Housing Delivery Authority – Record of Briefing

Date and Time: 23 July 2026 – 3.00PM – 5.00PM

Location: Parkline, 252 Pitt Street, Sydney

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

HDA Members

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

Member Alternates

Rebecca McPhee – Deputy Secretary, Investment NSW

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

DPHI Staff

Madeleine Thomas - A/Deputy Secretary, Development Assessment and Sustainability, DPHI

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

Ben Lusher– A/Executive Director, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Kate McKinnon – Director, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Emma Heagney – Senior Project Officer, Panels and Housing Delivery, DPHI

Jemima Royall – Team Leader, EOI Evaluations, DPHI

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

Tim Mahoney - Senior Planning Officer EOI Evaluations, DPHI

Mark Rutherford – Director, Probity, DPHI

Apologies

Simon Draper - Secretary, Premier's Department

Tom Gellibrand – Chief Executive, Infrastructure NSW

Summary of decision

The HDA considered 51 EOI applications received by DPHI. The HDA considered each application against the "Housing Delivery Authority State Significant Development Criteria" published on the Department's website.

Of the 51 applications, the HDA recommended to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces that:

- 17 EOI applications be declared SSD.
- 34 EOI applications are not recommended to be called in as SSD.

Agenda items

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
A	Introduction • Acknowledgement of Country • Conflict of Interests	• **Noted** COIs: ○ Monica Gibson – EOI 354731 (Newcastle West)
B	HDA Operational Briefing	• **Noted** the verbal update on HDA procedures and operational matters. • **Noted** updates from previous HDA meeting cycle. • **Discussed** proposed updates to Governance documents • **Discussed EOIs** deferred by the HDA
1.	366207 - 9-11 & 13 The Boulevarde, Brighton Le Sands - Miava Construction Pty Ltd (c/- Gyde Consulting) **LGA:** Bayside Council **Summary of proposal:** A 20-storey residential flat building containing 115 apartments with 15% affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 115	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 68.8m where current height of building controls for the site are 28m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, including response to the Sydney (Kingsford Smith) International Airport's Obstacle Limitation Surface (51m), in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing

2.	353354 - 1-7 The Grand Parade, 161-169 Bestic Street & 53 General Holmes Drive, Kyeemagh - Dickson Rothschild
	
	LGA: Bayside Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Shop-top housing providing a mixed use scheme with building heights ranging from 4 to 25 storeys, with 306 apartments and 1,570sqm of retail and/or commercial floor space.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 306
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

3.	360770 - 86 Arncliffe Street, Wolli Creek - Planning&Co
	
	LGA: Bayside Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Shop top development over retail (supermarket) and commercial podium with residential towers the proposal provides 3.3% of total residential uses, or 10% of the residential GFA uplift, delivering 23 affordable dwellings held in perpetuity
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 600
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly
		  ▪ Criteria 2.5: Has addressed any previously refused proposal
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Recommended** the applicant be advised that the HDA will not consider any future EOI applications on this site, given it is significantly

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		constrained. It is recommended that the applicant consider other pathways for the development of the site. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
4.	355564 - 1070,1080 Richmond Road, Marsden Park - Developable Pty Ltd **LGA:** Blacktown City Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a residential flat building development, with 996 residential apartments across four towers with a maximum height of 18 storeys. To contain 15% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over a 15-year tenure. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 996 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 3.1: Well-located ▪ Objective 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that the HDA will not consider any future EOI applications on this site, given it is not well-located for additional housing and is significantly constrained. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
5.	357098 - 95 Farmand Drive, Schofields - Catalina Developments **LGA:** Blacktown City Council	The HDA: • **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
	Summary of proposal: Construction of an 18m residential flat building development, comprising 660 dwellings with no affordable housing proposed. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 660 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ 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 ○ 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 proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
6.	359690 - 13, 15, 17 Second Avenue, Seven Hills - Innovative Builders **LGA:** Blacktown City Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 20-storey residential flat building, with 123 residential apartments and 0.8% of residential GFA (1 dwelling)	The HDA: • **Recommends** to the Minister that this project be declared SSD under s4.36(3) of the EP&A Act • **Noted** the reasons for HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the objectives and criteria of the HDA EOI.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 123 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	• **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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 70m where current height of building controls for the site are 20m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include a more significant contribution to affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Recommended** that the applicant investigate incorporating the adjacent isolated site (19 Second Avenue) into the

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		development. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
7.	358757 - 210A Burwood Road, Burwood - WEN Architects **LGA:** Burwood Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of an 18-storey shop-top housing development, with 105 residential dwellings and 15% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over a 15-year period. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 105 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes a significant variation of 100% above the current floor space controls for the site (4.5:1), a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
8.	360912 - 1 Burwood Road, Burwood - Developable Pty Ltd **LGA:** Burwood Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 28 storey (90m) shop-top housing development, with 100 dwellings and 15% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 100 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site following the finalisation of the Burwood North State Led Rezoning precinct. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
9.	364919 - 5 Burleigh Street, 26 & 30-32 Railway Parade, Burwood - Think Planners **LGA:** Burwood Council	The HDA: • **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: ○ The proposal adequately satisfies the

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	Summary of proposal: Construction of a 42-storey shop-top housing development, with commercial uses and 209 residential dwellings above, with 10% of the residential GFA, dedicated to affordable housing for 15 years and 3.5% in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 209 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 145m where current height of building controls for the site are 70m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal should respond to

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		Clause 4.4A of the Burwood Local Environmental Plan 2012, including the requirement for provision of community infrastructure benefits aligning with the additional floor space ratios proposed above current controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
10.	357174 - 856 Hume Highway, Bass Hill - Established Projects **LGA:** Canterbury-Bankstown Council **Summary of proposal:** The proposal seeks approval for a shop-top housing development comprising ground floor retail and approximately 120 residential apartments (15% of which will be affordable for 15 years). **No of dwellings (indicative):** 120 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
11.	354618 - 266-268 & 270-272 Canterbury Road, 2 & 4 Fore Street, 1 Berna Street, Canterbury - Allera Planning Pty Ltd on behalf of the landowners **LGA:** Canterbury-Bankstown Council **Summary of proposal:** A mixed-use building comprising 250 apartments within a single 25-storey building,	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	including 5% affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 250 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	development standards ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1 Well-located – free of specific environmental hazards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
12.	355688 - 388-390, 392, 394 Canterbury Road & 1 Allen Street, Canterbury - Hayti Projects **LGA:** Canterbury-Bankstown Council **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing proposal comprising a 10 storey building containing ground floor commercial and approximately 100 apartments, with 15% for 15 years offered as affordable housing. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 100 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
13.	359210 - 82-90 Blackwall Road, Woy Woy - The Trustee for Dimitriani Unit Trust **LGA:** Central Coast Council	The HDA: • **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
	Summary of proposal: Construction of a 14-storey (45 metres) shop-top housing development, with commercial and retail spaces and 169 residential dwellings with 10% of residential GFA (17 dwellings) as affordable housing over a tenure of 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 169 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ 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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 45m where current height of building controls for the site are 24m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
14.	368521 - 50 Great North Road, Five Dock - Developable Pty Ltd **LGA:** City of Canada Bay Council **Summary of proposal:** Demolition of structures and construction of a shop top housing with 101 units above a commercial ground floor across a total 29 storeys. 15% of the units will be dedicated as affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 101 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five-year horizon ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site, specifically, a development application following the finalisation following the proposed Five Dock Precinct Planning Proposal. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
15.	355940 - 78 Hughes Avenue, Ermington - Knight Frank Town Planning	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	LGA: Council of the City of Parramatta **Summary of proposal:** Residential flat building development comprising 196 dwellings, with ground floor commercial floor space, maximum height of 23 storeys, including 15% as affordable housing for 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 196 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	• **Notes** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well Located ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
16.	354666 - 41 & 43 Hunter Street, Parramatta - Lockhart-Krause Architects Pty Ltd **LGA:** Council of the City of Parramatta **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing comprising approximately 300 dwellings including 15% (of dwellings) dedicated as affordable housing for an unspecified period and approximately 30,000m^2 GFA. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 300 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Criteria 2.2: Positive commitment to commence ▪ Objective 3 Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1 Well-located ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
17.	359741 - 142 Macquarie Street, Parramatta - JQZ Eighteen Pty Ltd	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	LGA: Council of the City of Parramatta **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing comprising three towers and two standalone buildings providing 1,351 dwellings, 15% affordable housing for 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 1351 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Criteria 2.2: Positive commitment to commence ▪ Objective 3 Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1 Well-located ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
18.	355579 - 2-8 Hope Street, Rose Hill - APX Hotel Apartments **LGA:** Council of the City of Parramatta **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing development comprising 28 storeys, commercial premises at ground floor level & approximately 427 apartments including 15% affordable housing for 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 427 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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 ○ 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

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act." • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 95m where current height of building controls for the site are 28m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
19.	355866 - 48-50 Stanley Street, Darlinghurst - Inspire Planning **LGA:** Council of the City of Sydney **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 17-storey (60 metres) shop-top housing development, comprising 100 dwellings and 15% of residential GFA	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	dedicated to affordable housing over an unknown period. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 100 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ 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 ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
20.	356549 - 219-241 Cleveland Street, Redfern - AXA Investment Managers Australia Ltd as Trustee for Aroland Australia Trust **LGA:** Council of the City of Sydney **Summary of proposal:** Concept approval for a shop-top housing and residential flat building development, with approximately 900 dwellings across 4 – 6 buildings and a height of 50m to 150m (approximately 15 to 40 storeys). Stage 1 is to include approximately 300 dwellings and 5%	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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
	of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative)**: 300 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total heights of 50-150m where current height of building controls for the site are 22m, a merit assessment will result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, including reduction to respond to the Sydney (Kingsford Smith) International Airport's Obstacle Limitation Surface (110m) and overshadowing impacts to any public open space in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process, which will determine the final height of the proposal. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

21.	338638 - 19, 21, 23 Station Street, Guildford - P & D Legal Pty Ltd
	
	LGA: Cumberland Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Construction of a 13-storey residential flat building, containing 97 dwellings and 10% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over a 15-year period.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 97
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five-year horizon
		  ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant
		  ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly
		  ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

22.	333078 - 351-353 Hume Highway, Cabramatta - Oscars Group **LGA:** Fairfield City Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of up to four residential flat buildings, with building heights ranging from 5 to 7 storeys (up to 24m), containing approximately 350 to 420 dwellings,	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	with an unspecified commitment of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over a 10-year period. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 390 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well – located ▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
23.	364456 - 48-50 Forest Road, Hurstville - FCFG Developments **LGA:** Georges River Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 17-storey shop top housing development with ground floor retail and 100 residential dwellings. To include 5% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 100 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		• **Recommended** that the Department liaise with Georges River Council to discuss future strategic planning opportunities for the area. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

24.	354732 - 1 Derby Street, Kogarah - M.H. Carnegie c/o Patch Planning
	LGA: Georges River Council
	Summary of proposal: Construction of a 25-storey (82m) shop-top housing development, with dedicated ground floor non-residential floorspace, 126 dwellings and 10% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over an unspecified tenure.
	No of dwellings (indicative): 126
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant
		  ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly
		  ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

25.	353375 - 14 Beaconsfield Parade, Lindfield - Rudder Development **LGA:** Ku-ring-gai Council **Summary of proposal:** The proposal involves construction of a 13 storey residential flat building development. The building will contain 102 dwellings,	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	including a minimum of 15% of the gross floor area dedicated to affordable housing for a period of 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 102 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five-year horizon • Criteria 1.2: Development is state significant (approximately 100 or more homes) ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings • Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards • Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including lodging a development application aligning with uplift and controls delivered by the Ku-ring-gai Alternate TOD masterplan. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
26.	353221 - 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 Reid Street, Lindfield - Reid 888 P/L **LGA:** Ku-ring-gai Council **Summary of proposal:** A residential flat building for 103 dwellings with 10-15% of the dwellings dedicated for affordable housing. Height and density of the building is unspecified. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 103	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	Concurrent rezoning: No	▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **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 that utilises the infill affordable bonuses provided under the Housing SEPP. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
27.	354261 - 25-29 Middle Harbour Road, Lindfield - Rudder Development **LGA:** Ku-ring-gai Council **Summary of proposal:** The proposal involves construction of an 11 storey shop top housing development. The building will contain 134 dwellings, including a minimum of 15% of the gross floor area dedicated to affordable housing for a period of 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 134 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including lodging a development application aligning with uplift and controls delivered by the Ku-ring-gai Alternate TOD masterplan. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
28.	364613 - 1D, 3, 3A, 3B, 5, 5A Orinoco Street, Pymble - N/A **LGA:** Ku-ring-gai Council **Summary of proposal:** Demolition of existing structures and construction of a residential flat building development with 166 dwellings, communal open space, associated landscaping and car parking in basement levels. 5% affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 166 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 22m where current height of building controls for the site are 9.5-11.5m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

29.	354574 - 89-101 Cowles Road, Mosman - Cowles Road Residence Holding Pty Ltd
	
	LGA: Mosman Municipal Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Residential flat building up to 20 storeys in height. This development will deliver 100 dwellings of which 15% will be dedicated as affordable housing for a period of 15 years.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 100
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly
		  ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

30.	360363 - 64, 66 Spit Road, Mosman - Maison Mosman Pty Ltd **LGA:** Mosman Municipal Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 28 storey shop top housing development comprising	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	approximately 200 dwellings (including 10% affordable housing in perpetuity) above commercial tenancies on the lower levels. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 200 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
31.	355754 - 170 & 172 Cardiff Road, Elermore Vale - Palmer Bruyn **LGA:** Newcastle City Council **Summary of proposal:** Low density housing in the form of 50 semi-attached and 20 detached dwellings including Torrens title subdivision and strata subdivision. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 70 Concurrent rezoning: No	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five-year horizon ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1 Well- located ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well serviced ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

32.	354731 - 796-802 & 810 Hunter Street, Newcastle West - Think Planners
	
	LGA: Newcastle City Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Shop top housing (25 & 28 storeys) comprising 235 dwellings, including 10% affordable housing (across the two towers) for 15 years.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 235
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **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:
		  ○ 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
		  ○ 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 proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle.
		
		The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		• **Recommended** that the applicant investigate incorporating the adjacent isolated site (822 and 826 Hunter Street, Newcastle West) into the development. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests. • Monica Gibson did not brief the HDA on this matter due to a declared conflict of interest.

33.	360905 - 136 Hunter Street, 6 Newcomen Street, 151 Scott Street, Newcastle - 136 Hunter Street Pty Ltd
	LGA: Newcastle City Council
	Summary of proposal: Shop top housing comprising 119 dwellings and a monetary contribution in accordance with the Newcastle Affordable Housing Contributions Scheme.
	No of dwellings (indicative): 119
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **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:
		  ○ 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**
		  ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 42m where current height of building controls for the site are 20m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		refinement having specific regarding to retention of sightlines to the Christ Church Cathedral, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
34.	364306 - 164, 166 Kurraba Road, 6, 8 Shellcove Road, Kurraba Point - MAI **LGA:** North Sydney Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 15-storey (52 metres) residential flat building, with 145 residential dwellings and 15% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 145 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
35.	356908 - 2 Myoora Road, Terrey Hills - Trio Property Group **LGA:** Northern Beaches Council **Summary of proposal:** The proposal comprises three, 6-storey buildings. One residential flat building and two shop top housing buildings, each with two levels of basement parking, delivering a total of 234 dwellings. No affordable housing is proposed. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 234 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located ▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
36.	361743 - 47 Homedale Road & Lot 202/DP1133171 (part lot) Kendall Road, Kew - Jojeni Developments Pty Ltd **LGA:** Port Macquarie-Hastings Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a manufactured home estate, with 192	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	manufactured homes as 'multi-dwelling housing', and no affordable housing proposed. **No of dwellings (indicative)**: 192 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.5: Has addressed any previously refused proposal ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well serviced ▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** the applicant be advised that the HDA will not consider any future EOI applications on this site, given it is not well-located for additional housing and is significantly constrained. The applicant is advised that there remain alternative approval pathways in the NSW planning system for development on this site including the Infill-Affordable State Significant Development pathway or a Development Application through Council. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing

37.	354524 - 38 Horizons Drive Salamander Bay - Meliora Project Pty Ltd
	
	LGA: Port Stephens Council
	
	Summary of proposal: 8-storey Residential Flat Building (RFB) containing 65 apartments. The development is supported by approximately 104 above-ground parking spaces across two levels. No affordable housing is proposed.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 65
	
	Concurrent rezoning: No
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing
		  ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located
		  ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well serviced
		  ▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

38.	354353 - 2 Buchan Street, Mollymook - Buchan Property Group
	
	LGA: Shoalhaven City Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Construction of two six-storey residential flat buildings, containing 46 residential dwellings, with 10% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing over a 10-year period.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 46
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **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:
		  ○ 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
		  ○ 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

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act." • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 22m where current height of building controls for the site are 11m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
39.	361153 - 76, 76A, 76B Princes Highway, Ulladulla - SMEC Australia Pty Ltd **LGA:** Shoalhaven City Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 3-4 storey residential flat building, containing 40 residential dwellings, with monetary contributions to affordable housing proposed.	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	No of dwellings (indicative): 40 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	• **Provided** the following advice to the Minister ○ 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 proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
40.	357025 - 2, 4, 6 Pilgrim Avenue, 11, 13 Albert Road, Strathfield - Nascon Pty Ltd **LGA:** Strathfield Municipal Council **Summary of proposal:** Alterations and additions to approved mixed use development with two 20 storey towers (SSD-80432461), with the addition of 20 storeys to one tower and 12 storeys to the other tower, resulting in 170 additional apartments of which approximately 34 affordable (20% for a period of 15 years)	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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
	No of dwellings (indicative): 170 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 135m where current height of building controls for the site are 54m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
41.	359593 - 397-411 Kingsway, 309-313 Taren Point Road, 40-42 Chamberlain	The HDA:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing

	Avenue, Caringbah - Caringbah Corner Pty Ltd
	
	LGA: Sutherland Shire Council
	
	Summary of proposal: The proposal comprises a residential flat building and a podium-and-tower shop top housing development, with a five-storey podium and tower elements ranging from 6 to 15 storeys. The proposal includes 550 dwellings with 5% affordable housing in perpetuity and 12% affordable housing for 15 years.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 550
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		• **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:
		  ○ 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
		  ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 65m where current height of building controls for the site are 9.5m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process.
		• **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle.
		The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
42.	364998 - 157A, 159A, 161, 165, 167 & 169A The Kingsway, Wooloware - Sunrise Investments Aus Pty Ltd **LGA:** Sutherland Shire Council **Summary of proposal:** Residential Flat Building to deliver approximately 160 dwellings across a mid-rise residential flat building precinct with buildings up to 8 storeys and a minimum of 15% affordable housing units managed for 15 years **No of dwellings (indicative):** 160 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Recommended** that the Department liaise with Sutherland Shire Council to discuss future strategic planning opportunities for the area. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
43.	353949 - 70 The Parkway, Beaumont Hills - Think Planners **LGA:** The Hills Shire Council **Summary of proposal:** An 8 storey mixed-use shop top housing development delivered in two stages with a total of 225 units proposed	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
	(104 in Stage 1, 121 in Stage 2). 10% affordable housing for 15 years. **No of dwellings (indicative)**: 225 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
44.	357095 - 12-14 Anella Avenue, 16-20 Salisbury Road, Castle Hill - Goodman Property Services (Aust) Pty Ltd **LGA:** The Hills Shire Council **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing including 5 to 6 buildings of 4 – 45 stories, including ground floor retail / community uses. 3,000 dwellings with 5% affordable housing for an unspecified timeframe **No of dwellings (indicative)**: 3000 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
45.	354389 - 14-28 Beach Road, 63-73 Gould Street, Bondi - HSN Property Group Pty Ltd **LGA:** Waverley Council **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing of 7-11 storeys comprising approximately 110 dwellings inclusive of 7% as affordable dwellings in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 110 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five year horizon ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
46.	366767 - 9 Help Street, Chatswood - Chatswood Help Landmark Pty Ltd **LGA:** Willoughby City Council **Summary of proposal:** Construction of a 60-storey shop-top housing development, with ground floor retail uses, commercial office uses on levels 1 & 2 and 424 residential apartments above. To contain 15% of residential GFA dedicated to affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 424 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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 ○ 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

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		significance under s4.36 of the EP&A Act." • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that Willoughby City Council is currently undertaking a capacity analysis of available infrastructure to support residential uplift within Chatswood CBD and any proposed rezoning will need to involve a discussion with Council on infrastructure augmentation and development contributions/ public benefit coming out of significant uplift. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal does not include a Floor Space Ratio (FSR). A merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes concurrent rezoning and would generally include affordable housing proportional to uplift with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

No.	Description	Record of Briefing

47.	361013 - 76, 78, 80 Cliff Avenue, Northbridge - EG Property Advisory
	
	LGA: Willoughby City Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Construction of a residential flat building development containing 100 dwellings within two buildings (a 6 storey and an 8-storey building). To include 15 dwellings dedicated to affordable housing, with 10 for 15 years and 5 in perpetuity.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 100
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant
		  ▪ 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
		  ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings
		  ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards
		  ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit
		Noted there are no member conflict of interests.

48.	360741 - 10 Timothy Lacey Lane, The Oaks - N/A
	
	LGA: Wollondilly Shire Council
	
	Summary of proposal: Subdivision for 130 residential lots providing free standing homes. No dwellings or affordable housing proposed.
	
	No of dwellings (indicative): 130
	
	Concurrent rezoning: Yes
		The HDA:
		• **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway
		• **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation:
		  ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being:
		  ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five year horizon

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		▪ Criteria 1.1: Development is a type to deliver high yield housing ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.2: Positive commitment to commence ▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Criteria 3.1: Well-located ▪ Criteria 3.2: Well-serviced ▪ Criteria 3.3: Positive commitment to affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
49.	356314 - 116-122 Corrimal Street, 1 Moore Lane, Wollongong - GS & DA Properties Pty Ltd & Kosto and Blaze Services Pty Ltd **LGA:** Wollongong City Council **Summary of proposal:** Shop top housing (18 storeys) comprising 150 dwellings including 15% affordable housing for an unspecified period. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 150 Concurrent rezoning: No	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Notes** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 1: Deliver more homes within a five-year horizon ▪ Criteria 1.2: Development is State significant

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		▪ Objective 3: Drive quality and affordable housing ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
50.	358987 - 162, 164,166 Old South Head Road, Bellevue Hill - Paro Consulting **LGA:** Woollahra Municipal Council **Summary of proposal:** Residential flat building comprising approximately 134 dwellings with 10% of the uplift GFA as affordable housing in perpetuity. GFA is unspecified **No of dwellings (indicative):** 134 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **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: ○ 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 ○ 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 noting the proposal includes significant height variation, proposing a total height of 50m where current height of building controls for the site are 13.5m, a merit assessment may result in development standards and dwelling yield lower than proposed in this EOI application. Whilst the site is a good location for proposed housing

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		development, the project will require refinement, in consultation with the Department, through the merit assessment process. • **Recommended** that the applicant be advised that the proposal includes significant uplift and would generally include affordable housing that is in perpetuity with feasibility as a guiding principle. The proponent is to provide analysis and information that supports a proposed approach to affordable housing as part of the SSD merit assessment process. The Department will work with the proponent to determine an approach to affordable housing that reflects the expectation that there is value returned to the community from the significant uplift achieved above existing planning controls. • **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.
51.	365045 - 76-78 New South Head Road, Vaucluse - DM Services 88 Pty Ltd (A division of ALAND) **LGA:** Woollahra Municipal Council **Summary of proposal:** 12 storey residential flat building providing 103 dwellings and 5% affordable housing in perpetuity. **No of dwellings (indicative):** 103 Concurrent rezoning: Yes	The HDA: • **Did not recommend** this project be declared SSD under the HDA pathway • **Noted** the reasons for the HDA recommendation: ○ The proposal does not adequately satisfy all objectives or criteria of the HDA EOI, being: ▪ Objective 2: Identify projects that can be assessed quickly ▪ Criteria 2.1: Largely consistent with development standards ▪ Objective 4: Optional Concurrent Spot Rezonings ▪ Criteria 4.1: Significant changes to development standards ▪ Criteria 4.2: Proposal has strategic merit

No.	Description	Record of Briefing
		• **Noted** there are no member conflict of interests.

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

Chair: Kiersten Fishburn Date: 24/07/2026	Member: Bec McPhee Date: 24.07.26	Member: Said Hirsh Date: 24/07/2026

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE (DPHI)

HOUSING DELIVERY AUTHORITY (HDA) BRIEFING

23 JULY 2026

PARTICIPANTS:

HDA MEMBERS:
Kiersten Fishburn

MEMBER ALTERNATES
Rebecca McPhee
Said Hirsh

DPHI STAFF:
Madeleine Thomas
Monica Gibson
Ben Lusher
Kate McKinnon
Jemima Royall
Emma Heagney
Angela Kenna
Tim Mahoney
Mark Rutherford

[Start of recorded material at 00:00:00]

Kiersten Fishburn: Good afternoon, I'm Kiersten Fishburn, I'm the Secretary of the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure, and it was my great pleasure to chair the Housing Delivery Authority meeting of the 23rd of July 2026. With me today here are Rebecca McPhee, who is the Deputy Secretary, Investment New South Wales, and is the alternate for Simon Draper, and Said Hirsh, who's Head of Strategy, Planning and Innovation at Infrastructure New South Wales, who was the alternate for Tom Gellibrand.

The meeting considered 51 different expressions of interest. The panel itself had no conflicts of interest noted. We did have one conflict of interest from Monica Gibson, Deputy Secretary of PLUSHI in relation to EOI 354731. Monica left the room during the discussion of that particular matter.

Moving into the EOIs that were considered, I will read out the expression of interest number and the recommendation made by the panel. I will also, as I do each meeting, provide some commentary for those that were not recommended. However, noting that it's quite challenging to do both tasks simultaneously, if there is information that I miss, departmental staff will provide further commentary that was made by the HDA panel. They will be representing the comments of the HDA panel if required.

Let's get it going. The first of the expressions of interest was 366207. This was recommended to the Minister.

The next is 353354. This was not recommended due to the scale of the development being inconsistent with the surrounding context.

The next was 360770. This was not recommended due to the complexity of the assessment with site constraints and the fact the proposal is well over the OLS. It would not be able to be assessed in the time that the HDA sets for assessment.

The next was 355564, which was not recommended due to the complexity of assessment and the known site constraints. Noting that the proponent is currently working with Council, we suggest they continue with Council. It's a complicated assessment.

357098 was recommended.

359690 was recommended, will be recommended to the Minister.

358757 is recommended for the Minister.

360912 is not recommended due to the fact that it is inconsistent with

on exhibition Burwood state-led rezoning. We suggest the proponent responds to that process.

364919 will be recommended to the Minister.

357174 is not recommended due to the proposal being out of context with the surrounding area.

354618 is not recommended, noting that significant local and state strategic planning has been done, and this is inconsistent with recent strategic planning and local context.

355688 is not recommended, noting that this is inconsistent with local and strategic planning for the area and proposed development context.

359210 is recommended for the Minister.

368521 is not recommended. This is inconsistent with the context and strategic planning that is being undertaken by Council, noting as well that it is just at yield, so any change to it to align more closely with local context would take it below yield.

355940 is not recommended. This is industrial land, and there are also a number of known hazards there. It would be a complex assessment outside of the timeframe of the HDA, and the proponent may wish to work with Council.

354666 is not recommended. This is a very complex site environment, and would be work that would take longer than the assessment period proposed for the HDA. We recommend that the proponent works directly with Council.

359741, this again is an area where it would be complex to assess. There are many aspects that would require detailed assessment work and would not be able to be done during the period of the HDA, and we suggest that the proponent work with Parramatta Council.

355579 is recommended for the Minister.

355866 is not recommended. The development proposed is well out of context for the local area, the scale as well.

356549 is recommended.

338638 is not recommended, it's below the yield that is proposed for the HDA.

333078 is not recommended. It's not well located, and there are environmental constraints as well.

364456 is not recommended. The development proposed is inconsistent with the local context. However, the HDA noted that the recommendation is that the Department should discuss with Georges River Council strategic planning for the Hurstville area.

354732 is not recommended. This extrudes well into the OLS as an absolute constraint. It also has a constraint around a hospital helipad, and any reduction in scale to manage those two things would take it below yield.

353375 is not recommended. This is inconsistent with recent strategic planning undertaken by Council and adopted by the Minister.

353221 is not recommended. This is inconsistent with recent strategic planning done by Council and adopted by the Minister.

354261 is not recommended. Again, this is inconsistent with recent strategic planning done by Council and adopted by the Minister.

364613 is recommended.

354574 is not recommended. This is inconsistent with the local context and character.

360363 is not recommended. This is an area that the LMR controls apply to, and that's considered the right strategic context, and this is well above those controls.

355754 is not recommended, noting that this is below the yield and threshold for HDA and SSD.

354731 is recommended.

360905 is recommended.

364306 is not recommended. This is inconsistent with local character and context.

356908 is not recommended. This is not well located, and it is also on rural and MRA land.

361743 is not recommended, noting significant environmental and infrastructure constraints for this particular project.

354524 is not recommended, noting that it doesn't meet the well-located threshold and is on RE2 recreation land. We would suggest the proponents discuss a planning proposal with Council, should they wish to pursue.

354353 is recommended.

361153 is recommended.

357025 is recommended.

359593 is recommended.

364998 is not recommended, noting that the proposal is out of context with the local site. This is one of a number of proposals that the HDA have seen in relation to Woolooware, and we would recommend that the Department discuss with Sutherland Shire Council the merit of strategic planning in this area.

353949 is not recommended. The proposal is out of context of the local environment.

357095 is not recommended. This is a proposal on regionally significant industrial land.

354389 is not recommended. The proposal is of a scale that is out of character and context for the local area.

366767 is recommended.

361013 is not recommended. The proposal is inconsistent with the environment and location, and this is also an environmental living zone that would anticipate significantly smaller development.

360741 is not recommended. This is not well located and is also on rural land, and for the first time in the HDA that we've seen on cemetery zoning, so would require significant work; complex assessment process.

356314 is not recommended, noting that the SSD component of this is below the yield threshold for the HDA. We did consider, though, that it may well have merit, and we suggest the proponent returns to Council for a modification.

358987 is recommended.

365045 is not recommended. This would be a very complex assessment due to site constraints, and the proposal is only just at yield, so any modification would take it below. We would suggest that this is one it would benefit being worked through with Council.

That was the 51 EOIs that have been looked at today. Thank you, as always, to the Department for their hard work to get us to this point,

and thank you to my fellow panel members.

[End of recorded material at 00:12:31]