



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1050132

**CITY OF PARRAMATTA COUNCIL**

**LOCAL PLANNING PANEL**

**RECORD OF COUNCIL MEETING**

**PANEL MEMBERS:**      **STEPHEN O'CONNOR (CHAIR)**  
                                 **DAVID RYAN**  
                                 **ALF LESTER**  
                                 **IAN GILBERTSON**

**DATE:**                      **3.34 PM, TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2019**

MR S. O'CONNOR: Good. Okay. Good afternoon, and welcome. My name's Steve O'Connor. I'm the chair of the Parramatta Local Planning Panel today. Joining me, I have David Ryan on my far left, Alf Lester, my immediate left, and Ian Gilbertson on my right. The City of Parramatta Council acknowledges the  
5 Burrattagal clan of the Darug, the traditional owners of Parramatta, and pays its respect to the elders both past and present. I just need to make you all aware that this public meeting will be recorded. 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 public gallery, you should be aware that your presence may be  
10 recorded. We don't have any apologies. We have a full complement, in terms of the members of the Parramatta Local Planning Panel. And declarations of interest, there's a – would you call it potential interest?

15 MR D. RYAN: Yes, perceived.

MR O'CONNOR: Perceived – potential perceived interest – conflict of interest in relation to items 6.5 and 6.6 for David Ryan, so when we get to the – towards the end of the matters that are before the planning panel this evening, David will excuse himself and leave the room, and we will still have a quorum to continue to deliberate  
20 in relation to those final two matters, which – which are planning proposals. So that brings us to item 5, which are – are two – well, 5.1 and 5.2 are two development applications. The first is for a dual-occupancy at 6 Bond Avenue, Toongabbie. I don't believe there's anyone here wanting to address the panel in relation to that item. If not, we have a recommendation before us - - -

25 MS C. STEPHENS: ..... up on the big screen. It's up on the big screen, if you want to have a look at it.

MR O'CONNOR: Terrific. Thank you. That certainly helps.

30 MS STEPHENS: Yes, it does.

MR O'CONNOR: And that is that we exercise the functions of council, pursuant to clause 4.1 – sorry, it should be section 1.4.16 - - -

35 MS STEPHENS: Yes, sorry. That – it should be section 1, yes.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, and grant development consent for this development application, subject to the conditions  
40 documented in the – the reports council officers prepared and are before us. Any members of the panel want to make any comments or say anything? No? We're all comfortable with the recommendation as it is and with the conditions, so I'll declare that carried unanimously.

45 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And the reasons are as stated in the report?

MR O'CONNOR: Correct, yes. Thank you for that.

MS STEPHENS: We've popped them up on the screen for you as well.

5 MR O'CONNOR: Great. Yes. There's – there's four reasons - - -

MS STEPHENS: Yes.

10 MR O'CONNOR: - - - all relating to the – the fairly minor variation of that development standard and the justification that's been provided to justify that particular variation to the development standard, a very minor variation indeed. That deals with item 5.1. Moving on to item 5.2, which is a modification application to modify – I think it's condition 3 of the development consent for a premises at unit 5, number 5 Clyde Street, Rydalmere. Again, I don't think there's anyone in the  
15 audience who's wishing to make a submission or presentation to the panel. In that case, we'll just go straight to the council officer's report. This is a fairly straightforward modification, just looking to change one condition – as I said, condition 3 – to give basically a two-year monitoring period to prevail, to allow council to assess how the particular development performs over that time. Any panel  
20 members wish to make any comments or – no? Once again, we're comfortable with the recommendation, so again, it will be unanimous that we grant development – development – that modification to the development consent which has been sought. That's the change to condition 3. And, again, for the reasons that are outlined in the report, just allowing that monitoring period. So now we'll move - - -

25

MS STEPHENS: I'll grab the strategic planners - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

30 MS STEPHENS: - - - because I get to - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

35 MS STEPHENS: - - - tag out.

MR O'CONNOR: That completes the development applications that we have to deal with this evening, but we have six planning proposals. These are proposals to change the zoning and the – and the planning controls that relate to the various parcels of land. Two of them – these planning proposals have already been endorsed  
40 as a preliminary stage and have been on public exhibition, and we've – we've received the feedback from the public exhibition. The other four are new planning proposals. And the role of the planning panel is simply to provide council with advice. We don't make a decision whether or not these planning proposals proceed or not proceed, but – that will be a council decision, but council is required to seek  
45 comments from the Local Planning Panel, and so our comments, whatever they might be, will be provided to council, and in due course, these matters will come before council for their consideration. Now, we do have two speakers in relation to

the first item, item 6.1, which is a planning proposal for land – or multiple parcels of land, being the Western Sydney University Parramatta Campus on James Ruse Drive, Collett Parade and Victoria Road and Pemberton Street. The first speaker is Jane Anderson. Jane is here?

5

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll start – we'll actually start with Michelle.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .....

MR O'CONNOR: Not a problem. Thank you. Michelle Le. You might want to come forward, take a seat.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Copy of the PowerPoint that's – might just - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - be a bit easier than looking at the screen.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Much appreciated. Ta.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And for members of the public, the presentation is also available on the screens.

25

MS LE: Yes. So thank you, Mr Chair and panel, for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. We are – I'm going to just provide a little bit of background and context to our planning proposal, and then I will hand over to Jane, who will take us through – through that proposal. So I think if we just go to the first slide in the – yes. Great.  
30 Thank you. So – so the university has been developing a campus network strategy that is responding to the changing needs of education for the region of Western Sydney. We are a multi-campus institution that is spread across Western Sydney, and we have 12 campuses currently spread across – across the region.

35 We have been reshaping the campus network to establish new vertical campuses in key centres of Western Sydney, and they are to complement the existing traditional campus network that we have always had. The – the university has very recently established its first vertical campus in Parramatta CBD at One Parramatta Square – so that's the Peter Shergold Building – and is very focused on delivering a second  
40 vertical campus in Parramatta city. So we have a – currently, a development proposal for the establishment of an engineering innovation hub in the CBD, within the proximity of the existing vertical campus.

45 So the university has really then looked at its Parramatta North campus located in Rydalmere – it's situated adjacent – or diagonally adjacent to the Parramatta South campus at Rydalmere – and has looked at developing a plan around transitioning away from that particular campus site; still focusing very much on growing and

developing at the Parramatta South campus, but focusing on moving off that Parramatta North campus. So our planning proposal before you today is in relation to that site. So I'll hand over to Jane. She can take us through the proposal.

5 MS ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr Chairman. My name is Jane Anderson, and I'm  
a senior urban planner at Architectus. Today I'm speaking on behalf of the  
applicant, Western Sydney University, and I will continue our presentation from  
where Michelle left off. This is the subject site. It is a 6.3 hectare site located in the  
suburb of Parramatta. The site is bound by Victoria Road to the south and James  
10 Ruse Drive to the east. There's existing low to medium-density residential  
development to the north and west. The site is currently occupied by student  
accommodation, decommissioned education buildings that are no longer used,  
overflow student car parking, and vegetation. Go to the next slide.  
The site is located approximately two kilometres from Parramatta city centre, or 10  
15 minutes by bus. To the east of the site is the Property New South Wales site and  
former Macquarie Boys' Technology High School, which is subject to a planning  
proposal that was approved at Gateway in September 2017. To the southeast of the  
site is the WSU Parramatta South campus, one of the largest Western Sydney  
University campuses. Next slide.

20 The planning proposal submitted to council proposes to rezone the site to part R4,  
high-density residential, and part B4, mixed use, increase the maximum building  
height to 28 to 84 metres, and increase the FSR to 1.59 to one. As you can see from  
these diagrams, the proposal mirrors the land uses and development controls  
25 proposed over the road at the Property New South Wales site. Next slide. A concept  
plan for the site was originally lodged to council in December 2017. Since then, the  
plan has been significantly reworked to directly respond to council's comments.  
Three workshops and one site visit were undertaken with council during 2018 and  
2019 to amend the concept plan.

30 This is the current concept plan. We consider that the workshops held with council  
were collaborative and have resulted in a strong scheme that responds to council's  
requirements and will ensure a well-connected, high-amenity, exciting new place is  
delivered for the people of Parramatta. Key features of the plan include strong east-  
35 west and north-south connections, a new pedestrian and bicycle bridge over James  
Ruse Drive, building heights that reflect the Property New South Wales site and  
transition down to existing residential neighbourhoods, a – a street pattern that  
protects sightlines with sky views to reduce perceptions of density, and land uses  
including new public open space, shared community space, retail uses and affordable  
40 housing.

The proposal has taken a precinct planning approach. We have considered the  
context of the current and future character of this part of Parramatta in detail: the  
new light rail stop at Parramatta – sorry, at Rydalmere, the Property New South  
45 Wales development, the Western Sydney University Parramatta South campus, and  
various existing proposals – existing and proposed schools, as well as existing  
transport connections. The proposed scheme is considered to be contextually

responsive in terms of scale, density and structure. Building heights respectfully transition down from north to south and from east to west. The street pattern unlocks a previously closed site and creates a walkable new neighbourhood. We just have a few more slides. I know we're running over time.

5

MR O'CONNOR: Three – three minutes.

MS ANDERSON: This diagram demonstrates that the proposed scale and density of the WSU site is in context with other major renewal areas in Greater Parramatta, including the Property New South Wales site and the Camellia site. The following slides describe why we consider the proposed controls justified. The land use zones mirror the surrounding sites, R4 to R4 and B4 to B4 along Victoria Road. The building heights mirror the surrounding sites, 84 metres to 84 metres and 28 metres to 28 metres. A site specific DCP will be prepared following the determination of the planning proposal to ensure development of the site is in line with the proposed concept plan.

Next slide. The concept plan includes building heights that reflect the Property NSW height, where appropriate, and provide a height transition to the north and to the west, to ensure the amenity of the adjoining properties will not be unreasonable impacted.

Next slide. This slide demonstrates that the proposed density on the WSU site is less than on the Property NSW site. The first diagram shows the WSU site area superimposed onto part of the Property NSW site. The number of dwellings per hectare is less, 174 versus 184. The second diagram shows that – what the FSR would be on each site, if equitable site areas and land uses were compared. The FSR on the WSU site is less.

Next slide. This slide demonstrates that the WSU site is well positioned for development. When compared to the Property NSW site, the WSU site has better access to bus stops, with 83 per cent of the site within a 200 metre walking catchment, compared to 32 per cent. It has better open – better access to public open space, with 16.4 per cent of the site proposed for public open space, compared to nine per cent. And it has better access to the surrounding active recreation areas.

Last slide. This slide talks about the benefits of the scheme. The redevelopment of the WSU Parramatta North Campus is in accordance with the – in accordance with the proposed controls and the proposed concept plan, would result in huge benefits for the people of Parramatta. The site will deliver a new connected neighbourhood that is integrated with the surrounding precinct. It will deliver housing diversity, including affordable housing. It will deliver retail opportunities within walking distance of public transport. It will deliver high amenity public open space, flooded with sunlight and protected from the noise of James Ruse Drive.

45

We have tested the capacity of the site and redevelopment, in accordance with the concept plan proposed, will not cause environmental, social, economic or

infrastructure burdens on council or surrounding neighbourhoods. We recommend the panel considers the proposed controls and the proposed concept plan for approval. Thank you.

5 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Jane. If you could just stay there, we might have a few questions for you.

MS ANDERSON: Of course.

10 MR O'CONNOR: I might start off, just a question around – there's, I think, three parcels of land. If we can go back to the slide – yes, we're coming back up - - -

MS ANDERSON: I will also introduce – some of our project team is here with some technical - - -

15

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MS ANDERSON: - - - consultants, as well.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Fine. Yes, there are three parcels of land, I think they front James Ruse Drive, that have been left out of your definition of the site but logically fall within the precinct you're talking about planning.

MS ANDERSON: That's right

25

MR O'CONNOR: Can you just talk to us about those? Why - - -

MS ANDERSON: Yes.

30 MR O'CONNOR: - - - they have been left out and what you think the ultimate - - -

MS ANDERSON: So the sites - - -

MR O'CONNOR: - - - destiny of those sites might be?

35

MS ANDERSON: Yes.

MS .....: Do you know what page those are?

40 MR O'CONNOR: If you go towards the end of the presentation. That's good enough. That one you just had there, if you go back.

MS .....: This one or the one - - -

45 MS ANDERSON: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, that one. That's fine. Just – thank you.

MS ANDERSON: If you go to the next one - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

5 MS ANDERSON: - - - that's our proposed plan. Yes.

MS .....: The one prior?

10 MS ANDERSON: Two down. Yes. Yes, so those lots are currently not in WSU ownership. Through our discussions with council, it was recommended that the lots be included for rezoning and so in our zoning plans, we include them in the R4 zone, and our concept plan provides a street address to those lots, so that if they were to develop in the future, they could be included within our scheme. The lots were not counted towards our site area. So our FSR does not include those lots. We do note  
15 the council scheme proposed excludes the lots from their zoning and so they would stay R3. And so we're not entirely sure what council propose to – how they propose to integrate those lots in the future.

20 MR O'CONNOR: But you would argue that they can be serviced by that future road that you're proposing?

MS ANDERSON: Through an internal road. That's right. Not from James Ruse Drive.

25 MR RIORDAN: Yes, I might just – hello, I'm John Riordan. I'm a town planner, as part of the project. So they could be serviced within the concept plan. And through a – through the rezoning process, we would envisage that we would have to prepare a development control plan. So we would also work at that stage, I suppose, to deal with interface issues and the relationship of those lands within the broader  
30 precinct.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Any quick questions?

35 MR LESTER: Just a quick question. There are actually three sites there.

MR RIORDAN: Sorry?

MR LESTER: There are three separate sites, as I understand it.

40 MS ANDERSON: That's right, yes.

MR LESTER: And only one of them would be directly accessed by a road. So are you suggesting that you would have to amalgamate them in some way or – in order to service all of them, if that was to form part of the development?

45 MR RIORDAN: Do you know .....



MS .....: It's – yes, actually the – the IPA ..... you could give, like, a right of way at the back of this lot, if James Ruse happens to be accessing there. So ..... that - - -

MR LESTER: Provided they agree?

5

MS .....: Yes. That's – that's if therefore, individually, but if it is amalgamated in the future ..... then, yes, we can do that. They can share that.

MR RIORDAN: I believe they can be accessed by James Ruse Drive.

10

MS ANDERSON: They are.

MR .....: There is a ..... as well, and also, the existing lot that's from ..... Avenue, ..... go through to make an east-west connection. I just note that that's actually council's DCP, as well, so hence the reason why, with the future planning of the site, not just ..... just in case those – those sites are included .....

15

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Other panel members or do you have further questions?

20

MR LESTER: Yes, I do. You mentioned public accessibility. When you talked about bus stops, you didn't mention rail. Would you like to talk about the rail accessibility - - -

MS ANDERSON: Yes. So - - -

25

MR O'CONNOR: Maybe we could go to that - - -

MR LESTER: - - - for the two sites - - -

30

MR O'CONNOR: - - - figure - - -

MR LESTER: - - - that you're comparing?

35

MR O'CONNOR: - - - on the presentation that has the circles around the bus stops, so a little bit further on. No, keep going. You will get there.

MS ANDERSON: One more? Yes. So this diagram - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

40

MS ANDERSON: The first diagram shows the portion of the site that's within a 200 metre walking distance of bus stops. We showed this diagram to compare how accessible the site is to public transport when we consider bus stops. Obviously, there's also the Rydalmere future light rail stop and the site is within an 800 metre walking distance of that site, as well. But through our discussions with council, the focus did seem to be on the light rail stop and seemed to forget the access to bus stops. The site is within a 10 minute bus commute to Parramatta City Centre and so

45

we consider that it is highly accessible. The future connection across James Ruse Drive would be a bicycle and pedestrian connection.

MR LESTER: So those bridge across, you mean?

5

MS ANDERSON: That's right. Yes. And that would link through the Property NSW site and provide even better access to the light rail stop, so it certainly is accessible to the light – light rail but, in this diagram, we really wanted to highlight that it's extremely accessible by rapid bus network, as well.

10

MR .....: Probably also contemplate there is the central metro west, as well, ..... either way, they're both ..... accessible within .....

MR RIORDAN: I think we felt, if I can just stay on the busses – so to the north there, you get the busses going to Parramatta, into Eastwood and then onto Chatswood. You get the busses going east-west between Parramatta, right into the city. So it does have this great serviceability by busses and in terms of, if you look at other areas – say if you look at the lower north shore of Sydney or the eastern suburbs, granted, there's a rail line in the eastern suburbs, but there's a lot of areas of the eastern suburbs that it's density has been based on – and the lower north shore, because of its bus systems. So from a town planning perspective, I think we take the view that the busses help justify the density, as well. Plus that future light rail stop.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Any further questions?

25

MR LESTER: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Go ahead.

MR LESTER: You mentioned the comparable densities between the two sites, but I noticed in the drawings, they appear to - - -

30

MS ANDERSON: Just go up one slide.

MR LESTER: - - - basically focus on part of the adjacent area.

35

MS ANDERSON: Yes. So - - -

MR LESTER: Rather than the totality of it.

40

MS ANDERSON: That's right. So - - -

MR LESTER: Have you examined the totality of it?

MS ANDERSON: I guess - - -

45

MR LESTER: And does the comparison still stand?

MS ANDERSON: Yes. So in these two diagrams, we firstly compared like for like site area onto the Property NSW site in their densest portion, which is that south-west corner. Just to show that, in fact, the dwellings per hectare on the WSU site is less. The second diagram shows a break up of how FSRs could be compared, when you  
5 compare like for like zones, as well as areas. And because the Property NSW site is so much larger, and slightly lower density in the northern portion, the FSRs don't come out the same when you compare them - - -

10 MR LESTER: If you took the total site then? Have you actually done that analysis?

MS ANDERSON: I might pass you over to ..... for - - -

MS .....: For – for, like, just ..... - - -

15 MR LESTER: For the – for the adjacent site.

MS .....: For the adjacent? For .....

20 MR LESTER: It's just unusual to take a segment of a site and then compare it with your site.

MS .....: I think – I'm pretty sure we've done that in one stage. I think we've probably .....

25 MR RIORDAN: Not too sure. We will have to check the .....

MS .....: Yes.

30 MR RIORDAN: This was – this was our ..... as a way of – as we went through the workshop with council, to get a like for like, because the way that we were going to do it by other means was not working, so we – we showed the breakdowns from ..... and if it's not clear enough, we can ..... detail. We did a lot of work for the council on that. This is just the – the snapshot. So if – I think for this – the image on the left, which is ..... density sort of flips the site area to the Property NSW site. The one on  
35 the right, which is ..... ratio is just outlines it to the zone. So it was really more of a zone comparison. I think what you were trying to get at was the one on the – the right sort of mirroring it, that we were sort of saying, if you took the zoned areas, or the – the zones that we're proposing, this is kind of how the ..... actually cut, rather than a site FSR, which is what is - - -

40

MR LESTER: It is fairly normal to take a total site and to do your comparison for that total site, rather than take a section. It just may twist one way or the other in terms of - - -

45 MR O'CONNOR: Just before you ask your next question, just forgetting the Property NSW site, the difference between the 1.4 that council has – staff have

recommended, and the 1.59 that you're seeking, can you tell me what the approximate difference in dwelling numbers on - - -

MS ANDERSON: It's 142.

5

MR O'CONNOR: - - - site would be? Like, is it 2000 compared to 2200 or - - -

MS ANDERSON: No, it's 142.

10 MR O'CONNOR: Sorry?

MS ANDERSON: 142.

MR O'CONNOR: 142?

15

MS ANDERSON: Yes.

MR LESTER: Okay.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Thanks. Yes, go ahead. Ian, any questions? David?

MR RYAN: Just so I can be clear, so the – we've got two versions before us, yours and the – the council's, both in terms of the LEP amendments and the DCP. And the layout and the DCP is obviously quite different. The council's version is quite  
25 different to yours, and that's reflective of the – obviously, the zone boundaries and follow. I understand there have been some discussions with council in relation to the – the DCP layout. Do you still maintain that the – your own layout is the one that you want us to pursue? And hence the LEP - - -

30 MS ANDERSON: So I will just outline, we did have – we originally submitted the planning proposal and concept planning December 2017. So that was more than 18 months ago now and since then, we've had three very structured workshops and a site visit with council. And through those structure workshops, we really tried to  
35 focus on urban design issues. And the concept plan that we propose now, we think is really the best option for the site. On the handouts that you've got, we have a table on the – attached to the front, which provides a summary of the comments that received from council, and how they've addressed them and how we've addressed them. And, in each case, I think that our concept plan does deliver a better outcome for the site. I'm sure our team has other comments on that, as well.

40

MR RIORDAN: I guess it's – I mean, where – on council's scheme, they've included those additional three sites, as well. So that skews the numbers a little bit more. As they're not in our planning proposal currently. Also, I think, as well, I feel that we did – we did go through those – a number of workshops and did quite a  
45 considerable amount of work that has been done behind the scenes in order to come to this outcome, and I think that we have so worked quite collaboratively with council most definitely. There were a number of comments that council stated

originally they didn't like but then once we worked them through the workshop, you know, then they incorporated it into their own scheme. They did. Equally, on our side as well, you know, having the single portion of open space we feel is really the best outcome ..... for the site. So we would be open to working with council,  
5 continuing to work with council as we go through the DCP – site specific DCP. But, currently, where we're at today – we're very proud of ..... it's very good.

MR RYAN: All right. So the recommendation before us is to adopt the council's version. You're putting to us that you want your version as it is both in LEP and  
10 DCP terms adopted.

MR RIORDAN: And if I can just add to that. We have valued the working process from council. But it was a really strong engagement process over the last – what has been many months that we've been working with council, particularly the urban  
15 designer team. Also as well, we've done a lot of technical studies, which I don't know if they're attached to your papers. But there's an awful lot of reports that have been done on the infrastructure and transport and economics, and I'm sure I've missed one.

20 MR O'CONNOR: We have volumes.

MR RIORDAN: Yes. As you can see. There's a lot of work there. And a lot of those studies was to do that sort of common town planning test to test the capacity of the land in terms of the – of the FSR. So those reports are confirming that the FSR  
25 of 1.59 to 1 is acceptable and it works. It won't create a burden to, say, traffic systems or things like that. So – yes. We do stand by that concept plan that is being presented in the Architectus's documents and papers.

MR RYAN: Yes. Go ahead, Ian.  
30

MR GILBERTSON: If we were to accept the council's recommendation what problems do you see that would put onto you by using that as a practical – I'm not a planner. I'm a community person. And I'm looking for some practical – why would you – what problems would you see?  
35

MR RIORDAN: Well, I think it's – it is based on the comparison work that you've done.

MS .....: Yes.  
40

MR RIORDAN: I might pass to the urban designer to - - -

MS .....: So I think what Townsville proposing is – at the moment it's – it is a larger block. So what we try and doing or plan is based on the workshop with the council before. They do prefer a bit more like a regular grid layer, which is good for  
45 ..... plans. And it's also a finer grain. It's easier for, you know, walking distance, because when you have a finite rain you have a better permeability so people don't

have to rely on cars, for example. So we do rely a lot on those permeability and creating the sample space, which is, I think, during the discussion with council in – from their maintenance issue that’s also better for them, because it has consolidated the recreational area. And the fact that it’s focused on the central of the land – it’s, like, everyone has an equal access to the recreational area, so that it’s, I think, one of the main points for the updated client.

MR O’CONNOR: I’ve just got a question. Kept looking at the two zoning plans before us. Your scheme has the R4 and the B4 zones. Northern and the southern portion of the site. The council plan has an RE1 zone. Basically in the middle where they’re proposing their open space area. Is there any reason why you haven’t opted to – because you have in your - - -

MS ANDERSON: So public open space is permissible in both R4 and B4. So we would still be able to achieve the open space, and it would be locked in through the site specific DCP. We felt that providing a more regular zoning pattern that reflected the property in New South Wales site would be a better option for the site, while still be able to achieve the open space that is required.

MR O’CONNOR: So you’re saying the property in New South Wales site – it – well, it’s disappeared again, but - - -

MS ANDERSON: It’s disappeared. It’s also the two zones.

MR O’CONNOR: It just has the two zones. It hasn’t tried to identify where the open space areas might be.

MS ANDERSON: That’s right. Yes.

MR .....: I think the recommendation that council got in their report is the same zone as what we represented. I know they have the only one in scheme that they’ve assessed, but I don’t think that’s actually the recommendation.

MR O’CONNOR: Yes. It’s actually shown as the proposed controls for the site.

MS ANDERSON: But in their recommendation up front they recommend B4 and R4.

MR .....: ..... yes ..... outline ..... in hindsight, recommendation should have been updated .....

MR O’CONNOR: So that’s council’s intention.

MR .....: Yes.

MR O’CONNOR: Yes.

MR .....: Yes. That's ..... before.

MR O'CONNOR: So if there's no further questions from panel members - - -

5 MR RYAN: Just one thing. I mean, as you say, we're in a – one way or the other.  
Everyone is agreeing that it should be rezoned, so there's not an issue there. But  
we're still a way – even though you're saying you've taken on board a lot, and there  
has been some good discussions, you're still not there yet in terms of getting council  
signed up to your view. Is there any more discussion to be had or – as far as you're  
10 concerned, this is really it, and - - -

MR .....: I think we've adequately justified the planning controls. We've  
dropped to ..... of 1.75. We've worked ..... with council. We have a good working  
relationship with council. We all agree on the site specific strategic merit of it. It  
15 really comes down to the COMSAT plan and how you cut it. And we've done a lot  
of work on that. And we would be willing to do more. But I think that what we've  
proposed – and I think all of our technical studies really back this up – is that the site  
can handle maximum controls of 83 metres height that transition to the north, south,  
east and west. And they can handle ..... control of 1.59, and provide a density – a  
20 dwelling per hectare number that is lower than the properties on some point. So  
we're very confident that – the question should be why should we drop it down to  
1.4.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Well - - -  
25

MR .....: I think there's a number of other issues as well at the site, including the  
bridge, and potential acquisition of other sites in order to ..... so I think, you know,  
there will be further negotiations we have through the BPA discussion through the  
site specific DCP. But I think the reports are very, very strong.  
30

MR RYAN: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Right. There's no further questions. Thank you very much for  
your submissions. The panel might retire to have a discussion, and we have to be  
35 back soon to tell you what will be recommended to council. Mind you, council will  
be the decision-maker in terms of whether it proceeds for a gateway.

40 **ADJOURNED** [4.11 pm]

**RESUMED** [4.33 pm]

45 MR S. O'CONNOR: Well, we thank you for your patience. We have reached a  
decision on the guidance we'd like to give council. I've got four points that I will  
read out slowly so you can take them down. The first point is that the panel supports

the proposed R4 and B4 rezoning of the site and in the manner shown on the applicant's proposal, the proponent's proposal, not with the RE1 zone inserted, as council had mentioned when asked the question. So we're supportive of the proposed rezoning. In terms of floor space ratio, which seems to be the most  
5 contentious issue, we would be supportive of a 1.4 to 1 ratio up to a 1.5 to one ratio, subject to a comprehensive traffic management plan demonstrating that move from 1.4 to 1.5 can be achieved with satisfactory traffic impacts.

We'd be looking to see a minimum of 20 per cent of the site set aside as open space,  
10 and we'd recommend that be in a consolidated rather than in a fragmented manner. And the final point is that we'd be looking for a transition, in terms of heights, that the buildings on the site to the development to the west, similar to what council has proposed in its proposal. So they're the four points we would recommend to council they keep in mind to have regard to when they're considering the council office's  
15 report when it's submitted to council. Okay. I can double-check that at the end of the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will get a ..... with you later.

20 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. And thank you for your presentations and council staff, as well, for their input. So that brings us to item 6.2, which is - - -

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry. Excuse me. Isn't it a – it's a requirement that you give reasons for your decision.  
25

MR O'CONNOR: To have reasons.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

30 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. The reasons for our decision relate to the strong justification provided in the planning proposal for the increased density of development on the site. Secondly, the – we've had due regard to the New South Wales property planning proposal on the land to the east and believe that establishes appropriate guidelines to be followed. Do panel members have any other reasons  
35 they want to - - -

MR LESTER: Do we actually have to give reasons for planning proposals?

40 MR O'CONNOR: I'm not sure that we do, but I'm comfortable in providing those two reasons. Yes. Just those two reasons. Thank you. As I said, item 2 is a post-exhibition outcome in relation to the planning proposal for 23 to 27 Harold Street in Parramatta. Now, we do have quite a few people who've requested permission to address the panel in relation to this application. I'm going to take them in the order that they're listed on the document that's been given to me. If I miss anyone, you  
45 know, I will certainly give an opportunity for anyone who I might have overlooked to have their opportunity to speak.



So when your name's called out, if you wouldn't mind coming forward, sitting down next to the microphone. You're allocated a maximum of three minutes to be able to make the points you want to make to the panel. As the chair, I've got the discretion to be able to extend that if that's deemed appropriate. But you don't have to take  
5 three minutes. You can just take the time that you might feel comfortable with that's less than three minutes. So can we start with Laurie Bennett. Is Laurie here? Do you mind coming forward, Laurie.

10 MR L. BENNETT: Good afternoon. My name is Laurie Bennett. And I'm here to help provide you with some information about the proposal for 23, 25, 27 Harold Street. Now, I've been a long term resident adjoining this development site, for over 70 years, and my family has been in the area for just under 200 years, so I think we know what's been of concern to the area and what's gone on. Now, as a community  
15 member, I can feel confident in saying there is a good deal of community concern about this development proposal. It's come out of nowhere. It hasn't been through a planning proposal stage. On top of that, our examination of the available information is there's no overall comprehensive study for this North Parramatta precinct, which looks at the major issues of the public spaces, traffic, parking, the views and the size of the building. It's overshadowing of nearby developments and houses.

20 The – any wind effects that may be created by these very large buildings – and they're over 25 storeys high, as I understand, and the one on this site is a bit more. So – and on top of that, I perceive that if these development goes ahead without proper investigation and consideration, there'll be a rush of developments into this  
25 North Parramatta precinct, trying to get exactly what has been proposed here without – and the community won't have any protection at all with an overall strategy of what's best for the community's interests and will be based on what's best for the proponents, and I think that's a matter of great concern. I'm sure you'd be concerned about that too, because the community's interest does have some say in these  
30 meetings. And I would hope that you would recognise that that's equally as important as the proponent.

The proponent, in my opinion, has gone for an ambit claim. You know, the zoning is quite clear currently. It's worked well within the community. And the community,  
35 on the whole, has not significantly objected to it, because the plan currently has a well thought-out transition strategy between the high rise on Church Street and adjoining sites back to the very dense residential areas of both three-story walk-ups and single story cottages. And I would have thought that this claim really needs to be considered in the overall concept of a study which looks at all people's interests,  
40 you know, about the area, because it's not an insignificant development in its own right.

And conjoined with other proposal adjoining, which is 470 Church Street, there will be over – what was it – 420 residents. And if you take it at about 2.2 people per unit,  
45 we're talking 1000 people in a very small stretch of one little suburban street in North Parramatta. And I think that just should not go ahead. I know the local school, the North Parramatta Public School, if you've had a chance to have a look at

it. They haven't got room to swing a cat in, let alone put any more demountables in there. And when I spoke to the principal about it, they had no solutions. But, equally so, the Education Department hasn't responded as to their capacity to handle – if you get 1000 people, how many kids are you going to get out of there?

5

MR O'CONNOR: Can you wrap up now, please?

MR BENNETT: Yes. Sure. No. Well, I think I've just highlighted a few of the points, let alone the heritage issue. It's a very rich heritage area. I did a listing off the state's heritage website. I got over 430 sites north of the river between Parramatta Park and, basically, Buller Street. And that shows that it's got a very significant link to our past, which I think is important and should be recognised and it needs a sympathetic treatment as well. So I do thank you for your time. And Mr Jim Colman will obviously carry on with some of the points that I raised as well. So thank you very much.

10  
15

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Laurie. James Colman. Thank you, James.

MR J. COLMAN: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Mr Chairman, before I start, I've got some documents I'd like to table, not necessarily for you to read immediately, but I'd like to make sure each member of the panel has got it. I've also got copies for the proponent and for the council. So can I just table those now?

20

MR O'CONNOR: Certainly can. Yes.

25

MR COLMAN: That's for the council.

MR O'CONNOR: That's not the right way.

MR COLMAN: And for the applicant.

30

MR O'CONNOR: That's behind you.

MR COLMAN: And for the members.

35

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

MR COLMAN: And having said that, would I be permitted to speak for five minutes instead of three?

40

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. I'm happy.

MR COLMAN: Thank you very much.

MR O'CONNOR: That's fine.

45

MR COLMAN: Mr Chairman, I'm an architect and planner with some 40 years experience, internationally and locally. I'm a fellow of the Australian Institute of Architects. I'm a fellow of the Planning Institute of Australia. And I teach at three Sydney universities part time. So today I'm speaking to my submission, which is of the 30<sup>th</sup> of May, on behalf of Mr Laurie Bennett. The documents which I've supported – which I've handed up support our case. Today, we respectfully suggest to the panel that you're in the driver's seat when it comes to the future of North Parramatta as a well-planned precinct and a precinct which is ideally suited to the kind of local strategy which our Minister is promoting at the moment.

10 It is one of the oldest urban precincts in Australia. Parts of it are older than The Rocks in Sydney. So it's truly a threshold moment for you today. Why do we say it's a threshold? Because the proposal before you, if gazetted, will provide statutory power to approve the current DA for this site. And if that DA is approved, construction of the area's very first 25, 80 metre high building, will follow. And I want you to be clear on one point: although it's described as a slender tower, it is not slender by any means as the drawings clearly show. As you probably know, the proposal in the – there is a proposal for the adjoining site, on the Church Street corner. So yet another PP for zoning changes to the enlarged CBD is also in the pipeline.

20 And in my professional opinion, it's a statutory planning shambles, which we've got here at the moment. These two sites in Harold Street, separate architects, separate planners, separate design consultants, separate DCPs, separate VPAs and adjoining sites, believe it or not. There's been no evidence that real effort has gone into trying to bring those sites together, to get a quality resolution for that important corner. So in document after document, we are being – promised what is called “design excellence and visions.” But what about good urban design?

30 Grandiose towers and spot rezonings which are not favoured by the current Minister, by the way, seem to be in the order of the day. Whilst the public domain is neglected and awaits skilled attention. The vital point here, Mr Chairman, is that nothing has yet been built. The Council's own model, you've got a photo of that here, makes the point very clearly. Approval of the – of the subject DA and its partner will trigger the transformation of this historic gateway area into the city and make it what will – it could well become an urban wasteland dominated by poorly related towers such as are currently being proposed and which we'll see in parts of downtown Parramatta, and certainly in the CBD of Sydney.

40 So “design excellence” is starting to mean nothing here. It's the public domain which will suffer. And because we don't have a proper plan for the public domain, this proposal is being considered in a – in a vacuum. I think you have three options. You can adopt the Council's recommendations in toto. That will surely be the kiss of death for North Parramatta. Because it will open the floodgates for more massive buildings and it will make it almost impossible to prepare a proper urban design strategy in line with what the Minister wants us to do. Or you can reject

recommendations B to G. Or you can recommend to the Council that it defer the matter.

5 And Mr Bennett and I strongly urge you to take that line. Because there's still time to get a good local strategy in place. Minister Stokes requires such action, have a look at yesterday's Herald. It would be in the interests of good strategic planning as well as in the wider public interest. And we suggest, with respect, that your brief from the Government surely requires that a Ministerial directive for local strategies is given full support. What we are advocating for North Parramatta is a dedicated plan.  
10 No more ad hoc rezonings, no more flying blind on this matter. The opportunity to prepare such a plan will be lost the minute these spot rezonings are gazetted and the bricks are laid.

15 Such a plan will, obviously, embrace heritage. As you walk around, you cannot miss the extraordinary richness of the local heritage. Council files show over 400 listed items, as Mr Bennett has proven with his schedule, and many of them dating back to the 1880s, 1800s, when Church Street was just a part of the old road to Windsor. We expect our Local Planning Panel to be an independent, open-minded advocate for good planning. That means making sure that urban design chaos of downtown  
20 Parramatta is not repeated here in the north. Endorsement of our recommendation will be a move towards meeting Minister Stokes directive.

The urgency is clear. Because of what you have today is the first in the north which has advanced to DA stage. We have a chance to make, take a breather, and to get the  
25 controls right, before construction commences. So let me finish. You'll be pressured by the proponents to support the subject proposal. They will tell you that there should be no more delay. All the boxes have been ticked. But we say that the most important box cannot yet be ticked, because it does not exist. There is no dedicated Strategic Plan for North Parramatta to provide the context for what is  
30 currently being proposed. Fortunately, as we'll see from the documents that I've handed up, most of the research has been done.

We wouldn't be starting from scratch. There's been an enormous amount of study done by the consultants, by the Council, by others. By the state and Federal  
35 Government. So the – the material is there. It just needs somebody just to crack the whip and get stuck into producing the kind of plan that we have in mind. So there's no – there's no need to delay any further. Let's get the job finished while there is time. Now, we say that it is not your business to accede to private interest pressures or impatient consultants. Your business is to support the cause of good planning.  
40 First and foremost, in the public interest. And the public interest has nothing to do with high FSRs, dubious claims of "design excellence," or developer pressure. Thank you for your time, Mr Chairman.

45 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you James, if you could – great. Thank you. Our next speaker is Cheryl Bates.

MR COLMAN: And this – it's for the Chairman, it's just a copy of the – Draft Resolution.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

5

MS C. BATES: Can I - - -

MR O'CONNOR: You can proceed.

10 MS BATES: Okay. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this matter. My name is Cheryl Bates. And I'm the President of the National Trust, Parramatta Regional Branch. The National Trust opposes this Planning Proposal for several reasons. The reasons can be summarised as the Development Application will have a disproportionate floor space and result in a building that is too tall for its setting.  
15 And have a significant impact on the adjoining heritage item Currawong and bordering Sorrell Street Heritage Conservation Area. As a broader consequence, this ad hoc approach to individual planning proposals is counterproductive to a more considered approach for planning in the area.

20 Firstly, the Trust rejects the conclusions of the Heritage Interface Study of 2017. Their statements provide an over simplistic heritage assessment and rely on a separation distance of 21 metres between the proposed building and the dwelling Currawong. This is a misleading calculation. As a setback on the proposal's eastern boundary, adjoining Currawong is only three metres. And with the remaining 18  
25 metres setback being the curtilage around Currawong. This curtilage provides the dwelling setting and contains a number of outbuildings that form part of the historic significance of Currawong.

30 We understand Accepted Planning Principles take into consideration that impacts associated with a development should be contained on the proposed site. To allow only a three metre setback from the Currawong Boundary and a vertical building height of 70 metres or 81 and 21 storeys with the design excellence provisions, this will create a totally unacceptable overshadowing, visual and sound problems. And, importantly, a bulky overbearing presence beside a two-storey heritage item. The  
35 Parramatta CBD Heritage Study conducted by Urbis in 2015 highlighted the importance of the Heritage Conservation area to the history of Parramatta and identified a number of properties as heritage items.

40 The Urbis study sensibly recommends a height transition with a maximum floor space ratio of three to one between the Heritage Conservation Area and the higher density development along Church Street. The current Planning Proposals provides, excuse me, the current Planning Controls provide this transition in a way that doesn't unduly impact on the conservation area or Currawong. Additionally, the Department of Planning's Heritage Report completed by GML Heritage recommended that the  
45 current controls continued to apply for this site. The proposal abandons this transitional approach. And the Trust fails to see how this can be described as an acceptable response to the heritage item and Heritage Conservation Area.

Second, the ad hoc approach to individual planning proposals is counterproductive to a proper planned approach for the area, as witnessed by a similar Planning Proposal for the adjoining property at 470 Church Street. The 470 Church Street Proposal sought a similar floor space ratio. But at the last Council meeting, that matter was  
5 deferred for further consideration. The current planning controls for the area provide a rational and logical approach for a lower density and height from Church Street to the conservation area. To allow this spot rezoning and development would result in an uncoordinated and haphazard approach to planning in Parramatta and have a detrimental impact on important heritage items and conservation areas.

10 These major changes to the development potential of properties, even when the zoning is unchanged, should be dealt with more strategically rather than individual Planning Proposals.

15 MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Cheryl.

MS BATES: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Next, we have Paul Rappoport.

20 MR A. BYRNES: Paul. I'll just say all, good morning to you. We've registered seven. We've been – we'll try to be a bit more efficient than that, I'm sure – you'll be pleased to hear. So there's three of us that would like to - - -

25 MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR BYRNES: - - - present. I wouldn't mind just kicking off - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Not a problem with me.

30 MR BYRNES: - - - and almost MC-ing, if that's all right. And then I'll hand you to - - -

MR O'CONNOR: As long as the rest of your team's happy with that.

35 MR BYRNES: All right. Thank you, sir.

MR O'CONNOR: Just state your name for the record.

40 MR A BYRNES: Sure. Thanks. My name's Adam Byrnes and I'm Director of Think Planners. I'd be happy to respond to any of the concerns raised by – the people that have presented submissions, thus far. And happy to respond to any or – any particular questions from – the panel in that regards. But I guess, I'd like to just sort of step you through the process for this PP. Not so much in detail about the  
45 process, but the – I guess, the way in which we've sought to address these issues of heritage and transition between Church Street, which is obviously where the light rail

is at one end of the block and the other end of the block, which is the Heritage Conservation Area.

I think it's fair to say – as you well know; the site sits outside the Heritage  
5 Conservation. And it's fair to say that the work that has gone on in this site, in this  
area has been substantial. It's been significant since April 2015. The Council's been  
involved in a City Centre Strategy. It's been tested by numerous studies, including  
traffic reports, Heritage Reports, has – has received a gateway from the Department  
of Planning. And I think it's fair to say there's been significant strategic work and  
10 good planning that's been undertaken in relation to this site and surrounds. In  
relation to this issue of, I guess, “What are we going to do about this – about – of  
approximate Heritage Conservation Area?”

I'd like to address that through both Planning Proposal steps that have been taken at  
15 that stage. I'd like to talk through – Paul about the heritage con – heritage issues,  
and then talk through, via Phillippe, the response that's embedded in the Design  
Excellence Competition that's responded to heritage issues and, indeed, the DA  
that's applicable to the site. First of all, the planning, a Planning Proposal has been  
amended throughout the process. We did lodge this in 2015. And we did, initially,  
20 include the house on the corner of Harold and Sorrell. So we – had an option over  
that site.

And as a result of discussions with Council, Council said, “Actually, we think it's  
inappropriate to include that site and to try and drag the FSR off that site onto 23-27.  
25 We'd like you to exclude it.” And that – we did through the process. So we haven't  
thought to sort of include it and drag FSR off the site. I think what's really important  
to understand here is the way in which the DCP has been intentionally developed to  
provide the transition between the quite hard edge urban design – urban fabric at the  
Church Street end and the Sorrell Street end, the heritage fabric. So the DCP for this  
30 site bucks the trend. What it does here is, as you well know, in Parramatta CBD we  
– the idea is for hard edge podiums to the front of – zero setbacks on the site, with a  
recessed tower.

The only one – the only site I know of in Parramatta that bucks the trend is this one  
35 where they've sought to, in the DCP, incorporate, I'll be – I'll be quick, incorporate  
setbacks to the podium. So we provide a four-metre front setback to provide a deep  
soil zone, a three-metre side setback and a 12-metre rear setback. In order to, at that  
ground level, to provide that transition and experience as you move from – from  
Church Street through to – to Harold Street. So that's been a very deliberate  
40 response to the heritage context in the – in the built form. Perhaps I will hand it to  
Paul, given it – given the time, to just talk about how this works from a heritage  
perspective.

Then I might ask Phillippe just to talk about the – the design elements that have been  
45 incorporated into the proposal as a result of the Design Excellence Competition that  
– that have had regard to the heritage element, the heritage to our east. You happy  
with that if I hand it to Paul?

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Adam.

MR BYRNES: And maybe if I could get one minute to wrap up at the end, that'd be appreciated. But as you – as you choose.

5

MR O'CONNOR: Sure.

MR P. RAPPOPORT: Thank you. My name is Paul Rappoport; I'm a heritage architect and consultant. I've been involved in this project for the last four years. So we got in quite quickly, quite early on in the process, as heritage architects, looking specifically at setbacks and curtilage. And one of the main reasons why I find this project, now, to be successful is that there is a very decent setback from Currawong, the heritage house, of 21 metres to the tower. And there is – almost an equivalent setback from the Sorrell Street Conservation Area to the tower.

15

So in terms of heritage involvement in the – from the applicant's point of view, I believe they got good advice, in the beginning, to set this tower as far away as possible from Currawong and from the Sorrell Street conservation area. And those are basically my issues. I think that the curtilage also works quite well because of the setback, and that's really all I wanted to say. Thank you.

20

MR O'CONNOR: You've left some more time for Adam. That's fine. Thank you, Paul. And Felipe? Felipe Miranda.

MR F. MIRANDA: Just so I can give a bit of background in terms of the design of the building itself, so it actually did go through a design excellence competition where three architects were involved in coming up with a scheme. The scheme which my office, so Cox Architecture, provided was the winner. It was unanimously selected by the panel, which included Kim Christani, Lee Hillam and Jonathan Knapp, and the – I guess the proposal was on the basis of how well we actually responded to the heritage item on the corner of Sorrell Street and Harold Street, Currawong, and the reason that we actually went to a lot of lengths in our design philosophy in terms of the design concept is that we actually took the existing sort of Italianate and filigree patterns that were actually in Currawong and actually adopted the proportions of the house into the façade that we actually developed further.

35

So the building itself was a respectful sort of reference of the house at 53 Sorrell Street, but we adapted the – I guess the proportions in an innovative way, and I guess that's why the building actually looks the way it does today. In terms of the design principles itself, we do have a three-storey podium. Now, the idea of the three-storey podium is that it actually does link to the actual house in the corner, so we wanted to maintain that line. So as you read the building from – coming from Sorrell Street and going into Harold Street, that there was a distinct datum line that actually applied to the house in the corner.

45

So the way that you experience the building from the street at the human scale was – was similar to the way that you actually experienced the house in the corner, and,



you know, one of the important aspects for us was to ensure that down at that lower level when you're down at the ground level, you do have a feeling that, you know, the proportions and the craftsmanship that is in the materiality down at the bottom actually do match what's actually down at the conservation area. You know, we took that quite seriously.

So I would say that the building is then split up into two sort of portions, so the lower part of the building the podium level, the proportions are much more detailed and much more granular. It actually deals a lot more with the – with finer details in terms of the balustrading as well as the articulation of the screens, and then above the three-story podium we use much more vertical proportions. So one of the things in the design itself is that we have dual columns that actually face the Harold Street façade, and the dual columns are also evident at the house at 53 Sorrell Street, and there – again, there is that link between, you know, the heritage, you know, referencing the heritage but adapting it, you know, in a beautiful manner.

The other thing that we actually did work through, since the DA got – or since we won the design excellence competition, the design panel actually said to us, look, it would be great to add another level of – level of design excellence by actually incorporating the work of an artist as well, and the proponent did at our – at our discussions to actually engage Brett McMahon, who's an artist that we've worked through previously, just to ensure that the actual articulation of the balustrading and the finer elements in the screens down at the base actually have that extra level of connection to the heritage, so – and that's something that was quite a great thing to do in a DA such as this one, and something that we don't typically do, and that's, you know, to the applicant's sort of, you know, consistent sort of, you know, ensuring that there is design excellence imbedded in the design from the beginning. Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Felipe. And that brings you back on, Adam. Yes.

MR BYRNES: I'll be very quickly. Yes. Thank you. So just in conclusion, from a planning proposal point of view, we say there has been good planning, good strategic work done here. It's probably important – and I don't want the panel to be muddled by the various heritage studies that have been completed. It's very clear that the heritage study that is currently adopted by – by the council, reinforced recently in a report to council in June, is for this site, the subject site, to still maintain a six to one FSR on the site, and – and the ability to achieve that, so too the site to the – to our west. However, the current position of council is to, of course, protect the – and not change the zonings along Harold Street – sorry – Sorrell Street.

It's important to note that the Heritage Office is in support of this proposal. They've raised no objection. They're happy with the setbacks and the way in which we've dealt with it. And I know we've gone to the detail of a DA, but I just wanted to sort of make it clear that we've gone from, I guess, go to whoa very much with a heritage emphasis, not only in the PP but so too the design excellence competition brief, the design excellence competition winning scheme, and through to the architecture in the

DA that has now been submitted and before council since July this year. Thank you for your time, and - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Adam.

5

MR BYRNES: I'd be happy to respond to any questions.

MR O'CONNOR: There's no one else to speak in relation to this matter, I don't think. Any questions from any panel members before – I suspect we need to retire to discuss this, so - - -

10

MR LESTER: Just one quick question.

MR O'CONNOR: Sure.

15

MR LESTER: You've talked about – generally about design and the relationship with the heritage study. We've heard a lot about curtilage and setback.

MR BYRNES: Yes.

20

MR LESTER: And apart from the reference to six to one support and FSR, has there been any direct relationship between the scale of the heritage element or building and the scale of the adjacent building? Has that been specifically referred to? Because I don't think we've had the benefit of either Felipe's work or the detailed heritage studies, so we're only reading abstracts of most of that material.

25

MR BYRNES: So it's certainly in Paul's report that I believe was before you, and Paul's report certainly talks to – when you're saying scale, I'm assuming you mean height.

30

MR LESTER: Right.

MR BYRNES: Yes. And I'm just madly racing through his concluding points, which – one of which states future development of the site, which is at the fringe of the Sorrell Street conservation area, would serve to make the heritage item Currawong and the conservation area a more readily identifiable part of Parramatta's historic urban fabric. And so in the report, obviously there's different ways in which you can respond to a heritage area. Do we – do we cascade this thing down? Can anyone even understand that when they're in the street? Or, in fact, do we try and make it so obvious that we're in a heritage conservation area by virtue of contrast of those areas that are different outside of the heritage conservation area?

35

40

And so that's spoken about in the report, that the way in which this tower, which is outside the heritage conservation area, helps to recognise the heritage conservation area is, by virtue of contrast – the quintessential example that everyone uses is the difference between Circular Quay and The Rocks. It's clear – it's self-evident that you – when you leave the Circular Quay area and enter The Rocks, because of the

45

change in scale. It's a similar approach here, and that's why we've then spoken about the curtilage, because what happens and how do you separate those changes in scale? So we're very happy with embracing that change of scale, but at the same time, we think we need to separate it, and also deal with the podium transition as well. That's why the podium is set back with the deep soil in front.

MR LESTER: Thank you.

MR RAPPOPORT: If I can just add one little point in answer to that question from a heritage point of view. If you take the 21-metre setback, which is equivalent to, if it were that way, seven storeys, and the height of 25, it's roughly one-third in length versus the height. So that is a workable scale as far as we're concerned in terms of heritage.

MR O'CONNOR: Any other questions after – David, over to you.

MR RYAN: You've heard the neighbours concerned about the lack of strategic planning for North Parramatta in this area, and I think your response was that has occurred – that had occurred in the context of the overall Parramatta CBD study extension over to this area, but I understand that to be your position in terms of strategic planning.

MR BYRNES: That's absolutely my position, and I'm happy to talk more to that, but yes. Yes.

MR RYAN: So in its own right as it stands in the absence of the outcome of the Parramatta CBD study being a PP and the zoning changes to it, it does stand in stark – it doesn't have a context that this would fit into as a site specific PP. It's reliant on the context being given to it by the implementation of the Parramatta CBD PP?

MR BYRNES: No. I don't accept that. I don't accept that there's a – that everywhere we look from here is a two-storey heritage conservation area. You've only got to look along Church Street and you can see an established – there's existing 15-storey, I think, apartment buildings to the north, about one or two blocks to the north of here, so this is an area in transition, and you've only got to stand on Church Street and look to the south and it's very – it's self-evident there's a 57-storey Meriton building here. There is – there is – yes. I totally disagree with that view that this area is incapable of being perceived as one of in transition. There is no doubt it's in transition. There's no doubt things are happening on Church Street. Yes, as you head to the east, Sorrell Street does – is different. We respect that and we're trying to embrace that.

MR RYAN: So you're saying it's an area in transition.

MR BYRNES: Yes.

MR RYAN: But that transition is being given effect to by the Parramatta Council's CBD study.

MR BYRNES: Not – not in - - -

5

MR RYAN: And the PP associated with it. Or are you saying that there are - - -

MR BYRNES: Sorry.

10 MR RYAN: - - - other areas adjoining to – not necessarily to your east, but to your south - - -

MR BYRNES: Both south and - - -

15 MR RYAN: - - - that are subject to other processes? I mean, they would need to go through their own – the process that you've been going through - - -

MR BYRNES: Absolutely.

20 MR RYAN: - - - in order to give effect to the transition that you're talking about, wouldn't it?

MR BYRNES: Absolutely. So we also represent the site immediately to the west of this, and that's also got the PP in action on it, 6.9 to one FSR as well, 25, 26-storey  
25 building as well. But not only are we just relying upon the CBD planning framework, those buildings that exist have occurred outside of this CBD strategy. This CBD strategy has certainly been in existence since April 2015, but there's already – those transitions aren't reliant – my transition argument is not reliant upon  
30 that strategy. Those buildings exist today. They've been built under planning controls. When you look – when you stand on this site and look around, there's a highly complex and certainly varied types of development and forms within close proximity of this site, some of which rely upon the CBD planning strategy. Many that exist do not.

35 MR RYAN: So you say – so then you're saying, though, that the comprehensive planning that's involved is as a result of the comprehensive – the council's work on the CBD strategy, but then you're saying you don't really need to rely on that in order for this DCP to – sorry – this PP to proceed.

40 MR BYRNES: I can't ignore that context – sorry.

MR RYAN: The objectors have raised the issue of where is the strategic planning, where is the plan.

45 MR BYRNES: Yes. Yes. So I think it exists. I don't know how you could ever suggest that there is no strategic planning that has occurred for this area. It has been in play since 2015. It has been the subject of two heritage studies by the council,

another heritage study from the Department of Planning. It has been the subject of traffic studies in concert with the RMS and Transport for New South Wales. It's been the subject of numerous individual reports to council, analysis by – on solar access, all sorts of things. So – so this area has been the subject of significant good strategic planning for four years, and we are certainly consistent with that. My  
5 commentary in relation to other sites was that this area is in transition notwithstanding that good strategic planning work that's been done, because those buildings have been built and approved outside of that strategy. This – we're just – we are just consistent with (a) the transition that's occurring historically, and (b) with  
10 the good strategic planning that is occurring. We're consistent with both.

MR RYAN: Just one more question.

MR BYRNES: Sure.  
15

MR RYAN: There's a comment here about the floor space ratio being six to one in a version of the Parramatta LEP, and then there's a sliding scale, and your – the recommendation from the staff, whilst in theory you would be subject to a 5.6 to one FSR under the sliding scale, they're suggesting that it – the – since you started the  
20 process when it was six to one, that should apply. I mean, is that reasonable in the circumstances?

MR BYRNES: I think they're also suggesting a little more than that, and so the purpose of the sliding scale is to ensure that you get good amalgamation of sites, and  
25 the sort of – they want sites of 1800 square metres or greater. This site is less than that, and the site next door is less than that. The question that we need to ask ourselves is, well, what's that sliding scale trying to achieve? Is it trying to achieve the amalgamation of those two sites to get a single tower at 6.9 to one, which would lead to an outcome of somewhere around 60 to 70 storeys on an amalgamated site.  
30 What the council say in their report to you is even if we amalgamated the two sites, the better outcome, the right outcome is two towers, and so if we did amalgamate them, we'd have two towers of 6.9 to one, and so the sliding scale doesn't do the work it's seeking to achieve on this particular occasion, because the alternative is, we buy next door and we do 6.9 to one, because, as you know, under the Parramatta City  
35 Centre Strategy, there's no height limit, so you could do 6, 70 storeys, and all the staff are saying is that's not the better outcome, and I daresay the submitters would agree that given all this context, probably 60 to 70 storeys there is not the right outcome. So we say that the sliding scale doesn't need to be considered in this context, because the outcome would still be two towers with good separation.  
40

MR RYAN: I might have an opportunity - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. By all means.

45 MR RYAN: - - - just to ask questions of the staff.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR .....: Sorry.

MR RYAN: You're it. I just want to get your response to Mr Byrnes' responses to my questions. The – in your view, is the context within which this PP sits  
5 established by the existing precedents that Mr Byrnes referred to in terms of height, or is it reliant on the fact that it's effectively seeking to implement council CBD PP proposals in advance of those happening?

MR .....: Hard to answer that question. It's really where does the ball of string  
10 start. I think there's merit in both arguments. It definitely is to some degree reliant on the CBD planning proposal proceeding ahead, and is relying on those controls to be implemented in the future. But that being said, there is a pattern of change that is underway, and current – council's current adopted position is what's before us, so I can see merit in both sides of the argument, but personally I would think that it is  
15 reliant on the CBD planning proposal controls being in force at a later date.

MR RYAN: It is? That's - - -

MR .....: That would be - - -  
20

MR RYAN: Okay.

MR .....: - - - my position, yes.

25 MR RYAN: And where is the CBD PP up to now?

MR .....: It received a Gateway determination on the 18<sup>th</sup> of December last year. That included several conditions which needed to be reported to council and then sent to Department of Planning before the CBD planning proposal can be publicly  
30 exhibited. A policy team is underway. Last conversations was to have the outstanding material reported to council in late October. We might miss that deadline, but that would be the moment at which we can have council's resolution on these outstanding matters and have some material to forward to the Department of Planning and to state agencies in the hope of eventually having the CBD planning  
35 proposal on public exhibition in early 2020.

MR RYAN: And I assume, given the recommendation that's before us, that council is satisfied that this can proceed in advance of that. So there's – it's – I don't think it has reached the stage of certainty and imminence.  
40

MR .....: Understanding that this will have to be reported to council following this panel and whatever determination you make or advice you issue to council, but as it stands, the planning proposal is consistent with council's adopted strategy.

45 MR RYAN: Okay. There is some risk that if this PP proceeds and something changes through the process of the CBD PP - - -

MR .....: Yes.

MR RYAN: - - - it would then have to rely on the second set of precedents that Mr Byrnes has spoken about the existing context. Otherwise you're presuming that the  
5 CBD PP will go through in its current form.

MR .....: I mean, it is a planning proposal. There's always additional risks that may come up in the future, but based on the assessment that we've made, we've identified that it is consistent with the studies commissioned by council in support of  
10 the CBD planning proposal, so it's consistent with the current strategy. If that strategy were to change in the future, there's no real conditions in the CBD PP Gateway which warrants that, but if it were to change in the future, it might – may very well affect its planning proposal, but that – I don't have a crystal ball and I don't see anything that strikes out that might warrant that to happen.

15

MR RYAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: No further questions, then? Okay. Well, we might excuse ourselves. We'll be back hopefully soon to indicate what our guidance to council will be in relation to this planning proposal.  
20

**ADJOURNED**

**[5.23 pm]**

25

**RESUMED**

**[5.47 pm]**

MR O'CONNOR: Our apologies for taking a while. We've had a lot of discussion  
30 about this. And the decision we've reached is actually not a unanimous decision. There is one member of the panel who's not supportive of this decision so that will be outlined. So I'll just read what the decision of the panel is:

35 *The planning panel's advice to council in relation to this planning proposal is that it would be premature to proceed with the planning proposal until the outcome of the planning proposal for 470 Church Street is known.*

I'll just let our typist catch up there. Full stop.

40 *And our reason for that advice is that to proceed on the basis of the staff's recommendation could result in the planning controls for the site being an anomaly if the CBD planning proposal does not proceed to be adopted in its current form.*

45 So basically, we think there's a level of uncertainty. We haven't got enough information because we don't know the outcome of the planning proposal for the adjoining block and that, we think is an important part of the total picture that needs

to be known to be able to make a decision. Now, as I said, one member of the panel – Ian – is not happy with that outcome and he'll give his reasons and he will be voting against that, but it will pass because it has a majority.

5 MR GILBERTSON: I'm – I am the local representative to represent the local  
people in the community here. And having done such, I have done the training as the  
local person with PIA. And I don't disagree with whatever – what the rest of the  
other three members of the panel have said. However, as the local member – local  
10 representative here, I feel very strongly that I cannot support this development due to  
the heritage and other issues and I just cannot support it.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your submissions.

15 MR BYRNES: Thank you. Just for clarity, just – if 470 is resolved, what happens  
with the second comment in your resolution? Just – I'm just confused how they  
work tandem – hand in hand if – let's say next week the council adopts 470. Does  
your second sentence have work to do? I'm just a bit confused by that. Does that  
mean 470, the – if that's resolved, does that mean this one is resolved or are you  
20 saying irrespective of what happens with 470, you want this to await the outcome of  
the city centre structure?

MR O'CONNOR: I expect, for the panel – and I'm sure they'll correct me if I don't  
get it right. We don't believe - - -

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR O'CONNOR: - - - we have the total picture to be able to make a decision.

30 MR BYRNES: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: If a decision is made in relation to 470, we could then come back  
and provide our opinion, but we're not saying what that opinion is because we don't  
know what the result of 470 is.

35 MR BYRNES: Right. Okay.

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you. We now move on to 6.3 which is a planning  
proposal for 22 Noller Parade, Parramatta.

40 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .....

MR O'CONNOR: We have just – sorry – we might have two people wishing to  
address us. Kirsty Hodgkinson. Thank you, Kirsty. If you want to come forward  
and take a seat.

45

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .....



MS K. HODGKINSON: Thank you. I'm Kristy Hodgkinson for the applicant for the project. I'm also joined by Peter Israel, who is the project architect for it. I don't propose to address you in any great lengths, other than to say that we are very pleased with council staff's recommendation for the proposal. I understand that you  
5 lot have visited the site today. And I think it's fair to say that standing in that urban context, the site is probably quite out of context in its current form compared to everything else that is around it. And I think that the council office's report clearly highlights the issues with the surrounding context and the need for transition that this site provides an opportunity to delve into, having regard to its context. Outside of  
10 that, we're happy to answer any questions as you see fit.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. And, Peter, did you wish to say anything or only if we have questions for you?

15 MR P. ISRAEL: Only if - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Okay.

MR ISRAEL: Yes.

20

MR O'CONNOR: Let's open to the panel. Any questions of either Kirsty or Peter?

MR LESTER: Kristy.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Kristy. Sorry.

MS HODGKINSON: That's okay. Happens all the time.

30 MR O'CONNOR: No, you're right. Doesn't look like we have any questions. And I think it's fair to say the panel would agree, having seen the context of the site, that what's currently there and probably the current planning controls are in need of upgrading.

MS HODGKINSON: They are.

35

MR O'CONNOR: Any panel members want to make any comments? No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No .....

40 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. So the panel is comfortable and happy to support the recommendation from the council staff for this - - -

MS HODGKINSON: Thank you very much.

45 MR ISRAEL: Thank you very much.

MR O'CONNOR: - - - particular planning proposal.

MS HODGKINSON: Thank you.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. And that's a unanimous - - -

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR O'CONNOR: - - - decision and I'll come to the reasons.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .....

10

MR LESTER: Steve, do you want me to do the reasons ..... agree with it?

MR O'CONNOR: Get what – sorry?

15 MR LESTER: Do you want me to do the reasons if we agree with - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Yes, I'm just about to do that. Our reasons are the arguments put forward in the report from council officers well and truly justify this proposed – this planning proposal ..... so then we come to item 6.4 and we – that's a host exhibition of a planning proposal for 10 Valentine Avenue in Parramatta. And we have Sandra Robinson. Hi, Sandra.

20

MS S. ROBINSON: Good evening, panel.

25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's very close .....

MS ROBINSON: I'm - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Come forward.

30

MS ROBINSON: I'm not here on my own. I'm actually here with Natasha Devlin and Hugh Kelly from Investor, representing the land owner Australian Unity, the architects Paul Reidy and Pei-Lin from Fitzpatrick + Partners. And I'm Sandra Robinson, the town planning consultant that prepared the proponent's planning proposal document. Obviously, we're very happy with the assessment officer's report. And I guess the only thing I really wanted to say was this planning proposal is in the heart of Parramatta. It's a planning proposal that's consistent with the central city district planning and regional planning. It's about an increase in jobs. The new building will accommodate – using council's floor space figures – 1300 to 40 1400 new jobs. It's an A-grade office building promoting sustainable design and the result of a design excellence competition. So the planning proposal is consistent with the CBD strategy.

35

40

And I've heard tonight your comments about the CBD strategy. I would make a distinction on this site in that the CBD core has an accepted expectation to promote employment. And it's not about speculative residential development. It's about promoting Parramatta CBD and making Parramatta CBD realise its role as Sydney's second CBD. So we've had a very good working relationship with the council

45

offices. The PP has been amended to take on board the gateway determination, which required the introduction of a height standard, whereas the CBD PP says no height standard. And the team's here to answer any questions that the panel might have.

5

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sandra. Any questions there - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

10 MR O'CONNOR: - - - David or Alf?

MR LESTER: Just had a broad question. But it's more of a – I suppose a design related and planning. The relationship between the proposed building – buildings and the existing building doesn't seem to really come through clearly in the linkages between them.

15

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They're two – they're totally separate so - - -

MR LESTER: Totally?

20

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it currently has a carpark that – so it's - - -

MR LESTER: Is attached to it, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - attached to the building. That attachment, I guess, still exists at ground level where the carpark entry/exit condition is, in order to minimise the crossovers on public domain. But that's – that's it. Other than that, they stand entirely alone as two separate buildings.

25

30 MS ROBINSON: Separate lobbies. Separate street addresses.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Separate .....

MR LESTER: Right. Because most of the hero shots don't really show that relationship and I was just interested in – they seem to - - -

35

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There was a lot of work done as to whether they should be combined or not combined and - - -

40 MR LESTER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - the commercial .....

MR LESTER: But they actually stand totally independent.

45

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .....

MR LESTER: Okay. And as I understand it, there's a DA ..... DA for a section of the building – a lower section of the building. And there's - - -

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct. In line with the current planning controls so - - -

MR LESTER: Yes, and that's been approved.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's been approved and - - -

MR LESTER: And – so what you're talking about is the extension of that - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is the piece that sits on top.

15 MR LESTER: Two slots above the top.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct, yes.

20 MR LESTER: .....

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's right.

25 MS ROBINSON: And the DA that's been approved has been designed – everything about it has the capacity for the extra levels. So it has enough lifts. It has enough loading zones. It has waste management. So it's sitting there, really. I mean, it's got so many lifts it looks silly for the – what building that's been approved because it's all designed for the - - -

30 MR O'CONNOR: For the ultimate.

MS ROBINSON: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In anticipation .....

35 MR O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR LESTER: Has a somewhat unusual car parking, single-sided.

40 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a very tight site. It's a very, very tight site .....

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Constrained by the – Sydney Trains on one side and the - - -

45 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: - - - road on the other.

MS ROBINSON: And the pool that runs underneath. So there's no opportunity for excavation.

MR LESTER: Yes, okay.

5

MR O'CONNOR: You got any questions, David?

MR RYAN: Yes, just a clarification. On page 1241 of the office's report it refers to a reference design plus existing building on the site, which is to be retained, amount to an FSR of 13.25 to 1 across the whole site. How does that – it works out – the PP, as I understand it ..... go to 10 and there's the option to – well, the design excellence gives you the 15. Where - - -

10

MS ROBINSON: Well, the - - -

15

MR RYAN: How does that work?

MS ROBINSON: - - - CBD PP and this site-specific PP doesn't measure commercial floor space in FSR.

20

MR RYAN: Okay.

MS ROBINSON: So we don't actually rely on the design excellence bonus to achieve the FSR, even though there's been a design competition. It's all about promoting jobs so - - -

25

MR RYAN: Okay.

MS ROBINSON: Yes.

30

MR RYAN: No, that's fine.

MS ROBINSON: Is that okay?

35

MR RYAN: No, that answers the question. I understand that.

MS ROBINSON: Yes.

MR RYAN: Yes.

40

MS ROBINSON: Thank you.

MR RYAN: .....

45

MR O'CONNOR: If that completes the questions – panel, are we comfortable in making a call on this now?

MR RYAN: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. So the panel's happy to endorse the council office's  
5 recommendation to council. And the reason relates to the fact that there was only  
one submission received from a member of the public in relation – in response to the  
public exhibition and the council report adequately addresses the issues of concern  
that were raised. And you're comfortable with that being a unanimous decision, Ian?

MR GILBERTSON: Yes, absolutely.  
10

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. That decision was unanimous. Thank you for your time.

MS ROBINSON: Thank you, panel.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you .....

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

MS ROBINSON: Good night.  
20

MR O'CONNOR: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Cheers.

25 MR O'CONNOR: Okay. That brings us to 6.5 and 6.6, which is your point of exit.  
And - - -

MR RYAN: Sadly, I .....

30 MR O'CONNOR: - - - good evening.

MR RYAN: Thank you.

MR LESTER: Safe at home.  
35

MR O'CONNOR: So the minutes can just note that David Ryan left the meeting at  
this point – left the room.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: David, will you be leaving completely?  
40

MR RYAN: Unless you want me to stay, of course.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, you don't need to stay. I just wanted to know .....

45 so I can note it.

MR RYAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

MR RYAN: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks.

MR O'CONNOR: So in relation to item 6.5, which is a planning proposal over several properties in Rosebank Avenue, Epping, we have Katherine Shives.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I spoke to Kate Shives before. She had to leave because she's unwell. But I offered – so she has a statement here which she's assured me is - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, guys.

15

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: - - - 3.25 minutes so I offered to read that statement on her behalf so - - -

MR O'CONNOR: Fine. Do you want to come forward just so it gets recorded properly.

20

MR .....: Sure.

25 *Good afternoon, my name is Kate Chivers. I live at 3 Rosebank Avenue, Epping. Previous to the takeover by Parramatta Council, our part of Epping was in the Hornsby Shire. It was Hornsby's policy to allow 12 metres in height for R3 development. Parramatta specifies 11 metres. The past three years living in our once beautiful street has been purgatory. For six days a week from 7 in the morning up to the allowable 6 pm we are not able to enjoy the outdoor areas of our home. There have been times when work was carried out illegally up to 10.20 at night and starting well before the legal starting times.*

30

35 *Doors and windows have to be shut. The noise is unbearable with horns sounding for all machinery and crane movements and anything else being moved in the area. Sometimes we have workers literally howling like animals and yelling to each other. It is like a zoo. I wonder what would happen if I went to the places of employment or outside the homes of developers or the powers that be and started yelling and screaming and then fired off a similar horn every minute or so. The police would be called, I'm sure.*

40

*There have been many times it has taken up to 20 minutes to get down Cliff Road or out of Rosebank Avenue which is a dead-end street. Pictures 1 and 2.*

45 Sorry, I do have some images.

*The dust has been so bad it could cause respiratory problems. Photo 3. One of the worse aspects of the past nine months is the demolition of the lower floors*

of the units on the corner of Cliff and Rosebank. Proper levels weren't taken so everything from just above ground level down had to be demolished, taking an inordinate amount of time using extremely large, noisy and dust-producing mechanised rock hammers. The building had to start again. Interestingly, when I rang the McKenzie Group, they were also the certifiers of the Opal Tower, and spoke to Alex, the certifier looking after these units. He knew nothing about all of this. Photos 4, 5 and 6.

We have been told by the local real estate guru that we shouldn't expect a lot for our properties because of the recent downturn in property prices. An increase to the height may help. It would have been more just to be allowed approval for R4 development similar to our immediate neighbours. I have an incurable blood cancer and other close family members have major health problems. It is very difficult being ill and unable to rest when the environment is overwhelmingly toxic due to noise and dust. If you research, you will see on the table of life events that moving house comes in third after death of a loved one and divorce.

Could this matter be extradited as I don't know what our immediate future holds and we don't need further stress.

There are many noncompliant variations to privately certified buildings in our streets and nearby area. If this can happen, and taking into consideration the last three years of torment, I look forward to you approving an extra metre to the height of the proposed R3 developments at the southern end of Rosebank Avenue, similar to the 12 metres allowed by Hornsby Council. We deserve nothing less.

MR O'CONNOR: Can you just confirm the address of Katherine.

MR .....: Yes. 3 Rosebank Avenue, Epping.

MR O'CONNOR: Okay. So she is directly impacted by this proposal.

MR .....: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: And she is in favour of it.

MR .....: Yes.

MR O'CONNOR: Yes. I won't ask you any more questions for obvious reasons. There are no other speakers ..... comfortable making a decision on this. So the panel's unanimous conclusion, notwithstanding we still have a quorum but we don't have David any longer, is that we support the council staff recommendation and the reason for that support are the arguments provided in the council officers' reports. Thank you.



And, finally, we have item 6.6 which is, again, another planning proposal for properties in Rockleigh Way, Pembroke and Essex Street, all in Epping. We don't have anyone notified wants to address us, no one here wants to speak in relation to that matter? Okay. So just give me a second. So are panel members happy to deal  
5 with this now? Okay. That this is involving several properties in streets close to each other. It's actually increasing – proposing to upgrade the zoning in some areas and downgrade it in others. The panel is – recommends to council that they are supportive of the council officer's recommendation and it seems quite a comprehensive report so the reason is the same as previously for the reasons outlined  
10 in the council officer's reports.

And there being no other items on the agenda I will declare this meeting of the Parramatta Local Planning Panel finished and concluded. Thank you very much for your attendance and council staff for staying back and our recorder as well.  
15

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[6.08 pm]**