



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-1020158

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: DOLPHIN POINT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION MOD 4

PANEL: **DR PETER WILLIAMS**
ILONA MILLAR

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID WAY**
DENNIS LEE

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** **ANTHONY WITHERDIN**
MICHELLE NILES

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

DATE: **9.19 AM, TUESDAY, 30 APRIL 2019**

DR P. WILLIAMS: Good morning, and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today, Malbec Dolphin Point Proprietary Limited and the Ulladulla Local Aboriginal Land Council.
5 The proponents are proposing to amend the conditions of consent for their residential development on Highview Road at Dolphin Point, New South Wales, in the Shoalhaven Regional Council.

10 My name is Peter Williams. I'm the chair of this IPC Panel and joining me is Ilona Millar. The other attendees at the meeting are Dennis Lee up at the end and David Way from the IPC Secretariat and Anthony Witherdin and Michelle Niles representing the Department of Planning and Environment.

15 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

20 It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website. So we
25 will now begin. And thank you, Anthony and Michelle, for coming to meet with us today.

30 The agenda is fully broad in one sense, but if you could begin by just talking a little bit around issues like the proposed modification, agency advice, just your overview of the key assessment issues and also anything on the conditions of consent of modification, that would be great.

MR A. WITHERDIN: Sure.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR WITHERDIN: Thank you. Just as a – by way of a quick background – so the site is located at Dolphin Point and that's south of Nowra near Ulladulla. And, as you can see in figure 1 of the department's assessment report, the site sits directly
40 west of the existing township of Dolphin Point. The original application was approved back in 2009 and that was for a 104 lot residential subdivision across seven stages and it also included a 6.2 hectare area of conservation lands. The proposal has been modified on three occasions. In terms of the proposed modification, it
45 essentially seeks to do three things.

The first is to delete a condition which requires a left-turn approach lane to be constructed onto the Princes Highway from the roundabout at Dolphin Point Road. It also seeks to replace two medium density residential lots with individual residential lots and, thirdly, it seeks to amend a number of Statement of
5 Commitments relating to ecology, urban design and other infrastructure and staging. The Department notified the application to relevant agencies and we also notified all owners within the subdivision area.

10 MS M. NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Council did not object to the overall proposal. It supported deleting the condition requiring the left-turn approach lane onto the Princes Highway. It said that the traffic calming device on Vista Drive should remain. It supported the – it supported removing the requirement for restrictions on the dogs
15 and cats because it's basically covered by conditions of consent. And then it raised concern, though, about some changes to the Statement of Commitments relating to the leafless tongue orchid and the white footed dunnart that are located within the overall area.

20 We also notified RMS. RMS didn't raise any concerns about the proposal. And we also notified OEH and they raised some concerns about changes to the management of the leafless tongue orchid and the white footed dunnart which we will talk a bit more about later. The proponent then provided a response to submissions and basically it sought to address council's and OEHs concerns. It provided a bit more
25 justification around deleting the requirement for the traffic calming device on Vista Drive and it provided some more justification and a report from an ecologist about the changes to the leafless tongue orchid and the white footed dunnart conservation measures. And so the key assessment issues for this proposal was, firstly, the deletion of the - - -

30 MS NILES: Left.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - turning – the left turn lane onto the Princes Highway. The important points to note there is that council support the deletion of that left-turn
35 lane.

MS NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: And council's reasoning for that was because they feel that
40 there wasn't a sufficient nexus for the proponent to solely provide that lane, but, more importantly, there is now an additional roundabout which has been constructed further to the north of this site and so that provides extra capacity within the road network. So that alleviates the potential traffic congestion around that – the roundabout that was closest to the subdivision area. So we carefully assessed that
45 proposal. And we should also note that the department previously didn't support a proposal to delete that left turn approach lane. The difference there, though, is that at that time that that modification, the previous modification, was assessed, there was

no additional roundabout further to the north of the site. So that's one of the key reasons why the department has changed its view on why that left-turn approach lane
- - -

5 MS NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - can be now deleted. We feel that that roundabout further to the north of the site provides an additional access point onto the Princes Highway. It provides that extra capacity, so alleviating any congestion and, basically, because
10 council and RMS fully support the deletion of that left-turn approach lane. Another key issue in the Department's assessment was the replacement of the medium density lots with standard residential lots.

The proposal seeks to basically replace two medium residential lots with six standard
15 residential lots. And the Department considers that change is acceptable essentially because it won't result in any additional impacts because the density remains very similar and it's in keeping with the low density environment of the existing Dolphin Point area. And then, finally, there's a number of amendments to the Statement of
20 Commitments.

MS NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: So we can go through those individually, if you want.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. That might help. We've got a copy, as well.

MS NILES: You've got a copy of the - - -

DR WILLIAMS: So that's great. Thanks.

30

MS NILES: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. Yes, that would be good.

35 MR WITHERDIN: Michelle, did you want to touch on the leafless tongue orchid
- - -

MS NILES: Yes.

40 MR WITHERDIN: - - - and the white footed dunnart?

MS NILES: So one of the amendments to the Statement of Commitments was originally to remove the management plans that were required for the leafless tongue orchid and the white footed dunnart. The proponent originally requested to delete
45 those commitments as part of the Statement of Commitments. Council and OEH both raised concerns with deleting those requirements fully. The proponent then engaged as part of their response to submission and an ecologist to review that

change. The ecologist came back and said that the requirement to – there should be some sort of management plan in place for those two – for the orchid and the dunnart.

5 The proponent amended their proposal to provide a monetary contribution to the National Parks and Wildlife Services to create the management plan and then implement the management as they will be – as they own that land. The proponent argued that it would be preferable that the National Parks implement and create that plan as they own the site, rather than the proponent creating a management plan for a
10 site that they don't own.

OEH and council both supported that way forward. The second change was to the translocation of the leafless tongue orchid. So the original project included development within part of the now conservation area. That changed as part of the
15 conditions of the project approval. Therefore, as that area now is a conservation area there's no need to translocate that orchid from the site into the neighbouring conservation area so the application seeks to delete that statement of commitments. OEH and council didn't raise any issues in terms of deleting that.

20 The next – so I guess the third change in terms of the ecology is the keeping of dogs on the site. The statement of commitments requires that there be a restriction on the titles of the site, that – titles of the lot – sorry – that keeping of pets, cats and dogs, is not allowed. Modification 2 to the project approval amended that restriction and allowed the keeping of dogs as long as they were kept within the residential premises
25 or on a leash when outside.

And so the proposal – this current modification just seeks to align that with the conditions as required. So the restriction has been changed to allow dogs to be kept within the confines of the residential allotment or on a leash at all other times and the
30 – and not cats be kept on site. That remains as originally approved.

The urban design change to the statement of commitments relates to the restriction that the – that any buildings opposite the conservation – the state conservation area be finished in darker tones and non-reflective colours. Because of the change in the
35 subdivision layout, no – the residential allotments I don't believe directly – are located directly opposite that conservation area so the proposal seeks to delete that requirement.

I note though there is a condition within the project approval consent that requires
40 that the material – all materials within the site be sympathetic to the surrounding area and be muted in colour. In terms of the changes to the traffic measures, there are two proposed. So the first one is traffic calming measures for Bonnie Troon Close. So, originally, the proposal proposed road connection to Bonnie Troon Close, which you will be able to see on - - -

45 MS I. MILLAR: 5.2 has quite a good - - -

MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

5 MS NILES: Yes. So figure 5. The location within stage 1 in the kind of north-west
of the finish, over here. Originally, it was proposed that this be a through road
connecting onto Bonnie Troon Close. As part of the conditions in the original
project approval, that was changed to be open space and drainage. However, the
statement of commitment did not – was not updated to reflect that so the proposal
10 just seeks to update that to reflect that.

The proponent argues, and council supports that, you know, the Bonnie Troon Close
is a cul-de-sac and so there's minimal opportunity for speeding to occur on that site;
therefore, it doesn't need any traffic calming, particularly as it doesn't connect into
15 the development as well.

The second change to the traffic calming measures is located at the Vista Drive
location so that's kind of at the boundary of the site, near stage 6 I believe – stage 5;
sorry. There was a requirement that a traffic calming measure be provided along
20 Vista Drive near the boundary of the subdivision. The proponent proposes to remove
that. Council didn't support that removal; however, the proponent argued that
because of the gradient of that part of the site, it wasn't possible to provide any
traffic calming measures at that location because it didn't comply with the standard
in terms of providing, you know, the gradients required for the traffic calming.
25

And then, also that road ends at a cul-de-sac and it services approximately 18 units –
18 lots, I should say; therefore, there was minimal need in terms of through traffic
entering onto that site as it ended in a cul-de-sac. The department supported that
measure and supported the justification the proponent provided us so we accepted
30 that change.

And then there was a number of administrative changes to the statement of
commitments to reflect the latest subdivision plan that's being approved as part of
the modification, so to correctly reference the plan as well as updates to energy
35 service provider names to reflect the current service provider and also in relation to
marrying up basically what has been changed as part of the modifications in terms of
traffic calming and things like that. So they're the changes to the – proposed as part
of the modification.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: So that's a summary of the findings of our assessment.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: So happy to answer any questions.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks, Anthony, Michelle. That's really helpful. We have got a few questions. Do you want to get the ball rolling?

5 MS MILLAR: I might just quickly start with the traffic calming for Vista Drive. Council had initially objected to the deletion of that requirement. Have – is there objections still standing or are they now comfortable with that, based on that further justification in the RtS?

10 MS NILES: They didn't respond to – I don't believe that they responded to that justification in the RtS. I can take that on notice and go check that.

MS MILLAR: Yes. That would be - - -

15 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Great. Yes. Yes.

MS MILLAR: That would be good.

MS NILES: But the department accepts the proponent's justification in terms of the gradient not being correct.

20 MS MILLAR: Gradient.

MS NILES: Yes.

25 MS MILLAR: Okay. Now, are you sort of able to point out on one of the figures sort of where the additional land was incorporated into the conservation area - - -

MS NILES: Yes.

30 MS MILLAR: - - - so that there's no longer the requirement for the relocation.

MS NILES: Yes. So I've got a copy of the original subdivision map. It's in here. This is the original subdivision plan that was approved. So, originally, the proposal proposed residential lots within this area and that would – and so – and a proposed residue lot – conservation area. That was a lot smaller. The project approval, due to concerns around the flora and fauna within that site, required a conservation area that reflects the current alignment that we've got.

35

40 DR WILLIAMS: I - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes. So all of that - - -

MR WITHERDIN: So all those lots and that there - - -

45 MS NILES: Yes. All - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - place

MR WITHERDIN: - - - have now been replaced.

MS NILES: Replaced. And they're conservation area now. And then, also in relation to the second change, there was – and this relates to the Bonnie Troon Close.
5 So there was proposed to be a link – Bonnie Troon Close was supposed – was originally proposed to connect into the development and provide a – and connect directly into the development. That was changed to provide some open space and drainage so there's no more – there's no direct link into Bonnie Troon Close from the development. Bonnie Troon remains a cul-de-sac as is now - - -

10 MS MILLAR: Yes. Okay. Great.

MR WITHERDIN: We can leave that with you anyway.

15 MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes. That would be - - -

20 DR WILLIAMS: I was going to ask you that, or a copy made available to us would be very helpful, if that's possible.

MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Either that or another copy for David would be very useful.

MS NILES: Yes. Of course.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

30 MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: And so that – it's that area there that – where the orchids and the - - -

35 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

MS MILLAR: Would have been translocated from.

40 MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

45 MR WITHERDIN: So it makes sense to keep them in situ.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: No, of course. And so has – that has been transferred to OEH or National Parks in terms of a transfer of title?

5 MS NILES: I'd need to check that to see whether that has occurred or whether there was a trigger later on in the development for that to occur. So I can find that out.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great.

10 MS NILES: No problems.

DR WILLIAMS: They've probably transferred or become a state conservation area.

15 MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Michelle and Anthony. Is it – is there a net loss or gain in the yield as a result of losing that area of stage 3? I mean, the subdivision layout looks quite different now.

20 MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: So has there been a net change really?

MS NILES: No. So there would have been a change as originally proposed but that was reflected in the project approval and number of lots approved. So even removing these lots, originally 104 lots were approved on the site and that included the removal of these lots there. So through various modifications it has increased – decreased, sorry, to 102.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MS NILES: And as part of the modification, because those two – those two medium density lots which - - -

MS MILLAR: So in the original proposal they were actually individual lots by the look of it.

40 MS NILES: It must – I have – I will confirm that but as part of the MOD 1 approval, they might have been changed to medium density lots, but I will have to confirm that to see.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

45 MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: So that's a way to plan a subdivision. It does show those lots there as medium density.

MS NILES: It does, yes.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS NILES: So that's the original approval. This is the MOD 1 subdivision plan.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Okay.

MS NILES: And I've got a copy of the

DR WILLIAMS: So in terms of habitat, particularly of the leafless tongue orchid, that's the main area of habitat and it's now into the conservation area?

15 MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

20 MS NILES: It will remain at the

MS MILLAR: And is that also the point where the interface had been in terms of the visual impact - - -

25 MS NILES: The urban design?

MS MILLAR: Yes, the urban design - - -

30 MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - and the lots opposite the State Conservation Area – so was that intended to apply to those lots or does it also apply to the – you know, these lots here, that effectively border on the - - -

35 MS NILES: Conservation area?

MS MILLAR: - - - conservation area?

40 MS NILES: I believe it applied to these lots, however, I have to double – I will - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS NILES: - - - double-check that and get back to you.

45 DR WILLIAMS: That would be in that condition E5(3)(f).

MS NILES: That condition applies to whole of the site.

MS MILLAR: Whole lot.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

10 MS NILES: So there's a requirement that all of the residential – all the future residential dwellings be of muted colour - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15 MS NILES: and sympathetic to the setting of the site.

MR WITHERDIN: We can check the actual wording again in the Statement of Commitment - - -

MS NILES: Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: - - - to see if it applied to the whole interface or just part.

DR WILLIAMS: So that's

25 MS MILLAR: It talks about the allotments opposite the State Conservation Area and retain public reserve, so - - -

DR WILLIAMS: And that has been removed, though.

30 MS MILLAR: I guess it's a question of how you describe or define opposite because, you know, technically, if that's the reserve there, all of these ones are potentially affected, as well.

MS NILES: Yes.

35 DR WILLIAMS: I mean, it seems that the restriction to use – it has been struck through on the Statement of Commitments.

MS MILLAR: For the proposal?

40 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

45 DR WILLIAMS: So I'm just wondering where it is now in the – so it's – at least it's not in the – well, it's not in the Statement of Commitments now

MS NILES: Sorry?

MR WITHERDIN: So is that referring to the urban design issue?

5 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

10 MS NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: So there is that condition that we mentioned earlier - - -

15 MS NILES: Yes. So - - -

MR WITHERDIN: - - - so it is proposed to be deleted.

MS NILES: Yes. So the commitment within the Statement of Commitments
20 surrounding the restriction on colour opposite the conservation area – that is being
deleted, however, there is a condition within the main body of the consent that
requires the future residential dwellings to be sympathetic in terms of colour
schemes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: And that would be that condition - - -

MS NILES: So that's E - - -

DR WILLIAMS: E5 - - -

30 MS NILES: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

35 MS NILES: That's right.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - (3)(f)? Yes.

MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. That's

MS MILLAR: And have you had an opportunity to look at the design guidelines for
45 the subdivision? Have they been – I mean, I – would they, again, pick up this
approach to colours, materials?

MS NILES: Yes. I will have to have a look. They weren't submitted as part of this modification.

5 DR WILLIAMS: So the Statement of Commitments does call up this draft design guidelines, so, hopefully, presumably, they incorporate those divisions. But if we could just see what the draft design guidelines contain, it would be very helpful, Michelle.

10 MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. Thank you. Any more questions?

MS MILLAR: I think just – I mean, in terms of the contributions for – to National Parks for the orchid and the white footed dunnart – that's 15,000 each.

15 MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

MS MILLAR: So two separate - - -

20 MS NILES: Yes. And that's the same dollar amount as previously required, as well.

DR WILLIAMS: So it's a total of \$30,000?

25 MS MILLAR:

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Okay. So presumably the Statement of Commitments are called up in the original project conditions of consent - - -

30 MS NILES: Yes. Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - so it has a condition that says that development is in accordance with the Statement of Commitments so – I mean, I notice it's not in the modification instrument, but I presume that's because it's already in the original consent?

35 MS NILES: Yes. So modification will amend the Statement of Commitments to replace the one that was there previously with this one. So I believe it is reflected in part of the documents that have been approved - - -

40 MS MILLAR: So they're in A4(6) request – no – that just talks about the submissions report - - -

DR WILLIAMS: So the reason for my question, I can't see any reference in here to the Statement of Commitments - - -

45 MS NILES: Okay.

- DR WILLIAMS: - - - so if the Statement of Commitments are going to be amended, I would have thought there would have been a condition to that effect. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I just wasn't sure - - -
- 5 MR WITHERDIN: Just to recall, Michelle, was it the additional information submitted to Allen Price & Scarratts - - -
- MS NILES: That's the 29 - - -
- 10 MR WITHERDIN: - - - on 29 March - - -
- MS NILES: Yes. So this - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: - - - which included a - - -
- 15 MS NILES: Statement - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: - - - the revised Statement of Commitments?
- 20 MS NILES: That's right, yes.
- MS MILLAR: So maybe that needs to be clearer.
- MR WITHERDIN: So you could make a specific reference to those Statement of
- 25 Commitments - - -
- MS NILES:
- MR WITHERDIN: - - - just to make clear - - -
- 30 MS NILES: Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: So that would be in condition A(4) somewhere – which ever paragraph you feel is the best place, but I think - - -
- 35 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: - - - there needs to be some - - -
- 40 MS NILES: Okay
- MR WITHERDIN: And, maybe, we could rephrase it to say and – instead of saying “and additional information” say “updated Statement of Commitments”?
- 45 DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes. Just so it's very clear, so - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

- DR WILLIAMS: Yes. If that's okay. Would that be right, David, to – just to make sure – to follow that one up
- 5 MS MILLAR: And do you have a consolidated version of the conditions of consent with all of the different modifications tracked through? I know with some developments, you get the multi-coloured - - -
- MS NILES: Yes.
- 10 MS MILLAR: - - - consolidated consents – because I think it would be useful to be able - - -
- MS NILES: Yes. We can - - -
- 15 MS MILLAR: - - - to look at that if you've got a copy that you can provide us with.
- MS NILES: We can certainly draw one up.
- MS MILLAR: Okay. That would be great.
- 20 DR WILLIAMS: you mentioned the traffic calming. So there's two areas where the traffic calming is being removed and council is either – well, no objection or supports or – basically, but you will confirm that Vista Drive - - -
- 25 MS NILES: Yes. Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: It seems very logical with the non-compliance with the Australian Standard.
- 30 MS NILES: Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: But, presumably, there are still other remaining traffic calming provisions?
- 35 MS NILES: I believe so. I believe so. Elsewhere on the site.
- DR WILLIAMS: Well, we're having a look at the site this afternoon, so we will - - -
- 40 MS NILES: Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: - - - ask that question out there.
- MS NILES: I will need to double-check that and get back to you - - -
- 45 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS NILES: - - - to see if there is any alternative.

DR WILLIAMS: I just wanted to make sure there are still – what other provisions
are still there for traffic calming. That would be in some earlier document with the
5 earlier - - -

MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - consent, I would imagine. Trying to think if there’s anything
10 else. So council’s views – I mean, we – I think we’ve asked if council wanted to talk
to us or have a meeting. I think it’s fairly straightforward to them but as far as you
can see, council has no outstanding concerns. RMS basically took the view, well,
council is the local traffic authority, so - - -

15 MR WITHERDIN: That’s right.

MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: But, again, I – presumably, if they had concerns, they would have
20 expressed it at the time rather than leaving it to the council. And OEH seems to - - -

MS NILES: OEH

DR WILLIAMS: - - - are happy with the - - -

25 MS NILES:

DR WILLIAMS: - - - contributions for the two sets of \$15,000.

30 MS NILES: Yes. OEH reviewed the condition - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS NILES: - - - and are happy with that.

35 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So it’s just that traffic calming device that we’re unsure
about council’s final position on that.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, if we could get that - - -

40 MR WITHERDIN: So we can double-check that.

DR WILLIAMS: - - - that would be great, Anthony, if that could be clarified, as
well. Just making sure we cover all our bases on

45 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Anything else, Ilona?

5 MS MILLAR: No. I think that's it. Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: David, have you got any questions?

10 MR D. WAY: You previously mentioned there you just wanted to check on the – if there were any changes to, I think, the strategic planning - - -

MS MILLAR: That's right. Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you.

15

MR WAY: - - - instruments for – from 2004.

20 MS MILLAR: Yes. So in terms of the inclusion of the medium density lots as part of the original development application, it's my understanding that, you know, the approach to the subdivision was based on strategic planning documents that identified a need for more medium density and a mix of housing types. You know, have you gone back and looked at, you know, how strategic planning approaches for the site have changed since the original approval that would justify no longer having those medium density lots or, you know, are there sufficient medium density lots throughout the rest of the site to address that need for a mix of yields?

25 MS NILES: Yes. Yes, so you're right. Originally, there was a requirement – I think 10 to 20 per cent – of developments have some sort of medium density component within them. I believe that has changed, as council's LEP has evolved, but I will go back and confirm that to make sure that there isn't any other overarching strategic planning documents that would require some sort of medium density but I believe that's not the case.

35 MR WITHERDIN: And just to note also that some lots will be able to accommodate dual occupancies, subject to, you know, future DA assessments. So there will be some opportunities for medium style residential development – medium density residential development on the site.

40 MS MILLAR: Yes. So are these – it's hard to read in the report – so they're the potential dual occupancy lots that are shaded in purple?

MR WITHERDIN: Shaded in purple. Yes.

MS NILES: Yes.

45

MS MILLAR: Okay. Yes – no, if you're able to check that point - - -

MS NILES: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - on the strategic planning, that would be helpful.

5 DR WILLIAMS: Just in relation – sorry. Just getting back one point again, back to
the traffic management – traffic calming. Just on page 4 there’s – under 4.1, the key
issues, government agencies and – it talks about council and originally not – the
referral to a proposed amendment to that condition V19.7. So I presume that might
10 be the relevant condition in the original proposal approval. That lists all the traffic
calming provisions. I’m not sure but that perhaps might be a starting point to see
what was proposed and what has been deleted and what actually remains.

MS MILLAR: Yes. So that’s – that’s what we’ve got there. So it previously was
15 road 1 and road 2 on Vista South and on Vista Drive South. So there’s still traffic
calming on road 1.

DR WILLIAMS: So that seems to be the only outstanding remaining traffic
calming?

20 MS MILLAR: Yes, that’s right. So which – we’ve got – that’s road 2, that’s road 3.
I’m assuming road 1 is the one going north, south perhaps.

MS NILES: Road 1 - - -

25 MS MILLAR: Road 1 – sorry – is up the - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Up there.

MS MILLAR: Okay. So that’s - - -

30

DR WILLIAMS: Looks - - -

MS MILLAR: All right. So it’s completely the other side of the site.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. So according to our reading of that condition, there still
appears to be lot – it appears to be there’s three sets of traffic calming areas – sectors
and two have gone.

MS MILLAR: And two have gone.

40

DR WILLIAMS: And there’s traffic calming along road 1.

MS NILES: Road 1.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Which will be – yes.

- MS NILES: That's required to be provided - - -
- DR WILLIAMS: Yes.
- 5 MS NILES: - - - in accordance with the ES standard in the RMS documents.
- DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Okay. I mean, that's one thing we did want to look at, just to see what traffic calming was still - - -
- 10 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.
- MS NILES: Was required. Yes.
- DR WILLIAMS: Still being provided down there. That makes sense, doesn't it, that road?
- 15 MS MILLAR: Yes, but that part is excluded now so it's – if we look on this one - - -
- 20 DR WILLIAMS: What does it look like now?
- MS MILLAR: - - - it will just be this bit there.
- DR WILLIAMS: That bit there. Yes. Yes. Okay.
- 25 MS MILLAR: That – yes, nothing there.
- DR WILLIAMS: Nothing there.
- 30 MS MILLAR: Nothing there.
- DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Okay. Well, that seems to be clear. I think that's our understanding. That's the remaining traffic calming.
- 35 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So B19, yes, comprises a suite of - - -
- DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes. Yes.
- MR WITHERDIN: Yes.
- 40 DR WILLIAMS: And it talked about B19(7) - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: Yes.
- 45 DR WILLIAMS: - - - and from the deletions there, it looks like the traffic calming in – is it road 2 and road 3 of the deleted - - -

MS NILES: Road 2 - - -

MS MILLAR: Road 2 and Vista Drive.

5 MS NILES: - - - and Vista Drive.

DR WILLIAMS: Vista Drive. Okay.

10 MS MILLAR: Yes. And then, that's also where you pick up the condition here in the B19(10) that there's no connection to Bonnie Troon.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes. Okay. That has cleared that point up for us I think as well. Okay. Anything you need?

15 MS MILLAR: No. I think that's it.

DR WILLIAMS: That's it. Dave?

MR WAY: No. It's all right.

20 DR WILLIAMS: No. Okay. Any other comments you would like to make, Anthony or Michelle?

MS NILES: No.

25 MR WITHERDIN: No. That's fine.

DR WILLIAMS: No. Okay.

30 MR WITHERDIN: We will come back to you on those extra points.

MS NILES: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: That would be fantastic. Yes.

35 MR WITHERDIN: And clarify those.

DR WILLIAMS: That would be great. No. Thank you very much. Well, if that's the case, we will close the meeting and thank you both for attending this morning.

40 MR WITHERDIN: No problem.

MS NILES: Thank you.

45 MR WITHERDIN: Great.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[9.55 am]