

Housing Delivery Authority – Record of Briefing

Date and Time: 16 September 2025 – 10.30AM – 12.30PM

Location: L12 Nambucca Room, 52 Martin Place, Sydney or MS Teams

Chaired by: Simon Draper - Secretary, Premier's Department

HDA Members

Simon Draper - Secretary, Premier's Department

Kiersten Fishburn – Secretary, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI)

Member Alternates

Ken Morrison – CEO, Bradfield Development Authority (Item 1)

Said Hirsh – Head of Strategy, Planning and Innovation, Infrastructure NSW

DPHI Staff

David Gainsford – Deputy Secretary, Development Assessment and Sustainability, DPHI

Monica Gibson – Deputy Secretary, Planning, Land Use Strategy, Housing, and Infrastructure, DPHI

Aoife Wynter – Executive Director, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Kate McKinnon – A/Director, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Chrissy Peters – Manager, Panels Delivery, DPHI

Mark Rutherford – Director, Probity, DPHI

Angela Kenna – Senior Project Officer, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Apologies

Tom Gellibrand – Chief Executive, Infrastructure NSW

Summary of decision

The HDA considered 39 EOI applications received by DPHI. The HDA considered each application against the “Housing Delivery Authority State Significant Development Criteria” published in December 2024.

Of the 39 applications, the HDA recommended to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces that:

- 21 EOI applications be declared SSD.
- 16 EOI applications are not recommended to be called in as SSD.
- 1 EOI applications already had state significance via an alternative SSD pathway. The existing pathway was considered appropriate.
- 1 EOI application was deferred for further information and future consideration.

Agenda items

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
A	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of Country • Conflict of Interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted COIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kiersten Fishburn – EOI 275004 ○ David Gainsford – EOI 272580 ○ Aoife Wynter – EOI 274656
B	HDA Operational Briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the verbal update on HDA procedures and operational matters. • Noted updates from previous HDA meeting cycle. •

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
1.	<p>275004 - <u>11-23 Scott Street & 277 Bigge Street</u>, Liverpool - TSOP Pty Ltd atf Scott Street Unit Trust C/- Willowtree Planning</p> <p>Local Government Area (LGA): Liverpool City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 750 apartments, build-to-rent, 5% affordable housing and preservation of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 750</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the proposal has state significance • Confirmed the build-to-rent housing SSD pathway as the correct development pathway for this application • Recommended the applicant be advised to pursue the alternative approval pathway offered through the build-to-rent pathway SSD pathway. • Noted the HDA would monitor the progress of assessment of this proposal. • Noted member conflicts of interest – Kiersten Fishburn. Ken Morrison sat as alternate member
2.	<p>269999 - <u>1 Akuna St, 100 Terralong and 55-61 Shoalhaven Street</u>, Kiama - Level 33</p> <p>LGA: Kiama Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 165 apartments including 7% affordable housing, with commercial floor space and retention of heritage item.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 165</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a future merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application and that the



No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>affordable housing proposed is not commensurate with the uplift sought and should at minimum be 10%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended as a general principle, not having applications in parallel pathways. • Noted that existing DA10.2023.220.1 for the site and associated LEC proceedings will need to be withdrawn. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>3.</p>	<p>270940 - <u>93 Parkes Lane and 512 Terranora Road</u>, Terranora - Zone Planning NSW</p> <p>LGA: Tweed Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Multi dwelling housing and community title subdivision for 128 dwellings in total</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 128</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well located (good access) ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well located (environmental hazards and constraints) ▪ Criteria 3.3: Well serviced ▪ Criteria 3.4: Positive commitment to affordable housing • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application with Council. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
4.	<p>273759 - <u>126 Mahers Lane, 138 Mahers Lane, 140 Mahers Lane, 153 Mahers Lane</u>, Terranora - Zone Planning NSW</p> <p>LGA: Tweed Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Subdivision, multi dwelling housing (102 dwellings), dwelling houses (167 dwellings), 269 dwellings in total and no affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 269</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within the Housing Accord period ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 1.1: Development is a type to deliver high yield housing ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located – transport and services ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well-located – free of specific environmental hazards ▪ Criteria 3.3: Well serviced ▪ Criteria 3.4: Positive commitment to affordable housing • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application with Council. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
5.	<p>271009 - <u>71 and 73 Windsor Road</u>, Norwest - Knight Frank Town Planning Sydney</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>LGA: The Hills Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 150 apartments in three 10 storey buildings with retail ground floor space and 5% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 150</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards • Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system including a development application following a planning proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>6.</p>	<p>271375 - <u>629 – 639 Pacific Highway, Chatswood - Polytec Australia Four Pty Ltd</u></p> <p>LGA: Willoughby City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Amending DA for an additional 47 apartments (100 apartments in total) in a 38 storey building with ground floor retail and 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 100</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within the Housing Accord period. ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards • Recommended the applicant is advised to continue to progress approved DA-2023/256. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>7.</p>	<p>274840 - <u>1a Bowen Street, 1B Bowen Street, 3 Bowen Street, 5 Bowen Street,</u></p>	<p>The HDA:</p>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>7 Bowen Street, 9 Bowen Street, 11 Bowen Street, 13 Bowen Street, 15 Bowen Street, 17 Bowen Street, 19 Bowen Street, 21 Bowen Street, 23-25 Bowen Street, 27 Bowen Street, 29 Bowen Street, 12 Moriarty Road, 14 Moriarty Road, 16 Moriarty Road, 18 Moriarty Road, Chatswood - Sun Property Group Australia Pty. Ltd.</p> <p>LGA: Willoughby City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 129 apartments, 2 buildings, 6 storeys, 4% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 129</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Noted an existing local development consent on the site will need to be surrendered (DA-2022/308). • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
8.	<p>271689 - 11 Butler Street, Byron Bay - Planning & Co</p> <p>LGA: Byron Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 70 apartments with 15% affordable housing, a neighbourhood shop and recreation facility (indoor)</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 70</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>9.</p>	<p>271733 - <u>17 Tincombe St, 19 Tincombe St, 21 Tincombe St, 23 Tincombe St, 25 Tincombe St, 27 Tincome St, 29 Tincombe St, 98 Minter St, 100 Minter St, 102 Minter St, 186-192 Canterbury Rd, 194-196 Canterbury Rd, 198-200 Canterbury Rd, 202-204 Canterbury Rd, 206 Canterbury Rd, Canterbury - Arada Development Management Pty Ltd</u></p> <p>LGA: City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 403 apartments with affordable housing, retail and commercial space and a publicly accessible civic plaza.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 403</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended the applicant be advised that the proposal should address the design and built form standards of the Canterbury Transport Oriented Development Precinct. • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
10.	<p>271875 - <u>310, 312 and 314 Taren Point Road, Caringbah</u> - MBD Developments Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Sutherland Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Amending DA to provide a total of 120 apartments (71 additional), 13 storeys and 10% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 120</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within the Housing Accord period. ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant. ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards • Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including an amending DA via the local council. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
11.	<p>271891 - <u>84-88 Restwell Road, Bossley Park</u> - South West Italian Australian Association (SWIAA)</p> <p>LGA: Fairfield City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 157 units - 117 independent living and 40 residential care facility</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 157</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that the affordable housing as defined in s1.4(1) of the EP&A Act should be provided. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>12.</p>	<p>271898 - <u>79 Rickard Road</u>, Leppington - Royal Freemasons' Benevolent Institution</p> <p>LGA: Camden Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 236 independent living units, 7 storeys, shared community facilities and potential ground floor retail</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 236</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>13.</p>	<p>273228 - <u>176 Rickard Road and 225-231 Byron Road</u>, Leppington - Leppington24 Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Camden Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Concept plan with Stage 1 providing 300 apartments,</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted reasons for HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>1500 apartments in total, commercial, retail and other uses, 5% affordable housing for 15 years.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 300</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal sufficiently satisfied the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. ● Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. ● Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has state significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document 'HDA consideration of state significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act'. ● Recommended that the applicant be advised the proposal should address the Leppington Town Centre Review Planning Proposal (PP-2023-284), that a merit assessment may result in development lower than proposed in the EOI application and that additional affordable housing commensurate with the uplift sought is required. ● Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>14.</p>	<p>271962 - <u>8-10 & 12-16 Innesdale Road</u>, Wollli Creek - PRINCIPLE planning + urban design</p> <p>LGA: Bayside Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 105 apartments, 10% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 105</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. ● Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. ● Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. ● Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that the applicant be advised that the overall height of the development will need to manage OLS and PANS OP restrictions. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>15.</p>	<p>272476 - <u>8 Hoxton Park Rd</u>, Liverpool - Lateral Estate Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Liverpool City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 200 apartments, ground floor retail, 30 storey, 10% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 200</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application. • Recommended that the applicant be advised that the overall height of the development will need to manage OLS and PANS OP restrictions. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>16.</p>	<p>272558 - <u>70 John Whiteway Dr</u>, Gosford - Taskin Satici</p>	<p>The HDA:</p>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>LGA: Central Coast Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 120 apartments, 10% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 120</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>17.</p>	<p>272580 - <u>86-92 Harris Street</u>, Pyrmont - Time & Place</p> <p>LGA: City of Sydney Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 150 dwellings, non-residential floor space, 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 150</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot rezoning. ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit ▪ Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system including a development application following a planning proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests. • Noted David Gainsford did not brief the HDA on this matter due to a declared conflict of interest.
<p>18.</p>	<p>272789 - <u>193 Rocky Point Road, 197 Rocky Point Road, 199 Rocky Point Road, 66 Ramsgate Road, 68 Ramsgate Road, 2 Targo Road, 4 Targo Road,</u> Ramsgate - Fabcot Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Georges River Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 195 apartments, 5-11 storeys, ground floor full-line supermarket, 3% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 195</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended to the applicant that the land reclassification process commence immediately to secure land tenure ahead of requesting Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
19.	<p>272830 - <u>18-24 Princes Highway</u> Kogarah - Landmark Element Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Georges River Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 100 units with 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 100</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
20.	<p>273259 - <u>164 Talavera Road, Marsfield - Dickson Rothschild</u></p> <p>LGA: City of Ryde Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 100 apartments, 17 storeys, affordable housing but no quantum committed.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 100</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify housing projects that can be assessed and constructed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application following a planning proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>21.</p>	<p>273383 - <u>224 Railway Parade, Cabramatta - Iris Hotel Property 3 Pty Ltd ACN: 682 145 768</u></p> <p>LGA: Fairfield City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 440 apartments in two towers with 5% affordable housing, retail floor space and a public paid carpark.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 440</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that the affordable housing proposed is not commensurate with the uplift sought and should be closer to 10% and that consideration be given to a reduced scale as a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>22.</p>	<p>273411 - <u>2 Garthowen Crescent, 4 Garthowen Crescent, 22 Garthowen Crescent, 24 Garthowen Crescent, 26 Garthowen Crescent, 28 Garthowen Crescent, 24 Old Castle Hill Road, 26</u></p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Old Castle Hill Road, 26A Old Castle Hill Road, 28 Old Castle Hill Road, 30 Old Castle Hill Road, Castle Hill - Castle Diamond Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: The Hills Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Amending DA to provide an additional 102 apartments. Current DA under assessment – residential flat building (153 apartments), hotel (143 hotel rooms) and retail component</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 102</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system including an amending development application following a planning proposal and determination of DA366/2025/JP. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>23.</p>	<p>273467 - <u>195 Parramatta Road</u>, Homebush West - Wentworth Freehold Pty Limited</p> <p>LGA: Strathfield Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 173 apartments, retail uses, 5% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 173</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well located with good access to transport and services ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well located free from specific environmental hazards • Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning



No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>system for development on the site, including a development application following a planning proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>24.</p>	<p>273477 - <u>216 Boomerang Drive</u>, Blueys Beach - 218 Boomerang Drive Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Mid-Coast Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Zone R3 land: 50 - 60 apartments with ground floor retail, 50% affordable housing for 20 years. Zone R2: subdivision 8 large lots</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 60</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify housing projects that can be assessed and constructed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well-located free of specific environmental hazards • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application following a planning proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>25.</p>	<p>273711 - <u>81 Kildare Road</u>, Blacktown - Sportsman's Freehold Pty Limited</p> <p>LGA: Blacktown City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 2,000 apartments including 5% affordable</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted reasons for HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>housing, 16,000m² of ground floor commercial space, retention of existing Blacktown Tavern.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 2000</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well located (environmental hazards and constraints) • Recommended the applicant be advised there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site, including a development application following a planning proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
26.	<p>273908 - <u>46A Cross Street</u>, Baulkham Hills - Ethos Urban</p> <p>LGA: The Hills Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 300 dwellings including independent living units, residential care facility, café, health, wellness & community amenities</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 300</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the application be advised to investigate the Seniors Housing SSD pathway and

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>that a merit assessment may result in reduced scale and dwelling yield.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>27.</p>	<p>274301 - Lot 901 / DP 1029336 <u>Windsor Road</u>, Rouse Hill - Caladines Town Planning Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: The Hills Shire Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 4 residential flat buildings with approximately 352 apartments, 30 affordable apartments and a centre-based childcare facility.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 352</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional concurrent spot rezoning ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • Recommended the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system including a development application following a planning proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>28.</p>	<p>274386 - <u>26 Campsie St , 28 Campsie St, 30 Campsie St, 1 Assets St</u>, Campsie - Nascon Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 130 apartments, ground floor commercial premises, 16 storeys, 15% affordable housing subject to negotiation</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>No of dwellings (indicative): 130</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant is advised that as part of a merit assessment process the height and FSR increases proposed in the EOI may need to align more closely to the standards within PP-2024-2261. Consideration of an appropriate amount and type of commercial floor space will be required and overshadowing to heritage listed squares to the south will be required. • Recommended that the applicant be advised that affordable housing needs to be provided as part of the proposal. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>29.</p>	<p>274656 - <u>11 Countess Street, 13 Countess Street, 13A Countess Street, 15 Countess Street, 15a Countess Street, 17 Countess Street , 17a Countess Street, 20 Rosebery Street, 22 Rosebery Street, 24 Rosebery Street, 26 Rosebery Street, 28 Rosebery Street,</u> Mosman - Capitel Group Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Mosman Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 120 – 150 units (exact number not provided), 6 – 8 storeys, 3% affordable housing</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>No of dwellings (indicative): 125</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted there are no member conflict of interests. • Noted Aoife Wynter did not brief the HDA on this matter due to a declared conflict of interest.
30.	<p>274664 - <u>328-344 Elizabeth Street</u>, Surry Hills - Paro Planning Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Sydney Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 157 dwellings, retail, heritage restoration works, cultural and creative industries</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 157</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended the applicant be advised that interface with adjoining sites will need to be considered and any proposed rezoning will need to involve a discussion to ensure an appropriate amount of non-residential floor space is provided. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
31.	<p>274756 - <u>3, 5, 5a, 7, 9, 9a, 9b Gladys Ave</u>, Frenchs Forest - PRINCIPLE planning + urban design</p>	<p>The HDA:</p>



No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>LGA: Northern Beaches Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 205 apartments, 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 205</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>32.</p>	<p>275090 - <u>195 Church Street, 38 Hunter Street and 65–79 Macquarie Street, Parramatta</u> - Urbis Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Parramatta Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 450 build-to-rent apartments with 3% - 5% affordable housing and commercial floor space.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 450</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well located - free of specific environmental hazards

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Criteria 3.4: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional concurrent spot rezoning ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system including the build-to-rent pathway for a proposal that meets clause 7.44(5) of the LEP. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>33.</p>	<p>275733 - <u>27 Argyle Street</u>, Parramatta - PM2 Argyle Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Parramatta Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 513 apartments, commercial and retail with 3% - 5% affordable housing in perpetuity.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 513</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards • Recommended the applicant be advised to pursue existing SSD-79267479 for build-to-rent housing on the site. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>34.</p>	<p>275126 - <u>167 Hume Hwy</u>, Chullora - Palms (Chullora) Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation:







No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Summary of proposal: 291 apartments, retail, hotel accommodation, 5% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 291</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. ● Formed the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. ● Provided the following advice to the Minister: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” ● Recommended that the applicant be advised that a future merit assessment will need to address the interface with adjoining R2 land. ● Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>35.</p>	<p>275184 - <u>8 Beaumont St, 2 Hudson Street</u>, Hamilton - Sydney Junction Hotel Property Pty Ltd as Trustee for Sydney Junction Hotel Property Trust</p> <p>LGA: City of Newcastle Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 272 apartments, retention of the heritage façade, ground floor pub, retail shops, 18 levels of residential, affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 272</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act ● Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. ● Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. ● Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.”

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that the applicant be advised a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI. • Recommended that the applicant be advised that any proposed rezoning will need to involve a discussion with Council on public benefit coming out of significant uplift. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>36.</p>	<p>275345 - <u>1 Grey Street, 3 Grey Street Wickham, 5-11 Grey Street Wickham, 64 Hannell Street, Wickham</u> - dmpps on Behalf of Awabakal Enterprise Aboriginal Association</p> <p>LGA: City of Newcastle Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 160 apartments, 14 storeys high, adaptive reuse of heritage item for childcare, outreach facilities, counselling and administrative purposes, 15% affordable housing in perpetuity</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 160</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deferred consideration of this proposal to obtain further information from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>37.</p>	<p>275655 - <u>7 Thomas Laycock Place, Bradfield</u> - PRINCIPLE planning + urban design</p> <p>LGA: Liverpool City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 490 apartments/dwellings, 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 490</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well-located free of specific environmental hazards ▪ Criteria 3.3: Well serviced • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application when the enabling infrastructure is available. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>38.</p>	<p>276171 - <u>644-650 Pacific Highway</u>, Belmont - Gunyah Hotel Property Pty as Trustee for Gunyah Hotel Property Trust</p> <p>LGA: Lake Macquarie City Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 192 apartments, retention of the Gunyah hotel, 19 levels of residential and affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 192</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI. • Formed the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria. • Provided the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act.” • Recommended that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.
<p>39.</p>	<p>276533 - <u>166-174, 176, 178, 184-186, 188, 198-200, 202-212, 214 Military Road</u>, Neutral Bay - Arkadia Property Services Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: North Sydney Council</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Three stages, total of 144 apartments including 10% affordable and 2 new through site links, footpath widening and public domain embellishment</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 144</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway. • Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly • Recommended the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application when the enabling infrastructure is available. • Noted there are no member conflict of interests.

HDA Members endorse this as a true and accurate record of the briefing

 <hr/> <p>Chair: Simon Draper Date: <u>17/09/2025</u></p>	 <hr/> <p>Member: Kiersten Fishburn Date <u>17/09/2025</u></p>	 <hr/> <p>Member: Said Hirsh Date: <u>17/09/2025</u></p>	 <hr/> <p>Member Ken Morrison (Item 1) Date: <u>16/09/2025</u></p>
---	--	--	--

MR S. DRAPER: Hey, it's HDA meeting on the 16th of September, and we've considered 39 items today. I think Kiersten was going to make a general comment at the beginning. So do you want to just comment on that?

MS K. FISHBURN: Yeah, thank you, Simon. I just wanted to make two general comments for
5 noting for future proponents. We have had applications both today and in the past proposing developments that exceed the OLS and PAN-OPS controls. Really important for proponents to note that OLS and PAN-OPS are absolute controls, so no deviation from those can be considered. The other is a general statement across all of the HDA applications, and it's in relation to affordable housing provision. All the proponents should be aware that affordable housing provision will need
10 to be delivered proportionate to the uplift sought as part of the EOI, and that will be part of the merit assessment that is undertaken in the Department.

MR DRAPER: Great. And I also note before we get started that Said Hirsh is on the HDA today and has a delegate on - Tom Gellibrand is on leave. So we'll just go through them. EOI
275004. This one was not recommended to - we're not recommending it to the Minister for
15 declaration. But we note that it is already state significant and that the utilisation of the BTR, the State Significant Development Pathway, is the most efficient method of delivering proposed development on the site. And also note in relation to that EOI that Kiersten Fishburn declared a conflict of interest and didn't participate. Instead, Ken Morrison was part of that discussion.

Next one is 269999. This one is recommended. I don't think we have any comments on that
20 one. 270940 was not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This particular EOI was not recommended due to servicing, and infrastructure needs, and biodiversity and bushfire issues. Not to say that it may not be meritorious, but Council will be in the best position to undertake assessment.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 273759, was that one I just said?

25 MS WYNTER: No, that's the next one.

MS FISHBURN: That's the next one there. Close to contiguous.

MR DRAPER: Yeah, not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: It's the same comment as the previous one, and again Council will be best positioned to undertake servicing and infrastructure considerations.

30 MR DRAPER: And 271009 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This particular development is a substantial distance from the Metro station and doesn't meet the well-located threshold. And in addition there's some uncertainty around land

tenure.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 271375 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This wasn't recommended as it's an amending DA with a yield that's significantly under the HDA threshold.

5 MR DRAPER: 274840 is recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Yep, this has come before the HDA previously, but the proposal is a new proposal, and they will surrender current consent.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 271689 is recommended for declaration. 271733 is recommended for declaration.

10 MS FISHBURN: Noting that the proposal for this one should address the design and built form standards for Canterbury TOD Precinct.

MR DRAPER: 271875 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This one is not recommended as it's an amending DA that would be under yield and is quite in excess of the acceptable scale for the context.

15 MR DRAPER: Yep. 271891 is recommended. 271898 is recommended. 273228 is recommended. 271962 is recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Just noting that this is a development subject to the OLS controls that I mentioned at the beginning of the discussion.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 272476 is recommended. 272558 is recommended. 272580 is not
20 recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is part of the commercial zoning in the area and any transition from commercial to residential in this location needs broader strategic context and work.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 272789 is recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Noting that there is some complexity around land reclassification for some of
25 this development. We recommend that that process commences immediately, so land tenure can be secured ahead of request for SEARs.

MR DRAPER: Yep. 272890 is recommended. 273259 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is significant uplift, but even then meeting borderline dwelling yield. Once merit considerations are applied, it's likely to be underneath the yield.

30 MS WYNTER: Sorry, can I just interrupt there. I think actually that was an incorrect EOI

number. I think it should be 272830 for the previous one.

MR HIRSH: Number 19.

MR DRAPER: Number 19. What did I say?

MS WYNTER: 890

5 MR DRAPER: Ah, yes, so 272830. Is that the one I got wrong?

MS WYNTER: Yes.

MR DRAPER: Yeah, so that one was recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Yep.

MR DRAPER: Great. Thank you.

10 MS WYNTER: Yep.

MR DRAPER: Sorry for that. Now, I've lost my place. Which one did I just do?

MS WYNTER: You've done 20.

MR DRAPER: Okay. Number 273383 is recommended. Number 273411 is not recommended.

15 MS FISHBURN: Noting that this particular development is currently going through the planning panel as an RSDA. If unsuccessful through the planning panel, the HDA would consider a future EOI and my Department will be in touch.

MR DRAPER: Thanks. 273467 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is centrally located employment in industrial land.

MR DRAPER: 273477 is not recommended.

20 MS FISHBURN: This is a rural residential setting and the scale proposed is really out of context. There's also biodiversity and bushfire issues.

MR DRAPER: 273711 is not recommended.

25 MS FISHBURN: This is quite a significant scale that is proposed particularly for the site context. The site is also quite isolated for the level of development that is proposed here and surrounded by low density as well. There's also flooding issues.

MR DRAPER: 273908 is recommended from the (indistinct) for seniors housing. 274301 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is very important employment land, which is ancillary to Rouse Hill

Hospital.

MR DRAPER: 274386 is recommended. 274656 is recommended. 274664 is recommended. 274756 is recommended. 275090 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is a key site in the Parramatta LGA. The Department has done significant
5 work to set contemporary site controls, which address heritage, the commercial importance of site and overshadowing as well, which are inconsistent with this new EOI proposal.

MR DRAPER: 275733 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: This is the important part of the commercial core in Parramatta, and the proponent should pursue their existing BTR SEARs for the site.

10 MR DRAPER: 275126 is recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Noting that the HDA recommends that a future merit assessment addresses the interface with adjoining R2 land.

MR DRAPER: Yeah. 275184 is recommended. 275345 will be deferred.

MS FISHBURN: The recommendation from the HDA is that the Department seeks further
15 information from the proponent on land tenure arrangements.

MR DRAPER: 275655 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: Servicing will not be delivered in this area for a significant period of time, and it's inconsistent with the precinct plan.

MR DRAPER: 276171 is recommended. And then, 276533 is not recommended.

20 MS FISHBURN: This is a proposal that has complex land tenure and is a non-contiguous development, which would lead to extensive assessment time required outside of the timeframes that are set for HDA recommendations. However, if some of these issues can be demonstrably resolved, then the HDA would consider a subsequent EOI.

MR DRAPER: Thank you.

25 ADJOURNED