that may arise today, of course.

The proposal is consistent with both the district plan and council's plan for the strategic vision for Parramatta. It's well-located close to public transport and services. It provides increased amenity through the civic space and new commercial
25 office space that will assist in co – accommodating four and half thousand jobs of the 50,000 additional jobs targeted by 2036. We believe that our proposal will strengthen council's strategic intent as the river city and the second CBD of the Greater Sydney region. The proposal balances the history and the future of the parish operations in Parramatta with the importance of activation and good urban
30 design. We are taking the fragmented facilities and landholdings of the parish and, essentially, creating an extension of the new Parramatta Square with modern commercial facilities, public benefits and an enhanced setting for one of Australia's oldest and most significant state-listed heritage assets, the St John's Cathedral. Ah, the model over there – and, you know, you're welcome to stand up and – and review
35 it, and I can point out, ah, various aspects. Um - - -

MS J. LLOYD: Do you want to point, or - - -

MS TANG: Do – would – would you like – are you happy to sit there, or would you
40 like to just - - -

MR O'CONNOR: We – we've had a look at the model.

MS TURNER: We – we – we - - -
45

MS SUTHERLAND: We – we – we have had a walk - - -

MS TANG: You have had a look at it?

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes. Thank you.

5 MS TANG: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: Yeah, we've – we have.

10 MS TANG: So as in – the commercial tower, um, the – the taller, um, dark building there, ah, which fronts Macquarie Street, ah, is – is a tower with a 1200 square metre floorplate and three podium levels to house the parish operations and activities, and that will front both the new square and Centenary Square. The new office tower will provide accommodation for approximately four and half thousand people, as I said earlier. There is a new square created via the integration of the eastern end of Hunter
15 Street into the new square, the removal of car parking which is currently in front of the cathedral, and a comprehensive landscape plan for the whole precinct. A through-site link is provided from the new square to Macquarie Street, coordinated with the adjacent property at 57 Macquarie Street. A smaller residential-style building will frame the square to the south of the site.

20 In the process of arriving at this outcome, we explored various options for the site, all of which involved changes, to some degree, to St John's Hall. This was the subject of considerable analysis through the process with council. Removal of the St John's Hall will support the creation of a high-quality public open space and a better urban
25 setting outcome. We appreciate that the council office's report endorses our position that the public benefits, on balance, provides justification for the removal of the hall. We note that there are no other outstanding planning issues, and that council supports our preferred proposed scheme. We acknowledge that there are issues to be addressed during the VPA process to be undertaken with council, and we appreciate
30 that council's – we appreciate the council office's support for the parish's planning proposal, which followed a series of workshops pre-submission and working through principles of the proposed development. Finally, we would like to thank council officers for preparing and even and well-reasoned report that supports an equitable outcome for all. Thank you.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Tina, for those, um, comments. Any panel members have any questions for Tina? No?

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

40 MR O'CONNOR: Oh, go ahead. Go.

MS SUTHERLAND: Um, I just need to know the reasoning or the, um, justification for the quantum of floor space that you're – and – and the fact that you
45 think you should be exempt from the sliding scale for floor space.

MS TANG: Ah, it - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Ah, by using the roadway that council's – owns.

MS TANG: Okay. Sorry. I'm just – ah, I'll start with the first - - -

5 MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

MS TANG: - - - part of the question, which relates to the, um, amount of floor space.

10 MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

MS TANG: So the commercial – ah, to make it all – to make it viable – so we're providing – ah, we're providing parish facilities, and to make, ah, the development a viable development and to provide for the job creation that we antis – well, you
15 know, that we've seen is required in the Greater Sydney Commission, um, proposal for the district. We believe that contributing a space to accommodate four and a half thousand people is – is a reasonable option for a property that's so close to public transport. So that's one - - -

20 MS SUTHERLAND: You meant the plaz – the open plaza that – are we talking about the act – or - - -

MS TANG: Well, the entire property is actually - - -

25 MS SUTHERLAND: Yes. Yeah.

MS TANG: - - - two minutes walk to the station.

MS SUTHERLAND: No, I know. We've been there.

30 MS TANG: Yeah.

MS SUTHERLAND: We've been there before.

35 MS TANG: Sorry. Yes.

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MS TANG: So - - -

40 MS SUTHERLAND: Sorry.

MS TANG: Ah, so that – that's why we're – we're proposing that sort of scale of development. Um, in terms of the sliding scale, ah, I don't believe that applies to the
45 commercial tower – correct me if I'm wrong, anybody – but, ah, there is a sliding scale applied to the southern tower, and we accept – ah, I know that the proposition in the model indicates – and in our, ah, planning proposal submission - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MS TANG: - - - ah, indicates a larger tower. But council, in discussion with
ourselves – we’ve acknowledged and, ah, we accept at this stage that prior to
5 consolidation of the site next door with our site that we would be subject to a sliding
scale for that particular site. But the sliding scale doesn’t actually apply to the
northern tower site.

MS SUTHERLAND: ’Cause that’s a large enough site. If it’s – it’s an
10 amalgamation

MS TANG: On its own? Yes.

MR O’CONNOR: It’s above 1800 square metres.
15

MS SUTHERLAND: It’s an amal - - -

MS TANG: Yes. Correct.

MS SUTHERLAND: It’s an incentive to amalgamate. And to avoid that, you were
20 going to try and include the roadway in your site calculations.

MS TANG: Ah, no. No. The inclusion of the roadway is actually a public benefit
outcome that we strongly believe is the right solution for the area. So we are trying
25 to create a public square - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Sure.

MS TANG: - - - that is, you know, usable for public events, and private events, I
30 guess.

MS SUTHERLAND: Ah - - -

MS TANG: And – and that does include the end of Hunter Street. That isn’t done –
35 that wasn’t done specif – you know, it wasn’t done to create additional FSR.

MS LLOYD: Tina, can I – sorry. Um - - -

MS TANG: Please.
40

MS LLOYD: I’m, um, work with - - -

MS TANG: Sorry. Jane Lloyd works with me at Jattca.

MS LLOYD: Yeah.
45

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MS LLOYD: Um, the northern tower is within the existing holdings. It doesn't cross into the roadway.

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

5

MS LLOYD: That site is 2155 - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

10 MS LLOYD: - - - square metres.

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

15 MS LLOYD: And on the southern side, as Tina said, we accept that it will sit within the bounds of 45 Hunter Street. And so we're – we're not taking any of the road out to allow for that. Ah, the southern tower allows for the sliding scale, the six to one, um, and doesn't include the roadway.

20 MR O'CONNOR: But there's a basement car park underneath the roadway.

MS LLOYD: Correct. That's right. And so the SP1 zone - - -

MR O'CONNOR: So the project does include the roadway.

25 MS LLOYD: Pardon?

MR O'CONNOR: The project does include - - -

30 MS LLOYD: Yes, it does.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

35 MS LLOYD: And so the SP zoning – um, ah, we – we agreed with council that the SP zoning would allow, ah, for the, um, cars to go under the - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Ah, permitted use.

MS LLOYD: - - - under the square, correct.

40 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The – as an SP zone.

MS LLOYD: Correct. That's right. Or part of that SP zone, I should say.

45 MS SUTHERLAND: Well, I've got – just, I'm reading - - -

MR R. COLOGNA: be confused.

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - out of this report we've got.

MS TANG: Sure.

5 MS SUTHERLAND: And it's got here:

However, if the floor space of the building is calculated using just the site area of 45 Hunter Street, you get an effective floor space ratio of 16 to one – 15.8 to one.

10

MR COLOGNA: Ah - - -

MS TANG: So - - -

15 MR COLOGNA: Mr Chair, can I - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah. I need to understand this.

20 MR COLOGNA: I think the – the – the issue that may be causing confusion is, the area that is referred to is not actually roadway.

MS SUTHERLAND: Oh.

25 MR COLOGNA: The intention was to change some of the area that was zoned SP1 to B4.

MS SUTHERLAND: Oh, sorry. SP1. Sorry.

30 MR COLOGNA: So I think the confusion may be coming to the reference to the roadway.

MS SUTHERLAND: Sorry. Yeah.

35 MR COLOGNA: The proposal – if you look at figure 5 - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

40 MR COLOGNA: - - - it shows the applicant's proposal to extend the B4 in front of the church - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MR COLOGNA: - - - into the SP1 zone, rather than the roadway. That was - - -

45 MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MR COLOGNA: I think that's what's – the – what the – ah, the panel member is referring to.

5 MS SUTHERLAND: Sorry. Yes. Um, but, ah, it's still fairly – anyway. I'm just wanting to understand it, 'cause some of the information's a bit sketchy. Um, and in terms of the hall, the church hall – have you got your heritage person here or not?

MR P. DAVIES: Yes.

10 MS LLOYD: Yes, indeed.

MR DAVIES: Hello.

15 MS TANG: Paul Davies.

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah. Hi. Um, there's – we've – how many heritage reports have we read?

20 MR O'CONNOR: Quite a number.

MR DAVIES: Mmm. There's a few.

25 MS SUTHERLAND: Would you like to tell us why you feel that it's – what – what your views are on the, um - - -

MR DAVIES: On the church hall.

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - demolition, or the – or the retention, or - - -

30 MR DAVIES: The way - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: What's the value of this building in - - -

35 MR DAVIES: Yeah. The way we tried to structure the, ah, project was to – to leave some options around it so that it wasn't mandated that you must demolish the church hall. But - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

40 MR DAVIES: The location of the hall actually creates quite a lot of issues in terms of the setting of the cathedral, the creation of the square and how the site is developed, and certainly the functionality of the church.

45 MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MR DAVIES: So we thought – we looked at, really, three basic options. One was, what happens if you leave it there and keep it as a church hall? What happens if you

leave it there and adapt it and try and build around it? And – and what happens if you take it away? And so we've tried to explore those three options. Um, they've been tested out by council and by various consultants that council have engaged to review it. Um, I think the – um, the retaining it as a church hall as an entity has sort of generally been dismissed as not being a great idea. It just doesn't really work. It's not a desperately functional building. It's not a bad building, but it's not particularly functional. Um, there are explorations of what happens if you actually built over it at a higher level. Um, I think most people have agreed that that's not a good idea. Ah, it's certainly my view that you shouldn't build over heritage buildings. It sort of just reinforces the notion that they're an impediment rather than something to celebrate, so just a bad way to go. And you don't get a very good urban design outcome from that, um, although someone may be able to come up with a design as part of a competition that incorporates the hall in some creative way that no one's thought of. So that is an open proposition at the moment. Ah, I guess the preferred option is to allow it to be removed to see what else then happens in terms of creating that urban space. I think the thing that persuaded me, as a heritage consultant – 'cause I – I do a lot of churches, and I I don't like demolishing buildings – um, is that the whole setting of the cathedral has changed so much over time, you know, particularly around the 1940s when it ceased to be a – a fenced and gated place. I've done a cathedral in the city as well, the Anglican cathedral, and, you know, I remember that as a gated and fenced enclosure, and it's now Sydney Square. And suddenly the whole context of the building changes, and it becomes civic and urban and not church-based. And the inclusion of small buildings like that becomes quite difficult when they're sitting in a – a large urban space and they have no particular function. If the building was sitting somewhere else and was well away, there might be a possibility to incorporate it in a more creative way.

But I think it's always been that notion that you have a church hall as far back into the corner of what was then the site as possible. Um, it's – you know, it was the back corner of the site. And in the future, it'll actually become the focus of the site, because the west door and the connection through to Parramatta Square becomes so important, I think, as a civic space. And I think – it's that sort of balance between – I'm reticent to see it go, on the one hand, but I think the outcome for the cathedral and the operation of the church and the civic role of the cathedral is actually balanced up by letting it go. So that's probably about the best answer I think I can give.

MS SUTHERLAND: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Any further questions?

MS SUTHERLAND: Um, um, access from Macquarie Street - - -

MS TANG: Mmhmm.

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - and – and the back – this proposed laneway at the back of your – of 41, 43 that we have no agreement. For.

MS TANG: Mmhmm. The – okay. So there’s two things. So access from Macquarie Street - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah, yeah.

5

MS TANG: - - - is one aspect, and - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: It’s this - - -

10 MS TANG: - - - access from Marsden Lane across the back - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm. Mmm.

MS TANG: - - - of 41 and 43 Hunter Street.

15

MS SUTHERLAND: That’s not, sort of, sorted, because it’s not supported in principle by council. Was it?

MS TANG: Ah, I didn’t think that was the case.

20

MS SUTHERLAND: Let me have a look. Let me just see. It was here somewhere. But the – the laneway at the back, the proposed laneway.

MS TANG: Yes.

25

MS SUTHERLAND: Have you dis – had discussions with those neighbours?

MS TANG: Yes, indeed, we have.

30 MS SUTHERLAND: And?

MS TANG: So we have, ah, and we’ve made, ah - - -

MS TURNER: He’s saying - - -

35

MS TANG: - - - proposals to acquire the adjacent site, to be able to do that. And our understanding in discussions with council is, as time goes on and as development, ah, submissions go in for those sites – because - - -

40 MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MS TANG: - - - we are aware that they’re looking at a proposition there – ah, potentially, as part of council conditions, as I understand it, a right of way will be created to the back of the two pro – including our property.

45

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmhmm.

MS TANG: A right of way will be created to the back of the adjacent property, and this will allow access into our basement and also across to Queensland Arcade, which has that pedestrian access issue off Church Street. Yes. Does that answer your question?

5

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah. Yeah.

MS TANG: Yes. Great.

10 MR J. CARLE: Sorry. Can I just, um – Mr Chair, I'd just like to, um, just let the room know that we've received a – a letter from the owners of 41, um, Hunter Street, um, and they've raised some concerns about the council officer, ah, proposal to introduce the land reservation acquisition - - -

15 MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MR CARLE: - - - notation at the rear of those properties. Um, I'd just like to let the room know that we have, um, given a copy of that letter to the panel, um, and I do – I don't know if the panel has any – wants to open it up for – for questions, or - - -

20

MR O'CONNOR: We'll come back to that after.

MR CARLE: Yeah. Yeah.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MR CARLE: Okay.

MR O'CONNOR: Um, any other questions for Tina?

30

MS TURNER: Yeah.

MS SUTHERLAND: Probably not from me.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. I just have a question, Tina. You – in your presentation, you talked about the public benefit of the square that would be created if this project proceeds, um, but as I understand it, the square's gonna be retained in the ownership of the church. Is that right?

40 MS TANG: Mhmm. Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: So how do you see that working, being a public benefit but being in private ownership?

45 MS TANG: So, presently, the cathedral has grounds, ah, open around it, and that is in private ownership by the cathedral, but – ah, and, you know, I'm sure the client will add to this, but, ah, the arrangement with council, ah, the agreement – there is an

agreement in place with council that allows that space to be open, ah, 365 days a year, for all intent and purpose, ah, and the members of the public get to use it on a daily basis. The cathedral – the parish will use it on special occasions, weddings, funerals and the like. Ah, but apart from that, it is open for public use. And we
5 would – we would set that into an agreement with council.

MR O'CONNOR: See - - -

MS TANG: Just like the current grounds are also the subject of an agreement with
10 council.

MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS TANG: And that would all be part of this VPA process that we und - - -
15

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MS TANG: - - - we understand we need to go through.

20 MR DAVIES: Can I just add something to that? I think - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Certainly.

MR DAVIES: The cathedral has its main entrance as the west door, and currently
25 it's the car park and service area, and it should be the principal space where you gather. Um, it's the same as the – St Andrew's in the city, St Mary's. They've now created these significant spaces that actually allow large public events and also a sense of connection into the building. So the intent here is to actually reinstate a setting to the west door that actually has some status and that is sufficiently large that
30 it actually makes the connection back through to, um – through to the main thorough – thoroughfare going in the other direction, because while the church faces the right way, you know, east and west, um, Parramatta Square doesn't. In terms of its liturgical value, it obviously does for other reasons. But I think this is a way to actually really positively connect the church back into the pub – public realm.

35 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

REV MORRISON: May I – may I just - - -

40 MS SUTHERLAND: I think that's – that - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Certainly.

REV MORRISON: - - - briefly add – add to that. Um, so, um, we – we're actually,
45 um, increasing the public space. The project actually increases significantly the public space available, um, not only with the resumption of – of part of, um, Hunter Street, but also because the new facilities will be significantly further back, um,

from, ah, the new square, um, than the existing hall. What that does is it creates a larger square to the west of the cathedral, ah, gives it a – a – um, an architectural address, ah but it also opens up – the throat between, ah, the church building, the cathedral building, and what is currently the hall is eight metres across that throat.

5 Ah, that goes to 18 metres. So you get a – a – a connection right around, um, the – the cathedral, um, and that opens up the – the concept of the three squares. It's one – one to the east, with Parramatta Square, the Centenary Square, and the new square on the west.

10 Um, our – we – we've had a long history of working with city council, um, in allowing, um, public access. We welcome people into the grounds. Um, and, ah, in – in a sense, there's – there's a sense of early place-making, actually, that – that we've had, um, and that we've worked together with council on. So it's something that already has a significant history. What we'd love to do, actually, is remove the
15 vehicles, ah, and – and make it a space that – that is appropriate and – and – and worthy of the heritage asset that sits in the middle of it.

MR O'CONNOR: Go ahead. You want – got a comment?

20 MS SUTHERLAND: Um, well – sorry. I've got a – everything keeps coming to me.

REV MORRISON: Sure.

25 MS SUTHERLAND: Um, this is in – from your traffic assessment. Who is – you're here?

MR T. WHEATLEY: I - - -

30 MS TANG: Yes.

MS SUTHERLAND: Cou – the DCP currently prohibits vehicular – I found it - - -

MS TANG: Yes.

35 MS SUTHERLAND: - - - vehicular access from Macquarie Street. Um, do you know why that is, and – and how your development – because you're – you're proposing to have access from there.

40 MR WHEATLEY: Yeah. I – I don't know why the – the DCP has that in it. Is that what the question was?

MR COLOGNA: Ah - - -

45 MS TANG: May - - -

MR COLOGNA: Through you, Mr Chair, the – the, ah – the – the current DCP for – um, for the Parramatta CBD is based on a previous planning paradigm.

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

5

MR COLOGNA: As part of the CBD planning proposal, that's all under review. Um, and it is not the – and our traffic people, um, have not raised, at this point in time, concerns with access to Macquarie Street. Um, the light rail has changed significantly - - -

10

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MR COLOGNA: - - - ah, access and traffic arrangements. And so while we acknowledge – when you said to me earlier, “It's in the report” - - -

15

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah.

MR COLOGNA: - - - it wasn't in the council officer report. It – but it's - - -

20

MS SUTHERLAND: It's in the traff – in the applicant's traffic report.

MR COLOGNA: It's in – it's in the tra – ah, the traffic report. Yeah. But it is – and – and certainly, um, council's traffic and planning officers do - - -

25

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MR COLOGNA: - - - would not object to an access off Macquarie Street at this point in time.

30

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmm.

MR COLOGNA: Um, but all of that is also subject to the consultation process.

MS SUTHERLAND: Right.

35

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. I think that probably concludes our questions. Thank you, Tina.

MS TANG: Thank you.

40

MR O'CONNOR: Um, ah, is there anyone else? That's the only registered speaker we have. Is there anyone else wishing to address the panel in relation to this matter? Another two people. Sorry, what's your name?

45

MR M. BALDRY: Ah, my name's Matt. I'm the property manager for the Cancer Council New South Wales, part-owner of 43 Hunter Street.

MR O'CONNOR: Matt. Would you like to come - - -

MR BALDRY: Yes.

5 MR O'CONNOR: - - - forward and - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Sit at the microphone.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - just state your name.

10

MR BALDRY: Ah, my name's Matthew Baldry. I'm the property manager for Cancer Council New South Wales. Um, we only – we received the letter yesterday, um, about this meeting, then, obviously, went online and looked at the 896-page document. Um, obviously, the idea – and I speak on behalf of Rotary as well, who

15 are one of the other part-owners. We're a little bit dismayed by the idea of the acquisition of six metres at the back of our property. Um, not for profit organisations, that's a serious devaluation of our property, and, obviously, we are going to get advice on how we can object – object to that, moving ahead.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR BALDRY: That's all I have to say.

MR O'CONNOR: All right, then. Ah, any questions of Matt from any members of

25 the panel?

MR JOHNSON: Actually, just one quick one. Which – which property is that, ah, you own, sorry?

30 MR WHEATLEY: We're level 1.

MR JOHNSON: Of?

MR BALDRY: 43 Hunter.

35

MR JOHNSON: 43. Okay. Thank you.

MR BALDRY: Thank you.

40 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Matt. Anyone else? Would you like to come forward.

MS C. BATES: Thank you. Um, my name is Cheryl Bates, and I am the president of the National Trust Parramatta Regional Branch. Um, like our other speaker, we

45 only have heard about this, ah, proposal yesterday, and we haven't had an opportunity to do that, but I do have a statement I'd like to make.

MR O'CONNOR: By all means.

MS BATES: The – the National Trust is deeply concerned at a planning proposal to delist the locally heritage-listed St John's parish church hall, and proposals to either
5 demolish the hall or cantilever a new development over the hall. The National Trust notes the city's heritage advisor and heritage advisory committee do not support the demolition of the church hall. The trust also agrees with the position of the Parramatta City Council's Heritage Advisory Committee that the committee noted their grave concern on the impact of this development, especially regarding the scale
10 of the development, impact on major community open space, and the change in amenity from a religious community gathering point. Thank you very much.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. If you just hang on a moment. Are any panel members having questions for Cheryl? Okay. Thank you very much.
15

MS BATES: Thank you very much.

MR O'CONNOR: And there was someone else, I think.

20 MR L. WEHBE: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Would you like to come forward, please. Again, if you can just state your name.

25 MR WEHBE: My name's Lou Wehbe.

MS TURNER: Where was this?

MR O'CONNOR: I think we have a letter from you, Lou.
30

MR WEHBE: That's correct.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

35 MR WEHBE: I just - - -

MR O'CONNOR: By all means.

MR WEHBE: I came along - - -
40

MR JOHNSON: Page 83?

MR WEHBE: - - - today to just listen, ah, but, ah, I was, ah, affronted, to be honest, by, ah, Ms Tang's, ah, comment that, ah, she had consulted the owners of, ah, 41 and
45 43 Hunter Street. I did not know about this development whatsoever until yesterday, when I received a letter from Parramatta Council, and there was no consultation. And this, ah, proposal for a laneway at the back of my property causes me grave

concern. I will be getting advice. And, ah, I needed to correct the record, ah, because I don't want the panel to be misled by, ah, ah, something that was said, ah, from this seat. So - - -

5 MR O'CONNOR: Well, we certainly have got a copy of your letter, so we're well aware of your concerns. Any panel members have any questions for Lou?

MS TANG: May I respond? Am I allowed to respond to that or not?

10 MR O'CONNOR: Ah, no.

MS TANG: Okay.

MR O'CONNOR: I don't think that's necessary. Thank you.

15

MR WEHBE: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Um, is there anyone else? If not, um, I might just clarify that – just so people are aware of what the process is. Ah, this planning proposal is in its very early stages, and it's been referred to the, um, Parramatta Local Planning Panel for - - -

20

MS TURNER: Mmm.

25 MR O'CONNOR: - - - advice about whether it should proceed, and if so, in what form. That will form part of a report that will go to a council meeting – I understand it's likely to be on the, ah, 16th of December – where the council will actually be the body that will make a decision about whether this should proceed further. Um, so we'll provide input to council. Council can ignore our advice or – or take our advice or – or do something in between. Um, once council makes a decision, if it's a decision to proceed, ah, there are quite a few steps in the process, including referral to the Department of Planning, Environment and Industry, who have to issue what's called a Gateway certificate before, ah, a planning proposal can be placed on public exhibition. If that's issued – and it – it may change again, with their input. If that's issued, then there are formal public exhibitions, co – further consultation, and the matter will come back to this, ah, local Parramatta planning panel again for advice. And then it – that advice will go back to council, and then it will go back to the State Government. So it's quite a lengthy, ah, process. This is not the only opportunity people will have to have a say and express their concerns or support or otherwise. So before we retire – 'cause I think we will wanna discuss - - -

30

35

40

MS TURNER: Could I just have one question?

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, by all means.

45

MS TURNER: But I'm not sure who – who would answer this. But, ah, we were there today, and there's a great crack going all the way down the front of the hall.

REV MORRISON: There is.

MS TURNER: Is – is it structurally sound, the hall, as it is? Or can it be fixed?

5 REV MORRISON: Um, there are several quite significant cracks in the building. Um, we've had it assessed for safety currently and, currently, it is safe, um, on – on our understanding. Can it be fixed? Um, I really have no know-, no way of answering the question.

10 MS TURNER: You – you don't seem to have put that up as a reason why it should be demolished – that it is - - -

REV MORRISON: Ah, we - - -

15 MS TURNER: - - - structurally unsafe or - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Well, it's not unsafe.

MS TURNER: - - - costs too much.

20

MR O'CONNOR: We've just heard - - -

REV MORRISON: It's not – it's not - - -

25 MS TURNER: It's - - -

REV MORRISON: - - - unsafe.

MS TURNER: Or costs too much to fix.

30

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

REV MORRISON: Yes, but, um, it's – it's just an indication that it's past its use-by date.

35

MS TURNER: Okay.

MR DAVIES: But you're correct. It's not an argument to be to put - - -

40 MS TURNER: Yes. That's right.

MR DAVIES: No. Well, we're – we're not trying to pursue that, and it's a long argument.

45 MS TURNER: But – all right.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Well, um, we might just have a couple of minutes, um, and we'll come back soon to give our, um, determination of what we'll be recommending to council, and for those people who have other items on the agenda, then we'll deal with those other items. Thank you.

5

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[4.09 pm]

10 MR O'CONNOR: So, thank you, everyone, for your patience. Um, the panel has had an opportunity to visit the site earlier today and, obviously, um, read the reports from the council officers and all the various attachments, and, clearly, we've had opportunities to discuss this proposal as well. We're, um, happy with the planning proposal, um, or we're happy to indicate to council that we support the planning
15 proposal, but there are a couple of changes that I'll just read out that we want made to the recommendation which appears on pages 5, 6 and 7 of the local planning panel report. Um, so those changes are Roman numerals 7. Ah, that's - - -

MR JOHNSON: A7.

20

MR O'CONNOR: - - - A7. Um, that currently reads:

The existing heritage item identified as St Johns Parish Church Hall, which is item 1713, be delisted from schedule 5 of LEP.

25

Um, we would like that deleted, so we're not recommending that that item be delisted as part of the recommendation we would put to council. Um, that will require renumbering in Roman numerals of 8, 9, 10 and 11 accordingly. Secondly, in B, um, which currently reads that:

30

...the revise plan proposal be forwarded to the Department –

Oh, sorry –

35

...to the DPIE with a request for a gateway determination.

We want to add after the word “determination”:

...after consultation with the owners of lots 41 and 43 Hunter Street.

40

MS SUTHERLAND: Number.

MR JOHNSON: Should be - - -

45

MS SUTHERLAND: I think - - -

MR JOHNSON: Should be 45.

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - they're number. Are they number?

MR JOHNSON: Yes, 41 and 45

5 MS SUTHERLAND: Number

MR O'CONNOR: Ah, well, that's the - - -

MR JOHNSON: Number.

10

MS SUTHERLAND: Number 41.

MR O'CONNOR: That's the church.

15 MR JOHNSON: Okay.

MR O'CONNOR: We've already agreed.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Um - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes, you're right.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Sorry, what was your - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: It's number, not – not lot.

MR JOHNSON: Yes, they're not lots.

30

MR O'CONNOR: Sorry, lots.

MR JOHNSON: They're just numbers.

35 MR O'CONNOR: My – my apologies. Numbers - - -

MR JOHNSON: Numbers 41 and 43.

40 MR O'CONNOR: - - - 41 and 43 Hunter Street. Um, then in C, item Roman numerals 1, which reads, ah:

Significant heritage interpretation of the church hall recommended for delisting and potential future demolition.

45 Um, we wish to take out the words after “church hall” – “recommended above”, so – so take out those two words, “recommended above”. Leave in “for” and then take out the next two words “delisting and”, so it reads:

Significant heritage interpretation of the church hall for potential future demolition.

5 Okay, and then in Roman numerals 2, where the bracket around the word “laneway” appears – add the word “pedestrian” in front of “laneway”, and then after “laneway”, still within the brackets, “from Macquarie Street”, so just making clear where that five metre wide site through link’s proposed. So it reads, in brackets:

10 *Pedestrian laneway from Macquarie Street.*

They’re the only changes we are recommending to council. Otherwise, the rest of the points are as printed on the business paper.

15 MS SHAHIN: Would you like to give us reasons for those change or are you happy with that reason – the panel supports the findings of endorsed reasons?

MR O’CONNOR: Um, no. We – we - - -

20 MS SUTHERLAND: As amended. Just put as amended.

MR O’CONNOR: Yes. I think we – we will add just a couple of, um – of words there.

25 MS SHAHIN: Yep.

MR O’CONNOR: So after the word “report” – so just before the end of that sentence - - -

30 MS SHAHIN: Yep.

MR O’CONNOR:

35 *...and because the panel did not think that delisting the heritage item was a, um, appropriate course of action to take.*

Thank you.

MS SHAHIN: And the decision was unanimous? Is that correct?

40 MR O’CONNOR: That’s correct.

MR JOHNSON: It – yes.

45 MR O’CONNOR: Unanimous.

MS SHAHIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you for those that came for that item.

MS SHAHIN: Thank you.

5 MR O'CONNOR: Um, we will now move onto item 5.2.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

10

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

MS SHAHIN: Thank you.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Rightio. They'll be people left. So item 5.2 is on – begins on page 686 of the panel's, um, papers and this relates to a post-exhibition of a planning proposal draft – site-specific development control plan and planning agreement for 495 Church Street, Parramatta. Ah, we have one person who's registered to speak – Adam Coburn. Do you like - - -

20

MR COBURN: Mr Chair, I'm – I'm only here, really, to answer questions.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

25 MR COBURN: I don't have a presentation. If the panel has any questions about the
- - -

MR O'CONNOR: If we have any questions, we'll ask you to come up and take, um
- - -

30

MR COBURN: Yes. Otherwise - - -

MR O'CONNOR: - - - the – the seat.

35 MR COBURN:

MR O'CONNOR: Otherwise, we'll let you stay where you are, Adam. Okay. Any questions for Adam?

40 MS TURNER: No.

MR JOHNSON: I don't think so, actually. No. Do we need to hear anything from the planners? Probably not.

45 MR O'CONNOR: Deborah?

MS SUTHERLAND: Hang on.

MR JOHNSON: Do we have any more questions for the planners or - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes. The – in terms of – you’ve put in this new – yes, please.
Thank you.

5

MR JOHNSON: Yes, sure.

MS SUTHERLAND: So initi-, the initial one that’s been on exhibition was 11.521,
including a bo-, but that including the design excellence - - -

10

MR COBURN: Correct. Correct. We – yes, we – we’ve reduced - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: And that’s - - -

15

MR COBURN: - - - a 10 metre setback, so now it’s a 12 metre setback.

MS SUTHERLAND: What the site area again?

MR COBURN: Ah - - -

20

MR GORTON: 1082.

MR COBURN: Yes, one - - -

25

MS SUTHERLAND: How many?

MR GORTON: 1082.

MR COBURN: Yes.

30

MS SUTHERLAND: Okay. So – and you were asking for the sliding scale to be
not applying. Is that right or does that not apply anyway? Because I’ve got here
- - -

35

MR COBURN: Ah, that – that’s right. The recommendation is that, in this
instance, to – because there’s been a – a detailed study between Lennox Bridge and
Macquarie Street along Church Street, that - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

40

MR COBURN: - - - um, the sliding scale isn’t required in this particular site.

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmhhh.

45

MR COBURN: There’s, also, heritage items along here.

MR O’CONNOR: Either side.

MR COBURN: Either side. Um, so whilst it's, ah – doesn't quite meet the definition of isolated sites as per the CBDPP - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

5

MR COBURN: - - - practically, it is isolated, um, in all intents and purposes. The original strategy for this area as part of the CBD did identify just a – a number of tall towers, including The Riverside development to the north - - -

10 MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

MR COBURN: - - - 8 Phillip Street to the west - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes.

15

MR COBURN: - - - and this site, and I think - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes,

20 MR COBURN: - - - another couple of other sites on – on Church Street as well.

MS SUTHERLAND: Sure.

MR COBURN: So - - -

25

MS SUTHERLAND: Sure. So it's – it's on the basis that you can't amalgamate, so - - -

MR COBURN: Well - - -

30

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - it can't be done. Because that's - - -

MR COBURN: In essence, yes.

35 MS SUTHERLAND: That's the idea of the clause - - -

MR COBURN: Correct.

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - I gather. It's - - -

40

MR COBURN: Correct. Yes.

MS SUTHERLAND: They can't amalgamate, because of the heritage impacts next - - -

45

MR COBURN: Well, that – that’s part of it, I think, and the report talks to how if – if you did try and amalgamate, because there are heritage items, it would have an impact on those items, so, therefore - - -

5 MS SUTHERLAND: Sure.

MR COBURN: - - - through the detailed work that’s been done on this site, and it’s part of council’s study, which was done by an independent consultant along Church Street – found that an FSR of 10 to one would be appropriate on this site.

10

MS SUTHERLAND: Okay. But now you’ve added a boarding house, which is another two to one.

MR COBURN: Yeah, that’s, obviously, not incorpo-, - - -

15

MS SUTHERLAND: So that’s fair amount of bulk you’re putting on top of a 13 - - -

MR COBURN: But – but that’ll be assessed in – in – on the merits of the application. So even if we were to go in there today – so that’s under the – sorry, the Affordable Housing SEPP.

20

MS SUTHERLAND: Yeah, yeah.

MR COBURN: So we’ve – we’ve – and the reason why that’s been picked up is because we’ve already facilitated a design excellence competition on the sites.

25

MS SUTHERLAND: Mmhmm.

MR COBURN: Um, the – the finalisation of that has been held back pending the outcome on the planning proposal, but the boarding house, I would just like to stress, is – is still, certainly, separate and that’s – the bonus is subject to, obviously, the detailed assessment through the DA process.

30

MS SUTHERLAND: Yes. So what if you achieve this sort of building outcome – building bulk and form that – for 13.521 and you decide to change the land use down the track, and what’s that doing to do in terms of the - - -

35

MR COBURN: Well - - -

40

MS SUTHERLAND: I know where you’ve got the boarding house and the hotel – it’s – it’s much less in the way of parking requirements and traffic.

MR COBURN: Yes, that’s right. Well, I mean, that would have to be assessed on its merits. I mean, the intention is it – it, obviously, will be a mixed-used commercial. No residential proposed as part of the – the current process, and that’s what’s been incorporated in the design excellence competition that we’ve run.

45

MS SUTHERLAND: So you have any idea of a – a type of hotel operator or - - -

MR COBURN: Oh - - -

5 MS SUTHERLAND: - - - have you had - - -

MR COBURN: - - - it would be boutique-style operation, so probably in that four star – three and a half to four star category. We – we think that’s the market and the client thinks that’s the market for this particular site.

10

MS SUTHERLAND: So you’re – you’ve just added this? That’s all you’ve added, is the – the boarding house since – since the - - -

MR COBURN: Yes.

15

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - exhibited scheme?

MR COBURN: Yes. We’ve complied with the 12 metre setbacks - - -

20 MS SUTHERLAND: In terms of size.

MR COBURN: - - - and we’ve brought the setback into compliance with council’s study. Otherwise, the envelope is – is different. We were originally looking at residential again, and as the report talks to, there’s been a change from residential to hotel.

25

MS SUTHERLAND: so we – you’ve described – um, the density would be less for a hotel, too, than with, um, commercial or residential, um, in terms of traffic.

30 MR COBURN: Oh, yes. Absolutely, yes. Yeah, the car parking rates - - -

MS TURNER: So that’d have to – if you were to want to refit it as a – you know, a serviced apartment or something similar or - - -

35 MR COBURN: Yes. Although, council have a maximum - - -

MS TURNER: Later date, then you’d – you’d have to – you would have to deal with how to - - -

40 MR COBURN: Well, that – that’s right. I mean, we don’t know what will happen in the future. It’ll be assessed on its merits, but the council has a maximum car parking rate in the CBD.

MS TURNER: Airport height limits and – yes, they’re all on all of them.

45

MR COBURN: Yes.

MS TURNER: Mmhmm. Okay. So the intention is to re-exhibit the DCP and the – the planning agreement only, not the planning proposal itself again?

MR COLOGNA: Through you, Mr Chair.

5

MR COBURN: Correct, yes.

MS SUTHERLAND: Seeing as you're changing the land use, I think it, ah, may be an idea to fit – consider - - -

10

MR COBURN: Well, the envelope is – is largely the same. Um, it's compliant with the DCP. So the DCP that's been proposed has – has only changed because of the setback to Church Street. All the other aspects of that DCP are the same.

15 MR COLOGNA: Through – through you, Mr Chair – the – the planning proposal doesn't do anything to change the list of permitted uses.

MR O'CONNOR: No.

20 MR COBURN: Yeah.

MR O'CONNOR: The – but even though the planning proposal originally put on public exhibition had a reference design that was a hotel - - -

25 MR CARLE: Residential.

MR COLOGNA: Sorry, that was residential, a hotel was still always permissible all the way through the process.

30 MR O'CONNOR: Yeah.

MS SUTHERLAND: Oh, I know, I know, I know. I know, but - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

35

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - it's a – I know – um, anyway, it's – that should be in the DCP anyway. It'll – will it be in the DCP? No. It wouldn't be either.

MR COLOGNA: No. DCP doesn't – it doesn't - - -

40

MS SUTHERLAND: So the locals - - -

MR COLOGNA: - - - specify land uses.

45 MS SUTHERLAND: The community would have no idea it's changed - - -

MR COLOGNA: Well, the – the - - -

MS SUTHERLAND: - - - from a hotel to a - - -

MR COLOGNA: The – the report – the – the cover report would be put on exhibition with the DCP, so that the community understand the broader context.

5

MS SUTHERLAND: Okay. That's all.

MR O'CONNOR: No other questions for Adam? Thank you, Adam.

10 MR COBURN: Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: No.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Anyone else who isn't registered wish to speak to us about this particular matter? If not, again, we might just excuse ourselves and be back soon with our decision.

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[4.48 pm]

20

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Thanks, again, for your patience. The panel has had the opportunity of visiting this site this afternoon, reading the council officer's reports and, ah, having some, um, questions answered by the proponent's consultants.

25 We're quite comfortable with the recommendation that's, um, been reproduced in the papers on page 686 and goes over to 687, so we don't have any changes to what has been suggested to us in terms of the advice we give council and, likewise, um, for the reasons endorsed in the report – is fine inference of our reasons. Okay. So thanks for coming along.

30

MR COBURN: Thank you.

35 MR O'CONNOR: That brings us to the last item on the agenda, um, 5.3, which is on page 813. We don't – and that's a post-exhibition planning proposal and draft planning agreement for land at 14-20 Park Street, Harris Park. We don't have any registered speakers. Is there any here – one here that wants to address the panel?

40 MR MATTHEWS: Um, my – my name's James Matthews from Pacific Planning. Ah, this is a, um, Nicole the developer and owner, um, and we are here to if you've got any questions, but

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Any panel members with any questions for – in relation to this particular item?

45 MR JOHNSON: No. I don't. I don't. I'm pretty sure I'm happy.

MR O'CONNOR: Thanks, James.

MS SUTHERLAND: It's had quite a long history, by the look of it, already.

MR MATTHEWS: Mmhmm. Yes.

5 MR O'CONNOR: A very long history. Um, Maree, you?

MS TURNER: No.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Nothing? And Deb? No? I think we'll let you off the hook.
We're - - -

MR MATTHEWS: Thank you.

15 MR O'CONNOR: We're, again, quite comfortable with the council officer's report.
We've visited the site this afternoon and, um, we're, again, happy to endorse the
recommendation that's been put to us on page 813 – flows over to the top of 814 and,
again, the reasons will be as outlined in this report. That concludes this meeting of
the Parramatta Local Planning Panel. Thank you, council staff and – and recording
people and – and members of the public for attending.

20

MR MATTHEWS: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[4.58 pm]