



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**RE: GEORGES COVE MARINA SITE – 146 NEWBRIDGE RD,  
MOOREBANK (PP-2024-658) – GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW**

### **COUNCIL MEETING**

**PANEL:** ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR)  
JULIET GRANT

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** BRAD JAMES  
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON  
PHOEBE JARVIS

**LIVERPOOL  
CITY COUNCIL:** CR NED MANNOUN  
CR PETER HARLE  
CR FIONA MACNAUGHT  
LINA KAKISH  
MARK HANNAN  
IAN STENDARA  
STEPHEN PETERSON  
ZEAUL HOQUE  
MARUF HOSSAIN

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

**DATE:** 11.00AM – 12.00PM  
THURSDAY, 13<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2025

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

5 **MR MILLS:** I'd like to just start with an opening statement. So, good morning and welcome. And before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I acknowledge the traditional custodians of all the lands from which we virtually meet today, and pay my respects to their Elders, past and present.

10 So, welcome to today's meeting to discuss the Gateway Determination Review Request for the planning proposal applying to the Georges Cove Marina Site at 146 Newbridge Road, Moorebank (PP-2024-658) which is currently before the Commission for advice.

15 The proposal seeks to facilitate mixed use and residential development by introducing a new additional permitted use to permit residential flat buildings, multi-dwelling housing and restaurants and cafés, with a maximum total gross floor area of 1,500 square metres, as well as increasing the maximum height of building and floor space ratio controls.

20 My name is Andrew Mills. I am the Chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this Commission Panel, and I am joined by my fellow Commissioner, Juliet Grant. We are also joined by Brad James, Tahlia Hutchinson and Phoebe Jarvis from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of the information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

30 This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It's important for commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and you're not in a position to answer the question, please do feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we'll  
35 then be put up on our website.

40 I do request that all members ensure they do not speak over the top of each, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. And I'll begin by asking if each member joining could please introduce yourselves, those from Council in particular, and if applicable, provide a verbal declaration of any actual or potential personal interest that you may have in the project. And to complete the transparency and the record, I do acknowledge that councillors have voted on this matter previously at their meeting of the 13th of December 2023.

45 So, thank you, over to you, councillors. Mayor, if you would like to start perhaps both with an introduction and an indication of whether there's any conflicts of interest you'd like to mention.

**MAYOR NED MANNOUN:** Good morning. My name is Ned Mannoun, I'm the Mayor of Liverpool City Council. I too want to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on who me and where this project is based, the Cabrogal clan of the Darug nation. And I look forward to speaking in support of the review.

5

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. Perhaps do we have the Deputy Mayor with us as well?

**MAYOR MANNON:** No, I think there's Fiona Macnaught, I'm not sure if she's online.

10

**MS FIONA MACNAUGHT:** Hi everyone, yes, my name is Fiona Macnaught, I'm a Councillor at Liverpool Council as well. I'm familiar with the project. I'm also a community member in the vicinity of the project, so have had a long history with the project and I'm here to speak in support and support from the community as well. Thank you.

15

**MR MILLS:** Other councillors?

**MR PETER HARLE:** I'm not sure if you can hear me. Councillor Peter Harle.

20

**MR MILLS:** Yes, we can. Thank you.

**MR HARLE:** Thank you. I can't get video, so I'm assuming – I wasn't sure if I was on ... I'm currently the Deputy Mayor. We have looked at this project and I'm interested in the results of it.

25

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. Okay. If other people from the Council could just introduce themselves when they first speak in relation to this. I thank you very much for that. I'd like to perhaps start by getting Council's view on the strategic merit, any comments that you would like to make in relation to both the council and State strategies in relation to this as well as local plans and so on.

30

**MS LINA KAKISH:** Good morning. My name is Lina Kakish. I'm the Director of Planning and Compliance at Liverpool Council. I'm happy to offer up some comments on the strategic merit of this proposal.

35

As you know, Council officers recommended endorsement of the planning proposal for gateway, and that was subsequently endorsed by the Council. Since that time, the Department has raised a number of issues primarily in relation to flood planning. Council officers at the time of endorsing the proposal, I suppose it was on the premise of a caveat that the Department would address the flood planning and the flood related issues.

40

And since the Department has responded with a number of concerns, Council officers are of the view that the flood related matters must be addressed before the proposal – if consideration was to be given to support the proposal. However, I'd just like to make a couple of key points.

45

5 Firstly, the strategic merit, putting aside the flood planning, is sound for this site for a number of reasons. The residential units not only would support the economic feasibility of the development which has become a significant issue for Liverpool in this current macro-economic environment. It has stalled development; we don't have one crane in the sky in the CBD at the moment.

10 So, we are of a mind to ensure that feasibility of development is supported, without needing to state it, but without compromising, you know, optimum planning outcomes. And there's also the Council vision to activate the river, and this would be a prime development that would support the activation of the river and increase amenity for sort of the immediate local, more recent residential establishments and the broader community.

15 On flooding, I would just make a note that the concerns raised by the Department are supported, however, the broader concern that I have from the way that the planning proposals have been reviewed of recent times has just been the, probably the disproportionality between the type of development and what's required to address flood mitigation.

20 So, without delving into the technicalities of this, because I'm no expert in that field, the Council is obviously supportive of the fact that Moore Point received gateway for 15,000 dwellings. However, I'm just unsure about what the technical basis is to the fact that gateway was refused this on the proviso that significant work such as upgrading the entire length of Nuwarra Road, that being a caveat for 25 300 dwellings, is just something I'm not sure I'm not fully understanding.

30 And what that's doing is probably causing a bit of uncertainty for us in how to look at planning proposals from a flood planning perspective moving forward. So, I guess on that, again I'm not an expert, so Council does support the Department's concerns, but I just wanted to make that broader view on the disproportionality between the expectation at gateway stage for flooding.

35 But on that, Council has been briefed by the proponent in response to the Department's concerns in Council's submission. And we'd be of a mind to consider a review of any further documentation as part of this review, if the Panel was of a mind to do that. So, that's all I want to say at this time.

40 **MR MILLS:** Sorry, just in relation to that last point, Lina. Are you referring to the proposal for a further flood and evacuation [unintelligible 00:09:56] report that's been proposed by the proponent?

**MS KAKISH:** Correct.

45 **MR MILLS:** Yes, thank you. Can I just also ask, the Council hasn't adopted the 2020 report. I'm just trying to get the right years of the various reports that have been done. The 2020 report. Is there any reason that they haven't, despite that not having been actually adopted by Council, has that been taken into account, and do you have any views in relation to that being taken into account?

**MS KAKISH:** Just to confirm, you're referring to the report by Molino Stewart?

**MR MILLS:** No, sorry, the BMT.

**MS TAHLIA HUTCHINSON:** BMT report from 2020 and then also the Molino Stewart report from 2022.

**MS KAKISH:** Sure. Mark, I might invite you to comment on the BMT report, if you can. But I'll just make a comment about the Molino Stewart report before I handover to Mark.

As you may know, the Molino Stewart report was commissioned in response to the Department's view that Council had a number of planning proposals at a different stage in their assessment sort of process in the Moorebank East region and in the broader sort of area that is encompassed by high-risk flooding. And they asked effectively for a regional response to the fact that we had a number of planning proposals seeking quite significant density.

So, the Molino Stewart report was commissioned on that basis. The issues that we've come across with the Molino Stewart report, and probably the main driver as to why it hasn't been formally endorsed, has been to do with the variables that were used to inform the study. So, mainly the number of vehicles that would be assumed for residents in the area. There was a disparity in the number of vehicles. The report sort of assumed a high number of vehicle ownership, where Council on its existing data assumed a much lesser vehicle ownership number aggregate.

And also, it was the pattern of evacuation. I think the report spoke to a single point of evacuation for a flood event, and that was something that we weren't fully supportive of.

And the third point relates to the shelter in place concern. So, more broadly, we've been working with the Department, proponents of Moore Point, the Reconstruction Authority, and other sort of agencies around whether there is going to be an imminent policy position on shelter in place. Because the inconsistent risk appetite for what's considered acceptable has become an impediment to assessing proposals, not only for Liverpool but for Penrith and other relevant councils.

So, sort of those three main variables. It was probably the disagreement on the vehicle ownership, the pattern of residential evacuation to a single point, and also the shelter in place. While we've been relying on the report to some extent, I guess what we've been doing since the time of the report's inception has been we're trying to work with agencies to establish what consensus we can come to on those matters.

**MR MILLS:** Did Mark – did you want to add anything to that?

**MR MARK HANNAN:** Yes, good morning, Commissioners, thank you. My

name is Mark Hannan, I'm the Manager City Planning at Liverpool City Council.

I'd like to echo Lina's comments, particularly in regards to development on the floodplain. I think since the 2022 Flood Inquiry, Council, local government in particular have had a lack of clarity on some direction in terms of what can and what can't be done within the floodplain in terms of – and that's not just affecting this development but multiple developments within the Georges River catchment and the Hawkesbury-Nepean catchment at our western precincts.

In terms of whether the BMT Flood Study was applicable, I'd have to defer to Stephen, who is on the call today. I do understand that BMT's Flood Study did inform the planning proposal for the Liverpool Private Hospital. But I'm not sure whether it has been taken into account for this development. Stephen, are you able to confirm that? If we can't confirm it, we'll take that on notice and come back to you with an answer.

**MR STEPHEN PETERSON:** Hey, I'm Stephen Peterson, I'm the Senior Strategic Planner at Liverpool City Council. I'm aware that a flood report by the proponent hasn't considered the BMT 2020 report. As to reasoning why, that'd be best for our flood engineers to answer that question.

**MR MARUF HOSSAIN:** Good morning, Commissioner. This is Maruf Hossain, I'm the Coordinator of Floodplain and Water Management at Liverpool Council. In relation to the 2020 Flood Study, the flood model with the current adopted study Georges River 2004. The model is a 1D model, or a one-dimensional model, and that model is not suitable for flood impact assessment. So, Council, and Liverpool City Council and Bankstown City Council, we jointly initiated this flood study and ... Can you hear me?

**MR MILLS:** Yes. There seems to be some talk in the background with someone.

**MR HOSSAIN:** Yes. Okay. Because I'm in the office, it's unfortunate, sorry. So, we jointly developed this flood study as a 2D model, and this model is suitable for flood impact assessment. This model was not adopted by Council because there are a number of reasons.

One of the reasons is the Georges River is shared by eight different councils. We cannot in isolation adopt this flood study. So, at that time because this flood study is jointly funded by the Department, DPLH, and both councils, we have agreed that we develop a big picture, the full Georges River catchment. That will replace the current 1D model. And as part of that, we'll proceed with the risk management study and plan based on the new model.

So, the decision was we keep the current flood levels as per the 2004 study for the flood level controls. And the new model will be used for flood impact assessment within Liverpool and Bankstown city councils. So, this is just to see what is the impact of filling, what is the evacuation constraint, all this sort of thing, any development assessment. Because a 1D model is not suitable for that purpose.

So, for your information, Commissioner, the Department has already initiated that involving all eight participant councils to do that new flood study.

5 **MR MILLS:** Okay. Can we just unpack some of that in relation to flooding and infrastructure, in particular, I guess, some of the comments that have been made around evacuation, assumed vehicles, and so on, and perhaps stick to the differences, I guess, between the reports and the view of Council. In particular, a pattern of evacuation, I think I heard Council indicate that they had a different  
10 view in relation to that. Perhaps going into a little bit more detail around some of those things, please.

**MR HOSSAIN:** Commissioner, I'm not an evacuation expert, but what I understand from the Molino Stewart report, that there is constraint for the location  
15 capacity. And that is not actually in favour of any new development because that will take the existing capacity, [could affect 00:19:35] flood effected people within the catchment. So, that is my understanding. But that is all I can give in that regards.

20 **MR MILLS:** I thought I understood that you were expressing some differences of opinion in relation to some of the assumptions around the pattern of evacuation, the actual pattern of evacuation as opposed to the evacuation. Lina, is that something – I think you mentioned that? Just give us a little bit more detail and how do you see one might play out differently.

25 **MS KAKISH:** Yes, the concern has been the assumption that the pattern of evacuation would be that everybody would be sort of travelling in the same direction on Nuwarra Road. Based on the vehicle numbers that were assumed, which are higher than what our projections are, rather than looking at what would  
30 probably be a more organic pattern of evacuation, with people who, say, have family living in other directions. You know, not everybody is going to be evacuating to an evacuation centre in Homebush, for example.

35 It would make sense that people would be travelling to other safe places. There could be other local community centres that we typically, as Council, offer up in during times of natural disaster. Or there could be family or friends that they would be going to.

40 The assumption was around the maximum impact case that everybody would be getting in the car and driving up towards Homebush, I think I recall, as being the pattern of behaviour. So, that is something again that we have been liaising with the agencies on, particularly with respect to the Moore Point development. Because the assumptions there would not make that development feasible on any account. Instead, what they're doing is responding by looking at alternative  
45 strategies such as the pedestrian bridges that will go along the river, which will take on some pedestrian evacuation during time of a flooding event. And also looking at challenging those assumptions.

5 So, that's the sort of level of analysis that we've undertaken to date. But we haven't really progressed with a different sort of formal report or strategy, more so because we are seeking further clarity from a policy base position on what would be deemed acceptable. And shelter in place is going to be a big factor to consider in all of our proposals affected by flooding. Because we're not characterised by flash flooding, we are going to be to some extent relying upon shelter in place for those who choose not to evacuate. And so we've been really pressing in advocating for a policy position on that. Yes, that's probably all I can say to that for now.

10 The earlier discussions with the Department in relation to this proposal have – you know, there's been consensus from the Department that the variables that I've discussed as being issues within the Molino Stewart report are somewhat agreed by the Department and that's why the response was in relation to this proposal that there should be a site-specific strategy. And that was the assumption that was used to move this forward to seek gateway.

20 **MR MILLS:** Right. Just so I can understand the concern in relation to the assumptions about everyone going onto Nuwarra Road. Is it the case that that is because that will lead to the M5 and all of those roads are sufficiently above the expected potential flood levels, as opposed to other exit routes from that area, be it Governor Macquarie Drive or Newbridge Road to the east or to the west, which may have lower levels. Is that, would it be one of the line assumptions in the report that you disagree with or ...? I guess I'm just trying to unpack that a little more.

30 **MS KAKISH:** I'd probably ... Maruf, if you have any comments on what the most significant challenge would be in terms of that evacuation route and why other routes can't be relied upon. But my understanding has been that it's the – the reason why sort of the one route has been preferred is because it's an assumption that everybody would evacuate to the same location.

35 Road capacity's certainly a challenge and that's where the capacities for density uplift have been kind of nominated within that report to say, "Okay, based on this evacuation route, based on the uplift in density, this is what the roads can handle in those different sort of specific localities." So, the density and the vehicle movements, that's why the vehicle movements are important with the vehicle ownership numbers. Because I think that's what is being perceived as the biggest challenge. That if everybody had a vehicle and everybody was going down the same route because they were going to all evacuate to the same exact location, the accumulation of traffic ...

45 And I don't know whether the actual – I think, you know, this is all based on my understanding flood-free access. So, with the evacuation lead times and what not, the assumption is it would be flood-free access, but it's more the fact you've got a high volume of vehicles associated with the density uplift all travelling in the one location.

I probably can't speak to anymore in that respect, but I don't know if, Maruf, you have any additional points to make about what you – what the report speaks to in terms of that being a challenge.

5 **MR HOSSAIN:** Thank you, Lina. Thank you, Mr Commissioner. My understanding is, when there is a constraint in the longer route, then the people who are trying to leave from the flood area, they are stuck on the road. And by this time, we don't know how many hours – it is like a carpark. And while the level continues to rise and they may be trapped inside the flood water. That is the risk in  
10 when there is a location constraint along the route.

The road may be flood free, but when there's a huge number of traffic just gathering in one location, and you'd appreciate that there is more development been approved in Moore Point, as Lina mentioned. People will start moving in a  
15 different direction. And that was the – those are the issues and the risk that is understood from the presentation of Molino Stewart.

**MS GRANT:** So ...

20 **MR MILLS:** Sorry, go on, Juliet.

**MS GRANT:** So, Lina, is – I understand that the proponent is talking about limiting dwellings to 340. Is that something that came from them or was that a  
25 Council request in order to manage that volume of traffic movement for evacuation?

**MS KAKISH:** The main driver behind that figure was around the capacity that was nominated in the Molino Stewart report for that particular locality. So, that  
30 was my understanding.

**MS GRANT:** Okay. And if the planning proposal was to proceed, does Council have a mechanism in place, in mind, about how they would make that 340 a  
35 statutory requirement?

**MS KAKISH:** Look, most certainly we could include a special clause in the LEP. There could be force place restrictions. From a planning perspective, we could  
40 work around that through a number of different clauses. We could limit the actual yield to those numbers as an additional permitted use clause.

**MS GRANT:** Yes. And the proponent mentioned to us when we met with them that the use of an additional permitted use rather than rezoning the RE2 was  
45 actually a Council preference. Because I asked why you would choose one over the other. Is that the case?

**MS KAKISH:** Stephen or Mark, would you like to speak to that? I'm not sure I'm  
across that preference being put forward to the Department.

**MR HANNAN:** Yes, neither am I, Lina. Stephen, could you speak to that or take

it on notice if you can't speak to it?

**MS KAKISH:** We can take it on notice.

5 **MS GRANT:** It's not critical if you don't know, but if you're able to find out, that would be helpful.

10 **MR PETERSON:** Thanks. Yes, I'm not a hundred percent sure it's the past history of this as to why the RE2, if it was recommended by Council. Council had raised this with the proponent, and we've spoken to them recently, that the proponent is open to either rezoning or leaving it as the key site as it is. The only aspect that might come up as to why they chose the key site map was to do with the Ministerial Direction, the 9.1 direction regarding flooding. But ...

15 **MS GRANT:** Thank you.

20 **MR MILLS:** And in terms of foot evacuation in the instance of flood, the proponent also suggested to us there was a Council plan to build a – and this is for a completely different reason, more about the amenity and attractiveness of the site – a proposal to build a walkway around the river. Is that ...?

25 **MS KAKISH:** Yes, Commissioner, that forms part of the broader strategic vision for the local government area about having a continuous active shared pathway along the Georges River.

**MR MILLS:** And how far would that run for and what's the timeline expected for that to occur?

30 **MS KAKISH:** There have been some changes in discussions around how we could make it work. There was initially historically a proposal to have the pathway run across the gap that's along the boundary of the site adjacent to the river. And then there were some changes to that position on the basis of the feasibility of having a bridge going across. So, it was subsequently agreed that there would be a loop back across.

35 I'd have to take on notice exact timing. But there are some specific requirements that are built into the VPA that exists on the sites that have been associated with the marina approval and development. So, the plans for that – and Mark, correct me if I'm wrong on any of this – but the plans for the walkway along the site are secured in so far as they are in conjunction with the planning proposal that was initially attached to the site for the marina and the residential development that exists south of that.

40  
45 But any changes that would be discussed as part of this planning proposal would effectively seek to improve any contribution. So, in any case, that pathway is an obligation of the proponent as it stands. And there are milestones, but I'd have to take it on notice and I don't recall off the top of my head when the exact timeframes kick in.

**MR MILLS:** Yes, if you could, that would be useful. Thank you.

5 We have touched on quite a lot of what we intended to talk about. Is there any concern from Council in relation to transport for the site? Public transport I'm thinking about now, it's obviously not close to Liverpool Railway Station. But just more broadly, is there an expectation there will be additional busways or things like that, or routes that might be created?

10 **MR KAKISH:** Mark, did you want to speak to that? There is nothing anticipated in the immediate future. Nothing directly previously discussed in relation to this proposal. But Mark, maybe you want to talk about sort of more broadly some of the discussions that have been had particularly around Moore Point.

15 **MR HANNAN:** So, around the Georges Cove Marina, so the transport, the active transport corridor, so what Lina was just talking about in terms of the extension of the pathway that will improve connectivity for walking and cycling. In terms of bus services, I think existing services would be maintained as part of this proposal. There are no additional services that I'm aware of.

20 **MR MILLS:** All right. So, it's mainly the M90 service I think we read in the report.

25 **MR HANNAN:** That's correct, yes.

**MR MILLS:** And Juliet, did you have any other questions?

30 **MS GRANT:** Just one more broad, I guess, question in terms of how Council sees this in terms of satisfying and responding to local housing strategy and LSPS. Is this sort of a fundamental contributor to housing supply in the LGA or is this kind of an added bonus outside of that, your core sort of goals?

35 **MS KAKISH:** I would say it's a fundamental contributor because of a few reasons. I spoke earlier about the strategic vision around activating the river and increasing amenity around the river. And activation through residential living and local community sort of connection is key to that.

40 There's also the need for, and the Mayor may touch on this, is very passionate about this, but it's that variety of housing product and typology within the LGA that's not as prominent at the moment. So, looking at how we tap into our health and education and innovation precincts and how we can offer up housing that sort of corresponds to what we're doing in that space. So, having the largest hospital in the country, having four universities on board in Liverpool, how do we offer up higher quality and higher amenity housing for our medical and education and health professionals.

45 So, that's something that is quite visionary and we would always encourage sort of high-quality housing and high-amenity housing where we can leverage on good

5 location. So, it's quite visionary. Yes, we're able to meet our housing targets. Yes, this isn't going to break our housing targets or cause any significant dent in any of our sort of immediate strategic priorities. But from a visionary perspective, it's important that we do leverage on opportunities to deliver a wide variety of housing.

10 Also, as I mentioned, feasibility has become a significant concern for Liverpool. Because of the sale value in Liverpool, land values coupled with the macro factors including construction materials and interest rates, has meant that we have not had any development in the CBD at all. We haven't seen one crane in the sky for the best part of a couple of years.

15 So, what we did as part of our LEP review was economic analysis, just as an example of context, an economic analysis of the city centre to try and understand how we can change our controls to make development more feasible in the CBD. So, that's also become an issue. If the marina development can go ahead through having some residential, so it can stack up for the proponent, that's something that we're on board with, provided that all planning outcomes are met.

20 **MS GRANT:** Terrific. Thank you.

25 **MR HANNAN:** Lina, I might just add too, just on that. In terms of meeting our targets, as Lina said, this is not critical, but I would like to say too that most of our growth is happening in the western precincts, but it's also good to have a balance in the east as well. That's what this provides. So, it's not all happening in the west. This provides a bit of an equilibrium of growth.

30 This is a different product to what is being delivered out, say, Austral-Leppington, but there is a need to have residential opportunities across the LGA, not just in the western growth precincts, and that's what this development will do.

**MR MILLS:** Thanks. I don't think I have any further questions. Are there any final comments that anyone would like to make from Council?

35 **MS KAKISH:** No, just that again we would be receptive of additional time being afforded to them to submit any required information. That's probably my closing statement, from a Council staff perspective.

40 **MR MILLS:** Mayor, did you want to add anything?

**MAYOR MANNOUN:** Yes. Thank you. I guess, if I could share the vision, I guess, the role of the Mayor in leading the whole strategic planning process, and I guess the Mayor and the Council being responsible for the vision of our community.

45 What I'd like to point out to people firstly is the vast size of Liverpool LGA. So, just to give you an idea, the distance from Sydney Harbour to get to Liverpool is approximately 25-30 kilometres in distance, Liverpool from the beginning of the

Georges River and near Henry Lawson Drive and near the site of Moorebank to the other end is over 40 kilometres long. So, it's a very big area when you look at it.

5 So, what's important for us is to create, I guess, diverse housing options. And I think this, it definitely ticks that box for us, as Lina mentioned previously. Our community, they build strong communities, you know, families, friends, they don't really want to leave our area. But, however, they're being forced to because they're just not finding that diversity of housing.

10 Since I've been involved in Council, I would say that this marina is the number one project that I'm asked about on the streets when I'm doing my shopping. There is a strong community interest and support for this project, because they just want that, I guess, that diversity and aspiration. To the extent, and I think who this will benefit the most and how this will play in the housing market and challenge, dealing with Sydney's needs, is you've got a lot of people who I think want to downsize, you know, selling their home, the single double-storey home on a typical suburban block, and then downsizing into, I guess, more of a quality unit space.

20 Yes, Liverpool doesn't have a lot of units, and we put our hand up and we do take – we aren't afraid of doing our job in solving Sydney's housing challenge. But the reality is, people want some diversity, they may not want to live in the CBD. So, I think that's what I found personally from a lot of community members, they would want to move into that. Which then frees up those housing blocks for other younger families and so on and so forth.

30 So, I believe it achieves a significant benefit from that. The also thing is, when we're looking at Liverpool's role in greater metropolitan Sydney, and whilst this may not be consistent exactly with the current planning, but if you go back to the planning documents of the plan for growing Sydney, where you had the polycentric cities. And Liverpool was earmarked as the third major city within Sydney.

35 When we're looking at our planning and who we're servicing, it's not just about servicing the 250,000 residents of Liverpool today, or the 400,000 projected over the next, was it, when to get to 15-odd years, but rather we're looking at the whole southwest as a precinct, which has 20,000 people a year moving into it. We're looking at a population of around a million people. And when I say, "southwest Sydney", I'm referring to Fairfield, Campbelltown, Camden, Wollondilly, and Camden.

45 Now, those people are looking for great areas to live. And for us, whilst this is only 300 units and we think that's the appropriate amount, it's more about unlocking the river. The Georges River is a natural beautiful asset, and I think it's very under-utilised and we know obviously we have the urban hinterland effect, people want somewhere to go.

We can't have all of Sydney and all those people in the southwest rushing to go to Bondi and the eastern suburbs. We believe that the whole Georges River, Chipping Norton Lakes has that opportunity. However, it needs a catalyst project. This marina would be that catalyst project, in our opinion. You know, it's really – you've got four golf courses, you've got a racetrack, you've got two hotels, potentially the Moore Point project, so there's a lot of great opportunities along the river.

Our community is extremely excited about having that continuous walking track along the boundary of the river. And once again, you can have that walking track, but it's also about having destinations along that track, and this would be, once again, the major one of that.

So, I think from – it provides a complete uplift to our community, it provides that diversity of housing for residents who still want to stay within the LGA. It's got a high amount of community support.

I want to make a comment, if I can, about the flood evacuation. The flood evacuation, whilst we have a significant amount of land that's zoned for a higher density within the LGA, the question is about regarding, I guess, the economics of will that ever actually eventuate into multi-dwelling housing? We saw that with Amendment 52 that was done by, of the LEP, that was done on Liverpool City Centre, I think it was around, I think it was finalised, I think, 2017/2018, around that time. Where you had an increase in density from 6-to-1 to 10-to-1; however, the market has not taken that up. And I think that, yes, there's the broader market conditions, but even before COVID, just the land economics didn't work.

So, I guess what I'm getting at is that in the scenario where we're basing everything on flood evacuation and a PMF, I don't believe that we will ever have a scenario where we will be achieving the turnover of that land from low density into high density, and it's more going to be done on sort of a case-by-case basis. And I think it would be wrong to sort of, to hold back on one catalyst project which is extremely unique and can provide such a big benefit to the area, because of, well, we have, you know, down in Chipping Norton, there's a bunch of land that's zoned there for high density. So, I think that's a worthy consideration in this.

And I just want to reiterate what Lina said earlier. We have become a university city, with Wollongong University significantly extending their footprint, Western Sydney University having a strong footprint and expanding, and lastly, we signed an MOU with the University of New South Wales and Notre Dame University, and they're looking at their needs for the area.

And I guess that's once again similar to what I said about eastern suburbs. It's like why do we – why are we forcing – why does UNSW force their students to travel all the way into Kensington to access their services when they can provide them locally. And that's what I was saying previously about unlocking the river.

5 In doing so, the challenge that we have to make our city work, is attracting the managerial class to want to come and live within our area, because they're asking for that higher amenity product. And I think it's important to have that diversity reflecting the ambitions of the community. It allows us to bring in more businesses to the area. It has a very positive domino effect.

10 The hospital tells us that as well. As Lina mentioned, it's one of the largest – I think, no, sorry, it is the largest employer within Liverpool and within the LGA. And they're having – they want to be able to have their clinicians and researchers living locally because when they're deciding where they want to move, yes, great facility, but where do we find something that we can really match the, I guess, sort of lifestyle that we want to have.

15 So, I think overall that's why there's community support from whoever you speak to. And whilst we understand there's challenges, we do believe that those challenges can be overcome and hopefully the proponent can be provided with more time to do so.

20 And I want to just thank you very much for your time.

25 The last thing I will make, as we started today acknowledging our traditional custodians, the river has been such a fundamental part to our First Nations community. They themselves, of the different groups, the Land Council, which Council has a deed of agreement signed with them, I think we're the only council that actually has that in the country, and how we co-create together and build our nation together. They have a very enthusiastic ambition to also get community to appreciate and recognise the river, and having this whole Chipping Norton Lakes, Georges River precinct acknowledges that sort of getting back to country.

30 We look forward to, once the airport is opened and from our creating tourist destinations along the river, having Indigenous canoe rides up and down, and just because it was such a fundamental part of their lives, we used to have where, you know, not far from this location along the river where the two different tribes would gather and meet, being a natural land boundary. We think once again this can play a really good part of that story with it, and with the proponent, with Mirvac, we could actually work together on that as well.

35 But anyway, I want to thank you all very much for your time.

40 **MR MILLS:** Thank you, Mayor, for the broader strategic picture as well. That's good to know. Thank you. Any other final comments?

45 **MS MACNAUGHTON:** If I may just add a comment as well. Thank you so much for your time today. Really appreciate it.

Look, I'm just going to speak from a community perspective. I've had a lot of time discussing this project and echo what the Mayor says. It's one of the main things that people ask about. I do live in that area as well, and it's, you know, the

amount of times you're stopped at Woollies to ask, "What's happening with the marina?"

5 It's interesting, I think, that, you know, not often you don't get broad community support for an increase in housing density. But this is the place where we actually have had that and we've had that on multiple occasions. Where, you know, the community is very accepting and they know that this is – this precinct along the river is not only recreation but it's also housing as well. So, 300-odd units is not seen as excessive to the general public.

10 There are letters of support that have gone in at every step of the way for this type of development. There's a big appetite to reclaim the river from industry, which we've seen all along that precinct. And the community is really excited about opening that up for recreation.

15 But also I think a perspective that we may not have discussed today is also, you know, if we're going to be walking along that riverfront at night, which we would all love to do – during the day and during the night as well. Having the passive surveillance of residences there as well means that you don't have an empty marina building sitting along that foreshore for people to walk past where there's nobody else there. I think there's a real safety aspect that we need to consider by having that passive surveillance of housing in the area as well.

20 We've already seen that there are some houses built alongside where the marina and the marina housing development potentially will be. And I think that those people also have an expectation of what is to come there, would be a secure and a vibrant place to be at all hours of the day and night, not just during restaurant open hours and things like that.

25 I think also our community is quite mature in that they also understand that, you know, economic feasibility of things is a real struggle at the moment, and we're not seeing these things that we've dreamed of for years and years coming to fruition, because it's not economically feasible.

30 So, not only do you have that expectation of the safety that comes with people living in the area. People also know that if it's not going to – and this is something I don't come across often with the community – but if it's not economically viable for a developer to put a great recreational facility there, then they're not going to do it. So, I think that the public is definitely seeing that across the LGA more and more, but particularly in this site, we've known for a while that, you know, this all comes as a package; that's what the expectation is.

35 I know I'm not talking about the technical side of things. But from a community's perspective, I've not seen support for a project like I've seen this in my time, before council and on council as well. So, those considerations are really important to the public.

40 I think if I can just say one last thing as well. A difficulty that I've had in recent

conversation is that we're talking about 300 residences here in an area where we've got some new developments that have come up over the past decade as well, so complimenting that.

5 It's difficult for the public to understand why 15,000 residences in Moore Point is out for public comment, but we're really stuck on 300 here. And I know that there are differences, but that's definitely a conversation that I've had with community members on more than one occasion.

10 So, if I could just have those things on the record as a bit of a community advocate for that. Walking down to have a coffee on the riverfront while your kids walk along the boardwalk is something that we've all dreamed of for a long time. If we can make that work for everybody, that'd be awesome.

15 **MR MILLS:** Thank you, Councillor. If there's no other comments, I might bring this to a close. Thank you very much everyone for your time and for your input. We'll bring that to a close. Thank you.

20 **MS GRANT:** Yes, thank you very much. Very helpful. Thank you.

[All say thank you]

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**