



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**BAPTISTCARE CARLINGFORD - SENIORS HOUSING  
(SSD-33631237)**

### **COUNCIL MEETING**

**PANEL:** MS JULIET GRANT (CHAIR)  
PROF ELIZABETH TAYLOR AO  
MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** KENDALL CLYDSDALE  
CALLUM FIRTH

**CITY OF  
PARRAMATTA  
COUNCIL:** DOUG BENNETT  
MARK DILLON  
TINA D'SOUZA  
CAITLIN SUMMERS

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE

**DATE:** 1:00PM – 2:00PM  
MONDAY, 5<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2024

## <THE MEETING COMMENCED

**MS JULIET GRANT:** So that's everybody from Council now. Hang on, we've lost Caitlin. Tina, I can't see you. Did you think you had a camera on?

5

**MS TINA D'SOUZA:** Sorry, I'll just try it.

**MS GRANT:** Perfect. And we lost Caitlin, I think, in that process. Here she comes. Okay, that's everybody. Terrific. Thank you. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal country and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to elders past and present.

10

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the BaptistCare Carlingford Seniors Housing, case SSD-33631237, currently before the Commission for determination. This application seeks consent for site preparation works, construction of seven one to six storey buildings and basement levels, providing for a residential aged care facility, independent living units, respite day-care centre and car and bicycle parking on the southern portion of the former BaptistCare Carlingford Seniors Housing development site.

15

20

My name is Juliet Grant and I'm the chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Elizabeth Taylor and Michael Chilcott. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Callum Firth from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information relied upon by the Commission to base its determination.

30

It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are 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.

35

I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of others, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Who from Council would like to take the lead?

40

**MR DOUG BENNETT:** I'm happy to take the lead here. Thank you, Juliet, and I just wanted to say thank you to the Planning Commission for agreeing to hear us today and having a meeting with us. It's much appreciated. So my name is Douglas Bennett, I'm a development assessment officer with the City Significant Development Team at City of Parramatta Council. With me today from Council I have Mark Dillon in our Urban Design Teams and as well as Tina D'Souza, our

45

Public Domain Team and Caitlin Summers as well, who's also in our Urban Design Team. So I note that the Commission has put together an agenda of some matters that they were hoping to discuss with Council today. I suppose which is best – we're happy to just work off of that and I note that you'd put development density as the first matter to be discussed.

Just as a brief overview of the comments we've made in the past, we've made about three submissions for this application and throughout those three submissions, we've maintained the same point of objection that about the floorspace ratio 4.6 request. We understand the more technical nature of this request and how it relates to the site and the site to the north.

Our main concerns that we have are around infrastructure capacity constraints in Carlingford. We have been having ongoing problems in terms of infrastructure in that area. Both our LSPS, our local strategic planning statement and our local housing strategy both recommends that Carlingford precinct not have any further growth beyond that that's already planned in those strategies. And I note that we are already delivering more than what is planned in those strategies. So there is already ongoing concern there.

And we also recently had our dwelling targets reduced by the state government as well. I think we were one of the very few LGAs in Sydney to actually have their dwelling targets reduced as well and that's sort of reflected on infrastructure situation now, particularly in that area and in the City of Parramatta more broadly.

So in terms of density, that's one aspect that we are quite concerned with. I know that with this particular site that you have the 30% bonus which is afforded from the affordable housing SEPP. That site with that bonus was not obviously envisaged under any sort of DCP or VPA for this plan, so that's where our main concerns come from.

Also in relation to the density, it also ties into how the bulk and the scale of the development plays out as designed on the site and it ties in with a few other urban design issues that we've raised in our submissions. That's the main parts of our matters of contention. Was there particular questions that the Commission had about the density concerns so far or was it just for us to discuss?

**MS GRANT:** Yes, before I throw to the other commissioners to see if they had a question, I guess I'm just curious for you to explain, when you say that the infrastructure capacity is limited, are you referring specifically to roads, water, sewer, which infrastructure are you referring to?

**MR BENNETT:** Yes, so our local housing strategy does specifically mention road capacity as a major constraint and the lack of mass transit initiatives in that particular area, particularly between Carlingford and Epping. The traffic around there is quite problematic and we do get a lot of complaints from residents as well in terms of on street parking as well. So that's something that we're very conscious of in that area and that's why we're very careful as to what it is that we

approve or don't approve in that particular area. Yes. And we've included an excerpt of that particular part of the local housing strategy in one of our submissions as well if you wanted to go into further detail on that.

5 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. Elizabeth, Michael, did you have anything further on density before we move on?

10 **MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT:** I did, Juliet. Just to be clear on Council's position with respect to the strategy, the site has a particular zoning. The intent in terms of the sort of development one might see, you're not suggesting, I presume, that a compliant development wouldn't be something that Council would particularly oppose on this site, is that correct?

15 **MR BENNETT:** Yes. So when this site was rezoned, the intent obviously was for high density in that area and if there was a compliant proposal, then that would be in line with our expectations and in line with what was envisaged under both the rezoning proposal as well as our LSPS. So yes, if it was a compliant building in terms of floorspace and height, then that's what we would expect for the site, yes.

20 **MR CHILCOTT:** But notwithstanding that there's certain things that have happened and densities that have been delivered, it's the marginal increase in the scale of this proposal that is the trigger for Council's objective, not a fundamental objection to additional things living in this particular location?

25 **MR BENNETT:** Yes, and I think the main concern we also have is I guess the cumulative impacts of all these additional marginal non-compliances that have accumulated in Carlingford over the years that have led to this sort of situation that we're in now. And this site in particular is quite large, it's one of the larger sites in Carlingford, so a marginal percentage increase of floorspace does actually lead to  
30 quite a substantial amount of additional floorspace that they're seeking. That's something else that we're quite mindful of for this site in particular.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Right, thank you.

35 **PROF ELIZABETH TAYLOR:** Elizabeth Taylor here. I was just wondering if you had resolved the way in which the GFA is now being calculated to – in your first submission on the EIS you had concerns about areas that were missing. Has that all been resolved?

40 **MR BENNETT:** Yes. Thank you for the question, Elizabeth. So when I originally drafted the original submission that we did, I noted that there was a specific gross floor area definition under the housing SEPP. That matter was reviewed by the Department and they got internal legal advice on that, I think. And the position they came to was that even though there was a separate definition in the housing  
45 SEPP for that defined gross floor area differently than under the standard instrument.

There wasn't actually any specific mention of the term "gross floor area" in that

part of the housing SEPP, so therefore it couldn't be applied to any development that was approved under the housing SEPP, which was an oversight on when they drafted the SEPP.

5 So part of the reason why this SSD has been in with the Department for coming up on two years now is because they had to go and amend the housing SEPP to actually make sure that it was applicable to this development. Once that was done, the applicant did look into that and review their GFA calculations and brought it in line with what that definition said and we reviewed and we agreed with what was  
10 done there. So that was essentially how that was resolved.

The original submission was just pointing out that – we weren't even sure personally if it was actually supposed to be applied or not because the SEPP Was just unclear. So once it was amended, that was resolved, yes.

15 **PROF TAYLOR:** Has that been actually documented somewhere or did it just disappear off the discussion?

20 **MR BENNETT:** I think it was sort of a – it was quite a long drawn out process, so it wasn't – I don't think it was documented that well along the way. I think once they just amended the SEPP and provided the amended GFA plans, we just dropped the issue because we knew it was in compliance, I guess.

25 **PROF TAYLOR:** Right. So just confirming from your position that has been retired?

**MR BENNETT:** Yes, we're satisfied that they've calculated the GFA correctly now, yes.

30 **PROF TAYLOR:** Great. Thank you.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you. So the next point there was the DCP provisions.

35 **MR BENNETT:** So just as a bit of background, there was a site specific DCP done for this site as part of their rezoning proposal. I'll just bring up this – is it possible for me to share my screen at the moment?

**MS GRANT:** Callum, is that – yes, perfect.

40 **MR BENNETT:** So this is under part 8 of our DCP. I guess the DCP provisions tie into one of the main issues that we have here around the land that's due to be dedicated to Council under a VPA. This was the original vision of the site back when the rezoning proposal was done. Obviously the proposal that's currently  
45 before the Commission today is quite different from what was originally planned.

The most notable differences being that the DCP outlined a road going east-west along the southwest side, that sort of frames the publicly accessible open space and makes that area accessible to the public. From our understanding, the

applicant's claimed that the road here was not feasible or they didn't want to provide it as the north-south road along here couldn't be delivered because of the topography of the site, that it's just too steep to provide that road there and therefore having this road here they claim doesn't really go anywhere, so there's not much point delivering it.

We still would prefer to have a road there. That was always our position that it would be in line with the DCP and we acknowledge that with SSDs, DCPs don't apply obviously but we do also – are of the mind that this rezoning proposal for the site underwent a clear strategic process and it was always intended that this would be the outcome and this was done in consultation with both Council and the applicant over a long period of time and it does have quite – it is informative of what the public and Council expects for the site and the area. So we're a bit disappointed with what was envisaged in the VPA land down here.

We know that the drive to increase density sort of has pushed a building to be pretty much abutting the public open space to the point where there's some elements of the building that actually encroaches on to or projects over on to the public open space, which is something that we don't support at all and is something that we've consistently asked the applicant to amend and push that envelope further back away from the public open space. Unfortunately, we haven't had any success in asking for that.

It's something that we still very much would like to see. Mostly from a maintenance perspective, we don't really want to have our land have easements to cover parts of the building that will project over it. I think there's quite a few awnings on the ground floor that projects over on to the public open space. We don't think it's unreasonable for us to ask that those elements to be moved out of there if that space is going to come to us. I think here in addition to that, there was also concerns about the space would be read from the public.

The way that they've currently designed it, it is not immediately read as a public open space. It's not entirely obvious. The reason that we were mostly still asking for a road to be provided was for access to that area and also to frame it as more of an accessible area that the public can go in and enjoy. Without that, it makes it difficult for the public to – or for it to be interpreted as publicly open space. Mark, did you have any other comments you wanted to add on to that?

**MR MARK DILLON:** Yes. So Mark Dillon, team leader of City Projects and Precincts. So I lead the urban design team within the city design unit of Council. Thanks very much for the discussion. Yes, I would just build on what Doug is saying there in that particularly due to the characteristics of that open space that is meant to be enjoyed by the community, it's approximately 120 metres in length but only very minimal frontage to what would be the only public street address to that path.

So that's along Martins Lane. It would be less than 20 metres in this instance. And it's so closely collocated I guess with the aged care facility that in fact, yes, as

Doug was saying, there are elements of it which sort of appear to blend into the path, including just even a pathway, a footpath that services that building. Having that dual use in that zone again further compromises the public nature of that path or the intent that that is a publicly accessible open space.

5

So yes, and a street is sort of that universally acknowledged public domain element, which opens it up and provides an accessible way to enjoy the path and have a public frontage to it. It also allows for the building itself to be more accessible. So giving a street address, particularly to the building along the southern edge there, which is in the order of about 90 metres long, the only real public street address that it has is 2 Martins Lane, a very short frontage.

10

So you're not really having that public street address, it's going to create difficulties in wayfinding as well. So setting it back, a public street is strongly desirable but if that is not provided, which would be a shame, some kind of setback at the very least from that path that delineates movement associated with the building itself from the path itself, which is meant to be enjoyed by the public.

15

But yes, strongly pushing for an east-west road there and in terms of the applicant's discussion points around connecting roads around the entirety of the building, which is certainly preferred, there's still a great benefit in having that east-west link, even though it doesn't connect as a ring road due to all of the reasons that we've set out.

20

**MR BENNETT:** Were there any other questions from the Commission about this particular point that we could answer?

25

**MS GRANT:** Not from me. Michael, Elizabeth?

30

**MR CHILCOTT:** Not from me, no.

**PROF TAYLOR:** Just the one that you brought up there about the way the building is positioned over what could be your land. So I just want to confirm that what you were saying then there is there would be easements or maintenance agreements that you would need to enter into regarding where that overlap occurs?

35

**MR BENNETT:** Yes, so essentially yes, we would have to have some sort of easement for maintenance access or something like that if they're going to have elements that project over and on to Council's land. We have done that in the past and we do have some existing sites in the city that do project over our land, like in Parramatta Square, for example, that we have signs and awnings that project over on to Council's land that we have easements for.

40

It is done but it's not our preference and we prefer to avoid it in areas where it could easily be accommodated entirely on private land and that's something that I think would be the case here is that we would prefer it if they either removed the elements or pushed the building further back preferably, so that it's all located on their land.

45

**MS GRANT:** Can you just use your cursor there to show where the boundary of the land that would be dedicated to Council would be? Is it the dotted –

5 **MR BENNETT:** So actually you can see it here, it's roughly where this blue dotted line is.

**MS GRANT:** Okay, yes.

10 **MR BENNETT:** Sorry, the plans are still loading. So yes, this awning here is essentially – as well as part of the building itself is projecting into Council's land and it's something that we have strongly objected to. We would prefer it if that was deleted or moved back.

15 **MS GRANT:** So it's not just the awning then, it's also the pedestrian pathway that runs through that space?

**MR BENNETT:** That's right.

20 **PROF TAYLOR:** And part of the building.

**MR BENNETT:** Yes.

25 **MS GRANT:** And the positioning of that line tied with the VPA is the VPA specifically gave a dimension, is that how that line came to pass rather than being shifted so that the awnings are not in that space? Is there a size area that was required as part of that VPA?

30 **MR BENNETT:** Yes, the VPA does specify a certain area, amount of area of land and it's roughly in line with where the ecological zone is on the southern part of the site. I think it does – I have to double check but I think it does specify the dimensions of the land and it has a diagram in the VPA as well as to what part of the land the VPA refers to and it is essentially where this blue dotted line is on the plans.

35 **PROF TAYLOR:** Because there was a question that part of the ecological zone was also now within the footprint of part of the development at the western end.

40 **MR BENNETT:** Sorry, you said that this was part of the ecological zone, part of the footprint?

45 **PROF TAYLOR:** Yes. Well, I was looking at one of the diagrams, there's been so many and it did appear as though – I think it's on the – sorry, I'd have to find it. The part of the ecological zone seems to flow up into the bottom end of your diagram, I suppose it would be.

**MR BENNETT:** Like around here?



**PROF TAYLOR:** Yes, yes, that's right. Is that correct or that's all been sorted out or –

5 **MR BENNETT:** I think there were proximity issues that our biodiversity officer raised initially. From the most recent comments we've received from him, he seems fine with the biological biodiversity impacts itself. But the more space that we can give those trees, the better, I guess, is the terms there.

10 I don't think there's going to be any specific construction impacts in terms of those trees themselves, they're proposing tree protection zones around them and there is enough earth around those particular trees. I think there were other trees that they were concerned about in terms of construction impacts on that we raised in our submissions but I don't think it was the ones to the south. I'll have to double check that though if that's okay.

15 **PROF TAYLOR:** Okay.

20 **MS GRANT:** Which is a perfect segue to the next point, which is tree removal and impacts.

25 **MR BENNETT:** So yes, we did have our tree and landscape officer review these plans. For the most part, the main concerns were about the extent of transplantation of trees at the site and the impacts on the construction works. I think they were proposing encroaching quite close within tree protection zones beyond the acceptable limits under the Australian standards. I think those concerns were still outstanding as of this meeting, as of the time of this meeting, sorry.

30 The issues we have with transplantation is in Council's experience, they typically tend to - they don't really work with trees of this nature and size. It's good in theory and good on paper but in reality, they typically tend to not take root and they tend to die, which is not an outcome that we would want. We see it as that there is the opportunity that the building can be designed in a way to keep the trees in question or design around them. That would've been our preferred approach and we did think it was reasonable that that could be done.

35 But transplantation seems to be the main action that the proponent was seeking to undertake in terms of those trees. So we still do maintain our concerns about the effectiveness of transplantation and that our preference is that it not be undertaken, the trees be retained but we accept that the applicant has different views and the Department has different views on that as well.

40 **MS GRANT:** Do you have a plan handy that would show which trees we're referring to for being transplanted, just so we're absolutely clear about what we're discussing? If it's not handy, don't –

45 **MR BENNETT:** I don't have one that's handy at the moment. I just had the architectural plans downloaded.

**MS GRANT:** That's fine. We'll ask the applicant when we're on site tomorrow to point out exactly which trees they are.

5 **MR BENNETT:** Okay, yes. I can send through the tree numbers as well if that's helpful for you guys to get a better understanding of the trees in question that we're concerned with.

**MR CHILCOTT:** That would be helpful. Thank you.

10 **MR BENNETT:** No worries.

**MS GRANT:** Michael, anything further on that one?

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** No, I look forward to getting that further information.

**MR BENNETT:** Sure.

**MR CHILCOTT:** That'd help with the discussion with the applicant. Thanks.

20 **MS GRANT:** Elizabeth?

**PROF TAYLOR:** None from me at the moment.

25 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. Okay. Amenity of accommodation. I know you raised that in your submission as well.

**MR BENNETT:** Yes, so I'll pass this over to Mark Dillon's team. They can discuss with that. Mark.

30 **MR DILLON:** Now, just before I dive too deeply into that, I just want to – I mean, this also impacts on amenity but I didn't quite finish off on some of the building bulk discussions if that's all right to go back and – they overlap. But do you have a plan, just a site plan I think would be quite useful.

35 **MR BENNETT:** A site plan. Okay, give me a second.

40 **MR DILLON:** That labels where all the buildings are. Basically we are concerned that the height and bulk of the development result in a very mean development that has quite large buildings that are not generous in how they sit within the site and the space [unintelligible 00:28:40]. So I noted before that building F is approximately 90 metres in length.

45 We use a rule in site planning these large sites of about 60 metres maximum building length to allow space between the buildings and to not overwhelm the public domain with the bulk and scale of the development. So that building F, that's to the right of the page on the southern edge but even the remaining buildings that are on the site, you can sort of see that they interconnect in a lot of ways.

5 The spaces that are between the buildings are quite mean and for instance, along the east-west road to the north of the development, the spaces between the buildings are about 5.3 metres. That's in contrast to the development at the top of the hill, which includes a gap which is running north-south along those buildings that is 9 metres basically.

10 So it's much more generous, it allows for some breathing room between these very, very large scale buildings. It also establishes a view corridor source or a view to sky corridor at the very least between buildings, which it would be fantastic if that corridor or view to sky was continued into this site, so it's responding to its local context. It's just not happening here, there are sky bridges or there are – for instance, there's a lobby that bridges between two buildings, so you're not maintaining that view to sky. It's just it's too crowded on the site  
15 basically.

20 And especially where we do have quite a constrained site, Martins Lane in particular has a very steep topography but also a very narrow road reserve. So the scale of the buildings sitting in relationship to that public edge of the development without adequate space between buildings over the long buildings, it's just going to overwhelm the public domain.

25 So that's a key concern that we have and it's really just be more generous with the spaces between buildings and thinking about how that relates to the local context. So I can jump into amenity unless there's any particular questions from the panel on that.

**MS GRANT:** No, that's fine for you to proceed, yes. Thank you.

30 **MR DILLON:** So yes, in particular, concerned that the access to sunlight, solar access across the site is not equitably shared among the buildings. So my understanding is that they are achieving their ADG minimums across the site, however individual buildings are not receiving adequate sunlight access at all.

35 So building C, for instance, which is at the top of the site, achieves 45% of solar access to apartment and then 38% of apartments receive no solar access at all. So the particular wording in the ADG is that 70% of apartments in a building must receive two hours of direct sunlight. So we consider these discrete buildings and so it just means that people living within the development are not having equitable  
40 access to their amenities. That's the key point we wanted to make. Happy to take questions about that.

**MS GRANT:** And is there anything that could be done in the context of this design to address that?  
45

**MR DILLON:** I think sort of tying into what I was saying before about the bulk of the building, if there were to be more generous space between buildings, that would certainly facilitate greater solar access. Even if it was not direct solar

access, it's just greater access to daylight as well in apartments. Everything is just very tight, there are a lot of blank walls in between the buildings because they're obviously not meeting the minimums in the ADG for active interfaces of apartments. So there's a lot of control of the light within the development, just to squeeze as much on to the site as possible. I think that's really resulting in poor outcomes for the people who will live there.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Juliet, can I just ask, following up from that, those points you've raised are not minor points. They're almost redesign requirements. They're not tweaking this design. Would that be a fair interpretation of what you're saying?

**MR DILLON:** Yes, from our perspective, yes. I mean, we've been trying to influence the design from the start of the process, when we were first consulted and we do think that there are pretty fundamental site planning issues that are hampering this development.

**PROF TAYLOR:** Sorry, can you just repeat that last sentence?

**MR DILLON:** So I was saying that we've been trying to influence this design in a positive direction from the first time that Council did have access to the plans and there are some fundamental things that the development is just not doing from a site planning perspective. That's very difficult to resolve in tweaking the design. They're pretty fundamental changes.

But there can be improvements made by giving more generous space between buildings, for instance. It will impact on the development yield of course but anything we can do really at this point to improve the amenity of people living here I think will be very important. And even people using the public path for instance. Yes, everything feels too mean, too constrained, it's just not going to be a high amenity outcome.

**MR BENNETT:** I will just say in addition to what Mark's saying, these comments we provided to the applicant and to the Department since this application first came to us back in March. So the applicant's been aware of these issues that we've been raising in terms of solar access and amenity and we realised that even some of the apartments appear to be below natural ground level.

These comments have been with them for over a year now and we're still not seeing – we still hadn't seen any tweaks or changes to the design to sort of really respond to that and respond to the ADG requirements. So I acknowledge that providing these comments about major design changes at this stage seems quite late but it's something that we've been raising since day one and there's just not been any response really.

**MS GRANT:** Okay, thank you. Acknowledge that.

**PROF TAYLOR:** Could I have a question too?

**MS GRANT:** Yes.

5 **PROF TAYLOR:** Just could you elaborate on what you think – just had a total brain fade, but you’ve talked about solar but there’s also airflow.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Cross-ventilation issues?

10 **PROF TAYLOR:** That’s the word.

**MR DILLON:** Yes.

**PROF TAYLOR:** Could you just give a commentary on that?

15 **MR DILLON:** Sure. I think as well they’re showing technical compliance with that. They do have quite deep sort of articulations within the building, which is meant to facilitate airflow. That’s certainly not an ideal way to facilitate cross-ventilation in apartments. It’s very constrained and it’s not achieving a great outcome.

20 It’s also in doing it that way, instead of providing a solid break between – or a meaningful break between the buildings, it’s trying to do too many things at once. So that means if the buildings aren’t separated adequately, you’re then not able to use those recesses to get additional solar access as well. So it’s really attempting to achieve technical compliance but I don’t think it’s doing it in a way that is greatly improving the amenity of people who will live in these buildings.

25 **PROF TAYLOR:** Thank you.

30 **MS GRANT:** Thank you for that. Are there any other points you want to raise before we move on to talking about the draft conditions? Doug, you can probably stop sharing that screen and so we can see everybody. Terrific. Thank you. So the next point on the agenda then was Council’s response to the draft conditions. Notwithstanding obviously that the content of the previous discussion, if the application was to proceed, are there things that the Commission should be aware of in terms of the way that the conditions are put together or any other conditions you think that might be missing and would be beneficial?

35 **MR BENNETT:** I will start off by saying we haven’t had a chance to have an in depth review of these conditions. I think it’s only been with us for about a week now, so we haven’t been able to fully dive into it. I did have a brief look at it today before the meeting. It’s obviously not ideal, those conditions are not what we would’ve preferred. I think we would’ve liked to have seen – if it comes down to an approval, we would’ve liked to have seen more conditions geared at the treatment of the VPA lands, getting the building elements out of our land there.

40 I did note that some of the conditions, I can’t remember the number of it now, but there was a lot of conditions that sort of addressed the internal amenity issues that

we had discussed and about requiring design changes in that respect. I reviewed those and it did seem to me that there was quite a few design changes being requested as condition and it wasn't entirely clear what the outcome would be in terms of what the design and layout of the development would be when that condition is complied with. So there's a bit of concern about the uncertainty that might be created through that condition, which is something I suppose the Commission might want to think about.

We certainly do agree that those amenity concerns that we've raised should be addressed. If that's the best way to do that is by condition and consent, we're not entirely sure. I think it'd be best to do it – to address it beforehand so that we know what – so that the community and Council knows what the outcome and design of the development is going to be. I suppose that's really all I can say at the moment on the conditions. Yes, like I said, we've sent it out to a few of our internal officers for them to review and comment on, we just haven't had a chance to have a proper in depth dive into it yet.

**MS GRANT:** No, appreciate that and thank you and please feel free when you do have those comments back from your internal sections of Council to share them with the Commission or if you think of others as you get a chance to look through it. That would be very helpful. Thank you.

**MR BENNETT:** No worries. Thank you.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Juliet, can just ask, does Council have a timeline for that response in terms of how long you might take to get that to the Commission?

**MR BENNETT:** No set timeline but I'm happy to prioritise and get that out to you guys within a week or so.

**MS GRANT:** Callum, do we have a particular timeline that we would need responses back from Council?

**MR CALLUM FIRTH:** In the next week or two would be ideal. Yes, within a week would be great.

**MR BENNETT:** Yes, I'm happy to prioritise that and get that out to you guys as soon as possible.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you. Are there any other matters that Council would like to raise with the Commission?

**MR BENNETT:** I think we've pretty much covered off everything that was left outstanding. Our most recent submission that we made to the Department still contains most of our relevant outstanding matters, so we'd encourage the Commission to review that in their own time. And yes, we'll happily – we'll get back to you guys on the two points that we've taken on notice and get some additional comments on those conditions out to you as soon as possible.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you. Michael, do you have any other last questions?

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** No. Just thanks very much for the time and insights you've provided. It's been very helpful.

**MS GRANT:** Elizabeth?

10 **PROF TAYLOR:** I'd echo that sentiment.

**MS GRANT:** Terrific. Kendall and Callum, is there anything else that we need procedurally to ask of Council while we have this opportunity?

15 **MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** We're all good, thanks, Juliet.

**MS GRANT:** Well, thank you all so much for giving up your time, especially acknowledge that it was over lunch time as we were trying to sort of squeeze these meetings in so that we had a good understanding of what Council's issues were right at the beginning. So we've sort of come to this all just in the last couple of days, so we've got lots of reading ahead of us. We are visiting the site tomorrow, so your discussion points, we'll be able to crystallise those when we're on site. So thank you, really appreciate your time, for making the time to come and speak to us today.

25 **MR BENNETT:** Thank you very much everyone and thanks the Commission for hearing us out today and best of luck on site tomorrow.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

30 **MS GRANT:** Terrific. Thank you. Thanks, everybody.

**MR BENNETT:** Thank you very much.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**