



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-1057479

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING,
INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT**

RE: MUNDAMIA RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION

PANEL: **ROSS CARTER
CHRIS WILSON**

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID WAY
CALLUM FIRTH**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, INDUSTRY
AND ENVIRONMENT:** **ANTHEA SARGEANT
ANTHONY WITHERDON**

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

DATE: **10.02 AM, TUESDAY, 6 AUGUST 2019**

MR R. CARTER: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting.
5 Allen Price and Scarratts, the applicant, on behalf of Jemalong Mundamia, is seeking to develop the Mundamia residential subdivision in the Shoalhaven Council area. My name is Ross Carter. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner Chris Wilson, as well as David Way and Callum Firth from the commission secretariat.

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 decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of
15 this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate.

20 If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

25 So we'll now begin. So thanks, Anthony and Anthea. And, um, we've just got a pretty basic agenda here that sort of just hopefully provides enough, ah, dot-point sort of prompts for you to work through the department's perspective on the application and the, um, assessment report.

30 MR A. WITHERDON: Okay. Great. Um, I'll start with a bit of a brief background on the site and the proposal, and then we'll move onto some of the key issues listed down on the agenda. Does that sound okay?

35 MR CARTER: Yeah. Yeah. Can you just do your name and title, Anthony - - -

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR CARTER: - - - for the transcript, so - - -

40 MR WITHERDON: For sure. So my name's Anthony Witherdon. I'm the director of regional assessments.

MR CARTER: Great. Thank you.

45 MR WITHERDON: So in terms of a brief background on this proposal, the site, ah, sits about two and a half kilometres west of Nowra. Currently, it contains one

dwelling, and it's, um, mainly cleared lands, and it's been historically used for grazing purposes. The surrounding, ah, area is, um, bushfire-prone vegetation, and the site is accessed via George Evans Road, which runs, um, towards the south of the site. In terms of the surrounding land uses, ah, Wollongong University has a campus
5 that sits directly to the south. To the west, ah, there's, ah, Flat Rock Dam and Flat Rock Creek that drains towards, um, the Shoalhaven River, and to the north of the site is the Thompson Point Reserve and Shoalhaven River. Directly to the west is the, um – the rest of the Mundamia URA, and if you have a look on figure 2 of the department's assessment report, on page 11, you can see the rest of the URA outlined
10 in orange.

MR CARTER: Mmhmm.

MR WITHERDON: Now, planning for the Mundamia URA commenced back in
15 2006. It started with the Nowra-Bomaderry Structure Plan, ah, which identified the site as a future living area. A master plan was then created for the redevelopment of the site, and then, following the adoption of those two documents, the site was eventually rezoned general residential, and part of the western part of the site was zoned environmental conservation. The site's also been identified in the Illawarra-
20 Shoalhaven Regional Plan as a regionally significant release area, um, which is suitable for greenfield housing. So quite a bit of strategic work has been done for the site. So, in summary, it's zoned, it's service-ready, and it's located quite close to Nowra.

25 MR C. WILSON: Anthony, just - - -

MR WITHERDON: Yep?

MR WILSON: Sorry to interrupt. Just on that, there was a SSD to the –
30 immediately to the west of this site - - -

MR WITHERDON: That's right.

MR WILSON: - - - which was withdrawn.
35

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR WILSON: Was it withdrawn for ecological reasons or – because that hasn't
40 been rezoned, that site, has it?

MR WITHERDON: Ah, it has been rezoned. Um, I'm not sure about why that application was rezoned. It was – ah, sorry.

MR WILSON: Withdrawn.
45

MS A. SARGEANT: Are you talking about this one?

MR WITHERDON: Withdrawn. Yep.

MS SARGEANT: Was it a - - -

5 MR WILSON: But that's – that's east.

MS SARGEANT: Was it an SSD, though?

MR WITHERDON: It was.

10

MS SARGEANT: It was.

MR WITHERDON: It was.

15 MS SARGEANT: Okay.

MR WITHERDON: Yep. Um, but I could look into that for you, though, Chris.

MR WILSON: Thanks.

20

MR WITHERDON: In terms of the proposal itself, ah, the proposal's best illustrated, um, in figure 6, on page 17 of the Department's assessment report. Essentially, the proposal seeks approval for a 308-lot residential subdivision; it contains one commercial lot. It has got reserves for open space and drainage, and it includes the construction of internal roads and the supporting infrastructure to support the development. The Department notified the proposal for 30 days and the Department only received one public submission. Council and agencies made submissions on the proposal. None of the agencies and council objected to the proposal, but they raised a number of issues the Department's assessed in its report. So I'll move on to the key assessment issues.

25

30

MS SARGEANT: Can I maybe just add a couple of things?

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

35

MS SARGEANT: My name's Anthea Sargeant. I'm the executive director for compliance, key sites and industry, a Department of Planning Environ – sorry, Plan – Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. It's a bit of a mouthful. I just wanted to – to make one point about the application, because it was originally exhibited back in 2013, which is some time ago. Um, and – and Anthony's going to talk to, um, the various different issues, but there were a number of issues that we did need to work through with the applicant, um, and it did require some additional technical assessment work to be undertaken, um, to justify, um, ah, some of the impacts. So I just wanted to – to flag that it is an applicant that's been hanging around in the system for a very long time, um, but there's some – some strong reasons as to why, um – to why that is the case. Sorry for interrupting.

40

45

MR WITHERDON: That's all right. So the first key issue I'll talk about is – is the subdivision design itself. Um, the Department, ah, undertook a – a detailed assessment of the proposal against, um, the council's development control plan for the subdivision area. Um, and we identified, ah, a few minor non-compliances with the DCP. The DCP sets minimum density targets and the proposal, ah, falls short on some of those density targets.

Um, it requires, for example, five per cent of the lots to be dual-occupancy lots, um, which amounts to 15 lots for the proposal; it only provides 12 lots, so it's a minor non-compliance – compliance. But the Department knows that there's four other lots that can be used or – um, for dual-occupancy development, because they meet the council's minimum requirement. So the Department were satisfied that, um – that minor non-compliance would be acceptable.

Ah, the proposal also, um, as a minor non-compliance with the overall, um, dwelling rate for detached houses, ah, it proposes 10.35 dwellings per hectare but requires 12 dwellings per hectare. To offset that shortfall, the proponents increased the amount of medium-density lots that it's going to provide. So the total, um, ah, dwelling density would equal 11.5, which is very close to council's requirement of 12, ah, so the Department considered that short – minor shortfall to be acceptable as well. Um, some concern was raised about, ah, properties gaining access from road 1.

MR WILSON: Instead of from the rear of the properties?

MR WITHERDON: Instead of the rear of the properties. So the Department, as, um – conditioned a requirement that all access be provided from the laneway to some of those really – the higher-density lots.

MR WILSON: Is that a traffic conflict issue? Like, because it's a higher vehicle use, it - - -

MR WITHERDON: It is. And – for pedestrian safety, just to minimise the number of crossovers that would, um, interrupt the pedestrian footpath.

MR WILSON: Okay. Yep. All right.

MR WITHERDON: Um, there's also a minor variation to the, ah, bus route that was identified in the council's DCP. The proponents varied the bus route slightly, but the department considers it would be acceptable because it's a logical loop that follows the main spine road, and, importantly, all houses would be within a – an acceptable walking distance of the bus stops that will be provided within the subdivision area.

Council also initially raised some concerns about the open space not being in accordance with its DCP, but the department notes the council has recently undertaken, ah, review of the open space requirements within its LGA, and it's revised its open space requirements down from what's required under the DCP.

The proposal meets the requirements of the council's revised open space strategy and the open space that they're providing is, um, usable and it's within walking distance of – of all the residents within the site. So the department was comfortable with the open space that's being provided. In terms of bushfire impacts, bushfire impacts was
5 a key issue for the redevelopment of the site, because it's surrounded – within a – a bushland setting.

And the department raised some initial concerns around, um, the proposal because it relies on one access into and out of the subdivision site. And the department was
10 concerned because, ah, that road could potentially be cut in case of a – a fire, and it didn't strictly comply with the requirements of the Planning for Bush Fire Protection, which requires an alternative access to be provided.

Um, so the department consulted with the RFS. The RFS were comfortable with the proposal, um, because of the conditions that it was, um, suggesting, ah, and because
15 the site is – was of a sufficient size that it would manage the bush fire pro – the bushfire impacts associated with the proposal. Ah, RFS also, um, acknowledged that there was an east-west road further to the south to the site that could potentially provide an alternative access. And RFS also suggested that if the department was
20 still concerned with some of those access, ah, issues that we could undertake a – a strategic ass – traffic assessment of the proposal to see if there was any road upgrade works that would improve access and egress into and out of the site.

Um, so the department engaged a traffic expert to – to do that – to do that work. And
25 the review found that, um, relying on the existing roads, the site could be evacuated, ah, within 30 minutes, ah, during the daytime, or 15 minutes at night-time. And that's just for the subdivision area itself?

MR WILSON: Why's it quicker at night-time?
30

MR WITHERDON: Less background traffic, is my understanding.

MR WILSON: There'd be more people at home.

MR CARTER: Yeah, but they're getting on to roads that are less busy, so I suppose
35 the back-up in the model.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR WITHERDON: The review also looked at, um, the development of a full URA,
40 and the, ah, evacuation times would increase, um, with the full development of the URA, to 30 minutes, ah, at night-time and 60 minutes during the daytime. Um, and the review also suggested, um, some road upgrades that could be, um, provided to improve, ah, evacuation timeframes. We referred that information back to the RFS,
45 um, and they provided some comments on that. But because, ah, evacuation time's a bit of an emerging field and there's no accepted standards for evacuation timeframes,

um, it's hard to provide any kind of, um, strict answer as to whether or not those evacuation timeframes would be acceptable.

5 So the department continued to raise some concerns about that, um, particularly because the east-west link road to the south wouldn't be delivered for some time. And, ah, there was no strict conditions covering that access issue. So the department engaged a bushfire expert. The bushfire expert, ah, raised concern about the risk that would be associated with, um, the development relying on one single road into and out of the site – how that could be overrun by fire. To address those concerns, um,
10 the proponent has put forward a Neighbourhood Safer Place, and that would act as a bushfire shelter in times of a bushfire emergency. And the department referred that back to the RFS.

15 Um, the RFS, ah, support the provision of a Neighbourhood Safer Place as an additional bushfire protection measure. And council would accept, ah, the future ownership, management and operation of the Neighbourhood Safer Place. And ultimately the department considered that the Neighbourhood Safer Place would, ah, mitigate bushfire impacts associated with not providing an alternative, um, access to the subdivision. The department considers that, um, er, the provision of a
20 Neighbourhood Safer Place is more feasible than providing an alternative access, mainly because, ah, any alternative access from this site would also have to pass through bushfire-prone land. So the – in a – a major bushfire event there's also – there's a risk there that both accesses would be, um, cut during a fire.

25 Also, the site is really quite heavily constrained. So, um, it would be difficult to provide an alternative access to the east, because there's a creek that, um, would make it difficult to provide, ah, an access. To the north is the Shoalhaven River, um, and to the west would be the main bushfire front. So, ah, an NSP seems like the most reasonable alternative. Um, the NSP would also be constructed in accordance
30 with RFS requirements. It would provide, ah, future residents with two evacuation options. They could leave early, towards, ah, West Nowra. And if it wasn't safe to do so, they could shelter within the Neighbourhood Safer Place.

35 And then the department's also recommended a suite of, um, management plans, um, evacuation management plans, um, bushfire, um, mitigation strategies and, um, a number of other, ah, bushfire-related conditions to – to manage those impacts. And we've – we've conditioned those as deferred commencement conditions, so that we could be satisfied that all these details have been, um, sufficiently met prior to, um, making the, ah, consent operative.

40
45 MR CARTER: So, Anthony, just – um, because, obviously, bushfire on the site came out from – from the assessment report as being of major concern, um, and – and the logic does flow quite well in the – in the report, um, the expert that the department engaged, ah, gave a very, ah, like, strong assessment of the risks on the sites and the proponent's consultant provided a fairly reasonable rationale of mitigation against that.

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR CARTER: And that sort of does come through well from the report and then the suite of conditions, as you've mentioned. Um, I couldn't find anything, though,
5 from the RFS, where they'd, sort of, provided, um, input on – on their assessment of that. And, obviously, that's a piece that we're very interested in. We'll – um, you know, the RFS, you've quoted a number of times as saying they're quite comfortable with it, but, um, ah – so have you got any, sort of, definitive advice from the RFS that – saying, “Yes. We're happy with this suite of mitigations on the site”?
10

MR WITHERDON: Ah, yes. So, um, with or without the, um, Neighbourhood Safer Place, RFS have always been comfortable with the proposal. Um - - -

MS SARGEANT: And they issued that – I can't remember the exact name of it, but
15 there's some sort of certificate that they've issued.

MR WITHERDON: Ah, yes. Um, I've forgotten it also.

MS SARGEANT: Yeah. There's some sort of, um, certificate that the RFS issues,
20 um, to say that they're – they're comfortable and – and they're happy for the development to proceed. I'll find the exact name of it. But they've issued that certificate.

MR CARTER: Okay.
25

MR WITHERDON: Um, but we did go back to the, ah, RFS, just to confirm what – ah, and see what their view was on – with, um, increasing the bushfire safety protection measures on the site. And, um, basically, they've provided me with email correspondence confirming that they were satisfied with the NSP as an additional
30 bushfire protection measure.

MR CARTER: Okay. I'm - - -

MR WITHERDON: So I can share that with the, um, IPC, if you'd like.
35

MR CARTER: Yeah. That would be – be really good - - -

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR CARTER: - - - if you're comfortable to do that. I mean, obviously, we need to put that up on our website.

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

45 MR CARTER: So, um, if – if you do provide that through.

MR WILSON: Just – just on that, um, safer place, Anthony, how does it actually function? I mean – so how – how do people know whether to take the road or go to the shelter?

5 MR WITHERDON: Ah, look, it's – it's a – a good question. Um, there'll be a number of, ah, bushfire management plans and also, um, it's my understanding that RFS, um, ah, encourages each individual within a bushfire-prone area to develop their own plans as well, as to what they should do. Um, but the plans that we've conditioned, um, will spell a lot of those issues out. And, um, you'll see that we've, ah, recommended conditions which require, ah, a lot of further details about the design, the location, the operation and the capacity of the Neighbourhood Safer Place. Um, we've required them to demonstrate how it complies with RFSs requirements, also, um, conditioned, um, ah, the appraisal so that the applicant needs to demonstrate how everyone would gain access to the NSP in a safe manner. Um, there's a bushfire evacuation management plan and other operational plans - - -

MR WILSON: So I - - -

MR WITHERDON: - - - that will - - -

MR WILSON: I presume we're coming to - - -

MR WITHERDON: That will cover that.

25 MR WILSON: - - - communication in terms of how – what – how do people know what to do.

MR WITHERDON: Yep. And there's an ongoing piece, I think, with that - - -

30 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WITHERDON: - - - that council would have to manage as the future operator of that. Um, so I think there'll be an ongoing requirement for that.

35 MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR WITHERDON: The other bushfire issue was around the, um, suitability of the proposed APZs. Um, RFS and our bushfire consultant raised some concerns about the proposed APZs. The proponent, um, sought to utilise a performance-based approach to determine the width of the APZs, but RFS raised some concerns about the slope analysis that was used to calculate those.

MR WILSON: Yep.

45 MR WITHERDON: So we've taken a precautionary approach, in terms of the APZs that we're recommending. And our bushfire consultant recommended using the, um, APZs specified out of the bushfire protection, ah – Planning for Bushfire Protection

guideline. And, importantly, um, we've also recommended that a temporary, ah, 100-metre wide APZ be provided along the western boundary of the site. And that western boundary would be the, ah, main fire path that would potentially impact on this development. So providing a 100-metre temporary APZ - - -

5

MR WILSON: So it - - -

MR WITHERDON: - - - would improve the bushfire safety of the relevant - - -

10 MR WILSON: Is that additional – additional to the road that now - - -

MR WITHERDON: So it'll be a – a 100-metre temporary APZ on the eastern side of the main road.

15 MR WILSON: Right.

MR WITHERDON: Going along the western boundary of the site. And once the, um, develop further to the west - - -

20 MR WILSON: Sorry, say that again? On the eastern side of the road, on the western boundary? I've got it.

MR WITHERDON: Along the western boundary.

25 MR WILSON: Yep. Yep. Yep.

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR WILSON: Which is not really indicated in the plans, as such, in the - - -

30

MR WITHERDON: No.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MR WITHERDON: So we've conditioned that that be required. So they'll have to come back with further details showing - - -

MR WILSON: And push the lights back or something, in terms of getting that in? Or - - -

40

MR WITHERDON: Ah, so the lots, um, on that boundary would basically, um – the western boundary be cleared, to create that 100-metre wide APZ. And those lots wouldn't be developed until the land on the adjoining council-owned site - - -

45 MR WILSON: Ah, AP - - -

MR WITHERDON: - - - is developed.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WITHERDON: Once that's developed, those lots - - -

5 MR WILSON: The APZ changes. The requirement changes.

MS SARGEANT: Yeah.

MR WILSON: Yep.

10

MR WITHERDON: The risk goes away.

MR WILSON: Yep. Okay.

15 MR WITHERDON: So that was a – an added measure, to ensure, um, bushfire safety, you know, is optimised for the site.

MR WILSON: When is that due to be developed? Do you know?

20 MR WITHERDON: I don't know.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WITHERDON: Have to ask council.

25

MR WILSON: Okay. Will do.

MR WITHERDON: One of the other key issues for the proposal was groundwater. Um, and in - - -

30

MR CARTER: So – sorry.

MR WITHERDON: Sorry.

35 MR CARTER: Just to, sort of, finish off on the bushfire one.

MR WITHERDON: Yep.

40 MR CARTER: So it's really this combination of quite a range of measures that – that ended up satisfying the Department that the risk had been adequately mitigated? So it sort of went to – went to the range of management plans, the APZ issue, the NSP, and that – that was, sort of, where, on balance, you felt that the – what was quite a, if you like, definitive concern raised by your consultant initially had sufficiently – if you tracked all of those risks through, had mitigated all of them to an
45 acceptable level?

MS SARGEANT: Yep. And we've also relied on the advice from the RFS as well.

MR CARTER: And the RFS.

MS SARGEANT: Yeah.

5 MR CARTER: Yep. Okay. Cool. Thank you. Yeah. So groundwater?

MR WITHERDON: Groundwater.

MR CARTER: Yeah.

10

MR WITHERDON: Groundwater was the, ah, next key issue. Um, in terms of groundwater impacts there are – are two, um, groundwater-dependent ecosystems that could potentially be impacted by the development, and that was the – the Nowra heath myrtle vegetation, the spring tiny greenhood orchid habitat. Um, and the
15 impacts, ah, to those groundwater-dependent ecosystems are indirect, so, ah, once you develop the site it could change the characteristics of the groundwater flow and movement, um, which could then a flow-on effect potentially impact on those – those, um, groundwater-dependent ecosystems.

20

Ah, to assess the proposal the proponent put forward a, um – a groundwater – a hydrological assessment, and they proposed a – um, a recharge system. And basically a recharge system would collect, um, surface water and then, um, feed water back into the groundwater table to sustain those, ah, groundwater-dependent ecosystems. Ah, some concerns were raised about the modelling that was
25 undertaken, um, ah, to assess those potential impacts, um, in that it might not be representative of the soil profile and the – the groundwater characteristics of the site. Um, so the department asked the proponent to go away and address those concerns.

30

Ah, the proponent amended the proposal, um, and that partially addressed some of the concerns that were raised. But the – the modelling, um, ah, still needs further work, um, before the department would be, ah, entirely satisfied with the – the proposed recharge system that needs to be designed. So we've recommended conditions, um, basically requiring further modelling to be undertaken. Once that modelling's undertaken, um, we'll be able to gauge a better, ah, level of detail on
35 how the, um, recharge system needs to be designed to feed back that green – groundwater to the groundwater-dependent ecosystems.

40

Um, and then we've also recommended a monitoring, um, requirement to make sure the system works, and a contingency strategy, just as a – as – in case there's, ah – the
40 – the system failed. But the department overall is satisfied that a system can be designed to provide, ah, suitable groundwater for those groundwater-dependent ecosystems.

45

MR CARTER: So it's the sort of fine-tuning, is my reading - - -

MR WITHERDON: Fine-tuning.

MR CARTER: - - - of it, that you could get too much or too little.

MR WITHERDON: Yep. Yep.

5 MR CARTER: Um, and – and, ah, so (1) trying to get a more optimised design, but then (2) you’re – you’re really not going to know until you get a few, um, weather cycles through the site - - -

10 MR WITHERDON: That’s right, yep. Yep.

MR CARTER: - - - and then monitoring the vegetation and seeing how it’s responding.

15 MR WITHERDON: Exactly.

MR CARTER: Yeah.

MR WITHERDON: Yep. Yep.

20 MR CARTER: Did you have anything on that?

MR WILSON: No, that was my question - - -

25 MR CARTER: Just – yeah.

MR WILSON: - - - whether or not – in terms of the – the monitoring – the monitoring and the additional model – modelling is just to refine the system, but you’re satisfied that a system is achievable, or a process is there at least achievable to ensure the groundwater-dependent ecosystems will be protected.

30 MR WITHERDON: That’s right. Yep.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MR CARTER: And does that – that – you know, I guess the – the sort of usual path of residential subdivision is once – once it’s totally completed the – the – you know, the – the proponent moves on and it’s, really, council that ends up managing any residual issues into the future. So you’ve sort of tried to get that condition in the monitoring so that that all gets kind of tied up at a point in time that can then sort of
40 move into a more sustainable - - -

MR WITHERDON: That’s right, yep.

45 MR CARTER: Yeah.

MR WITHERDON: Yep. And it is quite a – a complicated technical issue.

MR CARTER: Yep.

MR WITHERDON: Um, and it's that fine-tuning of the – the modelling and the – the ultimate system that's provided. Um, that just needs to be finalised.

5

MR WILSON: There - - -

MR CARTER: Okay.

10 MR WILSON: On that note, Anthony, there is a number of things in here which are in perpetuity, and I presume the responsibility for those matters will move away from the applicant towards council?

MR WITHERDON: That's right.

15

MR WILSON: Because the applicant will move on and council will be left. So that – is that in the VPA, or further conditions, or both?

20 MR WITHERDON: Ah, it's – it's through the conditions, but we'll have to consult with council as a part of determining the ultimate recharge system that's provided, um, just to make sure that the ongoing costs and, um, management, ah, obligations, ah, are reasonable. Yep. So we'll consult with council, um, in terms of that, because they will ultimately take on the responsibility.

25 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WITHERDON: Ah, the other key issue was biodiversity. Um, to establish the proposal, um, it requires, ah, just over 10 hectares of vegetation to be removed. Some concerns were raised about, ah, the level of assessment that was undertaken,
30 um, to determine the impacts. And in response the – the applicant provided a revised biodiversity assessment and they also provided a biodiversity offset strategy. The department consulted with OEH and council about the revised biodiversity offset strategy. And ultimately, the department's satisfied that the proposal will be acceptable because the site's always been strategically identified as an important
35 greenfield release area.

Um, and all the potential impacts associated with clearing that land would be offset in accordance with OEHs requirements. And as mentioned earlier about the indirect impacts on the groundwater-dependent ecosystems, we've got those monitoring, um,
40 requirements and the on – the – and some contingency measures to ensure that, ah, the groundwater-dependent ecosystems would, um, also be managed. So the department was satisfied that the biodiversity offset strategy addresses the – those potential impacts. In terms of traffic, um, council raised some initial concerns about traffic impacts and the road upgrades required to support the development. Um, it
45 also raised some concerns about the – the modelling and the cumulative impacts associated with the development of the whole URA.

Um, but subsequently council prepared and endorsed a contributions plan, which specified what road upgrade works would be required to support the development. And the department has imposed conditions requiring, ah, contributions to be paid, ah, so that those road upgrade works are undertaken in the future. And the
5 department's satisfied that those contributions and the road upgrade works that are required would appropriately manage all the traffic impacts external to the site. The department – ah, council, um, did have a residual concern about traffic safety, ah, and just the traffic environment within the subdivision itself.

10 Um, and there was, ah, some disagreement on the modelling and the background traffic associated with the proposal. Um, and the department engaged a – the traffic expert to – to review this particular aspect of the proposal. And the review found that two additional, ah, roundabouts would be required above and beyond council's, ah, contributions, ah – above and beyond what's required in council's, um,
15 contributions plan, and that's ultimately to ensure that, um, traffic safety is – is maximised, um, and vehicle conflict and pedestrian, um, safety is – is optimised for that site, ah, and we've also required a – a raised threshold on the very far northern section of the site, just to – to manage vehicle speeds when they go further towards the north, towards, um, Thompson Point Reserve, ah, and that's really it for the key
20 issues on the proposal.

MR WILSON: Just on those two additional intersections, so they've been incorporated into the contributions plan, or they've just been – how are they being funded?
25

MR WITHERDON: Ah, so they will be funded through a VPA.

MR WILSON: Right.

30 MR WITHERDON: And so - - -

MR WILSON: Separate to the contributions.

MR WITHERDON: Separate to the contributions plan.
35

MR WILSON: Okay. Yep.

MR WITHERDON: Those roundabouts aren't required to manage traffic volumes, but it's really to optimise traffic safety.
40

MR WILSON: Design. Yeah. Okay.

MR WITHERDON: So they were the key issues associated with the proposal. Um, there are a few other issues I'm happy to go through, if you like.
45

MR CARTER: Yep. That would be good.

MR WITHERDON: Um, in terms of the geotechnical, ah, considerations for this site, ah, one of the key issues was making sure that all the infrastructure and future construction of houses minimise impacts on groundwater, ah, flows. So the department's recommended some conditions to ensure that, um, people are made
5 aware, through a section 88B instrument, that, um, you know, future designs have got to minimise impacts on groundwater flows, and there's specific requirements of how that's done technically. In terms of contamination, um, some contamination was found in a part of the site, um, and the proponents prepared a remediation, um, ah, action plan, and, um, the department's recommended some conditions that the
10 remediation be, ah, undertaken in accordance with that plan and that it's validated by an – a site auditor to make sure that the – it's remediated for residential use.

Ah, there's some acid sulphate soils within the site, so the department's recommended an acid sulphate, ah, management plan be prepared to ensure that any
15 potential impacts are managed. I think the risk is low, but there's a slight risk there. Um, the department's also recommended some conditions to manage Aboriginal cultural heritage. Um, we're requiring an Aboriginal cultural heritage management plan be provided, and a standard, um, stop-work, um, condition, um, is also imposed just in case there's any unexpected finds that are discovered.

20

MR CARTER: There hasn't been to date, though, has there, in any of the - - -

MR WITHERDON: No.

25 MS SARGEANT: No.

MR WITHERDON: So there was a study done, um, and it didn't find any, ah, Aboriginal heritage items on the site. There was some concern that, um, it was outdated, but, um, ah, the findings, um, were valid, um, but that's why we've put on
30 those conditions requiring the management plan and the stop-work requirements. Um, we've imposed development contributions in accordance with council's plan. Um, in terms of noise impacts, ah, there's a – the HMAS Albatross, ah, facility, um, within the vicinity of the site, and that gives rise to some aircraft noise.

35 So the department's recommended a condition, ah, requiring, um, some additional acoustic measures be implemented on future dwellings just to manage that – that noise impact. We've recommended a – a suite of management plans to manage construction impacts associated with the proposal, and, again, picking up on that aviation issue, um, we've recommended some landscaping plans, ah, be provided,
40 um, and that lighting comply with the relevant standard for lightning near aerodromes, just to manage off those – those other issues. So that – that finalises our key assessment issues. Happy to answer any questions that you – you may have.

MR WILSON: Just – just in terms of other approvals, Anthony, um, I don't have,
45 ah – so I understand you'll come back to us with the certificate - - -

MS SARGEANT: Mmhmm.

MR WILSON: - - - that was issued by – is – is that it, in terms of, um, Rural Fire Service in terms of approvals? There's no – it's not integrated. It's not - - -

5 MR WITHERDON: Normally, it would be - - -

MR WILSON: It's not required to be consistent with - - -

10 MR WITHERDON: Yeah. Normally, it would be integrated, but, um, because it's an old part 3A, um, and that was transitioned to SSD, those, um, integrated provisions don't apply, but still, um, we – we, um, consult with RFS, and - - -

MR WILSON: Sure. Okay.

15 MR WITHERDON: And we've included all their conditions within - - -

MR WILSON: But there's no - - -

MR WITHERDON: - - - our recommended consent.

20 MR WILSON: There's no physical – physical issue of a grant or permission or consent or – okay.

MR WITHERDON: No.

25 MR WILSON: All right.

MR CARTER: No. So it would be really helpful if you can send us that kind of exchange and the certificate so - - -

30 MS SARGEANT: Yep.

MR CARTER: Because that'll complete the picture from – um, as I say, the – the AR does set out the logic of the department's assessment and the input to it - - -

35 MS SARGEANT: Mmhmm.

MR CARTER: - - - but the bit that we just can't – haven't been able to sort of see is, well, what the RFS specifically say.

40 MR WITHERDON: Yep.

MR CARTER: So it'd be good to – good to get a copy of that stuff.

45 MR WITHERDON: No problem.

MR CARTER: Did you have any - - -

MR WILSON: Ah, I don't think I've got any more. I guess if we do have more, we can go to the department.

5 MR CARTER: Yeah. We're – we're going down to, um, um, meet with council and inspect the site next week.

MR WITHERDON: Okay.

10 MR CARTER: So we might have some follow-up questions following that.

MR WILSON: No, that's all from me. Thanks.

MR CARTER: That's all from me. So thanks very much, ah - - -

15 MS SARGEANT: Great. Thank you.

MR WITHERDON: Thank you.

20 MR CARTER: - - - Anthea and Anthony.

MR WITHERDON: Thank you.

MR CARTER: We'll close it there. Thanks.

25

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.41 am]