

## Housing Delivery Authority – Record of Briefing

**Date and Time:** 5 December 2025 – 3.00PM - 4.30PM

**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)

Tom Gellibrand – Chief Executive, Infrastructure NSW

---

### Member Alternates

N/A

---

### DPHI Staff

David McNamara – A/Deputy Secretary, Development Assessment and Sustainability, DPHI

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

Alison Burton – A/Executive Director, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Kate McKinnon – 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

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

## Summary of decision

The HDA considered 21 EOI applications received by DPHI. The HDA considered each application against the “Housing Delivery Authority State Significant Development Criteria”. EOIs 248699, 249403, 272585 and 273167 were assessed under the HDA criteria dated December 2024 and all other EOIs were assessed under the HDA criteria dated July 2025.

Of the 21 applications, the HDA recommended to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces that:

- 11 EOI applications be declared SSD.
- 10 EOI applications are not recommended to be called in as SSD.

## Agenda items

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
A	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledgement of Country</li> <li>• Conflict of Interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted COIs:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nil</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
B	HDA Operational Briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the verbal update on HDA procedures and operational matters.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> updates from previous HDA meeting cycle.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> EOIs 248699, 249403, 272585 and 273167 were assessed under the HDA criteria dated December 2024 and all other EOIs were assessed under the HDA criteria dated July 2025.</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
1.	<p>248699 - <u>1A Racecourse Road</u>, West Gosford - Conexions development Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Central Coast</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Shop top housing (420 apartments) with heights between 8 and 12 storeys, with an affordable housing component of 10% for 10 years and ground floor retail</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 420</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not recommend this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• Noted the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards</li> <li>▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Criteria 3.1 Well located</li> <li>▪ Criteria 3.2 Well-located - free of specific environmental hazards</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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 exhibition of the State-led rezoning (SLR) for Gosford.</li> <li>• Recommended to the Department that an SSD pathway be considered for the finalised SLR and that details of this proposal are provided to the State Led Rezoning team.</li> <li>• Noted there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
2.	<p>249403 - <u>10 Young Street</u>, 1 Racecourse Road, 61 Central Coast Highway, West Gosford - Japrico Development Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Central Coast</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not recommend this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• Noted the reasons for the HDA recommendation:</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Summary of proposal: 58 apartments with 60 hotel rooms and commercial GFA in a six and a 14-storey building</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 58</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: No</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal does not adequately satisfy objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> <li>Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Recommended</b> the applicant be advised there are alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including progressing current SSD or a development application following finalisation of the State-led rezoning for Gosford.</li> <li><b>Recommended</b> to the Department that an SSD pathway be considered for the finalised SLR and that details of this proposal are provided to the State Led Rezoning team.</li> <li><b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
<p>3.</p>	<p>287914 - <u>48-50 York Street, East Gosford</u> - Andaprise 2 Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Central Coast</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 130 apartments, ground floor commercial, 14 storeys and 20% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 130</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li><b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li><b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria established in the document “HDA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&amp;A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
4.	<p><u>272585 - 754-760 and 762, 764, 766, 768, 774 Canterbury Road, Belmore - Statewide Planning Pty Ltd</u></p> <p>LGA: Canterbury Bankstown</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 150 apartments including 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"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezoning</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> the applicant be advised to investigate the alternative approval pathway offered through the Infill affordable housing SSD pathway. A merit assessment can consider the appropriateness of the proposed uplift.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
5.	<p><u>273167 - 1, 3, 5 &amp; 7 Cleary Avenue</u></p> <p>Belmore - Statewide Planning Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Canterbury Bankstown</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation:</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Summary of proposal: 160 apartments including 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 160</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezoning</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> the applicant be advised that there are alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on the site including a development application following finalisation of the Belmore alternative TOD scheme.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
6.	<p>288054 - <u>388-390 Canterbury Road, 392 Canterbury Road, 394 Canterbury Road, 1 Allen Street, Canterbury</u> - Phoenix Property group Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Canterbury Bankstown</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 150 apartments including 15% affordable housing for 15 years, unspecified amount of ground floor commercial premises, 15 storeys</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 150</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards</li> <li>▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezoning</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site.</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
7.	<p>289678 - <u>56 Helen Street, 66 Clapham Road, 62 Clapham Road</u>, Sefton - Blairgrove Group Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Canterbury Bankstown</p> <p><b>Summary of proposal:</b> 5 storey shop top housing – 150 dwellings including 20% affordable housing for 15 years with ground floor retail/commercial</p> <p><b>No of dwellings (indicative):</b> 150</p> <p><b>Concurrent rezoning:</b> Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards</li> <li>▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> the applicant be advised there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site following the release of the Department’s Industrial Lands Policy.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
8.	<p>285001 - <u>Part 226 Grange Avenue</u>, Marsden Park - Universal Property Group Pty Ltd c/o Bathla</p> <p>LGA: Blacktown City</p> <p><b>Summary of proposal:</b> Construction of shop top housing comprising a total of 338 dwellings, 158 dwellings delivered in Stage 1, including unspecified amount of ground floor commercial space and 5-10% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p><b>No of dwellings (indicative):</b> 338</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> <li>● <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
<p>9.</p>	<p>286755 - <u>87 Cudgegong Road</u>, Rouse Hill - Think Planners Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Blacktown City</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 9 storey residential flat building comprising 275 dwellings with 14.5% affordable housing for 15 years</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 275</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>● <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
<p>10.</p>	<p>290128 - <u>1 Vardys Road</u>, Kings Langley - Developable</p> <p>LGA: Blacktown City</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation:</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Summary of proposal: 800 apartments including 5-10% affordable housing, 22 storey building</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 800</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> <li>● <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>● <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
11.	<p>287884 - <a href="#">178 Princes Hwy</a>, St Peters - Iris Hotels St Peters Property Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Inner West</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Mixed use development, 260 apartments, ground floor retail, existing hotel use to remain, 5% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 260</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>● <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:                                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards</li> <li>▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Criteria 3.2: Well located (environmental hazards and constraints)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criteria 3.4: Positive commitment to affordable housing</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> the applicant be advised there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including a development application or planning proposal.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
12.	<p>288819 - <u>83-91 Milton Street, 93 Milton Street</u>, Ashfield and 76-78 Arthur Street, Croydon Park - TOGA Health No1 Unit Trust</p> <p>LGA: Inner West</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 118 apartments in 3 buildings, health service facility (mental health facility) comprising 68 inpatient beds, restaurant/café and indoor recreational facility, 4% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 118</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this proposal be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal did not adequately satisfy certain objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Criteria 3.4: Positive commitment to affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezoning</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit-strategic context</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> the applicant is advised that there remain alternative pathways in the NSW planning system including a development application following a planning proposal.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
13.	<p>287940 - <u>23 Park Street, Port Macquarie</u> - Planet Warriewood Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Port Macquarie-Hastings</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	<p>Summary of proposal: Mixed use development, 210 dwellings including 35 affordable dwellings (7.5% in perpetuity and 7.5% for 15 years), 18 storeys with entertainment and commercial precinct, hotel and residential</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 210</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that given the prominence of the site, careful consideration of design outcomes will be required as part of the merit assessment.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
14.	<p>288058 - <u>582 Railway Parade and 3, 5 and 7 West Street</u>, Hurstville - Dickson Rothschild</p> <p>LGA: Georges River</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 101 apartments, 26 storeys, 222sqm retail/commercial ground floor, 15% affordable housing</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 101</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&amp;A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that the overall height of the development will need to manage OLS restrictions which may require further consultation with Sydney Airport.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
<p>15.</p>	<p>288598 - <u>4-10 Torrens Street, 394A Princes Highway, Part of 392-394 Princes Highway, Blakehurst - Think Planners</u></p> <p>LGA: Georges River</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 110 apartments including 5% affordable housing for 15 years, 8 storeys</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 110</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> that a concurrent rezoning may be required to support a State significant development application given the extent of variation to development standards proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
16.	<p>288088 - <u>1 Stanley Street</u>, Kogarah - Level 33</p> <p>LGA: Georges River</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 158 apartments, 20 storeys, ground floor commercial, 15% affordable housing for 15 years.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 158</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> an existing consent (DA2023/0222) will need to be surrendered prior to the determination of any new SSD for the site.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
17.	<p>288082 - <u>29 Flide Street</u>, Caringbah - Planning Ingenuity c/-Kingsway Garden Developments Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: Sutherland Shire</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 101 apartments, including 10% affordable housing, 15 storeys</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 101</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal has State significance as it is a major residential project as it satisfies the HDA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<p>SSD criteria established in the document “HDA consideration of State significance under s4.36 of the EP&amp;A Act.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant liaise with the applicant for EOI 288787 to achieve consistent built form and urban design outcomes for the precinct.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
18.	<p>288787 - <u>408-414 Kingsway and 33-35 Flide Street, Caringbah</u> - PRINCIPLE planning + urban design</p> <p>LGA: Sutherland Shire</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 275 apartments, 8% affordable housing for 10 years, two towers, 8 and 15 storeys.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 275</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of state significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> </ul>






No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised to consider increasing their commitment to affordable housing given the significant uplift proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant liaise with the applicant for EOI 288082 to achieve consistent built form and urban design outcomes for the precinct.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
19.	<p>288090 - <u>268-274 and 276-282 Devonshire Street</u>, Surry Hills - Fivex Pty Ltd</p> <p>LGA: City of Sydney</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 105 dwellings, including 10% affordable housing for 15 years. One 11 storey tower and one 8 storey tower, approximately 1,500m<sup>2</sup> of commercial gross floor area, retention of heritage fabric</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 105</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within the Housing Accord period</li> <li>▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant</li> <li>▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly</li> <li>▪ Criteria 2.3: Positive commitment to commence - commence development quickly</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> 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 or development application via the Infill affordable housing SSD pathway.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
20.	<p>289566 - <u>483 Wattle Street</u>, Ultimo - Scape Australia Management Pty Ltd (Scape)</p> <p>LGA: City of Sydney</p> <p>Summary of proposal: Renewal of 655 student housing to 1291 student housing including 3% affordable housing, x2 20 storey buildings, unspecified amount of ground floor retail.</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 1291</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does not recommend</b> this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing</li> <li>▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezoning</li> <li>▪ Criteria 4.2: Significant changes to development standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <b>Recommended</b> 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.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>
21.	<p>288513 - <u>24 Brookhollow Ave</u>, Norwest - Urbis Ltd</p> <p>LGA: The Hills Shire</p> <p>Summary of proposal: 245 apartments including 10% affordable housing, unspecified amount of ground floor commercial</p> <p>No of dwellings (indicative): 245</p> <p>Concurrent rezoning: Yes</p>	<p>The HDA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&amp;A Act.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> the reasons for the HDA recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Formed</b> the view that the development proposal is of State significance as it satisfies the HDA SSD criteria.</li> <li>• <b>Provided</b> the following advice to the Minister:</li> </ul>



No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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&amp;A Act.”</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised that a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in the EOI application.</li> <li>• <b>Recommended</b> that the applicant be advised to consider increasing their commitment to affordable housing given the significant uplift proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Noted</b> there are no member conflict of interests.</li> </ul>

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

 Chair: Simon Draper Date: 10 December 2025	 Member: Kiersten Fishburn Date: 8 December 2025	 Member: Tom Gellibrand Date: 9/12/2025
--	---	--



MR S. DRAPER: Okay, at the HDA meeting today we had an operation report, and we've considered 21 EOIs today. I'll run through them now with - - -

MS K. FISHBURN: Simon, can you just make a note of the date, and who is attending the HDA.

MR DRAPER: Yeah, sure. Today is the 5th of December, and the three panel members are  
5 here: Tom Gellibrand, Kiersten Fishburn, and myself. So the first one we looked at was EOI  
248699, and this one is in an area where there's a State-led Rezoning underway, so we're not  
recommending this one. But, Kiersten, do you perhaps want to comment further?

MS FISHBURN: We're recommending for this one that it goes through the process of the State-led  
Rezoning, however, the HDA panel recommends to the department that an SSD pathway be  
10 considered for the finalised State-led Rezoning and that these EOIs are provided to the State-led  
Rezoning for information and consideration as the SLR progresses.

MR DRAPER: And then number 249403 is similar; it's in the same category.

MS FISHBURN: The information for this one is the same as for the previous; it's also part of the  
SLR.

15 MR DRAPER: Yeah, so we're not recommending that one for declaration at this time for that  
reason. Number 287914 is being recommended for declaration by the Minister. Number 272585 is  
not being recommended for declaration by the Minister.

MS FISHBURN: The Council has recently completed their own TOD work for this area, and this  
proposal significantly exceeds the Council TOD controls.

20 MR DRAPER: Number 273167 is not recommended.

MS FISHBURN: The Council has recently completed their TOD planning for this area, and this  
proposal significantly exceeds the TOD controls.

MR DRAPER: Number 288054, not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: There's current strategic work indeed, a planning proposal on foot, which doesn't  
25 envisage residential development for this site, and the department considers this important industrial  
land.

MR DRAPER: Number 289678 is not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: This is land that is significant industrial land and shouldn't be used for residential  
at this point in time.

30 MR DRAPER: Number 285001 is recommended for declaration. Number 286755 is  
recommended for declaration. Number 290128 is recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: Just a note here, that the panel considers that merit assessment may result in a reduction in scale and yield here, but that will be determined when it goes through the merit assessment.

MR DRAPER: Number 287884 is not recommended for declaration.

5 MS FISHBURN: This is significant industrial land not suitable for residential at this point in time.

MR DRAPER: 288819 is not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: This is out of context with the surrounding low-density development and, therefore, wouldn't be considered well located or appropriate for the scale of development proposed.

10 MR DRAPER: 287940 is recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: Just a note for both the proponent and the department that the panel discussed that, given the importance of the site, careful design consideration should be undertaken through the merit assessment process.

MR DRAPER: Yeah. 288058 is recommended for declaration. Number 288598 is recommended  
15 for declaration. 288088 is recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: To note here that there's an existing court consent on this site, and that consent will likely need to be surrendered prior to any new determination being made.

MR DRAPER: Number 288082 is recommended for declaration. Number 288787 is recommended for declaration.

20 MS FISHBURN: This site and the previous site are adjacent and are actually surrounded by other HDA developments, so we would recommend that proponents make contact with each other and hopefully work together for good design and amenity outcomes.

MR DRAPER: Number 288090 is not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: We would recommend that the proponent pursues the infill affordable housing  
25 pathway for this particular development. That's an SSD pathway that is available to them.

MR DRAPER: And that is those two sites.

MS FISHBURN: Two sites, yeah.

MR DRAPER: 289566 is not recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: This is significant uplift for the context in the area and for student housing that is  
30 fairly new in terms of development. We suggest the proponent engage further with Council on this

particular proposal.

MR DRAPER: Yeah. Number 288513 is recommended for declaration.

MS FISHBURN: Yeah.

MR DRAPER: That's all the 21 we did today. Thank you very much everyone.

5 MS FISHBURN: Thank you, team. Thank you, Simon and Tom.

**ADJOURNED**