

MS A. TUOR: Well, 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 the elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the review of the Gateway Determination for the planning proposal to amend the Parramatta
5 Local Environment Plan 2011 in relation to the site restrictions at 55 Aird Street, Parramatta, proposed by Demian Property Group. My name is Annelise Tuor. I'm the chair of the IPC Panel. Joining me is Adrian Pilton on my left. The other attendees of the meeting are Dan Keary and Brent Devine from Keylan Consulting, who are assisting the Commission with this project.

10 As I understand, both Mr Keary and Mr Devine have worked for the Department and so, just for the record, I want to ask them if they have any actual or perceived conflicts of interest in this project.

15 MR D. KEARY: No conflicts but we note for the record that James Matthews, who I understand is a representative of the proponent, did contract to our consultancy about two years ago and, as Annelise mentioned, both Brent and I worked at the Department for a number of years.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you. Also with me are Matthew Todd-Jones from the IPC Secretariat. And I will ask each of the members from the Department to introduce who they are.

MS C. GOUGH: Christine Gough, from Sydney Region West.

25 MR S. MURRAY: Steve Murray, Executive Director of Regions for the Department.

MS A.M. CARRUTHERS: Ann-Maree Carruthers, director of Sydney Region
30 West.

MS TUOR: Thank you. 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
35 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 several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important that the Commissioners – for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues where we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a
40 position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put into – onto our website.

So we will now begin. I think you've been sent an agenda, which will give a, sort of, outline of how we presume the discussion will take place. I think we've got about an
45 hour. So we've got through item 1, the introductions, but if the Department just

wishes to give a description and justification – or just give a description of the proposal and outline your determination, I suppose.

5 MR MURRAY: I would be happy to give the description.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR MURRAY: I think it's up to council or the proponent to do the justification.

10 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR MURRAY: Yes.

15 MS TUOR: I agree. And I'm just looking at the agenda but you don't need to justify the planning proposal – I suppose you need to justify your Gateway review determination.

MR MURRAY: Yes. Our position.

20 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR MURRAY: More than happy to do that. So the planning proposal seeks to amend the planning controls and remove the maximum height of building controls and to increase the floor space ratio of a property at 55 Aird Street, Parramatta. The
25 proposal – yes. And part of the planning proposal says that if they meet certain extra provisions, they could increase the floor space ratio from 10:1 to 15:1. And my understanding of the proposal is that the urban design report that accompanied the planning proposal illustrated a 41 storey, eight storey podium with a 33 storey tower, a mixed residential and commercial use development, including obviously residential
30 and commercial uses and, my understanding, parking on three floors. Also part of it was it sought to take advantage of a decision council had adopted a policy on in terms of parking rates, which was consistent with work undertaken with the Roads and Maritime Services about reducing parking numbers where certain parking was
..... placed on-site, obviously with improvements to public transport.

35 So the department made an initial assessment of the planning proposal and determined that the proposal had a degree of merit and site-specific merit to proceed but in doing so conditioned the Gateway to include a maximum height of building control over the site and, in fact, remove a clause from the LEP that council sought to
40 apply in regard to airspace operations, which is basically where a building gets to a certain height, it has to deal with what we call PAN OPS and there's a consultation requirement and buildings aren't meant to penetrate that without approval. So we said we should have a specific height control on it and, as I go through the conditions, we will understand why.

45 MS TUOR: Sure.

MR MURRAY: Amend the floor space ratio to provide a maximum floor space ratio of 10:1 but at the same time ensure that a provision with the Parramatta LEP 2011 applied, which was a sliding scale and that has the effect on sites less than 1800 square metres - - -

5

MS GOUGH: Yes

MR MURRAY: Yes – of limiting the amount of floor space that you could achieve on a site and that would be 6:1 and if you applied the design excellence, it could be achieved up to – and that was satisfactory, it could be achieved up to 6.9:1. We also required the minimum commercial floor space to be reduced to 1:1 and not 3:1 as proposed in the proposal, remove the reference to high performance building incentives and obviously because we sought a different height, floor space ratio – we requested that the urban design report that accompanied council’s planning proposal reflect – was updated and reflected the changes to these conditions and be submitted to the Department prior to it being agreed to for exhibition.

So in considering the application, we had regard for the current LEP provisions. Obviously, we looked at the District Plan and the Plan for Greater Sydney and also council’s draft planning proposal that was before us. We formed an opinion, as outlined, and I think you will have a copy of our Gateway Determination report - - -

MS TUOR: Yes, we do.

MR MURRAY: - - - which actually explains all the reasons for us concurring – coming to that decision. And we also, in our Gateway Justification Assessment report, basically provided an assessment summary to the members of the IPC and its supporting staff that takes us through those issues. So we’ve – we came to the conclusion because we did not think the site warranted a building of that bulk and scale. We were concerned about the urban design outcomes in regard to that site and also, as our report addresses, we were pre-empting planning controls through a local environmental plan that had not actually been ratified and agreed by the Department as the GSC’s delegate that that planning proposal could proceed. So I’m talking about the broader - - -

35

MS TUOR: The CBD - - -

MR MURRAY: The CBD planning - - -

MS TUOR: - - - planning proposal?

MR MURRAY: - - - proposal.

MS TUOR: So what stage is that at?

45

MR MURRAY: Council has just recently resolved to make changes to that planning proposal. I haven't seen those yet, but I understand Christine and Ann-Maree have seen those. Council has recently submitted it to us.

5 MS GOUGH: Yes, on the 21st of this month.

MR MURRAY: And they're making an assessment of that with an aim to have an assessment report to me in the coming weeks, so the Department as a delegate of the GSC can make a decision.

10

MS TUOR: A Gateway decision?

MR MURRAY: A Gateway decision for that council's planning proposal.

15 MS TUOR: And none of the changes that they've made would change the facts in this – the reports before us? They haven't changed sliding scales or - - -

MS GOUGH: No, they were – no, they were silent on that.

20 MS TUOR: And the out-clause for the FSR, which - - -

MS GOUGH: No, they haven't – in the most recent resolution, there was no – they discussed it but they were waiting for the outcome of this hearing.

25 MS TUOR: Right. So, as I understand it, under the CBD proposal, there's a summary of what would be able to be achieved on the site - - -

MR MURRAY: And I draw you to page 3 of our Gateway assessment report. That may be the table you're referring to, I believe?

30

MS TUOR: Yes. And I think the applicant – proponent had a table as well. So it's 10 to 1 with the sliding scale that brings it down to 6 to 1 and then, as you said, if you're happy with design excellence you can get a bonus – 0.9 to 1 – which brings it up to a similar amount to what you put in your Gateway determination.

35

MR MURRAY: So we put in 6.9 to 1.

MS TUOR: Yes. And then there was the height that it would be. I think 36 metres was the height in the CBD – CBD planning proposal.

40

MS GOUGH: The CBD planning proposal height when the incentive height provisions are We haven't done a Gateway assessment on that as yet. We applied the maximum height here but we don't know what that is yet because the urban design reference hasn't been amended.

45

MS TUOR: Okay. So there's not actually a specified height.

MS GOUGH: There will – the Gateway requires that but we don't know what it will be until the amended urban design reference is submitted for our assessment.

MS TUOR: Okay.

5

MR MURRAY: So the purpose of condition 1 of our Gateway report is for council to do 1(a) to (e) and, as a response to that, come back with an urban design report that was to achieve this up to 6.9 to 1 and through that outcome we would then be able to set an appropriate height. So the idea was to not say, "You must be X and Y in terms of floor space and height" but say, "We believe this site, for the reasons we've outlined, is suitable for FSR. Now go away and do a suitable design outcome and then the height can be set as a result of that."

10

MS TUOR: All right.

15

MR MURRAY: So we've tried to let – keep the opportunity open for them to have a design solution for the site and not doing the traditional planning approach of applying very strict upfront planning controls.

20

MS TUOR: Sure. And for our benefit – because the CBD planning proposal is quite complex – can you just explain what those other FSR bonuses, are? - - -

MS GOUGH: In the CBD planning proposal?

25

MS TUOR: - - - that that applicant or the proponent with this Planning Proposal was seeking to have - - -

30

MS GOUGH: Sure. So a 3 to 1 – they've asked for an initial 3 to 1 originally of commercial floor space. The 3 to 1 relates to a provision in the CBD planning proposal that allows unlimited commercial floor space for office premises on sites over 1800 square metres. Again, this is all subject to Gateway review and determination.

35

MS TUOR: Sure.

MS GOUGH: There's also an opportunity sites provision in the CBD planning proposal that allows an extra 3 to 1 FSR on certain sites that meet certain criteria and that was recently amended in council's most recent resolution which we're still considering. There was also as - - -

40

MS TUOR: Sorry. The proponent wasn't asking for that 3 to 1 opportunity?

MS GOUGH: No. No. They were asking for 3 to 1 office space.

45

MS TUOR: Space not being included; yes.

MS GOUGH: That's right. And, yes, but that was only allowed in the CBD planning proposal for sites of a certain size to encourage A grade commercial office space.

5 MS TUOR: Yes.

MS GOUGH: Then there's also a high performance building bonus in the CBD planning proposal which was recently amended by council to change it to allow – potentially allow sites less than 10 to 1 to have high performance buildings but to change the mechanism so it wasn't an FSR bonus of 0.5 to 1 for sites that achieve that but it was a five per cent of the total floor space and that's council's most recent resolution and we're again still assessing that.

MS TUOR: So what's that one again? Sorry, the high performance - - -

MS GOUGH: The high performance buildings bonus.

MS TUOR: And that is for what?

MS GOUGH: It provides additional green controls over and above Basix in the CBD.

MR MURRAY: So I think put simply, it is that if you achieve a better sustainability outcome

MS TUOR: You get a bonus.

MR MURRAY: - - - in terms of the base you may get additional floor space.

MR PILTON: Five per cent of - - -

MS GOUGH: So – yes, so if the site is over 10 to 1 - - -

MR PILTON: The GFA.

MS GOUGH: Yes, yes. The policy was 0.5 to 1 bonus but now council has changed that policy. They didn't allow it previously on sites less than 10 to 1 but they've just changed their PP to enable a five per cent bonus on sites between 6 to 1 and 10 to 1 but again that's subject to further testing and review.

MS TUOR: And again the proponent wasn't seeking that bonus.

MS GOUGH: They were seeking it originally - - -

MS TUOR: They were?

MS GOUGH: - - - what they sought in the original FSR and the – part of this Gateway review is to see whether they can have that reinstated.

5 MS TUOR: So that's one of the things that you've deleted in condition 1, is it?

MS GOUGH: Correct.

10 MS TUOR: I see. (e) – (1)(e) - remove the reference to high performance building incentive. Okay. And then just if you can explain the FSR out clause. That's one that I'm not clear about.

15 MS GOUGH: So council put in place – they wanted to make amendments to the FSR sliding scale and reduce the thresholds for size of land. Then they also put in place a FSR out clause that said you can have any FSR you like. I don't – I might need to be corrected here but – and council can clarify it – but it is any site can achieve the maximum incentive FSR provided they meet design excellence and SEPP 65 and I think there's a new provision about - - -

20 MR: Active frontages.

MS GOUGH: Active frontages; yes.

25 MR MURRAY: So could I suggest to the Commissioners that it's probably – for a really clear explanation because we've only just received the CBD planning proposal – over the last – well, less than nine days – and there's probably a question best addressed later but if you would like us we can actually give you a written explanation of how we understand the clause.

30 MR PILTON: Yes. That would be good.

MR MURRAY: Okay. Well, we'll do that and we're happy to take that on notice for you.

35 MS GOUGH: Yes. Yes.

MS TUOR: So we interrupted your explanation.

40 MS GOUGH: That's pretty much it. The FSR out clause - you can have – achieve the maximum FSRs - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

45 MS GOUGH: - - - on smaller sites if you meet design excellence and SEPP 65 and active street frontages.

MS TUOR: Well, maybe if you just wanted in terms of the – your Gateway decision just explain the reasons why you didn't think that the site was suitable for a development of this form and scale.

5 MR MURRAY: Okay. Well, we formed that – you know, when – our position hasn't changed. We've reviewed the information provided. We also note that council has since made a resolution that the matter be withdrawn which you would be aware of and we felt it was appropriate since the Gateway had been determined –
10 the proponent had lodged a review and then council subsequently made a decision it should come through a review process so – but we – we – the department hold – holds the view that the FSR sliding scale should apply, particularly to small sites.

One of the things is that Parramatta has got a clear vision that it should have a really well built and new urban form and small sites and large towers don't often work in
15 the terms of an urban design outcome. And we believe that's the most appropriate outcome for the site so what you do is the development reflects the site and its ability to contain that. So we recognise that – and we do recognise that, you know, we understand the proponent has raised the issue that they believe the Gateway is forcing them to amalgamate the site or doing that. We recognise that site
20 amalgamation is not always possible. We understand that and in no way did our Gateway determination in any way say you must amalgamate the site.

Obviously in some instances you get a much better planning outcome but if you can't, therefore, the development must deal with the site it has. And on that basis we
25 felt that the site because of its size criteria that the – up to 15 to 1 on the site was not – not an appropriate outcome. We actually agreed with the council officer's assessment of the original planning proposal regarding the site. We don't believe the urban design form that will be achieved on the side with zero side setbacks and up to 120 metre blank wall is a good urban design outcome for the second CBD or, if
30 you're now, like, Central Sydney. If you follow the Greater Sydney plans which the department is required to look at – so is it a great design outcome that we would want to see within a burgeoning CBD.

We don't support the additional floor space bonuses for the reasons that they're
35 intended to apply to large sites. So when you look at the floor space – sorry, I'm just going back to get the right words – the floor space bonuses in terms of the additional commercial floor space and high performance building incentives that are proposed within the Parramatta CBD. We note that we haven't yet finalised the assessment of the Parramatta CBD planning proposal but we do believe large sites and the delivery
40 of A grade commercial space is important in any major CBD across Sydney and on that basis we didn't agree with that and obviously we wanted to ensure we had improved urban design outcomes on the site.

So that there's further justification – and I draw your attention to our assessment
45 summary on page 3 of our report that we've given in response to the Gateway. Obviously the Parramatta CBD sites are needed to provide areas of at least 1800 square metres to satisfy the A grade so, therefore, the 3 to 1 bonus for opportunity

sites is only proposed for sites greater than 1800 square metres and 40 metre frontage. We don't believe the site is capable of meeting these minimum requirements. They're some of the key considerations on which the department made their decision. More full detail sits within our Gateway determination report, plus our response.

MS TUOR: Okay. So just back on this amalgamation aspect which – when we read through the proponent's economic advice and their submission, they do largely focus on the fact that they consider that, by not allowing it to get the higher floor space ratio, the site will be rendered uneconomic and that, essentially, you're trying – well, it's – the provisions are forcing them to amalgamate and, if they can't amalgamate, that they would be effectively sterilised but from – what I understand you're saying is that those package of bonuses are to achieve, to some extent, larger sites that can cope – that can provide the larger floor plate, A-grade floor space, etcetera, etcetera, and then if you can't – not every site can amalgamate but, if you can't, you then just have a smaller development.

MR MURRAY: Yes. And that's the basis to which we've looked at this and said, "We acknowledge that there should be some development potential on this site." We don't require you – and we would not require them to amalgamate because we – in this instance – however, therefore, the form and shape of the outcome of that development should be suitable for the land area – and how it would respond to future development around it.

MS TUOR: Yes. And your opening was that this site did have merit in terms of having the extra floor space ratio compared to the LEP, ie, it should proceed in advance of the CBD Gateway proposal, but just – can you expand on that? Why should it proceed in advance of the Gateway planning proposal?

MR MURRAY: Well, there's a number of reasons. The department has let a number of planning proposals across the Parramatta CBD – move forward – where they've been generally consistent with the draft planning proposal and, obviously, as a delegate of the GSC, I can't predetermine the outcome of the CBD planning proposal, but at the same time, it is appropriate that development continue. There was enough strategic merit identified through the Greater Sydney regional plan and through the district plan and council's strategic work that underpinned their planning proposal, even though, as you said, it's not endorsed by us, to allow this matter to be considered and considered appropriately in the framework that existed, and as with any planning proposal, we would definitely have to ensure it has strategic merit, but we have to look at the merits of the site as well.

MS TUOR: The site. Yes. Yes. All right. Do you have any questions?

MR PILTON: No. I think I understand everything, more or less.

MS TUOR: Dan, have you got any?

MR KEARY: No.

MS TUOR: No?. No? No.? Okay. I'm hogging the floor. Just one question in their – the economic report that was put in. They said that you may actually get a
5 perverse outcome from the sliding scale. I don't know if you've read that or if it's too specific. It's on – in the economic report, I think it's on the second page.

MR MURRAY: So – yes. Yes.

10 MS TUOR: So I just wondered if you had any comments on that.

MR MURRAY: I think, in terms of planning, there's a number of considerations we need to take in. There's the social, there's the environmental, and the economic, and they must be balanced. So while – I'm not an economist and I will not comment to
15 that point – I think the department was reasonable in our approach and the conditioning is we actually asked for a revised urban design report. So while we've conditioned the Gateway to say these things, we've given some flexibility for Council – because, once again, we have to understand this is Council's planning proposal - - -

20 MS TUOR: Sure.

MR MURRAY: - - - even though it's driven by a private proponent – the opportunity to do some more urban design work based around those parameters,
25 which does create some flexibility. So the urban design work – we don't know the outcome of that but, if it came back with a different scenario, the department is open to consider that before it goes to exhibition.

MR PILTON: You've asked for an update on this urban design report.

30 MR MURRAY: Yes. To reflect conditions 1(a) through to (e).

MR PILTON: Yes. Okay. Thanks for this. Thank you.

35 MR MURRAY: And the purpose is, instead of just saying that's the end of it, come back, let's have a look, and then there's the opportunity for a further discussion.

MS TUOR: Okay. So just specifically on the proposal that they've put before us, I suppose – just in terms of the merits of it, in terms of amenity and design excellence,
40 I think we did have some concerns, particularly things like the ground floor is totally occupied by a loading dock, a car entry with a very, very small lobby, with no space shown for garbage rooms or plant rooms or anything like that - - -

MR PILTON: Or an active street frontage, for that matter.

45 MS TUOR: Or any active street frontage.

MR PILTON: It's impossible.

MS TUOR: And that the car parking is seven floors of car parking above ground and I understand that the council's DCP allows you to have above-ground parking,
5 but I can't understand how any development in a CBD context could be considered to achieve design excellence if you've got above-ground parking. So, anyway, that's just something that – and then in terms of amenity, the floor plates have – how you actually get three-bedroom apartments that get windows to these or the living rooms in the floor plan that's proposed – we had some concerns about it, so I don't know if
10 you want to say anything - - -

MR PILTON: There were some comments – sorry. Just to go on, there were some comments somewhere in here about the council's parking standards but I don't know what they were. Have they reduced the sort of number or - - -
15

MS GOUGH: They had been reduced.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS GOUGH: And we apply a site-specific course to all LEPs now and they're reduced in line with – I think they're in line with Sydney parking standards and it's subject to an agreement to reduce all the car parking standards in the CBD for all these site-specific planning proposals and council is undertaking a mesoscopic study and integrated transport plan as part of their CBD planning proposal, which is
20 currently underway, but the parking rates just allow these site-specific PPs to advance.
25

MS CARRUTHERS: So the parking rates are specifically listed in the local environmental plan now, so we can provide you with a copy of that.
30

MR PILTON: If you could, because I didn't see it. Sorry.

MR MURRAY: Yes.

MS TUOR: So when you say they're in the they're actually in the 2011 one or
35 - - -

MS GOUGH: They've been adopted as site-specific provisions. When we're doing a site-specific LEP, they're adopted as specific provisions for site-specific plans.
40

MS TUOR: That then go into that LEP.

MS GOUGH: Correct.

MS TUOR: Okay.
45

MS GOUGH: So it's a site-specific thing at the moment, but we're hoping to make it a broader CBD provision.

MS TUOR: And then, that's consistent with the City of Sydney's approach?

MS GOUGH: That's a – as I understand it, but their maximum car parking rates are like – I don't know what they are. I'm sorry.

5

MS TUOR: Yes. I think, in the city, unless it has changed, you don't actually have to provide car parking at all. They don't - - -

MS GOUGH: Look, there's a – it's a maximum rate.

10

MR PILTON: Maximum.

MS TUOR: Yes. It's only - - -

15

MR KEARY: Yes.

MS TUOR: So if you don't want to, you don't have to. There's no minimums.

MR PILTON: I think the City of Sydney would encourage you to have no parking.

20

MS TUOR: All right. Well, I don't know - - -

MR KEARY: Just one question.

25

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR KEARY: As I understand it, the sliding scale clause doesn't currently apply to this site through the current LEP provisions; is that right?

30

MS GOUGH: It should do.

MR KEARY: It does, does it?

MS GOUGH: The blanket sliding scale in clause 7.2.

35

MR MURRAY: Two.

MR KEARY: Okay. All right. It's shown on the FSR map, isn't it

40

MS GOUGH: It's clause 7.2 in the LEP.

MR MURRAY: Yes.

MR KEARY: Okay. If that's the case, then that's - - -

45

MR MURRAY: Yes.

MS GOUGH: And it applies the threshold of 1000 - - -

MR MURRAY: Sorry. Just drawing you to the page in our report.

5 MS GOUGH: 1000 square metres and 1800 square metres.

MR KEARY: Yes.

10 MS GOUGH: So the minimum – there’s three bands of sliding scale.

MR KEARY: Yes.

15 MS GOUGH: So less than 1000 square metres has one rate, 1000 to 1800 square metres has another rate - - -

MR KEARY: Yes.

MS GOUGH: - - - and over 1800 square metres has - - -

20 MR KEARY: Okay. So the Gateway determination condition to include that is basically not reinstating it just for this site. It’s saying it should continue to apply as is currently the case.

25 MS GOUGH: It currently applies at the moment.

MR KEARY: Yes.

MS GOUGH: That’s as my understanding.

30 MS TUOR: So that the sliding scale - - -

MR KEARY: Clause 7.2.

35 MS TUOR: Yes. So 1(c).

MS GOUGH: As I understand it – and I’m happy to be corrected – that I think the existing site is mapped at 6 to 1 - - -

40 MR KEARY: I think - - -

MS GOUGH: - - - and the sliding scale reduces the site to 4.2 to 1.

MR DEVINE: I thought it was – 4.2 was the existing - - -

45 MR PILTON: 4.2 was the original one.

MS GOUGH: As mapped.

MS TUOR: But you're saying it's – 6 is the base - - -

MS GOUGH: 6 to 1 is mapped.

5 MS TUOR: - - - and the sliding scale in clause 7.2 reduces it down - - -

MS GOUGH: To 4.2.

10 MS TUOR: - - - to 4.2 and then they can potentially get a design excellence bonus that adds on an extra .5 or something.

MS GOUGH: It's 15 per cent of the reduced - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

15

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: But what we might do is we might just clarify that as well, if you like, in terms of the existing provisions.

20

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS GOUGH: Yes.

25 MS TUOR: Because it's fairly complicated.

MS CARRUTHERS: It is a bit complicated.

MR KEARY: Yes. Yes.

30

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

35 MS GOUGH: Yes. The total fsr under the existing is 4.8 with the design excellence.

MS TUOR: And I suppose one thing that we're going to have to clarify is exactly what the proponent is objecting to in your condition 1 because it's not all of condition 1. It's only certain aspects of it.

40

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. We understand it's condition 1(c) and 1(e) that they would like removed. And I think if you could clarify that.

45 MS TUOR: And presumably part of 1(d), because they want commercial FSR – 1 to 1, which is agreed, but then the last part of it is – but remove the reference to – so I think they would want that removed as well.

MR MURRAY: I think that's – as you said, best to actually - - -

MS TUOR: To ask them.

5 MR MURRAY: - - - ask the proponent.

MS TUOR: Yeah. Yeah. Exactly what they want removed.

10 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. Sorry. 1(c), 1(d) and 1(e), I think it is. But yes, if you could clarify that.

MR PILTON: Yeah.

15 MS TUOR: Well, probably (a) as well: include the maximum height, building control, and remove clause 7.6, because they wanted it to be the clause 7.6, didn't they?

20 MS GOUGH: In other planning proposals, we've asked for a site-specific we've asked for a maximum building height. And if it's over 156, which is the air space operations limit, then we apply clause 7.6 as well. So we have the dual – we still have a height-of-buildings map.

MS TUOR: Yeah. All right. Any other questions?

25 MR KEARY: Can I just clarify – and there might be a simple answer to this. But in condition 1(a), you wanted to include a maximum building height but remove clause 7.6. Why the removal of clause 7.6?

30 MS GOUGH: Because it was under 156 metres.

MR MURRAY: Yeah. Because we've set a floor space – maximum floor-space ratio - - -

35 MS GOUGH: Yep.

MR KEARY: So the achievable height would be under - - -

MR MURRAY: The achievable height won't penetrate - - -

40 MS TUOR: Ever get

MR KEARY: Won't get to that. Okay.

45 MR MURRAY: - - - the air space operations.

MR KEARY: Right. Yep. Okay.

MS TUOR: Unless it's an even skinnier building than

MS GOUGH: That's right. Unless it's over 156 metres.

5 MR KEARY: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

MS TUOR: All right. I think that's it.

10 MR MURRAY: Thank you.

MS GOUGH: Okay. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

15 MS TUOR: Thank you very much for your time.

MR MURRAY: You're welcome.

20 MS GOUGH: Thank you.

MR MURRAY: We'll get those additional bits of information through to the secretariat.

25 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yeah. So the things that I've noted is that we'll provide the explanation of the out clause; we'll send a copy of your – the parking rates and clarify the existing provisions - - -

30 MS TUOR: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - of the site.

35 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS TUOR: That's good.

MR MURRAY: Okay.

40 MS TUOR: Thank you very much.

MR MURRAY: Thank you.

45 MR PILTON: Thank you very much.

MR: Thank you.

MATTER ADJOURNED at 10.31 am INDEFINITELY