

**Minutes of Pre-SSDA Meeting held via MS Teams 2pm Friday 31 October 2025 – WSU
Milperra**

Attendees:

Council

Nicholas Aley
Stephen Arnold
Adrian Raccosta
Margaret Southwell
Shereny Selim
Preetha Kumar
Peter Lay
Nathan Cheah
Garry Thompson
Babee Palanivel

Mirvac

Nibraas Ahmad
Arron Tanoai
Ashleigh Ryan
Lexie Drury
Shane Gray
Jerome Guinto
David Robertson
Alix Murray
Wayne Johnson
Paul Cai

Meeting held following the provision of Pre-DA comments by Council to a package of information submitted in August 2025. Correspondence sent on 3 September 2025 to Mirvac, raising 88 items. The DA was announced as State Significant Development by the Housing Delivery Authority soon thereafter. This meeting was held to answer questions from the proponent about specific items in Council's correspondence of 3 September 2025. Minimal additional information was provided. Not all 88 items were covered. The majority remain outstanding as far as Council is aware/concerned.

Introductions by Nibraas (for Proponent) and Nicholas (for Council)

Item 11 – Community title subdivision

11. *The creation of lot 30 (E1 and C2 zoned land) and the inclusion of a further community title subdivision of proposed lot 30 has not provided sufficient detail for consideration. It is unclear on what the intention of this will achieve and currently it is considered it should not be pursued as part of the initial DA. Sufficient details have not been provided to demonstrate why this should be considered and form part of a DA lodgement.*

Ashleigh Ryan spoke, describing the Community title subdivision of proposed lot 30 into 3 further lots. Lot 1 will be the C2 zone, with various relevant details associated including vegetation management plans, tree protection zones, etc. Lot 2 will contain the existing Child Care Centre.

Lot 3 will be a future retail lot. Conditions on lots will remain to maintain Lot 1 (being environmentally sensitive land). Council offered no comment.

Item 13 – Child Care Centre (CCC)

13. *Details are required to be provided to demonstrate how the childcare centre will continue operations during the development or where it is not sought to continue operating details outlining and surrendering the current consent that applies to the land is required. Where the centre is proposed to remain operational, the statement of environmental effects must comprehensively outline how the proposal and use will remain compliant with the relevant approval in place or seek to obtain further approval within the DA submission.*

Ashleigh Ryan spoke, stating that, proponent acknowledges the operation of CCC and the staging of works need to be linked, with the SSDA needing to show how it can remain operational. It will need to close during stage 3 (construction of roads and new car park) and the proponent will seek conditions of consent restricting operation during stage 3 (perhaps by way of a restriction on title). Council offered no comment.

Item 16 – Substation

16. *EV charging infrastructure and substations are not shown. The plans need to note the proposed locations for this infrastructure. These facilities need to be shown, where they are located within areas to be dedicated to Council in the future, do not form part of the minimum area required.*

Shane Gray and Jerome Guinto spoke to reasons for choosing the sites, in order to justify the positions of both the substation(s) and the EV charging stations. EV charging stations will actually be the largest electrical demand on the site, and the locations have been chosen to ensure substations are in close proximity to the charging stations.

Council acknowledged that Item 16 in the letter sought such a justification.

Item 20 – Shared Pathway widths

20. *The cross section provided within the civil engineering plans for the pedestrian access pathway must be updated and demonstrate compliance with the CBDP 2023, Chapter 11.13, 3.1, C23. The plans submitted do [not, sic] provide for the 5m shared path required by the control. A variation to the width is not supported.*

Proposed at 2.0m along all roads. Site-specific DCP requires 9m wide pedestrian links within 5m wide shared pathways. Proponent seeks to reduce from the 5.0m down to 2.0m, to reduce the amount of hardstand, similar to the 2.5m width in the DCP for other shared paths.

Council (Babee Palavinel) worried about the width for shared path not being acceptable. TfNSW and Australian Standards insisting on minimum width of 3.0m (2.5m is an absolute minimum, despite DCP stating 2.0m in some instances). Peter Lay advised that it was Council's plan to have accessible pathways through the LGA at 2.5m minimum.

The general consensus was 2.5m widths could be acceptable.

Item 10 – Ashford Ave Pedestrian crossing

10. *Further details and an address of the driveway placement for lot 2101 must be provided. The current design and kerb extension on the allotment appears to result in a driveway that would not be suitable in the current location. This should be reviewed*

and where necessary the lot width increased to enable a suitable driveway location to be provided for accessing the lot (should the pedestrian crossing design be accepted).

Question from proponent whether a raised pedestrian crossing is actually required. C14 of the DCP says such measures ‘may include but are not limited to’.

Wayne Johnson noted that it was not possible to provide a central pedestrian island. Felt that current pedestrian counts and the absence of a pedestrian footpath on the western side of Ashford Ave reduced the need for a pedestrian crossing in this location.

Shereny Selim advised that pedestrian counts taken now do not assist, as the pedestrian solution at this point is required to serve the future development and pedestrian demand from the completed development. As currently proposed, it is not a pedestrian crossing, and doesn’t give right of way to pedestrians.

Preetha Kumar advised that Council may plan to install a footpath on the western side of Ashford Avenue in the future. The absence of a footpath at present should not be used as a justification by the proponent for not considering the installation of a raised pedestrian crossing on Ashford Avenue.

Ashleigh Ryan – acknowledge it is not compliant, and the proponent will need to justify.

Shereny Selim confirmed that Council definitely requires a raised pedestrian crossing and it needs to be marked as such, with no need to restrict parking in close proximity, provided distances are consistent with the relevant technical direction.

Nicholas Aley summarised to say that, despite the DCP provisions, it is the position of Council’s traffic section that a pedestrian crossing is required. Given the options listed in the DCP, it is up to the applicant to prove to Council’s traffic section why a pedestrian crossing is not the preferred solution.

Item 22 – Pedestrian link along southern boundary

- 22. The application submitted does not make provisions for a future pedestrian link to the south as outlined by the CBDP 2023, Chapter 11.13, Section 3.1, C 25. The plans must be updated, and more details provided to demonstrate the pedestrian link along the southern boundary of the site (north of the M5) to Horsley Road. It is considered that suitable provisions could be accommodated within the development to achieve this link.*

C25 in section 3.1 of the DCP requires a pedestrian link along the southern boundary of the site (northern boundary of the M5) to Horsley Rd. Shane Gray advised that this part of the DCP was written prior to the Mount St Josephs’s school purchasing part of the old WSU Campus. It is not possible to achieve this anymore.

Nicholas Aley advised that this is acknowledged, and that through site links that achieve access through to Horsely Rd can still be achieved, just not directly and in the location anticipated in the DCP.

Item 26 – Horsley Rd intersection

- 26. A site plan that shows the entire site and road network is to be provided with the zoning map overlayed for assessment. A preliminary review appears that the location of Road 2B accessing of Horsley Road is located partially within the C2 Environmental Conservation zone and E1 Local Centre zone. The objectives and controls within the CBDP 2023, Chapter 11.13, Section 3.4 require that the development of the site enhance and conserve existing canopy cover and retain trees. A concern is raised over the placement of this road within the conservation zone. The road alignment should be*

reviewed and shifted south to ensure that the conservation zone is not impacted by the access into the development site.

The access shown to Horsley Road is unorderedly and at this stage the access design would not be supported. It is unclear how the design is operationally the best solution for accessing the site along Horsley Road.

The design should be revised, and the road alignment shifted to ensure the C2 zone is not impacted unnecessarily. Any access for the development needs to be detailed in a Traffic Impact Assessment submitted within any DA lodgement. The Traffic Impact Assessment must evaluate alternative treatments and locations for the Horsley Road access, and detail how the proposed access sought is suitable in the context of the site, and ensures the best outcome and safety of any user (pedestrian and vehicle) and limits any implications on traffic flows/restrictions as a result of the design selected.

Council require the retention of the existing roundabout. The solution provided in the meeting retains an important tree, despite encroaching into the C2 zone. Preetha Kumar confirmed that the roundabout must be retained and that consultation needs to be undertaken with nearby stakeholders regarding the proposed changes to the intersection. Arron and Nibraas indicated this had already occurred, particularly with Mt St Jospeh's school, considered to be the main stakeholder.

Shane Gray indicated that the new one-way access from the site into Horsley Rd would be sign posted (one way, no entry from Horsley Rd, etc). Preetha Kumar requested that evidence would need to be provided that the largest construction vehicle likely to access the site can achieve the manoeuvre.

It was confirmed that vehicles wishing to enter the site from southbound lanes on Horsely Rd would need to continue south to the next roundabout and complete a 180 degree turn to head north and then turn left (west) into the site.

Item 37 – BDAR

37. Biodiversity Assessment and Mitigation Hierarchy

[Extensive detailed advice from 3 Sept Correspondence not replicated here]

Alix Murray and David Robertson do not agree that the proponent has not avoided, as claimed by Council.

Council advised that the BDAR would need to demonstrate how the avoid/minimise/mitigate/offset hierarchy had been achieved through the consideration of various multiple alternative solutions, and explain why the chosen solution was the best outcome in terms of avoid/minimise/mitigate/offset.

David Robertson believes 7.2 in the BDAR achieves this.

Council reaffirmed its position that the BDAR needs to demonstrate how this process was resolved.

Next steps

Council will prepare minutes and circulate by Wednesday 5 November. Proponent anticipates lodging the SSDA by Friday 7 November.

Meeting ended 3.15pm