



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-1095791

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

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

RE: QANTAS FLIGHT TRAINING CENTRE

CHAIR: JOHN HANN

ASSISTING PANEL: CASEY JOSHUA
MATTHEW ROSEL

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING,
INDUSTRY AND
ENVIRONMENT:** CHRIS RITCHIE
JOANNA BAKOPANOS
PAMELA MORALES
WILLIAM HODGKINSON

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

DATE: 9.32 AM, TUESDAY, 19 NOVEMBER 2019

MR HANN: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet. And I would also like to pay my respects to their Elders past and present and to the Elders from other communities that may be here today. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal seeking approval for the proposed Qantas Flight Training Centre, application number SSD 10154. My name's John Hann, I am the Chair of this IPC panel and joining me is Casey Joshua, who you've met, and also Matthew Rosel, who is a consultant to the Secretariat. So Casey and Matthew represent the 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's taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It's important for the Commission to ask questions of the attendees to clarify issues when we consider appropriate.

20 If you are asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, if you could just provide the response to that in writing to us, subsequently – seven days would be appreciated. So that, of course, will go up on our website as well. Just so we're clear on that. And, look, could you introduce yourselves when you speak, for the transcript. It just makes it easier and it's difficult if you speak over the top of each other. So on the basis of that, were you ready to go Casey?

25 MS C. JOSHUA: Yes. There's a couple of issues with the presentation but, I think - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

30 MS JOSHUA: - - - you can still see it like that?

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR HANN: All right.

35

MS JOSHUA: I can't

MR HANN: Okay. From our point of view, the best approach is to take us through your assessment report. And particularly, just pull out the key matters you think we should be particularly aware of. And then we will just go from there in terms of any queries we have got.

MR C. RITCHIE: So just to introduce ourselves, so I am Chris Ritchie from the Department of Planning. And I am the Director of Industry Assessments and we want to thank the Commission for the time and the opportunity to present a report. With me today is William Hodgkinson, who is a senior planner within the team. And

45

Also Pamela Morales who is acting principal. And both William and Pam primarily worked on the assessment together.

MR HANN: Okay.

5

MR RITCHIE: Given the urgency and need to facilitate a quick assessment, which we will touch on in a second. Also today, with us today is Joanna Bakopanos who is the team leader of the team that looked after the project. So - - -

10 MR HANN: All right.

MR RITCHIE: - - - we thought it best that all the planners come along. And if there's any particular questions then we can refer to the planners to sort of delve into a bit more detail on some of the matters that are raised. We thought we would run
15 through, presentation wise, the project, just to remind ourselves of what the project is about. And we have touched on a couple of the key issues plus the images to show you, as well. Just to present the key issues that we have found in our assessment and how we have gone about our recommendation in our assessment report.

20 MR HANN: All right. Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: So as a start, Qantas at the moment have a training facility for their pilot training and also for cabin crew, already, within their Qantas landholdings, not far from the airport. It's the largest training facility in the southern hemisphere and
25 what's key about that training facility is any aeroplane within the fleet of Qantas has to have a full-motion flight simulator, of which they do. They have about 12. And the regulations under CASA require that throughout the year, we understand it's quarterly, that pilots must maintain their training in order to be able to fly.

30 MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: So any aircraft within Qantas's fleet, there is a full flight simulator that has to be available. There are aeroplanes that might be a little older in the fleet, which they still have a simulator for, up until the latest A380 aircraft as well. One of
35 the challenges for the project was there is a lot of infrastructure work that's happening in the area, and one of the projects proposed is what they call Qantas Drive.

40 MS P. MORALES: Sydney Gateway Project.

MR RITCHIE: Sydney Gateway Project. Which is - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

45 MR RITCHIE: - - - primarily updating Qantas Drive.

MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: They, Qantas, came to us earlier in the year and advised that RMS had informed them that that project was likely to impact on their existing training facility which necessitated the need to find an alternate site. We might just jump to the next image if we can. This is – it's really not working.

5

MR HANN: We're just having some troubles.

MR RITCHIE: Okay. We're just having some troubles.

10 MR HANN: Here we go.

MR RITCHIE: So the Gateway Project was likely to take out part of that building which meant that it had to be relocated. But the other thing, too, is the flight simulators are quite high tech and quite sensitive. So also, the proximity of the road was also going to be an issue, which would explain as to why, in terms of the new site, it's been laid out in a particular fashion. Given the urgency of the project, they will require roughly 23 months to build and relocate to the new site. Qantas approached the Minister to declare the project as SSD. Which you can under the - - -

20 MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - Environmental Planning Assessment Act. And that requires Qantas to justify by answering a number of questions to demonstrate whether it is of regional planning significance. We write a report that we have referred to the IPC. And on the 28th of Feb the then Minister agreed and ordered that the project was declared to be SSD. So the project envisages a new flight-training centre which will relocate the 12 flight simulators from the existing facility to the new one. They will also make room for new and emerging aircraft simulators that they need, including the Dreamliner, I understand is the latest aircraft that's coming online.

30

And that's primarily in the white building you can see there, there's three aspects. The red building is around the emergency training procedures hall which has the, like, an aircraft with a slide coming out of it with a pool acting like the ocean. So there's a lot of cabin crew training that goes along, as well. Procedures on how staff can administer medicines during flights, that sort of thing. The flights in that aspect were in the white building in the middle. So that has to have around three storeys to allow the simulators to have full motion control to actually do the full up and down and around.

40 Then the other aspect to it is that there's the car park which is the image to the left-hand corner. That's a multistorey car park of around 43.8 metres in height. That car park is quite, one of the quite important issues that we saw in the project. Which we will touch on in terms of urban design and traffic. But the site, at the moment, is a site that has about 791 car spaces at the moment. So Qantas have a lot of different car parks throughout the broader, the Qantas campus but also surrounds. They have about five and a half thousand or more spaces, currently, that are around different

45

areas. And due to different leasing issues that are occurring, they're having to consolidate a number of those spots into one location.

5 MR HANN: Is that essentially, sorry to interrupt.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: Just quickly. Is that essentially for employees?

10 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: The 5,000, thereabouts?

15 MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes. So the car park there will house about 2,049 car spaces from memory. And at the moment, that site actually has about 791.

20

MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: Ground level, at the moment.

25 MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: So let's jump to the next slide, if we can. So that's what a flight simulator looks like. You actually access the simulator through that gantry which then removes itself, which allows the actually simulator to be full motion controlled. We have another image, if we could pop to the next one.

30

MR JOSHUA: This narrow.

35 MR HANN: Narrow down.

MR RITCHIE: And just when you look at that image there, you can see the high required to allow the simulator to go up and down and side to side. Ah, so if we just pause that image there, so the bottom image illustrates what that simulator looks like from the inside. And you have your – your pilot on one side. Your co-pilot can be on the other side. Or the trainer or the actual instructor. And what they're able to do is manipulate through technology to, basically, portray an image of any airport location under any weather scenario throughout the world. So it allows the pilot to actually train under more realistic conditions, whether it's rain or smog or hail. Anything.

45

Um, and the actual simulator is exactly like it is like to fly an aeroplane in terms of the sound and the motion. Um, up above on that same image, sorry, is more the, the,

the emergency aircraft training aspect. So you've got a pool there, you've got an aircraft there as well. The current facility has quite an elevated aircraft model which allows you to slide down and run your normal emergency evacuation procedures. So just moving to the next slide. So in terms of the actual project itself, as I mentioned, 5 it is currently used as a car park. There's the three main elements to the project. You've got the car park, multi-storey car park which will be built over two stages, a stage A and a stage B.

10 And then you have your flight training facility as well as your flight simulator facility. You can see on there, Qantas Drive. But also, some of the accesses that will need to be used to access the site. So there won't just be the one access location. There's roughly three sites to get into that part of the Qantas campus. And one of the key issues that we'll talk about in the traffic section is what that traffic generation meant for, particularly, one of the intersections which requires a little bit of work. 15 We exhibited the application during June to early July. We received 16 submissions of which a local commercial business raised an objection, which we will touch on later in our presentation.

20 But the key issues related to traffic, construction noise and urban design. So from our, the Department's point of view, they're the three issues that we did focus on. So that gives a bit of a context to the proposed location and the current location. So you can see Qantas drive in that blue, located between the existing and proposed site, being the yellow and the red. There's also a freight line that runs along the eastern south, southern boundary. Which is the orange dashed line that runs through there. 25 But, primarily, the proposed site is located within quite a commercial slightly industrial district. So there's already, there's hotels, there's businesses. Some of those buildings are up to 50 metres high. So higher than the proposed car park.

30 In terms of the access ways, you can see the three main access locations to the south, the east and slightly to the west – well, to the north, sorry. So we'll just jump to the next one, if we can. In terms of when I mentioned there's a number of existing car parks that exist in the broader area, that figure is, basically, illustrating where they're located. With some of those will be – will be – removed as part of broader lease, leasing arrangements. Roughly 2 and a half thousand, as I mentioned before, will be 35 lost through more broad changes in parking arrangements. Which illustrates the need for them to have a consolidated located car park close to their proposed facilities.

So that probably shows more the access ways, again. I'll just jump to the next one. So one of those key access issues relates to access to what they call Lancasterian 40 Street. At the moment, there is a right-hand turn bay that turns off Qantas Drive into that intersection

MR HANN: This is if you're heading east. Is that right?

45 MR RITCHIE: This is if you're heading north.

MR HANN: North. Is – okay.

MR RITCHIE: North and turning east.

MR HANN: Right.

5 MR RITCHIE: Yep.

MR HANN: Okay. Yep.

10 MR RITCHIE: So again, we'll touch on it in the traffic component. But one of the key changes that we had to manage with RMS and the applicant is the queuing length along that right-hand turn was identified as being, probably, short by about 20 metres.

MR HANN: Yeah.

15

MR RITCHIE: So at the moment, it's about 80 metres.

MR HANN: Yeah.

20 MR RITCHIE: The – the need from traffic modelling with the changes to traffic movements would need about 97 metres. So it was extended to about 100. So RMS were – were satisfied with that proposed mitigation. And one of the key elements, which again, we'll touch on in the traffic part, is that we're not talking about a new traffic generation. It's a redistribution of existing traffic flow. So that's one
25 important point I want to highlight. It's not a new project with new traffic; it's a relocated project with redistributed traffic. So the traffic numbers aren't changing.

MR HANN: There's no net increase in the volumes of traffic - - -

30 MR RITCHIE: No. It's, so - - -

MR HANN: - - - it's a redistribution across the broader Qantas air terminal?

MR RITCHIE: Correct.

35

MR HANN: Domestic. And - - -

MS MORALES: Yes. It's - - -

40 MR HANN: - - - and we're dealing domestic, primarily, in terms of the international part of it is - - -

MR RITCHIE: In terms of the location for parking, you would say, "Yes."

45 MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: I'll just touch on some broader elements here and I will get William who dealt with this issue in our assessment to run through some detail. But the image here is to try and contextualise the proposed building in terms of its existing surrounds. But we saw, particularly, the car park as one of the key issues that we
5 wanted to focus on in terms of our assessment. And it was something that we raised quite early in terms of achieving some good design outcomes for the facility, particularly the car park. Because it is quite – it is quite high. And car parks, generally, can have a lot of design options. And we really pushed to get a really high-level outcome here.

10 MR HANN: Right.

MR RITCHIE: Given its location to a number of nearby businesses. But also given, as I said, its height and its prominence in the location. So maybe I will just hand
15 over to Will and Will can just run through some aspects of our assessment. Particularly, what we see as being a good design outcome.

MR HODGKINSON: Sure. So Chris has touched on the context of the site briefly there. Looking at that image we've got up on the screen, we can see that Travelodge
20 Hotel to the east, ah, that – that building's approximately 50 metres high. And then further north of that, there's the Corporate Connect development which is about 40 metres high. Um, so - - -

MR HANN: What is that?
25

MR HODGKINSON: Where is that?

MR HANN: What – no what is the Corporate Connect?

30 MR HODGKINSON: Oh, that – that's an office building.

MR HANN: It's an office building, is it?

MR HODGKINSON: Yep.
35

MR HANN: Okay.

MR HODGKINSON: Yep. Um, so the car park as proposed is about 43.8 metres high. Um, so acknowledging the prominence of the building, we – we met with the
40 applicant prior to lodgement to discuss a number of different design options. And – and stressed, sort of, that was a key assessment issue. Um, if I can jump over to the next slide, this will show you some of the options that the applicant presented in their options analysis. Um, and – and these we've described as more, sort of, concrete heavy designs. And, and we expressed a preference for a more lightweight design
45 and encouraged the use of landscaping and other softer design elements.

And that's probably reflected in what we've got with this prospective provided of the final design here. Looking at the façade, it's described as a mesh façade. So it's predominantly open. So it allows the airflow through. Looking at the elevation, as well, we can see, um, there is some pattern detailing along here. Um, metal discs in a triangular shape. Um, and it's described as a hit and miss pattern. Um, so when you actually look at the elevation, you will be able to perceive that pattern. And, additionally, there is some landscaping that has been provided. So that is something that was incorporated after lodgement.

10 So there's cantilevered planter boxes that come off three of the elevations, again, just softening the façade. Um, so Council did provide some comments about the design of the car park. And they were satisfied after consultation and after the additional elements of landscaping were included as part of the RTS stage.

15 MR RITCHIE: You should mention we got an architect.

MR HODGKINSON: Yes. The other point is we did consult with the Government Architect New South Wales. Because the site is located within, um, a precinct that's subject to a design excellence clause under the local environmental plan. Um, so we consulted with – with the Government architect early in the process. And they confirmed that the design excellence clause had been satisfied and that the design was what they called that the design excellence clause had been satisfied and that the design was what they called appropriate for the context and location and would have negligible public domain impacts.

25 The other matter, just to touch on, in terms of the urban design that did come up as part of the assessment process was the setback and the general layout of the development. The development control plan does specify a 9-metre setback from King Street. And that's – a 4.5 metre setback has been proposed. Council raised that as a concern and required some further justification around that. And what the applicant explained is that for the flight simulators, vehicular access is actually required around the perimeter of the building for installation and maintenance reasons. And the other key element in terms of the way the development has been designed is that the flight training simulators need to be located away from external noise sources.

30 And to the west, we've got the Qantas Drive and the Future Gateway, the airport. The noise sources are really located to the west. So that was the reason for the development locating the flight simulators to the east. And they were probably the two main urban design base considerations that are set out in the assessment report.

MR HANN: And the Travelodge Hotel still maintained their objection to the separation, I think, is that right?

45 MR HODGKINSON: Um, to - - -

MR HANN: They're no longer objecting to the traffic. So that's gone - - -

MR HODGKINSON: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - but they're still maintaining, um, a concern about separation of the housing.

5

MR HODGKINSON: Yes. Yes, that did – that was retained in terms of the concern, yeah.

MR ROSEL: And can I just quickly ask, do you know the setback of the Travelodge Hotel, roughly?

10

MR HODGKINSON: Yeah. I – I believe that achieves the 9 metres.

MR ROSEL: Yeah.

15

MR HANN: Nine.

MR HODGKINSON: Yep. I guess, another important consideration about the setback would be that it is a short block. And that Travel Lodge is a – is a fairly recent development in itself. But in terms of south of the development, we've got the freight rail line and Qantas Drive. So in terms of the ability for a precedent to be set along that block, there probably is limited potential for that.

20

MS BAKOPANOS: Will, is the other issue that in terms of the, um, height limit along that road, isn't it about 18 metres or something? And the Qantas building isn't that high. Is that – is that - - -

25

MR HODGKINSON: Um, so the site is subject to 44, a 44 metre height limit. And the simulator, building the flight-training centre is approximately 18 metres high. So there is a reduced setback to King Street. But I guess the point that should be remembered is that the building itself could be much higher and have a much greater public domain impact.

30

MR RITCHIE: Yes. The – the other element is that under the Act, SSDs aren't necessarily limited to requirements of the DCP.

35

MR HANN: No, no.

MR RITCHIE: So we did – while we did look at it, there were other extenuating issues in terms of having to satisfy the design, and separation, and noise management that the facility would require.

40

MR HANN: Well, you - - -

MR HODGKINSON: And Council, sorry to interrupt, Council were satisfied with – with the extra justification that was provided.

45

MR HANN: And I guess it comes down to, also, is there an amenity impact that's justifiable in terms of Travelodge Hotel, from the setback?

5 MR HODGKINSON: Yes. To answer that question, the side and rear setbacks as specified are satisfied by the proposal.

MR HANN: Yes.

10 MR HODGKINSON: So it really would just be the front setback.

MR HANN: Yes.

MR HODGKINSON: If there's an inconsistency there.

15 MR HANN: Okay.

MR HODGKINSON: All right. We might move onto the next issue.

20 MR RITCHIE: Just maybe that last image, because of the overall context. So that's, probably, the main public access point would be as you drive along Qantas drive in terms of what the site would look like.

MR HANN: All right.

25 MS BAKOPANOS: I believe that would be on the New Gateway, as well.

MR HODGKINSON: Yep.

30 MR HANN: Yeah.

MS BAKOPANOS: So that – that perspective.

35 MR RITCHIE: So noise would be the second main issue that we've discussed and outlined in our assessment report. Pamela Morales wrote that particular section. So I will get Pam to talk about that a bit more. The thing to, probably, set the scene in terms of noise is that we are in a very high noise environment here. You have not only a large international airport with Australia's National Carrier that operates there. You have a freight line that operates in close proximity plus an extraordinary amount of vehicles that would utilise Qantas Drive and surrounding road network. So it is
40 located within one of the ANF Contours.

45 There are, in terms of new building requirements, there are requirements that a lot of buildings have to be designed around their existing background noise environment. So I will hand over to Pam who will run through our noise assessment for you.

MS MORALES: Yep.

MR HANN: Okay.

MS MORALES: So as part of the DA, the applicant is seeking extended
construction hours in addition to the standard construction hours under the interim
5 construction noise guidelines. So what they're seeking approval for was to undertake
works between the hours of 6.00 am to 8.00 pm Monday to Friday and Saturday 6.00
am to 5.00 pm and Sunday 7.00 am to 5.00 pm with internal works. So that's
external works. And then internal works would be 24 hours. The reason for the
extended construction hours was to facilitate the acceleration of the construction of
10 the flight-training centre, just so that they could meet RMSs proposed - - -

MR HANN: So they need that to do it in 23 months, is that correct?

MS MORALES: Yeah. Yep.
15

MR HANN: And if it was – if the standard construction hours were applied - - -

MS MORALES: Yeah.

20 MR RITCHIE: There would, I understand, be difficulties meeting that timeframe.

MS MORALES: Basically. So RMS require Qantas to vacate their existing facility
by December 2021 at this stage.

25 MR RITCHIE: So there's one, there's an element to construct. But there's an
element to actually physically get and set-up and use simulators in that location, they
are, correct, quite high tech.

MR HANN: Well, commissioning presumably has a certain timeframe I would - - -
30

MR RITCHIE: And they would have to meet, you know, they would have to meet
certain standards to make sure they're operating properly.

MS MORALES: Exactly.
35

MR HANN: Okay.

MS MORALES: Yeah. So Chris already touched on the fact that the development
is located within an existing high noise catchment where you've got Sydney Airport,
40 an existing freight line and other commercial developments nearby.

MR HANN: Yes.

MS MORALES: So in terms of impacts to the nearest residential receiver that was
45 found to be negligible because of the high background levels. But, um, in terms of
the immediate land uses surrounding the site, the applicant's noise assessment found
the development, um, would, um, meet noise management levels for the nearby

commercial receivers. So that was 70DBA. In terms of the Travelodge Hotel, the noise assessment also found that the development, that predicted noise levels wouldn't meet the noise management levels under the ICNG. So having said that, Chris already, Chris also mentioned that the facility, the development itself is located
5 within the ANF, ANEF Contour.

So buildings within this contour are required to meet a certain level of internal noise amenity. So there's an Australian standard for that. So for a building like the Travelodge Hotel, having recently been constructed in 2017, we understand that they
10 meet those standards and would achieve that acceptable internal noise amenity.

MR HANN: Because they, again, they have maintained their objection on construction hours - - -

15 MS MORALES: Yep.

MR HANN: - - - slash noise, I think.

MS MORALES: Yep.
20

MR HANN: I don't remember exactly - - -

MS MORALES: So our assessment found that in terms of construction impacts to the Travelodge Hotel, we found that it would be acceptable on those grounds.
25 Having said that, we have, um, placed, or recommended a number of conditions around restricting the noise, um, that's the construction hours. So our – our, um, our noise specialist did revise the construction hours to 7.00 am to 7.00 pm, just to be in line with some of the more urban, some of the other similar urban developments in the area. And, um, we also placed, um, or recommended restrictions on some noisy
30 works. Particularly impact piling or board piling, things like that.

MR RITCHIE: So examples of works that might be okay 24 hours is more internalised.

35 MR HANN: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: So whether it's, you know, painting or wiring.

MR HANN: Yeah.
40

MR RITCHIE: Those, sort of, activities that we don't deem or see to be generating any noise that would cause an impact. In terms of, if we move to the next one, pardon - - -

45 MS JOSHUA: Can I please ask a question about that Travelodge. Do you know how many, um, hotel rooms are oriented towards the site, roughly?

MS MORALES: I don't know off the top of my head, no.

MS JOSHUA: Okay.

5 MS MORALES: But we can - - -

MS JOSHUA: Just put that in, yes.

10 MS MORALES: - - - we can find that out.

MR RITCHIE: Yeah. The thing about the, the hotel, it is close to the airport. It is close to, ah, like, a lot of, when you do travel, there's a lot of airport facilities located, or sorry, hotels located near airports. They, you know, are in a noisy environment. They're there - - -

15 MR HANN: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: - - - for convenience, often. Ah, I'm not sure if we can jump to traffic there, have we? Because we have jumped to other assessment issues.

20 MR HANN: Yes. Let's talk about traffic.

MR RITCHIE: I might just - - -

25 MR HANN: Before we get onto those other ones

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes. And I was - - -

30 MR HANN: Traffic and parking.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. I think I touched on it, but I will get Pam to run through a bit more, more - - -

35 MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - detail again.

MR HANN: That would be.

40 MS MORALES: So as we talked about earlier, Qantas currently have access to around five, like, over 5,000 spaces across the Mascot Campus and the Qantas Jet Base. And they're anticipating to lose around 2,000 spaces.

45 MR HANN: What's the timing of that? And, and is that a contractual matter?

MS MORALES: I imagine it is contractual - - -

MR HANN: From a lease point of view?

MS MORALES: Yeah.

5 MR RITCHIE: Some of those are lease arrangement is what we understand.

MS MORALES: So we're – we're not aware - - -

10 MR HANN: So what's going to happen to those? I mean, what – what do we – what do we know, what do you know about the likely outcome of – they're saying they're going to lose them. So that's meaning - - -

MS MORALES: So some may not - - -

15 MR HANN: - - - that the leases are going to come to the end, is it?

MS MORALES: Yeah. So those – those leases will be within, um, the domestic airport, I believe. And in terms of some of the – there'll be some carpark closures in the Mascot campus, which I believe will be due to some future development within
20 the campus.

MR HANN: We were talking about this earlier and Matthew raised the point, which I think is a valid one, and so this – the question for you is, can they renew their leases? And so you've actually got a net increase in car spaces, and, therefore, that
25 would change the traffic impact.

MR RITCHIE: I mean, I would say that a lot of those will be kind of out of our control in terms of, you know, committing the applicant to external lease arrangements. My take on it is there's a lot of development activity that's going on
30 out there. Ah, the aspects of the project that relates to the carpark is trying to manage the – their parking needs moving forward and to consolidate their parking arrangement into one clear, ah, accessible location.

MR HANN: Okay. Now, I understood it was more to do with, does the traffic
35 assessment – it – it – it's predicated on the fact that those car spaces - - -

MR RITCHIE: Will go.

MR HANN: - - - will go.
40

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MS MORALES: Yes.

45 MR RITCHIE: That's – that's – that's right.

MS MORALES: That's right.

MR RITCHIE: But we can – if you like, we can take that away and – and ask more questions, but our understanding is, ah - - -

5 MR HANN: Well, we'll ask the applicant. We can – we can do that. Anything further on that matter before - - -

MR ROSEL: No, that's fine.

10 MR HANN: - - - we go to another point? Well, you may

MR ROSEL: Okay.

15 MR HANN: Thanks. Oh, actually, I've got another – it's a related question. It's – and I might have missed it in your assessment report. Given that it's a relocation of and – and – and a concentration of car parking in one area with the – the loss of roughly 2,000 scattered around from that previous light, what's the pedestrian – this is, essentially, Qantas employees. There's obviously an impact in terms of employees who are used to parking in – at different areas now parking there. What's the pedestrian access for them?

20 MS MORALES: So I – I understand that they – they will still maintain some of the internal pedestrian network, but I believe that a lot of the staff actually travel to and from the airport and around the campus via, um, using shuttle busses. That's primarily how they get around the carparks, but - - -

25 MR HANN: So the current carpark that's got 790 or 810 or whatever that's on the – on the ground plan, I gather, is – is, what – so they use a shuttle bus to get to their - - -

30 MS MORALES: To get to Sydney - - -

MR HANN: - - - work – is that how it works, is it?

35 MS MORALES: To Sydney Airport, and I suppose with the corporate campus there would just – there would be a - - -

MR HANN: So that's how it's going to work. In other words the – it's not a pedestrian, ah – because there's – there's a few obstacles to get from the – for - - -

40 MR RITCHIE: There's some constraints.

MR HANN: - - - for 2090 cars and, presumably, that – at least that number of people, maybe more, how do they get to their place of work?

45 MR HODGKINSON: There is – there is a dedicated bus stop internally, um, that's proposed as part of, um, the development. It might be a little bit difficult to see on this slide, um, but the idea is that people from the carpark would then be able to use

that shuttle bus service that would then travel internally, um, within Qantas lands and – and take them, um, to their place of employment.

5 MR HANN: Would you be able to provide a – just a - - -

MR RITCHIE: We'll get some more details.

MR HANN: - - - and then – just a map that says, okay, there's a - - -

10 MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes.

MR HANN: And a note that goes with it, just so we can take that into account.

MR RITCHIE: Sure.

15

MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: So maybe we'll jump to the last slide. Is that right? Do you want to do anymore?

20

MS MORALES: Yeah. I think you've explained the increased length of the right-turn bay.

25 MR HODGKINSON: Yes. Sure. Um, in terms of the report, ah, there were the key assessment issues and there were other assessment matters, um, which were also addressed. I'm just running you through those briefly. Um, we looked at stormwater. Um, in terms of the arrangement that's proposed, ah, the development would be connecting to the existing Sydney Water drainage channel that runs through the centre of the site, um, and Sydney Water are comfortable with that arrangement. Um, flooding. There was an initial flood model that was prepared by the applicant and there were some differences in the levels between the applicant's model and council's model.

30

MR HANN: Yes.

35

MR HODGKINSON: Which the council then requested that a peer review was undertaken of the applicant's model, and our understanding of the differences in the levels were due to, essentially, the dates that the models were actually prepared, and the applicant's model, being more recent, factored in some of the more recent development within the vicinity of the site. Council - - -

40

MR RITCHIE: So – sorry. You go.

45 MR HODGKINSON: Ah, council were – were, um – accepted the peer review and comfortable with the revised model.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR HODGKINSON: From that, the flood impact assessment did show that there would be some minor flooding impacts to the northern property north of the site in the vicinity of about 60 millimetres. Um, so there were some negotiations between the applicant and council regarding that and council had expressed a preference for that to be, um, addressed and mitigating. Ah, so the applicant advised that that impact can be designed out at the detailed design phase. Um, from memory, they mentioned, ah, lowering the road, um, level – internal road level within the site and that would reduce the offsite impacts. Um, so council and the agencies were satisfied, um, that the flooding impact could be mitigated, um, through that.

MR RITCHIE: Ah, in terms of hazards and risk there's two key element to the – to the project. One is the project itself. Is it going to store dangerous goods that are above or below the screening threshold, of which this particular project it would be below. Ah, but, located nearby are a couple of high-pressure dangerous-good pipelines that we had to look at from a, ah – an impact from incidents associated with the pipe impacting on the project, but our experts were satisfied that that – that is okay.

MS MORALES: And I just wanted to add that, um, both Jemena and Qenos that are in the pipes, um, they – they – they pretty much confirmed that they were, um, okay with the development to proceed but, um, just requested additional consultation with – with, um, the operators during, um, construction of the - - -

MR HANN: And they've provided that in writing, haven't they?

MS MORALES: Yes. I think - - -

MR HANN: I think - - -

MS MORALES: - - - it's in the submissions.

MR HANN: From what I can see. Okay.

MS MORALES: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: And in terms of contributions there's a section 94 contribution requirement - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - which they've agreed to pay as required.

MR HANN: Can we talk about, ah, site contamination just so we're clear? From the documentation in the AR and – and also from the applicant's work, ah, do we understand that, I think, that the words used are that there's no significant issues in relation to contaminating, accepting where the bus depot is and the residual benzene from – presumably from the underground tanks, but that particular area has been

excised now from the, um – the project area. Is that right? But nevertheless, the conditions are such that it takes account of the normal, ah, pre-construction, ah – construction environmental management plan and – and an order that

5 MR RITCHIE: Do you want to run that page?

MR HANN: But I just wanted to - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

10

MR HANN: - - - ask you about the SEPP 50 – ah, SEPP 55, I think it is.

MS MORALES: Yes.

15

MR HANN: And the draft SEPP 55, which is also material.

MR HODGKINSON: Um, well, in terms of the history in terms of the development and the amended site boundary, um, that bus fuelling area was originally included within the site area.

20

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR HODGKINSON: Um, and then the applicant amended the application based on the fact that there were no works within that area as such that related to, um, what was being proposed, so that area was taken out.

25

MR HANN: Yes.

MR HODGKINSON: Council expressed a preference, um, for a site order statement to be prepared early in the piece - - -

30

MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - um, to which the applicant did accept and – accept that, and even after that area was taken out of the development site area, um, they were happy to still have a site order statement prepared, um, and the conditions reflect that.

35

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

MR RITCHIE: So in the conditions too is – what we'd have a standard requirement is an unexpected finds, and if they are – during the course of doing construction they do find something, there's a need to – to manage that.

40

MR HANN: All right. Okay. Now - - -

45

MR RITCHIE: Now, they have – they have approached us to seek to do some slight amendments to those conditions, which we’re looking at now and we’ll report back to the Commission in terms of what they’ve suggested.

5 MR HANN: Okay. All right. No. That’d be important. You had a query - - -

MR ROSEL: Just a - - -

MR HANN: - - - query on the draft. Yes.

10

MR ROSEL: Yes. Just a minor question. Um, whether the Department has considered the draft remedial land SEPP which is currently.

MR RITCHIE: Ah, we’ll take that on notice but I don’t see that there’s been a
15 significant change between SEPP 55 and the draft SEPP because we’ve been - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - involved on the SEPP 55 committee.

20

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

25 MR ROSEL: Well, if you could just let us know that, you know, if – if there’s no change, then - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

30 MR ROSEL: - - - that’s fine.

MR RITCHIE: I don’t – I mean, we do a lot of contamination. I don’t see this as a contamination issue - - -

35 MR ROSEL: No.

MR RITCHIE: - - - but we’ll report back.

MR ROSEL: Yes.

40

MR HANN: Given there is a draft, it is material in terms of the Act.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes.

45 MR HANN: We just want to make sure it - - -

MR RITCHIE: That's fine. We'll double-check that, as well as responding to their suggested amendments of the conditions - - -

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

5

MR RITCHIE: - - - on - on contamination. Will did touch on the point about amendment and I was going to mention that to the Commission, ah, towards - towards the end. So one of the issues, obviously, for Qantas is the timeframes they've got to achieve to - - -

10

MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - relocate, move and get prepared. They have approached us towards the later part of our assessment to - to seek to, ah, remove some aspects of what was proposed to deal with them separately, which is not unusual for applicants to seek to do some early activities.

15

MR HANN: Is this the demolition?

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So they have - - -

20

MR HANN: Yes. Okay. Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - removed, ah, the - - -

25

MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - demolition aspect to deal with that separately through complying development provisions, but also the boundary change which we've just touched on as well. The general course of action is, whoever the consent authority is, which in this case is the IPC, the IPC would need to be satisfied that they're happy to accept an amended application, which is why when you see in our report in one of the recommendations that we've referred back to the - - -

30

MR HANN: Yes.

35

MR RITCHIE: - - - the IPC to be comfortable with that decision. Now, we - we - we were comfortable in our assessment, which we've expressed in our report, but ultimately the decision will rest with - with you.

40

MR HANN: Right. Okay.

MR RITCHIE: And again, a lot of that is to facilitate to get - to get moving, to get going, to enable them to meet their - their deadlines to ensure that, you know, as the national carrier they've got ongoing and continual pilot training activities for all of their operations.

45

MR HANN: Yes. I mean, I – the imperative’s understood.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

5 MR HANN: It’s clear. And – and, ah, obviously they presumably were – this was an unexpected development with RMS, so that’s a tough – tough situation. No, we – we understand that.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Okay.

10

MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: Um, I think that’s all we had to present but we’re happy to take any other particular questions or any questions in writing that you would have following our discussions.

15

MR HANN: Just back on the traffic. Ah, you talked about the extension by 20 metres of the right-hand turn lane. The other intersection – essentially it’s the intersections – the other – ah, my – our understanding – my understanding is that they meet the criteria. The level of service for the intersection is, ah – is adequate given that – that – even though we’re – we’re – the assumption is that the same volume of traffic in the whole precinct, ah, is there, it’s just redirected into different, ah, ah, intersections.

20

MS MORALES: It’s also important to note that, um, just on the slide, RMS is actually proposing, um, a number of upgrades to O’Riordan Street and Robey – Robey Street. Um, they’re proposed and existing, so it doesn’t include the Gateway Project, but that will actually help, um, maintain or reduce congestion, um, in the area, and - - -

25

30

MR RITCHIE: But from a general level of performance, we’re satisfied that that would be maintained.

MS BAKOPANOS: I think it remain unchanged, the - - -

35

MS MORALES: It remains unchanged.

MS BAKOPANOS: - - - the other intersections.

MR RITCHIE: Pretty much.

40

MR HANN: And RMS is satisfied and council are satisfied and I understand now that Travelodge is also – because that was a third and critical part of their objection was the, ah, traffic - - -

45

MR RITCHIE: Traffic. Yes. That’s right.

MR HANN: - - - impacts on their access and - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

5 MR HANN: - - - their customers, presumably. So okay. All right. Ah, we've got a couple of other sort of discussion points, if we could. It really related around the conditions, and, Matthew, do you want to just - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

10

MR HANN: - - - raise those? It's to do with bicycle parking and – and a couple of – just a couple of other things for good order.

15 MR ROSEL: Yes. They're – they're only minor questions, really, but, we them with your response. Um, the first one has to do with the photo recognition - - -

MR RITCHIE: Boom gates.

20 MR ROSEL: Yes. That's right. So on page 24 of the Department's report at the bottom, um, it says that you have recommended a condition to require that. Um, it might be that I've missed it, but could you point us to where that condition is?

25 MS MORALES: I noted that down. I noted that down, actually, when I noticed that condition.

MR RITCHIE: So we will – we will look at that and - - -

MS MORALES: We will look at that.

30 MR ROSEL: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - check and then confirm.

35 MR HANN: Because you're already doing a little bit of work on the conditions anyway, so - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So - - -

40 MR HANN: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - in terms of the applicant's comments, but you'll - - -

MR ROSEL: So you can send that across to us so that - - -

45 MR RITCHIE: Yes. At the same time. Yes.

MR ROSEL: Okay.

MR HANN: As a package.

MR RITCHIE: If it's not in there, we'll draft it. Yes.

5 MR HANN: Okay. All right.

MR ROSEL: The other two questions were to do with car parking and bicycle parking. So the application is for 2097 car parking spaces and then 120 bicycle parking spaces. Um, we were just wondering whether the Department thinks it's prudent to include conditions to set a maximum car parking and a minimum bicycle parking requirement for the site because, again, I didn't see conditions to that effect. I mean, if there's a reason not to include it - - -

15 MR RITCHIE: Yes, well - - -

MR ROSEL: - - - then that's - yes.

MR RITCHIE: I mean, generally we - generally we - we wouldn't because the way the consent's structured is that the first condition you've got to comply with is how - is what you've described in your application or as otherwise changed.

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: Ah, there's nothing preventing that we can put it in there if we see fit, but in those instances we don't always put a - put a limit there an, ah - a maximum number. In terms of when you have a project, say it's a waste operation or you're extracting coal out of the ground, your whole premise or your assessment's based around an envelope of impact associated with a particular limit or extraction rate. That's where we would limit it, but in terms of traffic movement, ah, it's not really changing and - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes. That's fine.

MR RITCHIE: But if the Commission is inclined to, we can look at the drafts, I think.

MR ROSEL: It was more of a case of we were just interested to understand, you know, in certain circumstances, um, I think you do see those types of conditions, but - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR ROSEL: - - - if you're - - -

45 MR RITCHIE: Not so much from our side, I don't think, because - - -

MR ROSEL: Okay. Because if you're confident, that condition is sufficient.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Because it would say the development may only be carried out in compliance with BISO.

MR ROSEL: Okay.

5

MR HANN: Right.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

10 MR ROSEL: You're confident that covers that.

MS BAKOPANOS: And the plans will show those number of spaces, so they've got to comply with what's on the plan, but – but, yes - - -

15 MR ROSEL: Yes. Okay.

MS BAKOPANOS: - - - if you'd like, we can - - -

MR RITCHIE: We can look to draft something.

20

MS MORALES: Yes.

MR ROSEL: Okay. I just had another two questions, and this is just mopping up, so I apologise. Um, the report, um, suggests on page 3 that there's 791 existing car parking spaces, and I think it's page 28 it's suggesting there's 810 existing car parking spaces. Just for consistency or clarity, could you confirm, even if it's , um, what the existing number of car parking spaces are?

25

MS MORALES: Yes, we can confirm that.

30

MR HANN: Well, yes. In running our – in documenting it ourselves - - -

MS MORALES: Yes.

35 MR HANN: - - - we just want to make sure we've got a - - -

MR RITCHIE: I understand it's 791.

MR HANN: - - - an agreed number.

40

MR RITCHIE: Yes. That's fine.

MR HANN: An accurate number.

45 MR RITCHIE: All fine.

MS MORALES: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MS MORALES: We can confirm that.

5 MR HANN: Yes. All right.

MR ROSEL: And, ah, just the last thing was, um, the applicant in its addendum response to submissions says that council is now satisfied with the amended, um, environmental management plan and construction management plan. Um, and then
10 that – they received that in writing. Is that something the Department has seen? It's not something that I could locate on your website.

MR HODGKINSON: Confirmation from council specifically?

15 MR ROSEL: Yes. It's just this is a statement from the applicant saying that they've received confirmation that the council now is totally satisfied with those aspects, but I couldn't – even interrogating the website, I couldn't - - -

MS MORALES: Yes.

20

MR ROSEL: - - - actually locate a confirmation of that.

MS MORALES: I think we can have a look because I believe it might be in an email, I believe.

25

MR ROSEL: Okay.

MS MORALES: Yes. That we were CC'd into, so - - -

30 MR ROSEL: Yes. That'd be great. If we could have site, that would be amazing.

MS MORALES: Okay.

MR ROSEL: Yes. Cool. Thanks.

35

MR HANN: And the only other one which we'll look at – it's really just a query around reference to plans and if you wouldn't - - -

MR ROSEL: The - - -

40

MR HANN: We were talking about that earlier. It was really our curiosity - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

45 MR HANN: - - - in terms of the conditions.

MR RITCHIE: So the conditions – let’s just go back. So I’ve had probably a couple of questions come through the IPC on conditions and we as a department went through an exhaustive condition framework - - -

5 MR HANN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - for about 18 months to basically seek to standardise how we presented the conditions and also to respond to various questions or court cases that have identified issues and also how compliance have been on the ground to interpret
10 things post-once a decision has been made, so there has been a lot of work on that. So that’s just sort of just pre-empting, I suppose, some of your questioning - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

15 MR RITCHIE: - - - because I know at the last one I had there were some questions about definitions from the IPC - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

20 MR RITCHIE: - - - and we had to go and go – we’ve gone through a whole process. That’s how - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

25 MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - we like to work to be consistent.

MR ROSEL: I suppose that was just a query we had in terms of, um, condition A2,
30 um, as referring to plans in appendix 1, um, rather than listing plans within a table. It’s – it might be a stylistic thing for - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes. I think – and this is where you’ll get some differences in some teams where a team that purely does urban-based development - - -
35

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - are really particularly around listing all the plans - - -

40 MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - whereas traditionally for our area and other parts of the Department, we would list the key ones - - -

45 MR ROSEL: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - in any appendix at the back of - - -

MR HANN: So you're satisfied that the way it's ` - - -

MR RITCHIE: It's just how – it's just - - -

5 MR HANN: That's okay.

MR RITCHIE: People do it a little bit differently.

MR ROSEL: That's fine.

10

MS BAKOPANOS: But you're right, though, that there is often a plan table and we can - - -

MR HANN: Yes. Usually there's - - -

15

MS BAKOPANOS: - - - we can have a - - -

MR HANN: - - - table that's drawing XYZ - - -

20 MS BAKOPANOS: We'll have a look at that.

MR ROSEL: But it's – it's - - -

MS BAKOPANOS: But that's for some certain – certain - - -

25

MR RITCHIE: Particularly key sites. That's what they do and they can go for three, four, five pages, whereas - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

30

MR RITCHIE: - - - that's probably a bit too much in a consent.

MR ROSEL: Look, it was more of a question of just to explain why you've approached in that way, and - - -

35

MR RITCHIE: That's just how we do it.

MR ROSEL: - - - if you're satisfied that that's fine - - -

40 MR RITCHIE: That's how we do it.

MS BAKOPANOS: History.

MR ROSEL: Yes.

45

MR HANN: Yes. So from your point of view it's - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - standard.

5 MR RITCHIE: Yes. Because – yes – your more urban-based teams will list – they can go for many, many pages - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

10 MR RITCHIE: - - - and then you kind of - - -

MR HANN: Yes. No. That's all right. We see all different ones.

MR RITCHIE: I know. Yes, yes, yes, yes.

15

MR HANN: So it's just a case of getting our head around them and understanding.

MR RITCHIE: That's fine.

20 MR HANN: Okay. So long as you're satisfied that - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - that reference to those, ah – those drawings, if you like - - -

25

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Yes.

MR HANN: - - - is adequate. Okay.

30 MR RITCHIE: Despite the conditions to be consistent, there is some slight differences amongst the teams and – yes.

MS MORALES: Yes. But those plans would form part of the and RTS documents.

35

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. So they're covered.

40 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MS MORALES: So they are covered.

MR HANN: All right.

45

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR HANN: So the only other final query I've got is really just a timeframe on the conditions. Could you say your – could you just explain - - -

5

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So we were approached yesterday about a couple of - - -

MR HANN: From the applicant.

10 MR RITCHIE: Yes. From the applicant.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

15 MR RITCHIE: About a couple of amendments. We've looked at that. There's one that we might be okay with, one we're a bit unsure of, so we're going to go back and have a discussion with them, but we would look to come back to you by tomorrow or something - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

20

MR RITCHIE: - - - with a solution and probably a response to some of these questions that have been raised.

MR HANN: Well, we'll ask them about it today and - - -

25

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - say look, we understand that just recently you've approached - - -

30 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR HANN: - - - the Department for some

35 MR RITCHIE: And again even for them it's that notion that we have been through quite a detailed process to make them pretty standard.

MR HANN: Yes.

40 MR RITCHIE: When people will seek to change them, we want to know actually why, and there's a process by which if we do change something we've got to record what that change is.

MR HANN: All right. Great. Um, Matthew?

45 MR ROSEL: No. Nothing more from me.

MR HANN: Casey? No? All right. Meeting closed.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.23 am]