



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-927341

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: BARANGAROO SOUTH AND CENTRAL

PANEL: **DAVID McNAMARA**
 JOHN HANN
 WENDY LEWIN

PARTICIPANTS: **CAMERON SARGEANT**
 BEN LUSHER
 ANDREW HARTCHER

LOCATION: **LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET**
 SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **12.12 PM, TUESDAY, 14 AUGUST 2018**

MR J. HANN: Well, thank you, gentlemen, for making to time to come and brief us. I just – we’ve got a new – with the new legislation, we have some new protocols that we’re following. We’ve kicked those off, as you’re probably aware, where some of the public meetings since March 1. What I do need to do so we’re consistent –
5 and as you can see, these are now recorded, so our briefings and our meetings are now recorded along with the public meetings, so it will be the same with Lend Lease this afternoon, the applicant. So look, there’s a couple of key things that I just want to run through, but part of them, in a moment I will just ask you if you could just give your names so that it’s part of the transcript. If you could bear with me.

10 So welcome, and look, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people, and pay my respects to their elders past and present. So welcome to the meeting today on development application SSD7944 in relation to the public domain works Barangaroo South and
15 Central, from Lend Lease Millers Point Proprietary limited, the applicant, who is seeking an approval for the public domain works within the south and central areas of Barangaroo.

20 So my name is John Hann. I’m the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is Wendy Lewin and David McNamara of the IPC secretariat, who’s assisting the panel for us. And if you could just introduce yourselves, now would be appropriate. Perhaps begin with you, Ben. Yes.

25 MR B. LUSHER: Sure. John, I’ll start off. My name’s Ben Lusher, Director of Planning Frameworks of the Department of Planning and Environment. I managed this project as the director of the key sites assessments team.

MR HANN: Thanks, Ben.

30 MR A. HARTCHER: Andrew Harcher, senior planning officer in key sites assessments. I did the bulk of the writing of the report, so.

MR HANN: Okay.

35 MR C. SARGEANT: And Cameron Sargeant, then-team leader, key sites assessments, currently acting director key sites assessments.

MR HANN: Thank you. So look, in the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure we capture the full information of today’s meeting, we’re recording it, and
40 so we’ll have a full transcript, and that will be produced and made available on the Commission’s website. So this meeting is one part of the Commission’s decision-making process. It’s taking place at the preliminary stage of the process, and we’ll form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will make its decision. It’s important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to
45 clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate, so if we do ask you a question that you feel you’re not in a position to answer, then feel free to take that on notice

and follow that up with some additional information in writing. That would be appreciated. And we'll put that on the website as well.

5 So thanks very much. That's our introduction. So we're really over to the briefing proper. I suggest if you just take us through the keys points. We're familiar with the documentation. We've gone back to have a look at the concept approval mod 8. Obviously we're familiar with the other related approvals such as 4A, 4B. So if you could take us through the key points, and then we've just got a series of queries for you.

10 MR LUSHER: Okay. John, I'm happy to take the Commission through that fairly high level run-through just to start with, if you like.

15 MR HANN: Yep.

15 MR LUSHER: So this project, which is titled public domain works of Barangaroo South and Central, will effectively allow for the completion of the public domain in what's known as Barangaroo South in the Barangaroo precinct. The earlier public domain area known as the stage 1A public domain area has completed some time ago, and this is the other let's say half of that area within Barangaroo South. That said, it incorporates a lot of really important public domain areas which are part of the vision with the Barangaroo precinct and were created in concept, if you like, through the – what's known as the Barangaroo mod 8 application, which was a modification to the concept plan which provided for a rearrangement of buildings and public spaces. That was determined by the Commission about two years ago, I think, if I'm not mistaken.

25 MR SARGEANT: Yeah. June 2016.

30 MR LUSHER: This completes, in some respects, that vision. We have been working on this project for some time now, and in a lot of respects it also is informed by an application that also the Commission determined, which was the stage 1B basement project, which sits underneath – in the main sits underneath Hickson Park. Now, the reason that there's a key I guess interrelationship with that project is because of the way that that project has informed the design outcomes at the ground level specifically in respect to a number of the particular requirements in the concept plan approval that the Commission required at the time of the determination of mod 8. Other related applications to this are the buildings – the building footprints within this part of Barangaroo South. I guess more recently, or in particular, there's key relationships that we'll go into with the R4A and B approvals.

40 So we – like I said, we've been working on this for some time. I think that a large focus of our assessment has not only been about the quality of the space of the public domain but also the way in which the public domain design meets the requirements of concept approval, noting that there are a number of very specific requirements around things like location of tree planting areas, deep soil zones, the design of the foreshore interface in front of the Crown Hotel Resort. Those issues formed a key

part of the consideration that we took forward. And I think that that's reflected in the way that we've put our assessment report together. We've gone into some detail as to how that meets the requirements of the concept approval.

5 I suppose, without wanting to sound like I'm simplifying, the process or the assessment – the key points that we focused on toward the end of the assessment, if you like, the issues that stayed with us the longest, were things like the deep soil zone requirements for Hickson Park and the associated tree-planting location in
10 Hickson Park, and the way in which the park could, would or should be completed, having regard to the simultaneous construction of buildings R4A and B. We think, generally speaking, that the application is actually very well resolved.

We know that council has some concerns, we think in particular around either issues that were effectively dealt with through the concept approval, or at the other end of
15 the spectrum, quite fine grain design issues, which we think are quite well resolved in our view. So that said, that's been the fairly high level summary of our assessment process, without getting into the particular details of any of the issues, but happy to take on any questions or offer further advice on those points.

20 MR HANN: All right. Well, thanks, Ben. Look, there's a number of areas which for us – for our benefit it would be helpful to have some clarification. I think the first one that we wanted to ask you about is the staging, which you alluded to just a moment ago.

25 MR LUSHER: Sure.

MR HANN: And how you think that's going to work. Clearly it was a prime consideration in the concept modification 8, and it was quite specific as to how that would be addressed and effectively implemented. When we review your relevant
30 section on that, we're not clear - - -

MR LUSHER: Okay.

35 MR HANN: - - - as to – first of all I think the question is what's proposed in terms of exclusion zones, is this part of the application, or is it something that needs to be considered at another time? So just so we're really clear on - - -

MR LUSHER: Sure.

40 MR HANN: - - - how you believe this is to be treated by the Commission.

MR LUSHER: So in terms of what is specifically proposed in the application, if you go to the section of our report, and I think it's section – the relevant section is the applicant's document in EIS.
45

MR HANN: Yes.

MR LUSHER: I don't think it actually seeks approval for that stage in the area they're seeking approval for the public domain works.

MR HANN: All right.

5

MR LUSHER: In the main, that's the listed sense of what's proposed. That said, what is in the EIS and the associated documents - - -

MR HARTCHER: I'll just jump in. It was the RTS – they came in the RTS with additional info about

10

MR HANN: Okay.

MR LUSHER: In the RTS, there is information about these exclusion zones, even though - - -

15

MR HANN: Yeah.

MR LUSHER: - - - they're not specifically proposed as part of the application.

20

MR HANN: So they're not proposed as part of the application.

MR LUSHER: That's the points of things that they're seeking approval for, if you go through their itemised list.

25

MR HANN: Yeah. Okay. That's all right.

MR LUSHER: However, the way that, you know, the department structures its approval instruments – and this is consistent with best practice – is that the requirements are that it's – development is carried out generally in accordance with the EIS and the response to submissions, and in accordance with the conditions set out in the instrument if approved. So whilst it's not specifically sought for approval in the list of items of things that are proposed, it is in the EIS and RTS documents, so the applicant may in the future say, well, that was in our EIS and RTS, so the department's instrument envisaged that, and that was made clear to our application process. So if there was any ambiguity, that's probably why, because it sits in that space. And the other point I'd make is that the exclusion zones - - -

30

35

MR HANN: Yeah.

40

MR LUSHER: - - - are associated with works being carried out under a separate application and separate approval, which is R4A and B.

MR HANN: And yet they – correct me if I'm wrong. Are they – were they part of that application, 4A and 4B?

45

MR LUSHER: They – I'd have to check, John, whether they were sought for approval, but I know that it was foreshadowed as an issue in that application as well.

MR HANN: All right.

5

MR LUSHER: What were you going to say, Cam?

MR SARGEANT: Not to the extent that what we've got here. So with any – with the construction of any building, you need a construction area within which to construct a building, but the detail was not provided to the same extent as what we've got there. But it was certainly noted that there may be in the future a requirement to have some of those zones.

10

MR LUSHER: As part of this consideration - - -

15

MR HANN: This is in the 4A, 4B?

MR SARGEANT: Just – yeah.

20

MR HANN: Yeah. Okay.

MR LUSHER: I recall the impact specifically considered the issue as part of its consideration of 4A and 4B.

25

MR HANN: So on that matter, then, you make reference to a condition. The department has recommended a condition to this effect. This is on page 26.

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

30

MR HANN: So that's actually in the construction and management plan, I think. I can't remember the exact - - -

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

35

MR HANN: Is it H, is it? C8?

MR D. McNAMARA: C8.

40

MR HANN: So that says detailed construction exclusion zones, including alternate locations outside Hickson Park should be required. So do you envisage – so that's envisaged as, in reality, in practice, correct me if I'm wrong, that will be part of – if that instrument is approved, then that does include exclusion zones that would be as delineated in the application, but also perhaps somewhere else, in other words, on Watermans Quay. Is that right? Because that's the way that – that's a fairly broad condition.

45

MR LUSHER: Yeah. I suppose CMPs are fairly broad in that they consider or anticipate impacts associated with a very large construction process. But I guess the reason that it is there is because of the fact that it is the – exclusion zones are referred to in the applicant’s documentation. That will form a part of any consent document.

5

MR HANN: All right. Okay.

MR LUSHER: We have to anticipate that if an applicant speaks to a certain issue or a certain outcome in an EIS or an RTS, we have to anticipate that that will form part of what it wants to do at some stage.

10

MR HANN: However, you did say earlier that you didn’t envisage it actually being part of the application.

MR LUSHER: No. What we said is it was not specifically sought for approval in the itemised list of things that were proposed.

15

MR HANN: Right. But nevertheless, as it’s referred to, and given that there’s a proposed - - -

20

MR LUSHER: But for instance, if someone was seeking - - -

MR HANN: - - - condition - - -

MR LUSHER: - - - approval to construct a building and it sought a certain method of construction which had to be assessed as part of the application, the application seeking approval would not detail that as the itemised list of things for which it was seeking approval. It would just be something that was in the application documents that needed to be considered.

25

30

MR HANN: All right.

MS W. LEWIN: If this application was for – this is R4A and B. If the application was in the city, without any curtilage, without this – as standalone projects – objects in a field, this wouldn’t be a consideration. It wouldn’t be possible to excise streets from the development site. It would have to be a project considered as contained or constrained within the context of being in that part of the city. Was that ever a consideration when you were anticipating including or not including exclusion zones?

35

40

MR LUSHER: We – I’m trying to understand exactly what you’re asking me. I’m a bit unsure as to what you’re asking me.

MR McNAMARA: I guess buildings in the city - - -

45

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MR McNAMARA: - - - are constructed without the luxury of an exclusion zone.

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

5 MR SARGEANT: Well, look - - -

MR LUSHER: They are and they're not.

MR SARGEANT: For the most part.

10 MR LUSHER: Yeah. They do - - -

MR SARGEANT: But - - -

15 MS LEWIN: For the most part.

MR LUSHER: There are loading zones and - - -

MR SARGEANT: That's – road occupancy permits.

20 MR LUSHER: - - - road closures.

MR SARGEANT: I mean, you have - - -

25 MR LUSHER: And reporting areas and things like that.

MR SARGEANT: That's right.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

30 MR McNAMARA: Yeah, but not in a - - -

MS LEWIN: But it's very contained.

35 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MS LEWIN: And given that this may impact on the use and reworking of Hickson Park - - -

40 MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MS LEWIN: - - - in the future over an extended period of time, was – the question is really was that – was the restriction of the construction exclusion - - -

45 MR LUSHER: It was discussed with the applicant, yeah, and we discussed it at some length, and they, I guess, were adamant that that's what they thought they

required. Now, we don't necessarily subscribe to that view, and we are not experts in testing that.

MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

5

MR LUSHER: So that's why we've left it open in the CMP to – if there is a need to actually diminish that space to allow for the completion of the park within the time
- - -

10 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR LUSHER: - - - required, then there is facility to do that in the consent.

MR HANN: Okay.

15

MR McNAMARA: So that question might be – the question we can ask the applicant later today about effectively alternatives - - -

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

20

MR McNAMARA: - - - to the arrangement that - - -

MR LUSHER: The concern that we had – and this might help you understand our perspective – is that if we left it unattended in the consent requirements – if it was just there in the RTS - - -

25

MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR LUSHER: - - - and there was nothing to, I guess speak to that issue or to manage that issue - - -

30

MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR LUSHER: - - - we thought that there's a risk down the track that the applicant might say that it was in their application documents; therefore the department somehow as complicit in supporting that. So we've put that provision in the instrument to make sure that there's facility, should it be required in the future, for the applicant to remove that exclusion zone to allow for completion.

35

MR McNAMARA: Okay.

40

MR LUSHER: And we acknowledge, that you have, that in the City of Sydney or other highly built up urban areas that construction management is often quite constrained in the space it has available to it, and often the hoarding is at the boundary line. Sometimes it's not. Sometimes it's over the whole footpath. Sometimes there are a lane of a street that's taken up for loading and unloading, that kind of thing. It comes and goes. But yeah, it is generally more constrained, and I

45

think they've got about a 12-metre buffer there, which, you know, is quite large by comparison to what would occur there.

MR McNAMARA: Thank you.

5

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

MR HANN: Okay. All right. We – just in regard to planning, and this is to do with Hickson Park. In – sorry. I'm just trying to it's probably this one. This will do. Just whether there was any consideration, acknowledging that with the concept plan there was I guess an intent that a large degree of this would be open grass, if you like, but given the prevailing north-westerly winds when they do occur, quite significant – was there any consideration – any discussion with the applicant or any issue around providing any mitigation for those winds across here?

10
15

MR LUSHER: I think what we were looking at more so was the sight lines from Hickson Road through to the harbour that were - - -

MR HANN: Yeah.

20

MR LUSHER: - - - a particular requirement, and so - - -

MR HANN: Yeah.

MR LUSHER: - - - to provide for an open landscape through Hickson Park there. I think that was our prevailing issue.

25

MR HANN: Okay.

MR HARTCHER: Yeah. So I don't think we really gave consideration to that, but – yeah.

30

MR HANN: Okay.

MR HARTCHER: We were trying to satisfy the concept plan view corridor.

35

MR HANN: Yeah. No.

MR HARTCHER: Yeah.

40

MR HANN: Okay.

MR SARGEANT: I mean, it's a balance between providing large, mature trees and also ensuring visual connectivity and permeability of the site.

45

MS LEWIN: Yes.

- MR HANN: Yes.
- MS LEWIN: And a selection of the species too, the trunks.
- 5 MR SARGEANT: So when you look at the terms – in terms of what is required for Hickson Park, there are a number of things that need to be considered and you need to look at those holistically. So in some cases - - -
- MR HANN: Yeah.
- 10 MR SARGEANT: - - - you might provide large, mature trees there, but you're not going to allow visual connectivity.
- MR HANN: Yeah.
- 15 MR LUSHER: Apologies, John. When – just while I remember, I mentioned to David outside, but I forgot to mention to you, I have to leave at quarter to the hour.
- MR HANN: Okay.
- 20 MR LUSHER: Apologies. Yeah.
- MR HANN: Sure.
- 25 MR LUSHER: I mean, I'm happy for Cam and Andrew to stay around, but I just didn't want to have to - - -
- MR HANN: Yeah. All right. No, no, no. Thanks.
- 30 MR McNAMARA: With the design of Hickson Park, could I just clarify – this is on page 31 – that the area that sits within what is Barangaroo Central, is it expected that the design of that public domain is final now, or is that expected that it could change in the future once the proposal comes forward for Barangaroo Central? I can't remember where that level of detail got to, and is this approval indeed seeking to
- 35 construct works in Barangaroo Central?
- MR SARGEANT: It's seeking approval to construct Hickson Park, as illustrated, yes.
- 40 MR McNAMARA: But it wouldn't preclude when proposals come forward for Barangaroo Central that there might be additional planting or - - -
- MR SARGEANT: That's right.
- 45 MR McNAMARA: Obviously there's going to be a road.

MR SARGEANT: I mean, you've got to bear in mind that the northern third of Hickson Park is in Barangaroo Central.

MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

5 MR HANN: Yeah.

MR SARGEANT: But certainly any future proposals involving Barangaroo Central, they would anticipate that would involve some public domain works as well.

10 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR SARGEANT: I mean, part of the central promenade has been already constructed, which is along here, but certainly there's large public domain areas that you would anticipate - - -

15 MR McNAMARA: Okay.

MR SARGEANT: - - - there'd been some sort of works and they would obviously connect to the - - -

20 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR SARGEANT: - - - those works and whether or not they want to tweak it a little bit at that interface. Look, it's unknown at the moment.

25 MR McNAMARA: Future assessment planner.

MR SARGEANT: Yeah.

30 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR HARTCHER: Thank canvas.

35 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR HARTCHER: I think we talked about in the report that this site can be as flexible as possible because we - - -

40 MR McNAMARA: Okay.

MR HANN: In relation to the walkway on to the west of the Crown facility – this is probably not the best plan. It's in reference to the pontoon.

45 MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MR SARGEANT: Yeah.

MR HANN: There are a couple of – and it's on – so we've got, for example, that impression, and then I think it's further back here, or might be – there's a separate one.

5 MR LUSHER: Might be on the next page of that one.

MR HANN: I think it probably is. I'm just trying to look at where – yeah. The issue here, if you recall, in regard to the concept modification, the rationale for extending this to the west was with the envelope of the hotel facility, you've got
10 licensed areas that are going to encroach on what is the public domain, and this would go a long way to offsetting that. With the pontoon, have you considered what impact that has in terms of constraining the walkway? In other words, it's not that we don't understand that that's a public berth.

15 There are – the conditions will be to restrict vessels for being – you know, water taxis and so on for residing there for any great length of time. Nevertheless, it's not going to be part of the walkway. The walkway will then be a bottleneck back up through to the north. Have you given – have you had any discussion with the
20 applicant around that? Because I'm presuming that at this point on the western side of the envelope of the hotel, this is still the licensed area, so it's going to be quite narrow.

MR SARGEANT: So the western extension obviously comprises a number of landscaping or – you've got soft landscaping, you've got hard landscaping elements,
25 so that includes not only the paving area, but also floating pontoons, timber boardwalk, etcetera. So as long as access is provided to the entirety of that space which is proposed, then I think the public access issue and how it achieves that has certainly been met.

30 MR LUSHER: But, John, just going back to, you know, the intent around that western extension - - -

MR HANN: Yeah.

35 MR LUSHER: - - - of the foreshore walk, I don't know that – and being part of the discussions at the time, I don't know that it was designed to provide for relief of a pinch point to provide through access. It was more to provide a reasonable spatial quality, actually to spend time, not just as a throughway.

40 MR HANN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR LUSHER: So we think that in that regard, it's – the integrity of that space is fine.

45 MR HANN: Okay.

MR LUSHER: And I think that the dimension of the walkway is probably – or the promenade - - -

MR HARTCHER: Yeah. Combined with the tree avenue - - -

5 MR LUSHER: - - - with or without the nine-metre apron is consistent with the remainder of the dimension of the promenade in the rest of Barangaroo, which provides for more of that through - - -

10 MR HANN: All right.

MR LUSHER: - - - movement.

MR HANN: Okay. Wendy, do you - - -

15 MS LEWIN: So – yeah.

MR HANN: Sorry.

20 MS LEWIN: Yeah. No.

MR HANN: No, no. Go on.

MS LEWIN: I note in your initial comments, Ben, that in relation to City of Sydney’s concerns, many of them were considered to be of a fine grain design nature, and perhaps I take from that that they’re still open for development or further consideration by the applicant. But I’m just wondering how strongly the department considered this detail in relation to the public domain generally and its connection from Barangaroo South to what is proposed in – or what is considered to be likely in

25 Barangaroo Central. Do you consider it a pocket park within the overall domain, or do you see this as a particular identifiable precinct, or was that not part of the consideration? The applicant proposes a different type of street fixture, furnishing, ground treatment - - -

30

35 MR SARGEANT: For Hickson Park.

MS LEWIN: - - - for Hickson Park.

MR LUSHER: When you compare it to - - -

40 MS LEWIN: When you compare it to Barangaroo South, its detailed selection of fixtures and fittings.

MR SARGEANT: So sandstone blocks you’re talking about, those sorts of - - -

45 MS LEWIN: And the paving - - -

MR McNAMARA:

MR SARGEANT: paving and that sort of - - -

5 MS LEWIN: - - - and the interface areas where there are transition points and so on. And then there is also a different lighting system proposed and so on. And I'm just – I understand that they can be considered finer grain elements, but I'm just wondering whether they were considered at all.

10 MR SARGEANT: They – I mean, in the – in our report – and they do speak to the fact that the materials that they are using, like the paving and the sandstone blocks – they've already been used - - -

MS LEWIN: In Headland Park.

15

MR SARGEANT: - - - at the Headland Park, and so that would – you know, so there is some sort of consistency there, certainly. But the - - -

20 MR LUSHER: I think the issue that the city had is it didn't – wasn't consistent with its palette.

MR SARGEANT: Yes. With theirs. So - - -

MR LUSHER: Not so much the Barangaroo palette.

25

MR SARGEANT: Yeah. That's right.

MS LEWIN: No. That's true. Yes. That's true.

30 MR SARGEANT: So they – that's right. Yeah. That's right. So we considered that, given the fact that it – it is consistent with other materials and paving that's been used in other areas in Barangaroo.

35 MR HARTCHER: Yeah. It's used in Barangaroo Central waterfront promenade and the – in Headland Park.

MR SARGEANT: Yep.

40 MR HARTCHER: And it's the key unifying element with the Wulugul Walk, Watermans Quay and the wider precinct.

MS LEWIN: Or will be. Yeah.

45 MR LUSHER: Perhaps if you could tell us what your concern is, and make it easier to - - -

MS LEWIN: Well, it - - -

MR LUSHER: - - - understand how to answer the question.

MS LEWIN: It's – perhaps it's not a concern - - -

5 MR LUSHER: Right. Okay.

MS LEWIN: - - - in a particular directive sense.

MR LUSHER: Sure.

10

MS LEWIN: It's a consideration. What is proposed seems to be quite concentrated. It doesn't have that sort of broader linkage at the moment. Headland Park is definitely a precinct that is identified with a certain type of treatment, and certainly the inclusion of elements that are to do with lighting and servicing are very much

15 part of that more remote northern point, and we are talking about a pocket park or a city park, a green park that is more related to the city in a direct, connect connectivity sense of a materiality and so on, surfaces and associations, and the question was really related to that. Had the Department – it seems as though it's considered to be appropriate, from your report, which is – I think that's a reasonable reading.

20

MR LUSHER: Yeah. Yep.

MS LEWIN: And we're just wondering whether there had been any other discussion or consideration that the city of Sydney's palette might be more present. It's just a simple question.

25

MR LUSHER: Okay. So - - -

MS LEWIN: So the answer would be - - -

30

MR HARTCHER: I think – yeah, I think broadly - - -

MR LUSHER: No further than what we've already - - -

35

MR HARTCHER: Yeah, I think broadly between the different public domain areas, we've satisfied that things like street lighting and things and furniture and that type of thing were consistent with the city's palette, and then where there were differences, for places like Hickson Park, we considered that sort of acceptable, as they were sort of a distinct key place within the area. So yeah.

40

MR HANN: Do you want to ask about lighting as well, Wendy?

MS LEWIN: Well, I think that - - -

45

MR HANN: It's a similar vein.

MR McNAMARA: Same.

MS LEWIN: It's a similar thing that just touched on.

MR HANN: But do you have any more - - -

5 MS LEWIN: The lighting of course is – the lighting along the waterfront and the street will be the city of Sydney's, as I understand it, smart bulbs and so on, and Hickson Park in the small area, you're suggesting that the Department is quite happy for the applicant to introduce separate type of lighting that's present in the headland. Is - - -

10 MR HARTCHER: I guess – yeah, I wasn't talking about lighting specifically but the sort of streetscape transition paving to mark those key areas. We considered that acceptable.

15 MS LEWIN: Would it be possible for you to talk about the lighting, then?

MR SARGEANT: The lighting strategy that was prepared says that it's consistent with the lighting that was proposed for the 1A area, so you've got – along Barangaroo Avenue and Wulugul Walk, you've got the smart bulbs.

20 MS LEWIN: Smart bulbs. Yes. Yeah.

MR HANN: Yep.

25 MR SARGEANT: Yeah. And then in the other areas, Watermans Quay and Hickson Park, you've got different types of lighting, which is consistent with what they've used previously.

MS LEWIN: Headland. In the Headland. Yeah.

30 MR SARGEANT: And the 1A.

MR HANN: And 1A as well.

35 MS LEWIN: In parts of 1A. Yes. Yes.

MR SARGEANT: And the 1A South. Yeah. That's right.

MR HANN: Okay.

40 MR HARTCHER: Yes. That's right.

MS LEWIN: All right.

45 MR SARGEANT: That's right.

MR HANN: There's reference to – this is just something we couldn't quite figure out. In the development description, there's reference to pedestrian columnade to Hickson Road, but then there's no discussion about that anywhere else. What does that mean?

5 MR SARGEANT: Pedestrian columnade?

MR HANN: Yeah.

10 MR SARGEANT: To Hickson Road?

MR HANN: Yeah. Where would that be?

MR SARGEANT: Well, that – well, that's – I mean, that's obviously Watermans Quay. So probably we should have - - -

15 MR LUSHER: It might have been - - -

MR HANN: Well, we thought that was, but I wasn't – we weren't - - -

20 MR SARGEANT: East west link.

MR LUSHER: It may have been a typo. It may meant to have meant promenade rather than columnade.

25 MR McNAMARA: Do you want to - - -

MS LEWIN: Watermans Quay is - - -

30 MR SARGEANT: Promenade. Could be promenade.

MR HANN: It's just that you've got Watermans Quay as well.

MS LEWIN: You've got Watermans Quay there.

35 MR SARGEANT: Yeah. Yep. Yep. Yep.

MR HANN: add-on.

40 MR LUSHER: I think it's – we'll have to get back to you, but I suspect it might be a typo.

MR McNAMARA: Why don't you, yeah, take that on notice just to check.

45 MR HANN: That's all right.

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MR HANN: I'm just saying, have we missed something?

MR SARGEANT: Okay.

5 MR HANN: Is there another - - -

MR LUSHER: No.

MR HANN: - - - element to this public domain that we

10 MR SARGEANT: That's the only east west – that's the only east west pedestrian link that's – proposing.

MR HANN: Yeah. When you read it, you go back to Hickson Road.

15 MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MR HANN: That can only be that, we thought, but maybe - - -

20 MR SARGEANT: It can. Yeah. Yeah.

MS LEWIN: It would be good to clarify that. Yes.

MR LUSHER: I don't – yeah. I think check.

25 MR HANN: Okay. Ben, how are you doing for time? You all right?

MR LUSHER: Okay for the moment.

30 MR HANN: Okay. All right. Okay. Back to wind mitigation, with 4A and 4B, the strata, if you recall, there were – talked about the issues around the wind amenity within the strata between those four buildings, and one of the elements of that I think related to the ability to mitigate that with appropriate, mature planting. So the question really is, is that a consideration you've given in terms of what's proposed by

35 Lend Lease in terms of the tree planting in those areas? It's just trying to link in so that they're not satellite applications and developments, that they are linked in, even though they're separate applications.

MR LUSHER: Yep.

40 MR HANN: We're trying to look at this holistically.

MR LUSHER: Do you want to speak to that

45 MR SARGEANT: We do speak to wind, and provided supplementary information in the RTS.

MR HANN: Yeah. I just wondered whether it addressed that. I – look, I’m not saying it hasn’t. I just - - -

MR HARTCHER: Yeah. My understanding - - -

5 MR HANN: In the reading I’ve done, I hadn’t got that far.

MR HARTCHER: My understanding is the wind assessment does consider what’s been proposed in R4A, R4B.

10 MR HANN: Right. Okay.

MR HARTCHER: Including the strata. Yeah, we can take that on notice.

15 MR HANN: Would you mind - - -

MR HARTCHER: Yeah. Take that on notice.

MR HANN: Yeah. Not trying to put you on the spot.

20 MR HARTCHER: No, that’s all right.

MR HANN: Just if you - - -

25 MR McNAMARA: No. Guess it’s just making sure that if R4A, 4B expected a certain degree of mitigation, that that’s been achieved, because that’s – this application will deliver it or won’t deliver it.

MR HARTCHER: Yeah. Yeah.

30 MR HANN: Yeah.

MR LUSHER: Yeah. We understand.

35 MR McNAMARA: Yeah. Cool.

MR HANN: So yeah, if you wouldn’t mind coming back to us on that. Yeah.

MR LUSHER: Okay. Yep.

40 MR HANN: Wendy, did you have anything else that you wanted to raise? We covered everything that I had.

MR LEWIN: Yeah. species and so on I think are generally covered. I think we’re looking at the peer with the applicant, aren’t we?

45 MR McNAMARA: Yeah.

MR HANN: Yeah. Obviously some of these will flow on to - - -

MS LEWIN: Yeah.

5 MR HANN: - - - our questions. We've asked you, have you considered with the applicant such-and-such, so we'll obviously have some questions there. But look, I - - -

MS LEWIN: I think we're right.

10 MR HANN: That covers our key matters at the moment.

MR LUSHER: Okay.

15 MR HANN: So thank you very much for making the time.

MR LUSHER: Thank you for your time.

MR HANN: And I think we've made it just on your departure.

20 MR LUSHER: I appreciate that. It's apologise. It's not my normal MO to rush off from these conversations.

MR HANN: No, no, no. We have arranged it - - -

25 MR McNAMARA: We are - - -

MR HANN: - - - on your account, Ben.

30 MR McNAMARA: We are meeting with Lend Lease this afternoon - - -

MR LUSHER: Yeah.

MR McNAMARA: - - - as the applicant, and if there's any other questions, clarifications, come out of that, I'll be in touch tomorrow to discuss.

35 MR LUSHER: Please do. Yeah.

MR McNAMARA: And I'll probably contact you tomorrow just to get a feel for timing on those couple of matters that you took on notice today.

40 MR LUSHER: Yep.

MR McNAMARA: Great.

45 MR LUSHER: Yep. Will do. Thank you.

MR McNAMARA: All right. Thanks for your time.

MR HANN: Yeah. All right. Thanks.

5 MS LEWIN: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.49 pm]