



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-975702

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: REZONING REVIEW OF SHOWGROUNDS PRECINCT, CASTLE HILL

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN**
CAROL AUSTIN

ASSISTING PANEL: **ANDREW McANESPIE**
DAN KEARY
BRENT DAVINE

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** **STEVE MURRAY**
ANN-MAREE CARRUTHERS

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

DATE: **9.06 AM, WEDNESDAY, 19 DECEMBER 2018**

MR P. DUNCAN: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today and – on request for a rezoning review, or a planning proposal seeking to amend the Hills Local Environment Plan 2012 in relation to planning controls applying to multiple sites in the Showground Station Precinct, Castle Hill. The proposal seeks to amend the Hills LEP 2012 by adding a new key sites clause and amending the associated LEP maps to identify the subject land, including a bonus incentive floor space ratio and bonus incentive building height clause for those key sites and including a requirement for the provision of community infrastructure and affordable housing on the land if the bonus incentive floor space ratio and height, if utilised. My name is Peter Duncan and I am the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me on the panel is Carol Austin. The other attendees are Andrew McAnespie from the Commission Secretariat, Dan Keary and Brent Davine from Keylan Consulting who are assisting the Commission Secretariat on this project.

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. The meeting is one of a part of the Commission's processes of providing advice. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. You are quite within your rights to take questions on notice and provide something in writing and likewise we'll put that on the Commission's website, both the question and answers. It is important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're not in a position, as I said, to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. We will now begin. Over to you, Steve and Ann-Maree.

MR S. MURRAY: Okay. What would you like me to start with?

MR DUNCAN: I think we've – I think we just go through the agenda and just start with the general rezoning process.

MR MURRAY: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: And the city – central city planning decision. And if you'd like to cover anything in – by way of background, please do, and then we'll have some questions at the end.

MR MURRAY: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

MR MURRAY: So, first of all, I'll start by just explaining to the Commissioners the rezoning review process that has been established. The actual rezoning review process is an administrative process that uses certain aspects of the Act, so it's actually not a statutory process. However, it was a process that was brought in by government to give proponents an opportunity where a council had failed to deal with requests for a rezoning within 90 days or had failed to make a resolution regarding whether the planning proposal should proceed or not. So if they recommend that it should not proceed, they have the right to – they have the ability to answer a rezoning request. In this case - - -

10 MS C. AUSTIN: They're the only two terms - - -

MR MURRAY: Yes.

15 MS AUSTIN: Bases on - - -

MR MURRAY: Yes. So council fails within 90 days of receipt of an application or council has made a resolution not to proceed with the planning proposal. They're the two terms. So in a rezoning review request it's sent to the department. We made changes a few years ago. At that point the changes – the main change was that we introduced a strategic merits test and we also introduced a site specific merits test. But at the same time the then Minister for Planning said that the Department of Planning, where it had previously made an assessment and a recommendation, should now just make a summary document of the key issues and hand that over to the independent body to make.

So, in that, the strategic merit test relates to, in regard to – in Sydney, the relevant district plan, or corridor precinct plans that have been released or released for comment, and you can no longer rely on those plans if the Minister for Planning or the Great Sydney Commission or the department has announced that such a plan would be updated. So, for instance, if we had a corridor plan that applied to this area, we had it a draft and the person applied for a re-zoning consistent – and the minister, the GSC or the department said, no, we're going to do a new version, you can no longer rely on that. In this case there's a district plan and there was the recent amendments to the SEPP for the showgrounds site, so they can be relied on. And - - -

MS A. CARRUTHERS: And sorry, Steve, just to jump in, this side, as well, there is also the north west rail link corridor strategy - - -

40 MR MURRAY: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - that was prepared in 2015.

45 MR MURRAY: So the proponent in the test can also rely on a relevant local strategy by council, if that strategy has been endorsed by the Department. Or there has been a significant change in circumstances that no one foresaw, such as major

infrastructure investment, a key change of population demographics, major industry has moved to an area – you know, things that we couldn't foresee in the strategic planning. The site specific merit test looks at the natural environment, including any known significant environmental values, resources or hazards, we look at the existing
5 uses in the area, the approved uses, and the likely future uses, and that's the purpose of looking at the strategic document, or, in this case, we have a SEPP amendment, we have a corridor strategy and we have a district plan.

And – so, you know, to make sure it's in – consistent with what's proposed in those
10 areas. And then part of the process, we get the council's comments. So when you've seen our report in this instance, you would see that we've given an overview of the proposal and then we've provided a comment, but without a recommendation or conclusion under each of the key issues. In this instance, the matter went to the Sydney Planning Panel – to the actual Sydney Central Planning Panel, because that's
15 the process for a rezoning review.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR MURRAY: Rezoning reviews normally only come to the IPC for the City of
20 Sydney Council, because they don't have a Sydney planning panel applying to their local government area. At that panel meeting, the panel considered it. Heard from departmental staff, heard from council staff and heard from the proponents. And made a decision that the matter should not proceed. Under the rezoning review guidelines where a panel says the matter should not proceed, that's final, and that's
25 normally the end of the process. In this instance, the proponent raised concerns with possible conflicts of interest with panel members that weren't adequately dealt with, and on that basis the department, while we're investigating that separately for transparency and clarity and openness and fairness, that we should get independent advice from the IPC and has forwarded the request to the IPC for that.

30

MR DUNCAN: Just on that point, the conflict of interest that was raised is still being investigated?

MR MURRAY: Yes.

35

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay.

40 MR MURRAY: Yeah. So what we're saying is, well, someone has raised an interest – an issue.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

45 MR MURRAY: We're not saying that they were or they weren't, but at this time, you know, the person said, well, I don't believe I've had a fair hearing. They've raised a number of other issues and therefore they've said we don't believe that the

decision should be taken and therefore – so the department has looked at it and said from a transparency – yeah. Yeah, for a transparency point of view and – yeah.

5 MR DUNCAN: Just for the record, we've got the referral letter from the department.

MR MURRAY: Department. So, as you can see, we've referred it.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

MR MURRAY: So that's why we're here today.

15 MS AUSTIN: So the additional issues in it – you said conflict of interests and additional issues?

MR MURRAY: They raised issues, and I'm sure they'll explain it, that they believe that the decision – the reasons for the decision, and then the additional panel comments are in conflict. They say how can as a panel – and I'm paraphrasing the proponents.

20 MS AUSTIN: Yeah.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

25 MS AUSTIN: Yeah.

MR MURRAY: So – and I'm sure they'll be much clearer. They're saying – the proponents have said, "How can a panel say no and then turn around and said, 'If you went back to council and lowered heights and changed densities it would be all right.?'” So they're saying that's outside the panel's remit. We're not – the panel's given that advice. I'm not worried about that. That's the point of an independent panel.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR MURRAY: They have the right to give independent advice. But the purpose why we're here is not based on that. It was based on the fact that we're – well, for transparency and openness and reasonableness that the matter should have independent adviser.

40 MR D. KEARY: Okay. So on that point, Steve, to be clear, the Commission is not being asked to look at the conflict of issue - - -

45 MR MURRAY: No.

MR KEARY: The conflict of interest issue at all? It is purely the merits of the proposal.

MR MURRAY: Proposal, yes. That's the department's role under our guidelines. It goes through our complaints manager with legal services branch. So we step – my part of the department steps away from it, even though we're not – because I run the secretary that supports the panels.

5 MR KEARY: Understood.

MR MURRAY: Yeah.

10 MR KEARY: It's the requested permission.

MR MURRAY: For us, yes.

MR DUNCAN: So that makes it clear that that's to one side.

15 MR MURRAY: I'm sure that's what our letter – yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. So, look, it's does the proposal have strategic and site specific merit - - -

20 MR MURRAY: Site specific merit.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - to proceed.

25 MS AUSTIN: The proposal – so the - - -

MR MURRAY: As lodged with council.

MS AUSTIN: Which is option – which is not option 3. So the discussion in the decision talked about a late lodgement of option 3 and all those details. So we're looking at - - -

30

MS CARRUTHERS: Only the - - -

35 MS AUSTIN: - - - option 1 or 2 or - - -

MR MURRAY: Yeah.

MS CARRUTHERS: The option that was lodged with council.

40 MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: And we can - - -

45 MS AUSTIN: Yes, okay.

MR MURRAY: So - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - confirm that with you.

MS AUSTIN: So there is no – there should be no consideration at all given - - -

5 MR MURRAY: Well - - -

MS AUSTIN: - - - to subsequent proposals?

10 MR MURRAY: Yes, that’s correct. Under a rezoning review, one of the things that was previously happening, by way of background, were proponents were turning up to the panels after getting their no and saying, “Well, it would – we’ll knock off 10 storeys,” and councils were saying, “We haven’t seen it, we haven’t assessed it.” So when we set the process up we made it clear that it must be the proposal that was considered by council.

15 MS AUSTIN: Good.

MR MURRAY: Therefore it’s fair for all parties.

20 MR DUNCAN: So we have a document here, the ordinary meaning of council, the 24th of April - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

25 MR DUNCAN: - - - 2018. That’s the proposal - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, that’s the proposal - - -

MR DUNCAN: called Planning Proposal 1.

30 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. And what you’ll find in that meaning notes is that council offices also put forward, I suppose, a modified version - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

35 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - of the planning proposal, but none of the options were endorsed by council.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

40 MS AUSTIN: I think the documentation said they received it a day before the council meeting.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

45 MS AUSTIN: So they didn’t have an opportunity - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yeah.

MS AUSTIN: - - - to consider the - - -

5 MR DUNCAN: There wasn't time to consider - - -

MR MURRAY: So have we given you enough overview on our considerations and the panel's decision, or do you want further information?

10 MR DUNCAN: I think so. We've got the documents here to read through - - -

MR MURRAY: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: - - - and are certainly in the process, and, as we said, we might

15 come back to you if we need more on that.

MR MURRAY: That's fine.

MR DUNCAN: Yeah.

20 MS AUSTIN: Yeah. Can I ask a point of clarification. If it's established that there is no conflict of interest, what is the status of the recommendation relative to our proposal?

25 MR MURRAY: We will take the advice of the IPC - - -

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MR MURRAY: - - - at the - - -

30 MS AUSTIN: Irrespective of - - -

MR MURRAY: Yeah. I think you can't start a new - - -

35 MS AUSTIN: No.

MR MURRAY: We can't start a process, ask for independent advice - - -

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

40 MR DUNCAN: And then not – yeah.

MR MURRAY: Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: No, I understand.

MR MURRAY: But it's a very good question.

MR DUNCAN: Carol, have you got any further questions on the process?

MS AUSTIN: So just from the – I don't know whether we actually want to go into the process that led up to it all, or do we simply want to focus on the letter? The – so
5 the issues that are in my mind is the department clearly sought a lot of input into the review that resulted in the amendments to the LEP in December 2017. The proponent was involved in that consultation.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.
10

MS AUSTIN: So one could reasonably assume that there was widespread community consultation.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.
15

MS AUSTIN: Could you just fill us in a bit on - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. So - - -

MS AUSTIN: - - - how that process went, because we're only – we're sort of 11/12 months down the track. What was the department's view, the community's view, the developer's view – how did this process unfold? Was it highly contentious? Was it – how did it unfold? So how can we think about the content of the December 2017
- - -
20

MS CARRUTHERS: So the proposal sent on exhibition late – I think it was late 2015.
25

MR MURRAY: So we're clarifying, this is the proposal for the precinct?
30

MS CARRUTHERS: This is the - - -

MS AUSTIN: The precinct proposal, yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, this is the plan precinct proposal. So - - -
35

MR MURRAY: I just think we need to - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. So the - - -
40

MS AUSTIN: Yeah.

MR MURRAY: - - - clarify which one we're - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - plan precinct proposal - - -
45

MR MURRAY: - - - talking about for the record.

MS AUSTIN: Plan precinct proposal, yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: So it was endorsed by government to be – the area was
5 endorsed by government to be – the area was endorsed by government to be
investigated as planned precinct - - -

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - in – back in 2014.

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: And we exhibited a proposal at the end of 2015, early 2016. I
would have to clarify the number of submissions, but there was extensive community
15 consultation. There was drop-in sessions where – hundreds of people attended the
drop-in sessions. We met with various community groups, landowner groups, and
obviously we're meeting with council, as well. The submissions were varied. Some
were in support. Some landowners requested additional densities. Some were
20 against the proposal. So there was a mixture of issues raised.

MS AUSTIN: So the ultimate proposal, was that what the department was
originally putting up or was that a compromise, taking into account the views of
community?

MS CARRUTHERS: So it was a – it was fairly similar to what was exhibited with
some amendments because council had raised some concerns around the proposal.
Their main concern was, while they were generally comfortable with the built form
outcomes that were proposed, they were concerned that the land use controls would
30 generate – we'd estimated that there'd be about 5000 dwellings that would be
delivered over a 20-year period, but the land use controls will actually provide for
about – between eight and 10,000 dwellings. So council was concerned, that they
wanted to have greater resolution around the built form controls, and they wanted to
ensure that they got a master plan outcome through that process. So there was a lot
negotiations with councils – with the council staff, in particular, about the controls.

35 So the – I suppose the controls that are ultimately made were from a series of – series
of workshops that we'd had with council staff to inform those controls. They were –
those negotiations were led by the chief planner of the time to inform the final
controls. So landowner submissions were considered as part of that process as well,
40 but primarily – and then as part of that process, there was a couple of things that
were introduced that weren't originally exhibited, but were in keeping with the
intent, I suppose, of the original proposal. That included introducing a cap over – for
the number of dwellings within the precinct and that related to infrastructure
delivery. So the intent was that until certain infrastructure items had been committed
45 or delivered, then that cap would remain in place. So there were some state
infrastructure items like road upgrades, but also a school that would probably be
needed for the ultimate capacity of the precinct.

5 So once those matters had been resolved, consideration could be given to removing the cap. Council also had – they have put forward a proposal around apartment sizes that deviate from SEPP 65. So that was considered as part of that process. So that was about apartment sizes and apartment mix and, primarily, council would – wanted to see a different mix in apartment size to better suit their demographics, and the other thing that was introduced was a requirement for a 10,000 square metre site amalgamation to actually receive the ultimate FSR. So there was a base FSR that was introduced and then a maximum FSR, but you needed to amalgamate your site and deliver a few other things to be able to receive that bonus.

10 MR DUNCAN: The apartment size provision, is that peculiar to this council area or do other councils do similar things?

15 MS CARRUTHERS: Primarily, this council area.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

20 MS CARRUTHERS: Some larger apartments are provided for in what used to be the, I suppose, the Botany local government area.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. So it was same principle to – sort of looking at design and scale of the apartments?

25 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: So the one – it's slightly different.

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: Different local government areas have different controls.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: They might like to have a different mix. The issues in Botany was more around aircraft noise - - -

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - and amenity, but for Hills - - -

MR MURRAY: For The Hills, it was around minimum apartment sizes.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay.

MR MURRAY: They didn't want to have some of the minimums that SEPP 65 allowed you to achieve.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5

MS AUSTIN: With the cap on 5000 dwellings, if somebody – let's say – bought up a whole lot of land that was strategically located and chose not to develop it – or – sorry, let me rephrase that. How do you ration that so you could have it all developed by – very quickly? We could have people sitting on it expecting some changes in planning laws. How do you stage the development of the apartments in an equitable way? If big developments come up, does it mean that people are going to – have bought land and can't develop it? You're saying over a 20, 30 years period with additional infrastructure can support twice that number. So what's the sequencing arrangements for approval of developments?

10
15

MS CARRUTHERS: So there was no sequencing that was provided through the development control plan. Look, we did a lot of analysis around the economics - - -

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

20

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - and take up, so, you know, in terms of The Hills area, some of the larger land releases and other areas in The Hills, the take-up rate is around – between 200, 300 dwellings. We weren't anticipating – given that we had an area where you need – there was about 700 individual landowners, you needed a lot of consolidation, amalgamation to occur. So we anticipated that that would take some time - - -

25

MS AUSTIN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - to realise. So we did – I suppose we weren't concerned that the 5000 would be consumed in a very short time, given some of the market dynamics.

30

MS AUSTIN: Would you be concerned if it was consumed more slowly – considerably more slowly than anticipated, given the need for increasing stock of housing in New South Wales?

35

MS CARRUTHERS: Well - - -

MR MURRAY: Well, we've got limited leavers, so the zoning's in place, the opportunity to do it, but the response to housing is economics and investment, and it's very hard – even if we said, well, the cap could go up to 7000, it doesn't accelerate the release. The release of land is basically based on the economics, internal rate of return. "I've got this site. I need to get this yield on it to get this percentage back," and that's a decision driven by the market. And so while planning can put the rules in place – I mean, the government has some leavers it's used before,

40
45

its cap section 94, its subsidized state infrastructure contributions, but in the end, it's very much a market driven system.

MS AUSTIN: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Couple of questions: one is the proposal as put. How does that compare with other, sort of, centres? You know, is there something – is it similar to Epping or is it similar to – can you give us a - - -

10 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, so - - -

MR DUNCAN: - - - bit of an indication of scale and - - -

15 MS CARRUTHERS: So in terms of the height, the height that was proposed for Showground was fairly consistent with what council proposing for Castle Hill.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

20 MS CARRUTHERS: So it wasn't – and that was something that council, when we had discussions with council earlier in the plan precinct process that - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

25 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - they saw Castle Hill as their premier centre, so they didn't want to see anything greater than - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - what was being delivered in Castle Hill. Epping is slightly higher. I think the maximum height there is around 25 storeys - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - but – roughly, but it's also a different centre, in that, it's probably better serviced by public transport than something like the - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

40 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - Showgrounds Station precinct.

MR DUNCAN: And this will be distinct from the Castle Hill - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: - - - centre as well, so there'll be a separation - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Now, another question that we've been asked to look at is whether or not there should be – in the letters that should be submitted for a gateway determination, are there any factors or points that you think we should consider in that process?

5

MR MURRAY: I think – and it sounds a bit repetitive, but - - -

MR DUNCAN: I know.

10 MR MURRAY: - - - the key things you should look at is does it have strategic merit?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

15 MR MURRAY: So look at the district plan, look at the Northwest Rail Strategy, look at the recent amendments and say does this have strategic merit regarding to that? Has there been a significant change in circumstances? And then look at the site's specific merits, you know, is the site capable of development in this density, this yield? Can it be serviced? Is there any constraints that would preclude it or limit
20 it? What could be looked at on the site?

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Yes. Okay. Dan, is there anything from your point of view?

25 MR KEARY: No.

MS CARRUTHERS: I suppose one thing I just would like to say, in terms of the Northwest Rail Link Corridor Strategy – sorry, I said 2015 that was released. It was actually released 2013. I suppose one thing to consider is that the plan precinct
30 process then, I suppose, investigated that area in a lot more detail in terms of looking over design, transport and traffic and other matters as well, compared to the corridor strategy. It was obviously a much higher level document that was to guide future development and infrastructure delivery, and then, obviously, the plan precinct then gave it a greater level of detail around appropriate built form, what connections you
35 might need and infrastructure needed to support growth in that area.

MR DUNCAN: So in those processes of reviews or documentation, did much change in the thinking from 2013?

40 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, probably around the scale of the development. So I would need to confirm - - -

MR DUNCAN: Could you do that? It would be interesting to see - - -

45 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, but it was more that the - - -

MR DUNCAN: - - - the – what's changed with this - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: It was primarily the scale. When we originally – there was medium density residential proposed to the southern side of the railway line, whereas we took a view that you could probably have some greater densities along - - -

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - Carrington Road than what was first contemplated, and we obviously looked to expand the opening space as well.

10 MR DUNCAN: It would be interesting if we could just – just a snapshot of each one and what changes. It's sort of - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. No, that's fine.

15 MR DUNCAN: It gives us a view of any change in circumstance from a planning point of view.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR MURRAY: Happy to provide that.

25 MR DUNCAN: And the Northwest Rail Line opening is next year, isn't it, at that location?

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, mid-next year, I think, is what the - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Right. Okay. And when you mentioned the development being related to infrastructure, was that one of the cap issues, the rail itself, or was it mostly roads, schools and that - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: No, it was mainly the schools.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: Council had concerns around how they would deliver open space.

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: So they have now resolved that through an updated – what was section 94, now 711 plan.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS CARRUTHERS: And there are some roadworks that will need to be undertaken and, obviously, transport are working – with the opening of the railway line, they’re looking at how buses can better service that area as well.

5 MR DUNCAN: And car parking at that location, there was a - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: There’s a car parking – there’s communal car parking – a communal car park proposed - - -

10 MR DUNCAN: Proposed - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - that is being built at the Showground - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

15

MS CARRUTHERS: - - - station.

MR KEARY: Peter, can I just ask that - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR KEARY: - - - in relation to infrastructure with those additional initiatives from council and car parking, open space, etcetera, does that indicate that the infrastructure constraints, if you like, that previously set the overall dwelling cap has now shifted and there is more infrastructure capacity, or is there still - - -

25

MS CARRUTHERS: It’s around the - - -

MR KEARY: - - - as the understands an infrastructure constraint in the precinct which then still influences what is the dwelling capacity?

30

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, capacity have done a great job in terms of, you know, resolving the local infrastructure, but it’s the state infrastructure that’s probably the issue, particularly the need for a school.

35

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS CARRUTHERS: And that hasn’t - - -

40 MR KEARY: And those issues remain.

MS CARRUTHERS: And that hasn’t been resolved.

MR KEARY: Right.

45

MS CARRUTHERS: So education is still looking at a number of options of how they could provide a school in this - - -

- MR DUNCAN: School primary or secondary?
- MS CARRUTHERS: Primary school.
- 5 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. All right. Anything else, Carol?
- MS AUSTIN: Just to clarify, then. So the Northwest Rail Link Strategy was developed in 2013 - - -
- 10 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.
- MS AUSTIN: - - - and that gave a comprehensive overview of how the region would be developed.
- 15 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.
- MS AUSTIN: The amendments that were made in December 2017 to the LEP, so what changed to prompt the loosening of the density proposals that underpin the changes for it?
- 20 MS CARRUTHERS: I think greater analysis around the capacity of the area to take additional growth when – particularly when we started to look at what might be appropriate built form, what type of role that centre would play in the broader area.
- 25 MS AUSTIN: Okay.
- MS CARRUTHERS: We had greater analysis around economics and job growth and the like in the area. So there was a whole range of factors that were taken into consideration.
- 30 MS AUSTIN: So at the same time that the December '17 changes were introduced, were similar changes introduced to other sites along the Northwest Rail Link?
- MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. So we had also – at the time that we were considering the Showground station precinct, we were also considering Bella Vista and Kellyville - - -
- 35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.
- 40 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - which changed slightly – which changed as well from the corridor strategies.
- MS AUSTIN: So all of those changes would have been, essentially, an updating of the 13 - - -
- 45 MS CARRUTHERS: Corridor, yes.

MS AUSTIN: - - - and adopting consistent approach and strategy across all of those proposals.

5 MS CARRUTHERS: Yes, and council had been doing some work on Castle Hill
- - -

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

10 MS CARRUTHERS: - - - themselves. So, yes, there was a bit of a rethink based on
what was already occurring in The Hills as well and some of the initiatives that
council have been taking, and just in terms of the demand for jobs and housing in
that area and how it had changed since 2013.

15 MS AUSTIN: Okay. Good. So we can conclude that the December '17 update
took into account broader considerations that were happening - - -

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes. Yes.

20 MS AUSTIN: - - - along the rail link. So it wasn't simply a relation – an update in
relation to Showgrounds. It was in a broader context.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

25 MS AUSTIN: So that multiple facets were considered and in a broader context than
simply Showground.

MS CARRUTHERS: Yes.

30 MS AUSTIN: Good.

MR DUNCAN: Good. Anything else? Carol? No. Thank you very much.

MR MURRAY: Thank you.

35

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[9.36 am]