



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1021608

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

**RE: ISLAND POINT ROAD RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION
ST GEORGES BASIN MOD 3**

PANEL: **ALAN COUTTS
ADRIAN PILTON**

ASSISTING PANEL: **MATTHEW TODD-JONES**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** **ANTHONY WITHERDIN
EMMA BUTCHER**

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

DATE: **10.08 AM, THURSDAY, 2 MAY 2019**

MR A. COUTTS: Good morning and welcome to our meeting today. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the request to modify the development approval for a residential
5 subdivision at 74 and 92 Island Point Road, St Georges Basin. The request seeks approval to increase the number of residential allotments from 44 to 63, modify the road layout and the drainage strategy and remove the requirement for Asset Protection Zones in a Threatened Species Corridor.

10 My name is Alan Coutts, and I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me on the panel is Adrian Pilton and helping us out with the Secretariat is Matthew Todd-Jones. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the
15 Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

20 It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and you 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. So, with the formalities out of the way, we will now begin. And it would be good,
25 Anthony, if you could just give us a bit of an overview and put this in a bit of context for us because I gather there is a bit of history around how these developments were processed in the past and how they are now.

MR A. WITHERDIN: No worries. Will do. So I will start with a bit of a background on the site and then the existing approvals, then I will move on to our
30 key assessment issues. So the site is located in St Georges Basin, which is south of Nowra near Jervis Bay. The site previously adjoined vegetated land on the northern and southern boundaries. As you can see in the Department's assessment on figure 2, the vegetation on the north and southern sites has now been removed and has been redeveloped for residential purposes.

35 The original subdivision was approved back in 2006 and it included 47 residential lots, supporting infrastructure and, as you mentioned earlier, a wildlife corridor and some APZs. The approval has been modified on two separate occasions and, in summary, the key changes were reducing the number of lots from 47 to 44, it
40 introduced two stages and it modified the stormwater detention requirements and some other requirements relating to the Threatened Species Corridor.

45 So in terms of the current proposal that we've got before us, it seeks to increase the number of lots on the site from 44 up to 63, modify the subdivision and road layout and modify the staging. In terms of the staging, it introduces additional lots within the first stage and to reduce lots within the second stage. It seeks to reduce the width

of the road from eight metres to seven metres and remove the requirement for the Threatened Species Corridor and the other bushfire protection measures and modify the stormwater strategy for the site.

5 MR COUTTS: Are those bushland areas which were presumably there – or they were there when this was originally proposed – so have they been cleared as a consequence of other developments that have taken place since then?

10 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So I will just the Commission members an earlier photograph of the site taken back in 2014 and you can see this is the site that – the subject site. And, as you can see, previously to the south was bushland and, I believe, before this photo was taken, this was also bushland here. So there was a – basically, a swathe of vegetated land through this area.

15 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: So, as you can see, that has now been all redeveloped - - -

20 MR COUTTS: So this - - -

MR WITHERDIN: - - - on the north and southern sides.

MR COUTTS: So all this area here has all been subdivided and redeveloped, has it?

25 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So, as you can see here - - -

MR COUTTS: You can see yes - - -

30 MR WITHERDIN: - - - this is all redeveloped to the south. And to the north, it has all been redeveloped and cleared as well.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35 MR WITHERDIN: So, as a result of those changes to the land on the north and south, the proponents basically revised the subdivision because they felt that the Threatened Species Corridor and the requirement for APZs is no longer necessary, so they've redesigned the subdivision as a result of that change in contact between the - - -

40 MR COUTTS: How did they manage to clear all this land – all this land? I presume they – there's some question whether they had approval or not approval, I guess, seeing it's being investigated by council.

45 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So we've – note that it's being investigated by council. And we've raised this – that issue with our compliance officers. So we've done that. And that'll be sort of a separate matter to the assessment of the application. But I understand that a construction certificate was issued which cleared that land. So - - -

MR COUTTS: Right.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. But I'll leave that to our compliance team to sort of look into.

5 MR COUTTS: Interesting. Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: So the department consulted with council and relevant agencies, and we made the application available on our website.

10 MR COUTTS: Right. Just again – sorry to interrupt you.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

15 MR COUTTS: Historically, if I'm understanding correctly, these sorts of subdivision developments used to be done by the department. They're not done any more.

MR WITHERDIN: No.

20 MR COUTTS: They're done by council.

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

25 MR COUTTS: And this is sort of a hangover from that historical context.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: Is that right?

30 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. That's right.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35 MR WITHERDIN: So under the previous part 3A of the Act, it called up certain categories of development, and subdivision within coastal areas came to the Department of Planning for assessment and determination by the Minister for Planning. That category of development and part 3A has now been repealed. And all subsequent – all – and future subdivision within coastal areas is determined –

40 assessed and determined by councils.

MR COUTTS: Right.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

45 MR COUTTS: Good.

MR WITHERDIN: So in terms of the key assessment issues, the first key issue we looked at carefully was the subdivision layout. And essentially, the proponents sought to amend the subdivision layout and the road layout to increase the number of lots within the subdivision. And the department's looked at the revised subdivision layout. And we consider it to be acceptable. We think that the revised layout provides a logical subdivision pattern, and it reduces the number of irregular-shaped lots. Most of the lots are orientated north-south, which will provide future dwellings with good solar access. And all the lots comply with council's minimum subdivision size of 500 square metres.

So we think the subdivision layout itself is reasonable. And compared to the previous approval, one of the benefits of this application is it reduces the length of road that runs along the southern edge of the site. We can show you a map. So as you can see, with the latest approval, there's a road that runs along the southern edge of the boundary which provides – reduces the amenity for these residents on the opposite side. So that's now been deleted, and the road is now an internal road, with residential blocks backing on to that southern boundary. So we think that'll result in an improved outcome.

The – and the department notes that as a result of the changes – council raised some concerns with the road running along the eastern side of the boundary now, where lots used to be. Council were concerned that it would reduce the amenity of those residents on the back of the subdivision, and it would potentially provide some opportunities for access to be provided to those lots from this rearranged road layout. And, as a result, the department requested the proponent to provide a two-metre reserve through here. And that will do a couple of things. It'll provide a buffer between the road and these lots. It'll allow some landscaping to be provided and some stormwater swale. And it will prevent these lots gaining access from the rear of their properties to that road. So that resolves council's issue.

MR COUTTS: So that's the road that sort of goes in there and goes around. Is that - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: So that's a loop road.

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: In the original - - -

MR COUTTS: So that was originally going to be coming across here, was it?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Straight along that southern boundary.

5 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Right. Okay

MR PILTON: road. Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: So there's - - -

15 MR COUTTS: So it's just moved in as well.

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: So the road basically interfaces with less - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

25 MR WITHERDIN: - - - lots on the boundary.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Council also raised some concerns about the width of the access
30 to these battleaxe blocks here. In response, the proponent revised the frontage width
by 1.8 metres for lot 2 and 3.3 metres for lot 3 - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35 MR WITHERDIN: - - - I believe, and that will allow for better servicing and access
to those lots.

MR COUTTS: Is council happy with that?

40 MR WITHERDIN: I believe so, yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So, overall, the Department thinks the subdivision layout
45 is reasonable. It's a logical pattern. And - - -

MR COUTTS: There was some issue that council had with lot 63 - - -

MS E. BUTCHER: Yes. So the proponent provided a plan showing a building envelope – how it could be placed on that lot even with all the easements. And we provided that to council and they were happy with that.

5 MR COUTTS: The council were happy? Because they were concerned that was going to cause more work for them or something or - - -

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: Is that right?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

15

MR WITHERDIN: So there's – that lot is constrained by the stormwater easements running along the eastern – is that the eastern - - -

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

20

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - boundary of the site? And so – yes. As Emma was saying, the proponent provided a building envelope to show how that could be developed in the future and we've got a suite of conditions to basically manage council's requirements for that.

25

MR COUTTS: Right.

30 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR A. PILTON: Can I have a look at that – just for the contours of it – just following that way eyesight test.

35

MR COUTTS: Thank you.

MR WITHERDIN: So, overall, we're satisfied with the revised subdivision the next issue that the Department considered carefully was the removal of the requirement for the wildlife corridor. The wildlife corridor was originally imposed to manage the impact on a yellow-bellied glider and just to provide that connectivity between the existing vegetation on the north and southern sites as we mentioned earlier.

45

MR COUTTS: Seeing there's no further – no vegetation any more, there's not much point in having a wildlife corridor, is there?

MR WITHERDIN: That's right. So given those adjoining sites have now been developed, and the lands cleared, we considered it no longer necessary - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

5

MR WITHERDIN: - - - and it would serve very little purpose, so we were comfortable with the deletion of that.

MR COUTTS: And OEH seem to have the same view?

10

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

15

MR WITHERDIN: Also, as a related issue to the removal of the vegetation – the development on the surrounding sites, the proponent sought to delete all the bushfire conditions from the proposal. And we referred that aspect of the proposal to the RFS and they were comfortable that the bushfire threat has been reduced because of the development on the surrounding sites and they were comfortable with the removal of those conditions. Another issue that we considered carefully was council raised some concern about the need for a second access point into the subdivision.

20

MR COUTTS: Yes.

25

MR WITHERDIN: Council's preference was that the proponent would provide an additional access point to the north through that lot there. The Department looked at that carefully and we considered that the existing single access arrangement was acceptable in this instance. The overall increase in the number of lots is relatively minor. It's 19. No concerns were raised about that aspect in the original proposal. We note that there's a similar access arrangement for 57 residential lots nearby that have also access from a single point. RMS didn't raise any concerns about it. And there's no, sort of, bushfire threat or anything like that - - -

30

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35

MR WITHERDIN: - - - where you would need increased access - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes. That's usually when you have this question about a secondary access is to whether there's potential bushfire and a need for emergency evacuation or something like that, yes.

40

MR WITHERDIN: So, as a result of those issues going away, and because it's a relatively minor increase in - - -

45

MR COUTTS: I question whether it is a minor increase because actually it's 50 per cent but - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Look, even so – yes. I take your point. In terms of the traffic generation, I don't think it's going to be too significant.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

5

MR WITHERDIN: And we've, sort of, taken the advice from RFS – RMS, sorry, on that point, as well.

MR COUTTS: Yes. So RMS is satisfied with just the single access point?

10

MR WITHERDIN: They, basically, advised that there was – they didn't think there was any significant issues with regards to traffic or safety impacts - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

15

MR WITHERDIN: - - - so we didn't feel there was a compelling reason to require that second access point.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

20

MR WITHERDIN: However, in saying that, I do understand council's point of view on that, but, yes, just in this case, on balance, we consider the single access point is acceptable. The other issue was the road width and the removal of a requirement to provide a footpath within the subdivision area. The proponent seeks to reduce the width of the road from eight metres to seven metres and, basically, remove the requirement to provide a footpath along the loop road within the site. We consulted carefully with council on that – those changes. And, generally speaking, we do try and adopt council's requirements because it's their local infrastructure that they will have to manage down the track and, in this instance, we were satisfied that these changes comply with council's DCP for other subdivisions within this area. And council were supportive of those changes, so, in that regard, we were okay with those proposed changes, essentially because it complies with council's current requirements.

25

30

35

MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: And in terms of the other key issue that we considered was the stormwater – changes to the stormwater management arrangement.

40

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Originally, there was a proposal for the on-site detention basin to be located in this area of the site. And council raised concerns about the amenity impacts of having a large on-site detention basin located here. It was very steep, it was quite large and it was, sort of, at the entrance of the site. And, in response, the proponent changed the overall stormwater strategy.

45

And it now seeks to minimise the level of grading so they try and keep a more natural – retain the natural levels across the site with minimal earthworks, so they don't need to drain to that OSD any more. And, primarily, stormwater would be managed on-site by each individual lot. And we referred that to council and council
5 were satisfied subject to a number of conditions. And we think the overall strategy would work and is acceptable and the conditions would make sure that it's in accordance with council's requirements.

10 MR COUTTS: They have to develop a stormwater strategy because they get their construction certificate or something, don't they?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So there's a number of details that they will have to make sure that they comply with to meet council's requirements and each lot will have a requirement placed on its title that it has to manage the on-site stormwater detention.
15

MS BUTCHER: still have to give details prior to the construction certificate.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. And so there's a number of other issues here. We're
25 happy to run through those, as well, if you like?

MR PILTON: I'm just – sorry.

30 MR WITHERDIN: Sorry.

MR PILTON: Just while we're on the subject of drainage, I'm a bit confused when it says – sorry – the west drain catchments – well, it says stage 1, but stage 1 is all that lot. It said it has got to drain naturally to Island Point Road, but that's, like, five metres below the level here. So there's no way it's going to drain naturally to Island
35 Point Road, in fact, stage 1 – it says the western catchment – stage 1 is actually the northern area, if you like. I get that that lot could drain naturally - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yes, yes.

40 MR PILTON: - - - to Island Point Road, but I don't know where all this lot is going to drain to an easement over adjacent land which is down here – I see.

MR WITHERDIN: So - - -

45 MR PILTON: I haven't seen this drawing before. It has got - - -

MS BUTCHER: Sir, there is that easement on the south-eastern - - -

- MR PILTON: - - - an overland - - -
- MS BUTCHER: Yes.
- 5 MR PILTON: - - - flow path down here - - -
- MR COUTTS: Yes. That was one of the issues before. They didn't have agreement with the adjoining landholder they?
- 10 MR PILTON: Okay. Well - - -
- MS BUTCHER: Yes.
- MR WITHERDIN: So that condition could be clarified, actually, because - - -
- 15 MR PILTON: I think it needs - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: - - - it's a carry-over from the previous condition.
- 20 MR PILTON: Yes.
- MS BUTCHER: Yes.
- MR PILTON: I think so.
- 25 MR WITHERDIN: And the subsequent conditions managed the overall stormwater strategy, but you're right. That is a bit confusing. So that could be amended to clarify that point because it no longer drains as you have mentioned.
- 30 MR PILTON: Yes. I mean, whilst we're on the subject of drainage, I'm a bit confused about this easement coming down the eastern side of the site. So this A – easement A is obviously carrying the overland flow from the relocatable - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: Yes.
- 35 MR PILTON: - - - home site and so on. Then it narrows right down. That two metre - - -
- MS BUTCHER: Swale.
- 40 MR PILTON: - - - swale - - -
- MS BUTCHER: Yes.
- 45 MR PILTON: - - - or public – whatever you call it – I'm not sure how you're going to have a two metre wide swale to carry it or not – what the flow is down through there, but it's supposed to be landscape, so if you get a 100 year storm coming down

there, all your landscape will be washed away or else the water will be going through the fences into the next property or

5 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Well, we consulted with council's engineers on this - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

10 MR WITHERDIN: And they were quite comfortable with the latest outcome on that. So for those kind of details, it might be a good question to ask council.

MR PILTON: Yes. I mean, it might be – I don't know if it's within our remit to talk about details right down to that level.

15 MR WITHERDIN: It is - - -

MR PILTON: I just don't see how it can work.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So, look, as you know, we're not stormwater engineers.

MR PILTON: Neither am I.

25 MR WITHERDIN: But it's a relevant point.

MR PILTON: I'm a landscape architect. So - - -

30 MR COUTTS: I suppose I'm reasonably – bit more comfortable on the basis that they've got to have a stormwater strategy before they get their construction certificate.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

35 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: So obviously they – some engineering's got to be done around that issue before it can be signed off as part of the construction certificate. And that's in the conditions.

40 MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MR PILTON: I think if we can – we might need to sort of edit the conditions at that point.

45 MR COUTTS: Yes. So if we could ask you, perhaps, if you want to re-do that condition for us and clarify. That would – rather than we do it.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Yes.

MR PILTON: C2.

5 MR COUTTS: C2.

MR TODD-JONES: C2.

10 MR COUTTS: C2 drainage, apropos our discussion.

MR PILTON: Also with the C2, I don't fully understand the C2a, the on-site detention. So I understand that each block has to have a detention tank on-site or rainwater tank. But I'm not sure if that's, like, off-the-roof rainwater or what happens to all the water that flows on the drive strips and so on. Again, that might be a bit picky or petty. But - - -

MR WITHERDIN: No. No. Oh, we can take that on notice and clarify exactly - - -

20 MR PILTON: If you could clarify it. And – as I say, I find it hard to read these drawings. But I can't see stormwater pipes here on the easement. So presumably – I mean, I would hope that the road entirely isn't self-draining over land, if you like. I would have thought they would have had to collect it. I'm not a stormwater engineer.

25 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR PILTON: So perhaps if you could clarify that with the council, or we could do it, or - - -

30 MR WITHERDIN: We will clarify that. Yes.

MR COUTTS: Well, I suppose, again, we're sort of – your conditions are saying details of the proposed measures are to be provided to the certifying authority, which presumably is council, isn't it?

35 MR PILTON: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: So you're – I mean, basically, what we're doing here is we're making conditions such that council needs to be satisfied that the engineering detail is done to their satisfaction before they issue the construction certificate.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

45 MS BUTCHER: Yes.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

5 MR COUTTS: Yes. Look, I think we can probably live with that, if we can get clarity - - -

MR PILTON: It just – it needs a bit of editing, that's all, I think. It's - - -

10 MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes. A little bit of clarity around C2.

MR TODD-JONES: Okay.

15

MR PILTON: Yes. Yes.

MR TODD-JONES: Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: No problem.

MR PILTON: Yes.

25 MR WITHERDIN: Will do. So, Emma, maybe you want to pick up on some of those other points.

30 MS BUTCHER: Sure. So the next issue we looked at was the cut and fill, which sort of relates closely to the drainage, as Anthony was speaking about earlier. So MOD 3 as initially lodged in 2015 sought to reshape the land so that the drainage would naturally flow to Island Point Road, because they couldn't secure that easement in the south-eastern corner. So there was quite a fill in this eastern corner here. And council and the department raised concerns with the impacts on adjoining properties.

35 So when they came back to us in 2017 with their response to those issues, they were able to secure this easement. So as a result of that, they didn't require those earthworks. So the proposal now is to sort of maintain the natural levels. I think from looking at the engineering plans, there's a small amount of fill along the western boundary, which is consistent with the cut-and-fill plan approved for MOD
40 2. So council have looked at these and – the levels and haven't raised any concerns. However - - -

MR WITHERDIN: The levels between the adjoining site and this site are relatively similar.

45

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes. I mean – yes.

5 MS BUTCHER: Similar to what was approved.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

10 MS BUTCHER: But council has recommended new conditions C20 and D15, relating to earthworks and site filling, just sort of as a safeguard, to make sure any cut and fill is in accordance with their standards and the Australian Standards.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

15 MS BUTCHER: So quite comfortable with the cut and fill. The next issue we looked at was staging. So, again, stage 2 – when they couldn't secure that easement – introduced two stages, so that stage 1, the western portion, could be developed independently and could drain to Island Point Road and stage 2, the eastern portion –
20 that included all the infrastructure for that stage separately. Now, because that drainage issue has been resolved, the proposed staging is to have all the infrastructure and all the clearing done as part of stage 1 and to increase the number of lots in stage 1.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

25 MS BUTCHER: So council has reviewed that staging and hasn't raised any concerns with that. The other thing - - -

MR WITHERDIN: I mentioned APZs earlier.

30 MS BUTCHER: Yes. The next thing – so the stormwater easement along the eastern boundary originally was seven metres. So the proposal sought to reduce the width down to three metres, in accordance with council's conditions. So after some consultation with council about the drainage, the end condition has a three-metre
35 easement over lot 23 and a five-metre easement over lot 63, where it flows into that easement on the adjoining property. And those conditions came from council, and they're happy it's in accordance with their DCP.

MR WITHERDIN: So that's picking up - - -

40 MR PILTON: How do they handle the flow-through there, when there's presumably a back fence?

MS BUTCHER: There also – the condition required no fences through the
45 easement. Originally it said no boundary fences.

MR PILTON: Okay. Yes.

MS BUTCHER: But we modified it, as part of this, as recommended by council, to require no fences at all within that easement.

MR PILTON: Okay.

5

MR COUTTS: Good.

MS BUTCHER: Next thing – Shoalhaven Water advised they would need a sewer servicing strategy, just to confirm capacity. The proponent said, you know, that will be done at further stages. And we looked at condition F4 in the existing consent. They'll need to get a compliance certificate from Shoalhaven Water. So we're comfortable that that will be dealt with at that stage.

10

MR COUTTS: Yes.

15

MS BUTCHER: And then there's a number of updated conditions that've been imposed as part of this MOD. These are mainly to ensure compliance with council's updated DCP, 2014, and their new standard conditions, since a lot of time has passed between the original approval and this MOD. The proponent did raise some concern about these new conditions throughout the process. However, it's the department's view that because of the changed layout, the increase in the number of lots, the road layout, these conditions are warranted. And we consulted with council, and they sort of advised that these conditions are required. And we're comfortable that they should be imposed.

20

25

MR COUTTS: Yes. I mean, we haven't had much success at this stage getting any feedback from council. They're having their engineers or something look at it at the moment. But so far as you're concerned, council's comfortable with where you've landed with the report.

30

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. We consulted extensively with council. We also met with council. And we provided the final plans and engineering drawings to council. And then they provided us with their final feedback. And so we've incorporated basically all of that within the conditions, with regards to all those engineering requirements.

35

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: And so we feel it's pretty much been covered.

40

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: But it would be good to get council's comments again, of course.

45

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Well, if there's anything that comes up that council raises that we need to come back to you on – yes. We can do that.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Happy to do so.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Is that a fairly current photo of the site?

5 MS BUTCHER: Yes. This is the latest

MR COUTTS: So our area is this one here.

MS BUTCHER: Those two.

10 MR PILTON: This site here. Yes.

MS BUTCHER: Yes.

15 MR COUTTS: Yes. So pretty much all around it is now developed.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR PILTON: See what's happened here with cut-and-fill - - -

20 MR COUTTS: Level.

MR PILTON: - - - levels.

25 MR COUTTS: It's quite different, isn't it?

MR PILTON: Yes. Look at all this stuff. That's - - -

MR COUTTS: Is that a road through there, is it?

30 MR PILTON: Yes. Can't see where it is on that one.

MR COUTTS: Is this down near Bomaderry, is it?

35 MS BUTCHER: Think so. Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Just past

MR TODD-JONES: Further south. Yes.

40 MR COUTTS: Yes. I'm just trying to picture exactly where it is.

MR COUTTS: Presumably that's water.

45 MS BUTCHER: just south of Jervis Bay.

MR PILTON: That's Saint Georges Basin.

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

5 MR WITHERDIN: That's the Basin.

MR PILTON: There you are.

MR COUTTS: Yes. That didn't help me, because I couldn't see it. Everything's so
10 bloody small. Need my magnifying glass.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR PILTON: That's Jervis Bay, or "Jervis Bay".

15 MR COUTTS: We'll get it up on Google Earth later and have a look.

MR PILTON: Yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: That's right. So it's just west of Jervis Bay.

MR COUTTS: Right.

MR WITHERDIN: West of Vincentia.

25 MR COUTTS: Ah, yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Sussex Inlet's on the other side of the basin.

30 MR COUTTS: Okay. I'm with you now.

MR WITHERDIN: There's lots of little villages in and around that area.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

35 MR TODD-JONES: Can we keep this map?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. You can keep all the maps.

40 MR COUTTS: It's developed so much, hasn't it, down there? All right.

MR WITHERDIN: So that wraps up our assessment.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Do we have any other questions, Adrian?

45 MR PILTON: I just have detailed comments. Maybe I could ask the councillors about the landscaping and so on. The wording to me is very vague in some

instances. So things like, you know, “A suitably qualified person is to do a landscape plan.” I mean, what’s a suitably qualified person? Someone from the nursery or whatever? I don’t know why it would have taken out the “qualified landscape architect”, which is what the original condition had. And then stuff about the root barriers. It says “above- or belowground services”. So I’m not sure what a root barrier is going to do for aboveground services. It’s just wording things, which I guess we can – it’s picky.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So - - -

MR PILTON: But there’s not much else to find on this thing except details.

MR WITHERDIN: We’re happy to look into those for you.

MR PILTON: Yes. If you would. It’s just - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Again, we were, sort of, taking council’s advice on those matters.

MR PILTON: Yes. They’ve probably just got standard clauses that they put in. And the final one was about street trees. It says they’ve got to be suitably maintained until established. I personally think it needs to have a time or – whatever – 12 months or six months or something, otherwise, they will say, “Well, we planted them last month and they’re still alive, therefore it’s established”, but that’s, sort of, up to council, really, to make sure that happens. That’s - - -

MR WITHERDIN: It is, but I – there are – we often put conditions on the specific time

MR PILTON: Yes. Well, that makes sense to me to that because otherwise who knows that’s going to happen? I mean, do they have to grass the nature strip or do the owners of the blocks do that? Presumably, the owners of the blocks grass it to the kerb, but then the trees are – which – this is another point I have, which they’re talking about either two trees of 35 litre pot size or one tree of 60 litre pot size. I personally think it should be one or the other. And they require four 75 millimetre square posts – that’s a big lot of posts for a smallish tree. That’s massive.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

MR PILTON: Again, it has - - -

MR COUTTS: It has come from council

MR PILTON: It must have come – so standard - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

- MR PILTON: - - - but it's a pointless exercise to me to do that - - -
- MR COUTTS: Yes.
- 5 MR PILTON: - - - because – but they're all minor points in the scheme of things.
That's - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: So, as I said before, we've taken advice from council on those
10 matters, but it would be good to touch base with council and - - -
- MR COUTTS: Yes.
- MR WITHERDIN: - - - ask those questions.
- 15 MR COUTTS: Yes. All right. Okay. I don't think we have anything more at this
stage. I think
- MR PILTON: I don't, no.
- 20 MR COUTTS: I think – some of the issues that we were going to ask, you pretty
much covered in your briefing for us, so - - -
- MR WITHERDIN: Okay. Great.
- 25 MR COUTTS: - - - unless we get something coming back to us from council that
comes out of left field and if that does, we will come back to you, otherwise,
thank you for coming all this way. I was saying to Matthew, it might be a bit more
difficult when you move to Parramatta. We might have to have a video - - -
- 30 MR WITHERDIN: Maybe.
- MR COUTTS: - - - system rather than drag you from Parramatta.
- MR PILTON: We can meet halfway.
- 35 MR COUTTS: No, no. Where's halfway?
- MR PILTON: I don't know.
- 40 MR COUTTS: Strathfield?
- MR PILTON: Lidcombe?
- MR COUTTS: Lidcombe. All right. You didn't have anything, Matt?
- 45 MR M. TODD-JONES: No, I'm fine.

MR COUTTS: No?

MR PILTON: Thank you very much.

5 MR COUTTS: well done.

MR WITHERDIN: All right. Thank you.

MS BUTCHER: Thank you.

10

MR COUTTS: All right. Well, thanks very much.

MS BUTCHER: Did you want any more copies of the plans and the contours in those site maps?

15

MR PILTON: Yes, if you have - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

20 MR PILTON: Yes

MS BUTCHER: I've printed out a few.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much. Terrific.

25

MR COUTTS: We can keep all these, can we?

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. Definitely. Yes.

30

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.43 am]