



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-961926

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH PROPONENT

**RE: 123 GOLDEN VALLEY ROAD,
JAMEROO PLANNING PROPOSAL REVIEW**

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON
JOHN HANN**

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAN KEARY
BRENT DEVINE**

PROPONENT: **ELAINE TREGLOWN
BRANKO SIMICIC
NEVILLE FREDERICKS
TIANA SIMICIC
LAWSON FREDERICKS**

LOCATION: **DPE OFFICE
LEVEL 2, BLOCK G
84 CROWN STREET
WOLLONGONG, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE: **12.06 PM, WEDNESDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2018**

MR C. WILSON: So just some formalities first. Sorry, I will just – good afternoon. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past and present.

5 Welcome to the meeting today on the review of a planning proposal that seeks to amend the Kiama LEP 2011 to rezone land at 123 Golden Valley Road Jamberoo. My name is Chris Wilson and I'm the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me is John Hann. The other attendees at the meeting are Dan Keary and Brent Devine of Keyland Consulting who are assisting the Commission Secretariat today.

10 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 commission's process of preparing advice. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information on which the
15 commission will base its advice. 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 are not in a position to answer it, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which
20 we will then put on our website. We will now begin. So firstly, we would just like to ask you to go through the process of how you got to this point today, starting when I presume, back in 2011 or earlier, but we're just – understand from your perspective the process you've gone through to get to this point today and some of the key issues along the way.

25 MR N. FREDERICKS: Perhaps it's – Elaine was – is the town planner and been involved in the project for how long, Branko?

MR B. SIMICIC: About a year.

30 MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. And we've only – Lawson and I were brought into the project about a year and a half ago - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - invited in – we're property developers.

MR WILSON: Right.

40 MR N. FREDERICKS: And Branko got in touch with us and they've drawn us in and there's an intent that we would proceed in joint venture development if the zoning proceeds. So that's the – who we all are here.

MR WILSON: Okay. . Thank you. Thank you very much.

45

MS E. TREGLOWN: So Branko has been a landowner for- how many years, Branko, have you owned the land? How many years have you owned the land?

5 MS T. SIMICIC: Since 1980 – what?

MR SIMICIC: Eighty – 1982.

MS TREGLOWN: 1982. Okay. So the landholding that you're looking at today comprises – subject to planning proposals – only one small portion of the overall site.
10 So if we go back to a number of years ago when we made a submission – I can't quite tell you the exact dates, so excuse my lack of knowledge on the dates – but we went to council a number of years ago on behalf of Branko seeking to rezone part of the site. Now, Branko had approached us prior to that to look at what he could do on the land and we suggested that a planning proposal would be feasible but not over the
15 whole of the site. So that was based on some site investigations and we felt that this portion of the site had some suitability, leaving the remainder of the site for agricultural use.

MR WILSON: Right.
20

MS TREGLOWN: So we lodged a submission with the council at that stage in relation to the Kiama urban strategy.

MR WILSON: So this is back in 2011, or before then?
25

MR SIMICIC: It was maybe 2008. It was a couple of years.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. It was many years ago and the strategy - - -

30 MR J. HANN: All right. Okay. So this was prior – John Hann – this is prior, Elaine, to the strategy, the exact – the formulation of the strategy - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. The strategy was being prepared – yes.

35 MR HANN: - - - but it was prior to that?

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

MR HANN: Okay. Thank you.
40

MS TREGLOWN: So they've exhibited the strategy at that stage and they were calling for submissions. So we were one of a number of submissions that came forward. They had a council meeting at that stage and they invited people to make some verbal representations at the meeting, so I attended at that stage on behalf of
45 Branko and spoke to the councillors at that particular stage. Now, at that time, council then decided to include this particular site within the strategy which was

positive. It was a stage 2 proposal within the strategy and there were a number of lots within stage 1 that were intended to proceed prior to that.

5 Branko approached us in about 2015 – Branko – to see if it was possible to move forward at that point in time and our advice to him was that we would have to meet with council and speak with council to see if stage 1 had moved forward far enough and it would reach the point of lodging a formal application. So we met with council. Suffice to say we found that one of the most positive meetings we’ve had with any council at any planning proposal. As you know, planning proposals are
10 often not well-received at the early stage, but council was extremely receptive at that stage for us moving forward with the lodgement, so we did.

So we then moved forward with some more detailed investigations, obviously went through the gateway stage and moved forward with our investigations. It was
15 initially – we then lodged the planning proposal formally in the form fairly consistent with what has currently been lodged. Investigations were done in terms of a range of issues, and I’m sure you’ve got the reports before you – traffic, Aboriginal heritage – a range of investigations, geotech, contamination and the like. So they were completed, lodged with council. We initially had some – report was considered by
20 council and at that particular time, it was deferred pending some public exhibition which was to occur.

Public exhibition occurred and council did stall on its decision after the community made some representations. We lodged a review in relation to planning proposal and
25 the matter was then considered by the Joint Regional Planning Panel. We met with the Joint Regional Planning Panel and had some discussions. It would be fair to say that the key issues that were raised by the Joint Regional Planning Panel at that meeting related to visual and landscape issues and also related to the character of development – so the character – what style of housing we might have on that site.
30

MR WILSON: And that was – my understanding was pretty much the key issues that came out of the consultation process - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

35

MR WILSON: - - - that council undertook.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. So following that, we then moved on and we engaged Webb Consulting, I think it was Charlotte Webb, to prepare a visual assessment and
40 she came through with some recommendations in terms of some strategic planting on the adjacent site which is still in the ownership of Branko and council also moved forward with a section within their DCP which addressed character within - - -

MR WILSON: Section 33 – chapter 33?
45

MS TREGLOWN: Correct. Yes. So council has also since then, I understand, moved forward with another section of the DCP which is chapter 30 - - -

MR WILSON: 30.

MS TREGLOWN: - - - which is currently on exhibition, which relates to
preservation of areas of Aboriginal heritage in relation to, you know, preservation of,
5 retention and consideration of those areas. So that's where we are at the current
point in time. We have also, through the process, prepared an economic assessment
which I believe you would most likely have a copy of but if not, we're certainly
happy to provide another copy. I have a copy here if need be.

10 MR WILSON: No, we don't have that.

MR HANN: I don't think we – well, I haven't seen it so if - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Look, it was probably lodged - - -
15

MR HANN: -if - - you're comfortable providing it, we would appreciate that.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. I have got a copy here. It was probably lodged as a fairly
- - -
20

MR.....: We have got a hard copy here.

MS TREGLOWN: Hard copy. Okay.

25 MR WILSON: Can we get an electronic copy because I think we probably need to
put that on our website.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. Yes, certainly.

30 MR: We can email that to you.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

MS TREGLOWN: So look, it might - - -
35

MR: If I – could I have that

MS TREGLOWN: It might be worthwhile at this stage, if that's okay - - -

40 MR WILSON: Yes – no, by all means.

MS TREGLOWN: If the panel members are happy, if perhaps Neville gives you a
rundown on what came out of that economic assessment because it's certainly
relevant to some of the submissions that came in from members of the community.
45 If I could just say one thing. At the last council meeting we were at, the community
was – in my opinion, is quite mixed. There are obviously those members of the
community who have been opposed to this development over a period of time and

are opposed to any further growth in Jamberoo and the JRPP was mindful of that and did want council to look at, you know, preserving Jamberoo from significant encroachment into their agricultural land.

5 So they did ask them to have a look at that. But on the other side, there were some members – there was one particular family that spoke at that last meeting who I thought were very interesting and it was a young family and they were very interested in seeing some level of growth in Jamberoo because they felt that the critical facilities in Jamberoo could not be sustained if they didn't have some
10 reasonable population to support that. So I thought that was an interesting and a different perspective that came through and the young lady who spoke was very helpful.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

15

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

20 MS TREGLOWN: Certainly cemented in my mind what I thought was the case but, as a local, she indicated that was the case. Perhaps if I may - - -

MR WILSON: Yes – no, by all means.

25 MS TREGLOWN: - - - pass on to Neville to perhaps give a bit of a rundown on the economic assessment.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. Thank you, Elaine and Mr Chairman. Firstly, just to go on from that, there was a subdivision – a zoning application by Mrs Downes at
30 Drualla Road which preceded Branko's, was more advanced.

MR WILSON: Was that site 27A?

MR N. FREDERICKS: I don't know what it's called. It's on Drumorla Road.
35 There was about - - -

MR: adjacent - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: About 13 allotments.
40

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR N. FREDERICKS: About 13 allotments on the western side of Jamberoo.

45 MR WILSON: Okay. On the other side.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. Yes.

MR N. FREDERICKS: And talking to a Mr Boxall, who was very supportive of more growth in Jamberoo, there was a petition went around Jamberoo, one,
5 supporting that development which got 180 plus signatures, and one petition went around objecting and there was 150 plus. So that confirms what Elaine was saying, that there are mixed views.

MR WILSON: Sure. We appreciate that.
10

MR N. FREDERICKS: And now, just going back, my background – I grew up in Jamberoo. I'm fifth generation Jamberoo, a refugee from the dairy industry, and I used to own this property. In fact, I sold it to Branko so going – back in '81 when we quit farming. Now, just a bit of background on Jamberoo. In 1860 Jamberoo was
15 the largest town on the coast between Sydney and Melbourne. That was the time – 2300 people. That was the time when the four stone churches were built.

MR WILSON: Sorry, how many people?

MR N. FREDERICKS: 2300 in 1860. The 1860 census or thereabouts. And Kiama had 2200, which was just behind. That's rather interesting. So from about 1880 onwards, the population declined as the people were pulling back from the more marginal, steeper country and Jamberoo was by-passed with the Minnamurra Bridge and progressively Jamberoo declined. It fell to – about mid-1960 to about 460
20 residents. So that was the decline that took place. But running parallel to that, all of my life there has been a progressive loss of services in the town and gradually diminishing because they became progressively uneconomic.
25

And in the recent decade and a half the township has lost a petrol station, it has lost a country store, it has lost its bank. And that means for those services people have to travel 18 kilometre minimum round trip to get those services, where they originally got them locally. When we became involved, one of the first things we asked Branko to do was we thought that there was a need for a headline assessment of what sort of population was needed a viable range of services. And I mean, a key part of
30 any planning is economic, social and environmental sustainability. And from our perspective, one of the most important aspects to a sustainable community is a viable range of local services.
35

If you don't have that, then you have got people travelling some distance and that's not environmentally sustainable. It's not socially sustainable or it's not optimising the social outcomes. So this report was done by a fellow called Mike Cullen who is an urban economist. He specialises in town centre and village centre economics. He's really very good and a couple of the things that he said in here is that his calculations – this was done last year. The – at the beginning of last year I think.
40 The population of the village is around 940 people and the proposed expansion would add about 13 per cent and his advice was that that would be a meaningful addition to the viability of the shops there.
45

He said that the shops generally were performing above what you would expect for a community of that – a population of that size. They were clearly doing better and he said, in his view, that meant that they were vulnerable. You – they're right at the peak, they can't get much better, they're already performing, according to – by
5 industry standards, quite well. So I guess the most important contribution that we have made in coming to the scene was to highlight the importance of the creation of community through a viable main street and a viable range of services. If you're going – we have done a lot of work in our company on new townships.

10 We conceived and advanced the development of Tallenbar Village down here and the work we did at that time showed that the optimum – the very optimum outcome for a town centre – for a town centre to be really functional with the widest range of viable services, retail business and commercial services and social services, was a population of 5000. But a critical point – now, that's the optimum but once you get
15 to about two to two and a half thousand people, a number of things happen. For example, a pharmacy becomes viable and with the pharmacy you don't have to travel – a whole lot of other things will suddenly spring up and support that.

Now, with this development, there's probably – the whole township and district, to
20 meet that figure, you would probably need another three or four hundred dwellings if you're going to reach that sustainable level. Now – so I guess our view is, having – being experienced developers and worked in this field of the creation of viable townships is that this is a – we agree that with this report that said this is a positive addition to the township. And so – and I guess the – and it reduces the fragility, he
25 said, of the existing businesses. So that – I think that was all I had to say, Elaine. I hope I haven't gone too long.

MR WILSON: No, no. That's fine.

30 MR WILSON No, no. That's really helpful. Thank you. You answered one of our questions. I mean, we assumed 15 to 20 per cent, didn't we - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

35 MR WILSON: - - - increase in population. So it's 940 at the moment so - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. And roughly 120 people if you calculate 2.5 or 2.6.

MR HANN: Yes, 150, 120.

40

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

45 MR N. FREDERICKS: And that comes at about – the calc I did this morning actually came out 12.7 so round it off at 13.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR HANN: That's fine. Okay.

5 MR N. FREDERICKS: But that's supported a rural population.

MR WILSON: Yes – no, I appreciate that.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

10

MR WILSON: Just in terms of this, this hasn't been provided before?

MR N. FREDERICKS: We did provide it to council. Yes.

15 MR WILSON: You did provide it to council?

MR N. FREDERICKS: They – they – yes, but it was late in the piece - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

20

MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - later in the - - -

MR WILSON: The JRPP – did they consider it?

25 MS TREGLOWN: The JRPP have it.

MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - just before the JRPP.

MR WILSON: Okay.

30

MR N. FREDERICKS: And I spoke in a similar vein to the JRPP as I've spoken to you.

35 MR WILSON: All right. But does it form part of the planning proposal – the report itself?

MS TREGLOWN: I suspect formally possibly not because it's obviously just before the JRPP so it may have been provided - - -

40 MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

45

MR HANN...: Because I – I don't think we've seen - - -

MS TREGLOWN: It probably didn't form part of the exhibition documents either, just to make you aware, so - - -

MR WILSON: But that's okay. We will address it.

5

MR HANN.....: We will get the electronic – you will send an electronic version.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes, yes, I can send that through.

10 MR HANN.....: No, thank you.

MR WILSON: I guess in terms of – some issues that arose out of the process and you mentioned there were some questions to ask. I guess there's the cultural heritage issue in terms of the two sites that have been identified which are now registered on the OEHR Register. The DCP has been amended or in the process of being amended – sorry, that would be Chapter 30.

15

MS TREGLOWN: Yes, yes.

MR WILSON: And that has provisions incorporated which provide additional measures for protection or – in terms of applications lodged – development applications, that's correct. What are those provisions? What are the measures that have been adopted to, I guess, how you're going to address those two cultural heritage sites within your subdivision pattern, plan and so forth.

25

MS TREGLOWN: The DCP talks about – the main criteria of the DCP was protecting areas of high significance.

MR WILSON: Yes.

30

MS TREGLOWN: If you look at the Biosis report in relation to these items, they were identified as having high significance from a cultural perspective.

MR WILSON: Yes.

35

MS TREGLOWN: Some of the other criteria in terms of heritage significance and the like – they were lower or moderate significance.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40

MS TREGLOWN: The Biosis report makes a number of recommendations, the first of which is that the planning proposal should proceed. The second is that avoidance is recommended.

45 MR WILSON: Yes.

MS TREGLOWN: In the event that that cannot occur, it provides some recommendations in terms of what may happen.

MR WILSON: Sure.

5

MS TREGLOWN: We will be following the standard recommendations which occur at DA stage - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

10

MS TREGLOWN: - - - in terms of more detailed investigation on those items to clearly define the areas that need to be preserved and looking at the subdivision pattern in relation to that or looking at whether another option is feasible in terms of permits and the like, so - - -

15

MR WILSON: Would it be integrated development?

MS TREGLOWN: In relation to that, I - - -

20

MR HANN: The heritage items on the register?

MS TREGLOWN: I'm not sure, to be honest. I would have to – I would have to take that one on notice and have a look at that.

25

MR WILSON: Okay. So basically the DCP has provisions which you are required to consider at the time of lodgement with the DA in terms of visual impact, I presume, so then – sorry – Chapter 33 has been amended to include those recommendations from the - - -

30

MS TREGLOWN: So 33 in relation to character, yes.

MR WILSON: Sorry, I'm getting confused.

MS TREGLOWN: 30 is - - -

35

MR WILSON: 30 is a – yes, has the cultural heritage recommendations incorporated or the process of, just because they've been – they're out of sync.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

40

MR WILSON: So chapter 33 which has been adopted has the recommendations of your visual impact assessment incorporated?

MS TREGLOWN: Yes, yes.

45

MR WILSON: That's correct? Okay.

MS TREGLOWN: So 33 talks about a range of measures.

MR WILSON: Yes.

5 MS TREGLOWN: So it looks at dwelling character, it looks at dwelling placement, it looks at style, materials and the like.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MS TREGLOWN: So our visual assessment didn't get into that level of detail. That visual assessment looked at three viewing corridors towards the site - - -

MR WILSON: Yes, yes, no, we've read the report- - -

15 MS TREGLOWN: - - - and made some recommendations in terms of not linear planting of vegetation but more subtle and natural style of, you know, positioning of planting, shall we say. So that can be implemented in a number of ways. It could be quite clearly implemented as a requirement at the subdivision stage via condition of consent. Branko owns the adjacent site, so that's feasible to provide that and the
20 measures that are in the DCP, as with any subdivision. As we move on, same as any land in Jamberoo, any new purchaser would have to adhere to the requirements within that.

MR WILSON: Okay.

25

MS TREGLOWN: And certainly – look, I think it's fair to say as well – can I just perhaps make thing clear. That layout that you have that was attached to the back of the traffic report, that's a concept only.

30 MR WILSON: Yes – no, that's fine.

MS TREGLOWN: We're not in any way asking for it to be bedded down. We acknowledge there's some issues that need to be looked at - - -

35 MR WILSON: Sure.

MS TREGLOWN: - - - in terms of road positioning, vegetation, Aboriginal heritage. All of those issues need to be looked at which would, you know, happen as with any application to - - -

40

MR WILSON: And there's a commitment to work with council in relation to preparing that land?

MR N. FREDERICKS: Absolutely.

45

MR WILSON: Just in terms of the off-site mitigation– and I know we’re delving into DA type issues and I’m trying to avoid it but just in terms of the mitigation proposed for the adjoining – for your adjoining land, how do we guarantee that its maintained?

5

MS TREGLOWN: Well - - -

MR WILSON: How do we guarantee that outcome will be achieved when - - -

10 MR N. FREDERICKS: Well, I guess - - -

MR WILSON: I mean, just hypothetically, if you were to sell the site, how would that be maintained?

15 MR N. FREDERICKS: You could do it by way of easement.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

20

MS TREGLOWN: I was thinking the same.

MR WILSON: All right.

25 MR N. FREDERICKS: You could do it by way of a strip easement along the boundary just saying those – that vegetation has to be maintained and preserved.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

30 MR N. FREDERICKS: That would – that’s what we had envisaged once the - - -

MR WILSON: Right.

MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - landscape consultants provided that report.

35

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Because we knew that council would be looking for certainty and someone would ask the question that you have just asked.

40

MR WILSON: All right.

MR L. FREDERICKS: And in addition to that, once the trees get to a certain level of maturity they’re protected by council tree preservation order as well.

45

MR WILSON: Right.

MR L. FREDERICKS: So there will be multiple layers of - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR L. FREDERICKS: - - - requirements, I guess, to maintain that vegetation.

5 MR WILSON: Have you got any more?

MR D. KEARY: Only, Elaine, you touched on some reaction from the community but in relation to a development to the west of the Jamberoo village; correct?

10 MS TREGLOWN: This is probably Neville - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: I touched on that. Yes.

MR KEARY: Sorry. I'm sorry. I thought it was you.

15

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

MR KEARY: For this specific proposal could you just give us a sense of – I mean, we have – obviously there's a certain number of submissions that have been made, of
20 which there's a majority clearly are objections. But we just want to get a sense of your understanding of the community's views. You know, you have been involved in this process for a long time now and clearly you have been associated with the land here for a long time.

25 MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. Once - - -

MR KEARY: That would be helpful for us.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Okay. Once we became involved I guess we were at the
30 forefront of that, we attended public meetings and I guess, with this one, I think it's roughly about the same, maybe not quite the support that came for Mrs Downes' property of 13 allotments.

MR KEARY: All right.

35

MR N. FREDERICKS: I think there was a sympathy factor for her and people came out of the woodwork and a few people actively went around supporting her. We did not – supporting her application. We did not ask anyone to go around with a petition, for example. We – we were very confident that all of the principles had
40 been – planning principles had been addressed, that it was in compliance with council's strategic plan, and it had – when we became involved, we already knew that it had the support of the Department of Planning officers and the council professional planners support and it was part of the strategic plan.

45 So we didn't really get on the front foot in terms of trying to turn things around. We did attend a public meeting to deal with the DCP and we got roundly condemned for even showing up, Lawson and I, but – look, I think there were a number of people

who contacted us and one or two people were working hard in the community group. But like a lot of these things, the people who are happy for things to move ahead - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Are less active.

5

MR N. FREDERICKS: I'm sorry?

MS TREGLOWN: Are less active.

10 MR N. FREDERICKS: They're less active. You know, this is just the nature of a community.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

15 MR N. FREDERICKS: And quite often, there's a small group of half a dozen people who are highly motivated and have a vision of nothing happening ever again in this place - - -

MR KEARY: Yes.

20

MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - that can mobilize a community emotionally.

MR WILSON: We appreciate that. I guess - - -

25 MR: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - our job is to look at the merits of the proposal and make appropriate recommendations– but thank you for that.

30 MS TREGLOWN: Could I possibly just add one point to that if I could?

MR WILSON: Yes, please. Yes.

35 MS TREGLOWN: I think one of the things, from a planning perspective, I very much felt has come through from the community is that they really didn't want to see any further growth. They want containment in the current boundary width. That has been an interesting challenge I think for council or planners as such, because council does have a strategy that has identified some fairly careful and contained level of growth.

40

MR HANN: This is the 2011 Kiama - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Yes.

45 MR WILSON: KUS.

MR HANN: - - - Urban Strategy.

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. And I think, from what I have seen that I believe that council has adhered fairly well to the recommendations of that strategy in terms of following those growth parts and projections. One of the things I very much felt with this site when Branko approached us back in 2011 was that the area that we
5 have sought rezoning of is really – when you look at the current boundaries, it's sitting within that current cluster.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MS TREGLOWN: It's filling in the whole area. That was one of the reasons – not the only one but one of the reasons why we had suggested not going any further to the east.

MR WILSON: Just on that matter, in 2011 my understanding was you had sought the rezoning of the land with – along with the 2011 – making of the 2011 LEP; is that right?
15

MS TREGLOWN: We had sought in 2011 – if that's the correct date, if I'm in the correct date – we had sought to include it in the strategy at that stage.
20

MR WILSON: Not the LEP? Not - - -

MS TREGLOWN: No. Not the LEP.

25 MR WILSON: Okay. All right. All right. Just the strategy.

MS TREGLOWN: The strategy at that point. And then we submitted a planning proposal, once we were in the strategy. and then we met with council to say are we okay to lodge our planning proposal.
30

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS TREGLOWN: We then lodged the planning proposal at that time.

35 MR HANN: And this is where it had the two stages - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR HANN: with the table saying - - -
40

MS TREGLOWN: Yes. Yes.

MR HANN: I think it's five years or something like that that - - -

45 MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

MS TREGLOWN: We - - -

MR HANN: The subject land that we're here to discuss - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

5 MR HANN: - - - was part of that - - -

MS TREGLOWN: We hadn't submitted a planning proposal before that time - - -

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

10

MS TREGLOWN: - - - because we felt that the strategy was the first – the first step. There's no point in submitting a planning proposal if you're not in the strategy.

MR HANN: Okay. Yes.

15

MS TREGLOWN: So we felt that was the appropriate path to follow - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

20

MS TREGLOWN: - - - as you would, and once we were embedded into the strategy, then we waited – well, Branko very patiently waited for his turn in accordance with the timing and the strategy and then that was when council said yes, the time is right, lodge the planning proposal. So it was done in full consultation with council that went on.

25

MR KEARY: Okay. Chris, just got one other - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

30

MR KEARY: It's just a query just to clarify. Immediately to the west adjoining your land is a development that's currently underway now or is completed. That was part of the strategy as well. I think it's 27A; is that right? Was - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: That shows – that – yes.

35

MR KEARY: It's this one here, if I can - - -

MR WILSON: Yes. This is - - -

40

MR N. FREDERICKS: No. Which one are you talking about?

MR KEARY: I'm talking about – this is the subject - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

45

MR KEARY: This is the site that we're discussing now. It's this site here.

MR SIMICIC: That is on the strategy later on in five, six years' time.

MR WILSON: We were told it was developed.

5 MR SIMICIC: No, no.

MR WILSON: No?

MS TREGLOWN: No.

10

MR SIMICIC: Development was on the other side of the town.

MR HANN: Sorry. I'm referring to the Kiama Urban Strategy just for - - -

15 MR N. FREDERICKS: Number 26 has been developed.

MR HANN: This is 27A - - -

MS TREGLOWN: 27A

20

MR HANN: - - - which is in the strategy document.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. It's in the strategy - - -

25 MR HANN: Which is south-west, if you like, of - - -

MS TREGLOWN: Carney and – the Carney and Wilson site.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

30

MR HANN: So is that underway? Is that approved and currently being developed or not?

MR N. FREDERICKS: Not to my knowledge.

35

MR WILSON: No.

MR N. FREDERICKS: I don't even know – do they have a planning proposal?

40 MR WILSON: No.

MR HANN: Okay. Just - - -

45 MR N. FREDERICKS: This one down the other end of town, you know, this area, number 26 - - -

MR HANN: We're looking at the same plan, aren't we?

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. Yes, Lawson?

5 MR: Yes.

MS TREGLOWN: No doubt we would have heard about that.

10 MR N. FREDERICKS: Number 26 has been developed.

MR: Is that the 13 lots?

MR WILSON: And that was the last bit of stage 1?

15 MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. This was the one that's developed on the western side of town.

MS TREGLOWN: Is that Chapel Hill, the brown - - -

20 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR N. FREDERICKS: This is here.

25 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS TREGLOWN: This one - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: The one you were just referring to now is up on the hill.

30 MR WILSON: That has not been - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: Not to my knowledge.

35 MR WILSON: Right.

MR SIMICIC: I don't think so. That come 2020.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Okay.

40 MR SIMICIC: In

MR WILSON: All right. Thank you very much for that.

45 MR N. FREDERICKS: It runs up into very steep country.

MR SIMICIC: Yes.

MR WILSON: Thank you. Thanks for clarifying that, yes.

MR N. FREDERICKS: The 13 lots - - -

5 MS TREGLOWN: One would've thought we would've heard about it, with all - - -

MR N. FREDERICKS: - - - was up here.

10 MS TREGLOWN: - - - the community, if there was - - -

MR WILSON: Well, that's why I asked, because - - -

MS TREGLOWN: If there was an active - - -

15 MR WILSON: - - - you know the – you know the area intimately, and so I thought we would just clarify that, so thank you.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Mr Chairman, Lawson, would you have anything to contribute at this point in time?
20

MR L. FREDERICKS: No, I think everything's been covered, yes, I think.

MR HANN: Just ask one question about the subdivision. Elaine, you mentioned there was a concept subdivision design, but it's still single-lot detached dwelling subdivision? That's the intention? There's no other - - -
25

MS TREGLOWN: That's the intention.

MR HANN: - - - dwelling types proposed?
30

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes, the DCP doesn't really give you that option, but you can have duplexes on the 800-metre lots. The community seem to be very strongly of the view that we're going to preserve the character if we have 800-metre lots. Now, there are contrary views to that. I mean, that's big-block sprawl in some
35 people's mind, and when you have those larger blocks, you know that you're going to get larger houses on them, because that segment of the market who wants a big block will build a bigger house, so we have to work harder on getting a South Coast vernacular, rural vernacular, into the architecture. You know, if you look at Tallenbar, we've already done that successfully. We know how to do that, and so
40 we've got a set of controls that's only about two or three pages long that actually deliver that very effectively.

Can I – I might mention, and this is just an insight, some years ago I read a book by Thomas Sharp. You know, he was the principal of the urban design school at Oxford
45 Brooks at Oxford, and he, in 1940, he did a comprehensive analysis of towns and villages, and villages in particular, in Britain and what made them so attractive, and the summary that comes out of that is the essence of a village lies in its uncertainty.

What conventional regulations do is deliver certainty, and that's always a challenge. That's always a challenge, in the modern world, is to create something that people love, and the setbacks in a village are like this. There's a depth of field all the way down. You don't know what you're going to find around the corner, and that's what makes them attractive, and yet the regulatory framework requires you to do this, this, this and this, and so we get the ordinarily.

MR HANN: You get the same – you get the same everywhere, and that's really – we see that in the development industry. There's a lot of pushback from society or a community in general about doing the same thing everywhere, and it is a challenge for the industry, and for the community, I guess. They want some certainty in control over development, but they also actually really love the little villages that have that uncertainty, so it's a real tension between those two things.

MR N. FREDERICKS: So we have advised Branko and Tiana that we have a recommended schedule of controls that will give it a stronger South Coast vernacular.

MR WILSON: Okay. Look, I think we – do we have any further questions?

MR KEARY: I don't, no. Thanks, Chris.

MR WILSON: All right, so unless you've got something to close with or add to what we've discussed today, I think we're done.

MS TREGLOWN: That's it.

MR WILSON: That's it?

MS TREGLOWN: Thank you very much. Your time is appreciated.

MR WILSON: Okay, well, thank you very much for coming.

MR KEARY: Thank you.

MR WILSON: We appreciate it.

MR N. FREDERICKS: Yes. Thanks.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.40 pm]