



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-953133

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCILS

RE: YASS VALLEY WIND FARM

PANEL:

**ALAN COUTTS
PROF ZADA LIPMAN
ADRIAN PILTON**

ASSISTING PANEL:

JORGE VAN DEN BRANDE

ON BEHALF OF COUNCILS:

CHRIS BERRY

LOCATION:

**YASS VALLEY COUNCIL OFFICE
209 COMUR STREET
YASS, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE:

**10.44 AM, MONDAY,
12 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR A. COUTTS: All right. Well, thanks, Chris.

MR C. BERRY: That's all right.

5 MR COUTTS: Good morning and welcome to our meeting. We have introduced ourselves before the formalities.

MR BERRY: Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: I'm chairing this panel – Alan Coutts – and I'm assisted by Professor Zada Lipman and Adrian Pilton as fellow commissioners, and Jorge Van Den Brande from the secretariat, and we're here to – as part of our consideration of the development application from Goldwind Australia Proprietary Limited for the
15 application and the modification they're proposing.

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

20

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Chris, this meeting is – obviously, it's being recorded, and that's

25

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - part of the transparency process that the commission now goes through. This meeting will be part of our decision-making process.

30

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: We'll have a public meeting this afternoon.

35

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: We've already met with the proponent. We've met with the department, and, following this afternoon's meeting and our meeting with council today, if there are any additional sources of information we need, we'll go back and
40 seek - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - that information.

45

MR BERRY: Good.

MR COUTTS: So thank you for - - -

MR BERRY: That's all right.

5 MR COUTTS: - - - hosting us at your lovely town.

MR BERRY: That's all right.

10 MR COUTTS: And I guess – I don't have any specific questions to put to you. We've read both councils' submissions. So it really is an opportunity for you - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

15 MR COUTTS: - - - to put to us, you know, any issues you want us to bear particularly in mind, any concerns that Council might have - - -

MR BERRY: Yes, okay.

20 MR COUTTS: - - - to aid us in our deliberations.

MR BERRY: I certainly can, yes. Look, from my perspective as the director of planning here at Yass Valley Council, we've had quite an extensive involvement, obviously, and extensive negotiations and discussions with Goldwind since their involvement in this particular project. Things have evolved, certainly, in the last 12
25 months. Council's current policy right now is that we oppose all large-scale wind farms. We think the cumulative effect of the ones that have been approved is enough for the valley, but in this particular case council acknowledges that this wind farm, the Yass Valley – or Coppabella, as we call it now – Wind Farm is – had an approval prior to council developing that position. So we have to acknowledge that.

30 In June this year, Council, in considering – or further considering the proposal, indicated that its preference for its – the access to the site for the heavy haulage or the heavy vehicle movements should be a route other than Whitefields Road, as proposed. So the idea they came off – directly off the Hume Highway onto
35 Whitefields Road and then onto the site. Council felt that because of the roadside vegetation and its environmental values, that it preferred to see another route, and one of the suggestions was – it's actually in the diagram in – attached to the consent, if I can find it.

40 So the idea it would come off the Hume Highway at – I think it's Baramangaroo Road, then onto Whitefields Road and coming in from the opposite end of Whitefields Road, or, alternatively, going onto Coppabella Road. So still coming from the south but further along the Hume Highway, and that area's – Council felt that there was less significant roadside vegetation in that area. It did note that the
45 road was not sealed, and it was obviously a longer route, but the council felt that it would have – it would lessen the impact on the roadside vegetation and, in particular, Yass Valley residents, who've been very vocal in opposing that as the primary access

point. So that's what Council has suggested: that another alternate route be looked at.

5 The council went on to say that if Whitefields Road, as proposed, is to be used, then it needs to be upgraded. It needs to be sealed from the highway to – basically, to the site entrance. So it needs to be upgraded, and it needs to be designed in such a way that it minimises the impact on the roadside vegetation. Council has a road standard policy, and, depending on the – if you like, the volume of traffic on the road, we suggest a pavement with – of 5.5 to nine metres, depending on the volume of traffic,
10 but in the policy council says that we're prepared to vary that in the interests of protecting roadside vegetation. So we will vary that standard.

Now, looking at the consent – the draft consent notice from the department, which seems to be suggesting that Whitefield Roads continue to be used, the consent talks
15 about five metres with a half-metre shoulder either side – so basically a six metre-wide pavement comprising – I think there's a gravel shoulder and a sealed component. Certainly, I think we can live with that if that is chosen. Again, the width can vary depending on the location of that roadside vegetation that we're trying to preserve in that location.

20 So Council would certainly be prepared to vary its standards in that regard, and I think the condition as it's drafted, if Whitefields Road is to be used, would be okay. The – I did note that last week, we received a – the latest version of the plan from Goldwind, their consultants. Haven't had a chance to really review that. It's with our engineers at the moment. They will have a good look at that plan, but again, I
25 think there's certainly scope with what they've done to meet that requirement of the condition as it's drafted.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

30 MR BERRY: That's our second preference. Our first preference is an alternate route if we – if it can, but I'll leave that to wiser heads than myself. In terms of the draft consent, there's a couple of things that I've picked up through there. There's a definition that's been included in this consent about heavy vehicles, suggest that
35 anything above eight tonnes or two axels is a heavy vehicle; anything less than that, including rigid vehicles, is not. I just did a quick Google search last week on some heavy vehicles. Some of the ones that are – think this is Shona. Sorry about that.

MR COUTTS: No, that's all right.

40 MR BERRY: They can't make it.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

45 MR BERRY: Their replacement is in the army.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR BERRY: So it'd be over an hour before they got here. So – but she has given me some background, and I'll get onto that shortly.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

5

MR BERRY: Yes. I just did a quick search of vehicles, and some of the – there are some what we call water carts and tipper trucks that are below the eight tonne. They're two axels and they would still be perceived, certainly in our community, as heavy vehicles, and the impact of heavy vehicles on local roads is the major concern with all these developments, not only for the potential damage to the road pavement, but also, on narrow, rural roads, they can be an issue for the local residents. So I think that – the fact that we've got a definition is heading in the right direction. I suspect that most of the vehicles that they will be using will be more than two axels in any case, so really, it's probably just a minor concern on my behalf that there might be some in that lower range that may be a problem.

On that, in terms of the transport routes, I think it's condition number 31 in appendix 6 which – condition 31 pulls up appendix 6, which is the haulage route. Our contention all along has been the over-dimensional vehicle are not really a – are not a problem for us. It's the concrete, the gravel, the water carters, the truck and dog-type arrangement that causes more grief and more problems with our roads than the over-dimensional routes. So while that's – appendix 6 is nominating the primary access as the entrance for the over-dimensional routes, we would say that that should extend to all heavy vehicles. Again, it's important that we pick up those other vehicles because of the potential damage that they can cause to road, so before arriving at Yass Valley, I worked up at Goulburn Mulwaree Council, and the heavy – sorry – the haulage route for the over-dimensionals was the Crookwell Road going out to Upper Lachlan to the – in fact, to Goldwind's other project up at Bannister.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: But all the other vehicles, the truck and dogs, the gravel, water and cement trucks all came from Goulburn and went up via Range Road, and Range Road chopped up within about – within six months. The whole road virtually fell apart. So it made – it's a major issue, and we would prefer to see all the heavy vehicles, as well as the over-dimensional vehicles be pout onto those designated haulage routes. But if everybody in the community – very clear understanding of what routes the trucks and the larger vehicles are going to be used so that they're not contending on other roads, unintended roads. So that would be our view there.

40

Similarly, the road maintenance conditions, there's a couple there that would – and they relate – I think it's 29 and 32, from memory, road maintenance and the TNPs. Our view with roads, road construction and road maintenance has been very simple, is that the roads as they presently stand are good enough for the local traffic volumes that are there. So in this case, I think Whitefields Road is used by only a handful of people, and the occasional stock truck would go up there for the livestock. When we put a wind farm in there and with the level of truck movements that are involved, our

45

view is that the road needs to be built to standard prior to the works onsite commencing so it's fit for purpose. And the second is that it is maintained to that standard over the construction phase, and I'm obviously at the – if it's – we're talking at the other end of the process, the decommissioning.

5

So the idea is that the road is built to the right standard initially and then maintained to that standard over the construction period. And then when the construction period is completed, it's handed over to counsel for ongoing maintenance at that point in time. So we certainly have made it very clear to Goldwind and other wind farms is that that's our expectation; is that the roads are maintained. We don't want to see a situation whereby the road is built – we don't worry about it throughout the construction phase; we do a dilapidation report at the end of it, and then we repair it at the end. No, it has got to be maintained throughout the life of the project. So that would be – we would certainly be arguing that that should be reflected in those road maintenance conditions.

15

MR J. VAN DEN BRANDE: Sorry. Is that - - -

PROF Z. LIPMAN: 29.

20

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: 29A doesn't address that comment?

25

MR BERRY: 29, I think it was. Just bear with me. The – 29 talks about the preparation of a dilapidation survey. Our argument is that you don't need a dilapidation survey at the end of the project if it has actually been maintained to the right standard throughout the construction phase. And it's certainly a position that we consistently advocated with the department on a number of occasions, is that the roads are meant to be built first and maintained to that standard and then handed over at the end of the job to that standard.

30

MR COUTTS: Do you have an alternate condition that you would like to see? Not – I'm not asking for it now.

35

MR BERRY: I'm not – I don't – I haven't drafted one up.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: But it's - - -

40

MR COUTTS: I'm not asking for it now, but - - -

MR BERRY: Yes. We - - -

45

MR COUTTS: - - - if I give you the opportunity, would that - - -

MR BERRY: We can certainly look at that and make sure - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: I guess the key thing is we need to make sure it's not just we fix it up
at the end.

5 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: It has got to be fixed - - -

10 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - as it goes. So, you know, if there's a major – a failure in that
pavement - - -

15 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - we don't want to wait till the end.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

20 MR BERRY: We want to make sure it's - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

25 MR BERRY: - - - fixed there and then.

MR COUTTS: Yes. And I - - -

MR BERRY: That's the main thing, yes.

30 MR COUTTS: I understand where you're coming from, Chris. I mean - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

35 MR COUTTS: - - - perhaps if you wanted to have a look at those - - -

MR BERRY: Yes. Okay.

MR COUTTS: - - - particular conditions, and if you want to come back to us with
40 some suggestion, we're - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - happy to have a look at that.

45 MR BERRY: Yes. No problems. Yes, we can have a look at those ones. What
else did I have down? Community enhancement fund. The consent as drafted talks

about a contribution per turbine of 2500. Certainly our policy that we developed locally was – started at 2500, but that was several years ago now, and this consent has been around for a bit as well. I’ve just had a quick look at that. We – accounting for CPI movements, that would now be \$2825 per turbine, so we would argue that
5 that figure should be brought up to contemporary standards. They haven’t started – and this is – part of the problem with wind farms is because there’s such a long period of preparation to get them off the ground, is that the figure we quote usually at the start of negotiations tends to flow through to everything, but, you know, we could be 10 years down the track before we start. So I’ve just updated that figure too, so
10 it’s – 2825 is the current rate that we apply.

MR COUTTS: I think the department’s response to that, in my reading, is that seeing they’ve negotiated this community development fund, which is an extra sum of – what is it, 100,000 or something like that? That’s, I guess, the sweetener to keep
15 the 2500 as it is.

MR BERRY: Yes, we’ve had a – I’ve raised some concerns with the department about that extra 100,000 - - -

20 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - that they’ve talked about. And the main concern is that the way the VPA is set up is it’s very much that council is, if you like, managing those funds on behalf of the community as a whole. So we run it through our standard section
25 355 committees. We have – the proponent is included on that committee as well as councillors, and as well as community reps, and that can be – and it’s a very open and transparent process. It has been deliberately designed that way so that the community can actually see where that money has been spent and why it has been spent in those particular areas. The extra 100,000, it was unclear as how that was
30 going to be managed, whether it was just going to be simply managed by the company without any details about any openness and transparency around that part of the fund. Was it a separate fund than the VPA, or was it to be added to the VPA?

Again, I guess from a local government perspective, we would argue that it should be
35 – whatever mechanism is used, it must be open and it must be transparent. And the ones that have been managed by the companies, my experience has been that they’re not particularly open and transparent, whereas the ones that – managed by local councils are, simply because we’re required every year to – well, every meeting we have we’re required to make sure our agendas are public, our decisions are public,
40 we – the meetings are open. And anything that requires a call on our budget, we actually have to advertise our budget and we have to go through an open – a very open process of taking submissions every year on them and the budget process as well.

45 That doesn’t necessarily happen with the trusts that I’ve seen set up under a company structure. They tend to be dealt with by the company representatives. There’s very limited involvement of the community directly in the decision-making process. And

again, the ones that I'm most familiar with is that there is limited opportunity for council to be involved in that. The – a councillor is represented on that trust, the company trust. But they basically have to sign a confidentiality agreement. So it's not very open, it's not very transparent. So we would prefer that to come back to –
5 into the community enhancement fund, and it probably should be just simply used as the same mechanism.

So that extra 100,000 is added to whatever is in the community fund, and I think that will be probably powerful to the councils, but it's – if it's not, then it shouldn't be
10 having anything to do with the enhancement fund. It should be separate – a separate arrangement for separate discussions. But we wouldn't want to see it jeopardise the community enhance fund in any way.

On the community enhancement fund, we have drafted a VPA. That has been done with Hilltops Council so that we have a consistent approach. Even though both
15 councils will manage their own voluntary planning agreement, it – there is consistency between the council in terms of how they're structured, how they operate and the contributions that are going to it. So that level of consistency is there. We did look at having one VPA and one committee comprising of both councils to look
20 at that.

At the end of the day, our councillors felt it was more appropriate that it be separate. I think it's a bit of the Hilltops councillors not wanting the other councils to tell them where to spend their money and vice versa. I think it was – at the end of the day, it
25 was seen as a bit easier to administer them separately in that context. But that VPA has been drafted. It has been provided to the company. We haven't gone through the process of actually formalising it at this stage, but there will be a process we go through. I suspect they're simply waiting on the determination of this matter first.

30 MR COUTTS: Is that VPA that you've put to them, is that based on the 2850 figure?

MR BERRY: Yes, it is, and they haven't come back and said, "No, that's not right."

35 MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR BERRY: We've just simply indicated to them that figure has been CPI since the day we started negotiations on the VPA.

40 MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR BERRY: So they're aware of that. Again, we haven't gone through the formal process yet. You've still got to advertise the VPA. We've got to take submissions, of which they would be entitled to make a submission as well.

45

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: And it may well be that they argue that the extra 100,000 should be part of that or - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

5 MR BERRY: - - - taken into consideration. But we will deal with that - - -

MR COUTTS: Okay.

10 MR BERRY: - - - in due course.

MR COUTTS: Okay. So really, that's all still up for negotiation, essentially.

MR BERRY: I think so. Again, if that wasn't changed as a consent condition, I think we've got the mechanisms to be able to deal with that through the VPA.

15 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: So, again, it was probably me just dotting i's and crossing t's - - -

20 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - and saying, well, that was the figure then; this is the figure now.

25 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: That's it.

MR COUTTS: Understood.

30 MR BERRY: Now, the - I'll flick over and I'll try and represent - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35 MR BERRY: - - - Hilltops Council to the best of my ability on roads. In the diagram, again in appendix C still, is a secondary access point through Coppabella Road area, I think has been suggested.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

40 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: 26.

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

45 MR BERRY: Yes. Again, Hilltops are - it's a little bit difficult because we don't know the source of materials. Again, coming from the Hume Highway, it's pretty straightforward; it's got to come off - up Whitefields Road - one end or the other

end of Whitefields Road. But when you're coming – if the materials are coming from the north and they're looking at coming through roads through the Hilltops area, obviously, we've got the state road through there, but if they're using the local roads, and once they move off the state road network onto the local road network,
5 they have the same concerns as what we do in terms of the roads being fit for purpose.

The difficulty that they have at the moment is because they don't know the actual haulage routes in those areas, they don't know which roads need to be upgraded and
10 to what standard. They have a – some reservations about which direction the vehicles would come. They have made the suggestion – or Sharon's just indicated to me that they made a suggestion – is that those roads, once they're identified, they need to negotiate with Hilltops Council to come to an agreed standard and timeframe for the construction of the upgrade of those roads and maintenance of those roads.

15 So it's a little bit more – it's a little bit difficult for them because they have multiple options to access the site from the north as distinct from the south, which is a bit more clear-cut. So again, I could certainly make the suggestion to Sharon and her team that they actually look at the conditions of the consent and maybe come up with
20 some suggested wording - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

25 MR BERRY: - - - that might assist you - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - in that regard, but yes, it's a very similar issue to us. Again, it's
30 about making sure that the roads are appropriate for the volume and type of traffic going to the site, and that they – we already have local users on those roads. We have local school buses on some of those roads, so it is important that those roads are fit for purpose when we've got to take into account those – that local traffic, albeit at a relatively low- low numbers at this stage.

35 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: The roads are generally pretty good for that low-level local traffic.

40 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: The odd school bus movement, the odd stock truck and the light vehicle traffic. They're usually okay, but yes, when you put in a significant numbers of heavy vehicles, it chops up the roads and interferes with the locals' enjoyment of their roads, so they need to brought up to standard.

45 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: Yes. Sharon's just mentioned to me in terms of the community enhancement fund, again, that we've worked collaboratively as the two councils on the community enhancement fund and tried to ensure that – ensure that there is consistency. We don't – we originally suggested it was a – the right way to go
5 because we've had experiences in the past where each council's been pitted against the other. We wanted to make sure that we were taking a consistent approach.

I think Hilltops Council – originally their per turbine rate was much higher than ours, but over the years, they've agreed that we need to have that consistency between the
10 Local Government areas and that's where the 2500 has come from originally. We tried to develop that consistency and, similarly, we've tried to develop a mechanism for managing that money on a consistent basis, so again, there's no surprises for the company, and there's no surprises for the communities either, so, you know, you don't have one community saying, "But Yass do it this way."

15

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: "Why can't we do it that way?" So that's – that has been a really good, useful exercise for both councils in terms of getting that consistency and
20 driving that consistency forward, so I think that's – I think they're the major issues for us.

MR COUTTS: That's good. Okay. Yes.

25 MR BERRY: It's always about roads.

MR COUTTS: Yes, yes.

MR BERRY: Sorry.

30

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: It's roads and community enhancement. It's usually those things, and the other things that we have raised in the past is always about the consultation
35 processes and the processes involved in making sure communities get heard.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: You've done that by coming into the community, so we thank you for
40 that. We also, as an organisation, take the view that the public hearing is not for councils so much. It's really to maximise the opportunity for our local residents to have their say - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

45

MR BERRY: - - - in the process. That's why we don't register for addressing there.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: I understand that one of our councillors may be registered this afternoon.

5

MR COUTTS: As an individual?

MR BERRY: I'm not sure because the message I got was that he was registered as a councillor to speak on behalf of some constituents, but that seems to be in conflict with councils having a role to play in terms of whatever they've resolved.

10

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: So if they're – if those – if the residents he's speaking on behalf of have the same view of council, then I guess it's not a problem. It might be – it might – and I don't know. I haven't spoken to the councillor. So they're – if the views that are going to be expressed are going to be very different, maybe he is speaking as an individual rather than a councillor. So that may be something that you guys need to have a think about.

15

MR COUTTS: That's fine.

MR BERRY: We can only raise that with our councillors. I can't control them all the time.

20

MR COUTTS: Yes. Look, we're – it won't be a problem.

MR BERRY: Yes. Yes. But that's the only thing, and, as I said, we're very thankful that the – you guys come out and that the department have, in the past, come out and listened to the local people and given them plenty of opportunities to have their say.

25

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: Our job as a council is to try and find a whole of local government approach. Our job is not necessarily to represent a small group of ratepayers. We try to do the thing in the interests of all ratepayers.

30

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35

MR BERRY: Having said that, council's developed a policy about wind farms at the moment, but this one, we recognise, was in play before that policy came into effect. So we don't seek to try and apply our policy retrospectively.

40

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: Yes.

45

MR COUTTS: There's a – what's the level of sort of consultation slash involvement that councils have had with Goldwind? Has it been positive?

5 MR BERRY: Well, look, from an officer perspective, it has been terrific. Yes. We haven't had any major dramas. We've certainly, you know, had some differences of opinion about what we believe, you know, the community enhancement fund should be, what the standard of road construction should be. We do butt heads on that, but it's in a professional way, and I think the fact that we've collaborated with our neighbours – this is not the only wind farm that we're involved with with Hilltops.
10 With the Rye Park one, in fact, it involved Upper Lachlan as well. So there were three councils involved in that particular project.

We, as a group of councils in this sort of region, have basically said we need to collaborate together. Poor old Upper Lachlan blazed the trail, if you like, with wind
15 farms. I think they said they – the other day – they had 10 wind farms in their district. So they've brought some valuable experience to the table, and we've sort of tried to work with them to understand how they've developed their position and why they've developed their position, and, to be honest with you, the issues are exactly the same for us as they are for Upper Lachlan and they are for Hilltops.

20 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: It's – so it's been really useful to try and develop that consistency across the region rather than each council trying to battle everyone on their own.

25 MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

MR BERRY: It's been quite productive.

30 MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes. Yes, it's good.

MR BERRY: So, yes, we – we're – but we – yes, we have a good relationship with them. I think initially they came along and said, "We want to talk to each council separately," and the three of us got together and said, "No, that's not happening. We
35 – you know, we'll have the one meeting. We'll all go to the one meeting," and then, again, it's that consistent message and consistent understanding that the company now has. I think the company's come round to agreeing that that's a good way. It's a really useful way for them to have a meeting. They go to one meeting. They get everything out on the table at once. It's not as though they're going to have – you
40 know, repeat that between each of the councils.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

45 MR BERRY: So that's been – it's been good. It's certainly been better than some of the people that were involved in wind farm projects probably 10 years ago. I think the industry's moved on a lot. Certainly, I think a lot of them have got their act

together, and that's a good thing, but, yes, 10 years ago there were plenty of cowboys running around.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

5

MR BERRY: Now it's much, much better.

MR COUTTS: Yes. That's good.

10 MR BERRY: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: That's good.

MR BERRY: Yes.

15

MR COUTTS: All right, Chris. Well, thanks very much. I don't know if Adrian
- - -

MR:

20

MR COUTTS: - - - or Zada have any questions. Jorge?

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes. Yes. Sure. And to touch again on your request.
So you'll come back to us on condition 29, suggest - - -

25

MR BERRY: I'll - - -

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Suggest a wording.

30 MR BERRY: I'll play around with it, yes. Yes.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes. And you also mentioned road upgrades, which is
28. If that condition doesn't fully address your concerns, you could also provide
some wording - - -

35

MR BERRY: Yes, I'll - - -

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: - - - what you'd like to see there.

40 MR BERRY: I'll have a look at that when I get a chance to talk to the engineers.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Perfect.

45 MR BERRY: But my view is that we can probably work with that condition on the
road upgrade.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Okay.

MR BERRY: While it does specify a minimum distance – minimum pavement width and a shoulder width, it might be a little bit different to our policy. I think our policy’s got enough flexibility in it to say that, “Well, we can vary them anyway - - -”

5 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Okay.

MR BERRY: “- - - particularly because of the roadside vegetation.” The idea of preserving and avoiding, if you like, the removal of any trees is certainly something that we’re keen to see happen as well.

10 PROF LIPMAN: Okay. Yes.

MR BERRY: Yes.

15 MR COUTTS: And it’s more that issue about local roads and - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

20 PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - you know, the impact on heavy vehicles on local roads - - -

MR BERRY: Correct.

25 MR COUTTS: - - - is more concerned about their - - -

MR BERRY: Yes. Look, if we get a five-metre wide pavement down that road - - -

30 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: It’s a relatively – if it’s coming from that end of Whitefields Road, it’s a relatively short section of their front gate.

35 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: What happens in their front gate, I will leave that up to them.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

40 MR BERRY: I’m not worried.

MR COUTTS: I don’t want to seal where the road is flowing, but the landowner will have their view about those roads - - -

45 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - as well as the operator. But yes, that first section of Whitefields Road, it needs to be sealed.

5 MR COUTTS: Yes, I was thinking more when you were making a comment generally on your local roads, on those other condition, 31.

MR BERRY: Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: That's more the issue for - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: That you're concerned about. So - - -

15 MR BERRY: Absolutely.

MR COUTTS: As I say, if you want to give us something, I'm - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

20 MR COUTTS: We're happy to have a look at it.

MR BERRY: Yes, I can shoot some stuff through. I will have a – I will play around with it, fingers crossed, today or tomorrow. But - - -

25 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: Yes, we will get that.

30 MR COUTTS: Well, by the end of the week - - -

MR BERRY: Yes. Okay.

MR COUTTS: - - - would be fine, Chris. Yes.

35 MR BERRY: Terrific. Yes.

MR COUTTS: All right, Chris. Well, thanks very much for - - -

40 MR BERRY: That's all right.

MR COUTTS: - - - representing both Yass and Hilltop Councils. We appreciate that.

45 MR BERRY: Well, I will shoot a message through to Sharon and ask her to have a look at those and - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - shoot something through, again, by the end of the week. Yes.

5 MR COUTTS: Yes, look, if Sharon has any issues that she - - -

MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - doesn't feel have been covered by your representations here
10 today and she wants to put something to Jorge, feel free - - -

MR BERRY: Yes, terrific.

MR COUTTS: - - - because, I mean, after today's public meeting we generally give
15 people, what, seven days to make any further submissions, so - - -

MR BERRY: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - the same applies to Sharon. If she - - -
20

MR BERRY: Okay.

MR COUTTS: If council has any - - -

25 MR BERRY: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - further submissions, they've got seven days.

MR BERRY: All right. Well, I will shoot a note through to her and just say, "Look,
30 get -" get her guys to have a look at the - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: - - - draft conditions.
35

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR BERRY: And if there's any suggestions there that they give you some
40 feedback. Yes.

MR COUTTS: All right. Great.

MR BERRY: But there should be no dramas.

45 MR COUTTS: Great. All right. Well, thanks - - -

PROF LIPMAN: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Thanks very much. Thank you.

MR BERRY: Thank you.

5 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Thank you.

PROF LIPMAN: Thank you.

10 MR BERRY: Obviously, apologies for no councillors who - - -

MR COUTTS: Well, that's - - -

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.17 am]