



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-1271549

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH CENTRAL COAST COUNCIL

RE: DONNISON STREET GOSFORD

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON**
WENDY LEWIN

ASSISTING PANEL: **HEATHER WARTON**

COUNCIL: **EMILY GOODWORTH**
MARK WASSON
JOHNSON ZHANG
ANTHONY FAVETTA
ROBERT EYRE
STEVE GREEN
JOHN NOAKES

LOCATION: **SYDNEY**

DATE: **2.03 PM, THURSDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 2020**

MR C. WILSON: All right. Let's start. Good afternoon. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet and pay my respects to their Elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today. This afternoon's meeting is with Central Coast Council. The Lederer Group Proprietary
5 Limited is proposing a concept application for a podium and building envelope for five towers for residential and retail and commercial uses, a concept landscape plan, design guidelines and design excellence strategy for the site at 136-146 and 148 Donnison Street, Gosford. This is State Significant Development application 9813 known as Gosford Alive.

10 My name is Chris Wilson. I am the Chair of this panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Wendy Lewin, and Heather Warton from the Office of Independent Planning Commission. Representing the Council today are: Robert Eyre, principal planner; Anthony Favetta, senior development engineer; Steve Green, traffic and
15 transport engineer; Mark Wasson, strategic planner; Emily Goodworth, section manager, major development applications; and Johnson Zhang from water engineering.

MR J. ZHANG: Yes, water and sewer.

20 MR WILSON: Thank you. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and the 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 and it is being
25 conducted via electronic means in line with current COVID-19 rules around social distancing and public gatherings. It's taking place at a preliminary stage of this determination 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 meeting attendees to clarify issues as we consider it appropriate.

30 If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer straight away, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information in writing later, which we will put on our website. I would ask that all participants state their name before speaking and please be mindful not to talk over the top of one another so that
35 we can assure accuracy of the transcript. We will now work through the agenda. So the agenda, basically, is based around the concerns raised by Council. Are you happy to talk to the agenda in terms of those issues raised by Council in its submission and answer any questions; are you happy to do it that way or would - - -

40 MS E. GOODWORTH: Yes, I think we are.

MR WILSON: Okay. All right. Well, then, I'll pass it over to you then. Will it be you, Emily, to start off with?

45 MS GOODWORTH: Well, would you like us to go on to building envelopes, massing and height?

MR WILSON: Yes. Let's start.

MS GOODWORTH: Okay. We might as – I might ask Mark Wasson - - -

5 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS GOODWORTH: - - - to discuss his concerns in relation to those aspects and then Robert Eyre also may provide some information in relation to these issues as well.

10

MR WILSON: Thank you.

MR M. WASSON: Good afternoon, everybody. I am assuming you have read my comments. I have some significant concerns about the height of the development.

15 Also, the – the massing as well. In particular, I think if you look at the – the heights show or in the – the applicant's own sketches, I think it's page 15, I think it showed the – this concept of a step from Kibble Park to the building and to the Rumbalara Reserve behind. Now, once you actually look at their own drawings, you can clearly see that that concept really only works from one very specific area in the centre of
20 Kibble Park. The buildings are actually considerably higher than Rumbalara, or when viewed from most areas, they're considerably higher, so you do not get that hillside effect from behind.

The – certainly from – if you look at their view analysis – their initial impact
25 assessment, I should say, and you compare it with our – what they show as Gosford City Council SEPP envelope, you also see that the visual bulk of those towers clearly – if they're viewed from a very specific location in Kibble Park, you get a view through. When viewed from anywhere apart from that, the towers clearly overlap and the visual bulk – there's no view through and the visual bulk is excessive. The –
30 also, their solar access, they – I've noticed they do show in mid-winter that there is not much solar impact on – on the park. There is some in the morning, but they only show it from 9.

I would like to see solar access or shadow diagrams from actually earlier in the
35 morning because, clearly, by 9 o'clock, most people will be at work, but I think they really need to show them from – at 8 o'clock because that's also people will be using the park in mid-winter. Also, they show they are overshadowing the park during the equinoxes. Now, I – again, I accept that it's not a huge area of the park, but there are also proposals for the top of – on top of the existing shopping centre, the Imperial
40 Centre. I think when you combine overshadowing with this development with those on top of the proposed – on the Imperial Centre and other buildings which will be built around there, I think the cumulative effect of any overshadowing is unacceptable.

45 This is – really, we're the only part of Gosford City at the moment which there is – kids can play. There is reasonable solar access. I know there – the – there is the park there, but – the waterslide park which is under construction at the moment, but, also,

that will be overshadowed by the various other proposals which have already been approved. So the overshadowing of public spaces, I think, is a significant problem, particularly because it's caused by non-complying height and non-complying FSR. And other – another issue is that, to me, the fact that they are overshadowing, it just
5 doesn't demonstrate design excellence. I – I accept that this isn't Sydney and we're not going to get – it's a different demographic, a different economic situation.

We're not going to get some of – some – some of the astonishing architecture or acceptable architecture we get in Sydney, but, to me, it is – it's a – a couple – a few
10 relatively bland white boxes. I know there is some articulation and on the – but, then, to me, it is – it doesn't exhibit design excellence. I mean, I – personally, I'd like to see, you know, the Bosco Verticale from Milan or Central Park, but I accept that we're not – we're probably not going to get that in Gosford, but I think we can do better than simply two white – white developer specials. There are also some
15 issues with public spaces and – you know, also the common areas within the development, but my particular concerns are overshadowing and visual bulk.

MR WILSON: So just on that and it will probably come up later, but
overshadowing of Kibble Park, but, also, there's significant overshadowing along
20 down Donnison Street and on the TAFE, ABC and, to a lesser extent, the court; is that an issue for Council?

MR WASSON: Yes, well, it is – it's certainly an issue. I think it is less of a – a concern to me than the park. As density increases in – in Gosford, that park – the
25 Kibble Park is going to take on even more importance as a public space. And as I've said, that while the overshadowing from this particular development may be acceptable, I think when we're looking at the cumulative effects of redevelopment of the Imperial Centre, which is the existing shopping centre, I believe it's owned by the same developer as – as proposing this. They have come in with a preliminary
30 scheme which I think had, from memory, about 20 storeys, but it was – it caused considerable overshadowing of Kibble Park as well.

I think we have to – and there is already some overshadowing from the – the
35 Bonython building in Mann Street. Again, it's not – not a huge amount, but we have to consider that this is a very, very important public space within Gosford. Its importance will only increase as the population and density increases. And the cumulative impact of overshadowing of that public space is really – I think it's unacceptable of any overshadowing, really.

40 MR WILSON: Okay. So, well, just while we're on building envelopes, massing and height, Heather and Wendy, do you have any questions in relation to that matter?

MS H. WARTON: The issue of the slender towers has come up – or it's a theme of Council's submissions. So the applicant has said, "Well, the towers are slender
45 facing Kibble Park," and that's the main vantage point. And I think they exceed the 45 metre control, the tower envelope control. I think they're 48 metres for tower 1, for example, tower 3 is slimmer and 42 for towers 4 and 5. Has the Council got

anything – any issue or any area of concern they want to tell us about regarding that aspect of the DCP?

5 MR WASSON: Well, what my view is, again, that simply – well, one tower is –
does exceed it, but the fact that the other two are slightly less, so, to me, merely
complying with minimum controls, the minimum standards, does not – does not
exhibit desired excellence. I mean, I fully accept that, when viewed from Kibble
Park, the towers are relatively slim, but, again, I mean, not – Kibble Park is not the
10 only area in which they are viewed. And as I've said, if you look at their own visual
impact assessments and compare it with the envelopes, the – to me, the visual impact
is massive. And as I said, it's not even an – you know, astonishing good piece of
architecture.

15 It's – I fully accept that we're not getting – you know, the Opera House in Gosford,
but I do expect – I think to merely complying with controls just leads to mediocrity.
It doesn't – like, all they need to do is say, "Yes, we complied with controls." And
that's – that's not an acceptable standard, I don't believe, or it certainly doesn't
exhibit desire and excellence and doesn't justify such non-complying FSR and
height.

20

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS W. LEWIN: On that point, are there any – it's Wendy Lewin here. Are there
any examples within Gosford that are under construction or have been approved that
25 have such exceedances in floor space ratio and height? This is approximately 66 per
cent exceedance in floor space ratio and, of course, it's probably greater in height,
but we haven't been able to determine that yet. We don't have the data to do that.

30 MR WASSON: The – there was the three – three towers which are approved. That
was under a previous Council regime so I – I – I think they, at that time, they – they
complied, I think, with the – the control at the time was 100 metres AHD, something
like that, but so – so it's – compared to some of those issues which have been – I
think have been approved, it is probably consistent, but, also, those towers were – as
I said, were approved under a different regime in Council before we had the design
35 review panels. And they won't be overshadowing Kibble Park. They do cast
shadows over, actually, on the waterslide park, but they won't be overshadowing
Kibble Park.

40 MR WILSON: So – and thank you, but another thing we're just trying to get our
head around is this is – and you've touched on it already, is the gradation of building
heights to Rumbalara Reserve. And I think you said if you stand in the middle of
Kibble Park, you get some – from one view, you might – the two – the back towers
are the same height whereas the controls have a stepped nature coming down from
Rumbalara Reserve; is that something you'd like to comment on?

45

MR R. EYRE: It's Robert Eyre here, Chris. I don't know whether I should add
something to what Mark said now or Mark wants to finish before I - - -

MR WASSON: Yes, no, you go ahead, please, Rob.

MR EYRE: Okay. Basically, to put you in the picture, a lot of the – there has been a lot of developments approved in Gosford: the waterslide or the – the old Froggy's site; the one on the old Union Hotel, which is currently under construction now. That's the main one in the B3 or the City Centre that's actually gone ahead and it was actually the first one that was approved by Council at the time when the Council brought in the bonuses to try and get development moving. They all had a 30 per cent bonus to height and floor space ratio and some of those did a 4.6 and, obviously, exceeded that, but that was considered by the Joint Regional Planning Panel at the time.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: When you go back and look at the basic controls that were brought in over the different planning schemes we've had and all that sort of stuff, the basic principle that the Council and the community accepted at the time was that if you're down at the waterfront, the buildings are not going to exceed the height between the Rumbalara Reserve and Presidents Hill. They're going to be below the mountain tops. So I agree with what Mark's saying; is that, essentially, when you look at the development from Kibble Park, you're only getting – unless you're in that very particular spot where you can see between the buildings, you won't see the Rumbalara Reserve behind because as soon as you move to a point that you're not looking straight up between the gap, the building will appear as one big mass across – across the site.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: Now, I notice in the Department of Planning report, they did refer to in the other development applications that have been approved the RL heights in the different towers and so forth on – on the waterslide park, the Union Hotel site and a few others. The big difference between this site and those sites is when you're standing in Kibble Park looking back towards those sites that have been approved on the other side of Mann Street or towards the water, virtually you don't lose sight of Rumbalara Reserve because it's behind you. When Council did the Union Hotel site, you stand in Kibble Park and look at that. You've still got Presidents Hill to the right so you're not losing the Presidents Hill from that site either. One of the sites I suggested you go up and look at was from Presidents Hill, the lookout; did you do that or - - -

40

MR WILSON: We did. We found it extremely difficult to find the site, though. We walked around – we walked through the bush a bit, but, anyway, we did go up there.

MR EYRE: Okay. So – so the big difference with this site – like, the – the whole principle all along in the different planning schemes and people that had different goes at this was that, essentially, you don't end up like a park in the middle of a city

with tall buildings right around you. If you've got at least one side open to Rumbalara Reserve, you're going to feel like you're still a bit in the bush or nature or something or other. The other sides are probably going to get developed. Now, what Mark was talking about too is the northern side of Kibble Park, which is on the other
5 side of William Street, it has height limits which are also tapered up as you go back away from the park - - -

MR WILSON: Right.

10 MR EYRE: - - - with the idea that, eventually, if that – when that site is redeveloped – and it's also owned by the same Lederer Group that owns Kibbleplex now – that, essentially, you – you do not cause any significant overshadowing on Kibble Park. Now, one of the buildings that has been built – another building that has been built in Gosford in Mann Street is the – the Bonython Towers, which I think is eight or nine
15 storeys, I can't remember.

MR WILSON: Is that the white building behind

MR EYRE: As you go down to the north of William Street, you've got that tall
20 building that's just down next to the Imperial Centre.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

MR EYRE: Now, when we had that application, I fought tooth and nail to make
25 sure that they did not cause any – any shadow impact whatsoever on Kibble Park. Their argument was, 'We're only affecting three metres in from the edge of the park. It's over a concrete pathway.' As soon as you reduce the park – and that concrete could come up one day and it could be a grassed area; it could be where people want to sit. So, eventually, at least, the CEO at that time and the Council and – and the
30 regional planning panel supported that, basically, no additional overshadowing because you know you're going to get – as soon as you take each increment, well, who's going to benefit; who's going to – if you can only overshadow 10 per cent of the park, the first person gets the whole 10 per cent and the rest get nothing.

35 I didn't agree with the DCP that says you can overshadow a small part of the park because, like Mark says, you've got a park in the middle of a city which is planned to cater for another 30,000 people. You should be expanding the park area, not reducing it or increasing the impact on it.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. Yes. Yes.

MR EYRE: It's something that you'll never get back once you lose. I think, basically, the – from the original proposal, they have done some improvements to the heights on the stepping and so forth, but I did pick up, like you said, towers 4 and 5, I
45 think, have got the same RL, 101 on top. We've always, with all the towers in the other developments, said that between towers you should have at least a two – at least a two-storey minimum between levels. So in my view - - -

MR WILSON: They lowered the height of tower 5 at some stage. They probably had that at some stage.

5 MR EYRE: Okay. Yes, I can't remember.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MR EYRE: But I would suggest that tower 4 should be reduced at least two storeys because if you're in tower 5, you're virtually going to have tower 4 blocking you out, irrespective of all the other issues. If I was trying to sell tower 5, I'd be wanting some up the top to get some views to the west or the water, whatever the case they're trying to achieve use out. Or, if you go the other way, tower 5 should be lowered so tower 4 at the top gets views of Rumbalara Reserve, I don't know.

15 MR WILSON: No. That's okay.

MR EYRE: There – there should be a difference between tower 4 and 5.

20 MR WILSON: Right. So, in other words, there should be – Council's view is there should be a gradation of heights leading up from towers 1 and 2 to 5; yes?

MR EYRE: Yes. I think, basically, the way it should have been done is work out the height of what tower 5 should have been to preserve the ridge line of Rumbalara, then you - - -

25

MR WILSON: Yes.

30 MR EYRE: - - - step back towards the park. And I think the controls also say you step from left – north to south as well as east and west, or whatever the case may be. So you're getting a good variation between tops of towers.

MS LEWIN: Could I just ask, Robert, was it or is it still Council's intention for development to retain the kind of valley profile from Kibble Park?

35 MR EYRE: That's always been the intention, but I think that it's been lost to some degree in – in there. It was the original intention when we – the Council and the community got together and worked out all the controls of some previous planning scheme. That's always been the intention, but with these new controls, it says if you've got a certain site area, you can go up to whatever. That seems to be getting lost a bit, I think, now.

40

MS LEWIN: All right.

45 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

MR WILSON: You've touched on design excellence. What about visual impacts and – well, I guess that's what we're talking about to some degree. Are there any other concerns there?

5 MR EYRE: Mark, do you want to add any on that or - - -

MR WASSON: Well, I – I – the – an – there was an earlier scheme which actually was – it had some curves and – basically, visually interesting was – it was just as visually intrusive, I think, in that they had largely the same bulk and scale, but that
10 - - -

MR WILSON: Is that the one that connected to the retail centre?

MR WASSON: Not – not to the - - -
15

MR WILSON: Not to the scheme.

MR WASSON: It was the – it was – and I think last year – I can't - - -

20 MR WILSON: Okay. Sorry.

MR WASSON: There has been quite a few schemes on this site. It was actually higher and I will acknowledge that they have reduced the height and reduced the overshadowing, but they've also changed the design of the building. It's very much
25 just a unit above the podium. It's the uniform, largely square building with a slight – a couple of slight angles and cut-backs on it. And, really, it's – the – the visual impact of that is certainly, to – to me, not – as I said, it's – I don't – I don't consider it shows design excellence, really. And the – it's just a repeat of the – previously, again, the tower – there was variation between the towers. There is still variation
30 between, I think, the – the two facing Kibble Park and the ones behind, but it is simply a – as I've said, it - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

35 MR WASSON: That I don't think it exhibits design excellence. I don't want to be – be more scathing than that, but - - -

MR WILSON: Heather, have you got anything?

40 MS WARTON: Well, you mentioned that – the issue that there's a narrow-view corridor through – through to Rumbalara Reserve from Kibble Park. Are there any other key viewpoints that should be considered, besides Kibble Park?

MR WASSON: I think Kibble Park is the most important, but all of – as I said, if
45 you're looking coming down the hill from the north on Henry Parry Drive, there is – if you're looking down there because the buildings are very wide in the – that east-west direction, looking from Henry Parry Drive, which is one of the main entrances,

- they're particularly prominent. From the William Street Mall, again, once you're away from that centre section of the park, they're particularly visually prominent and bulky. From – as I say, I don't have the visual impact assessment right in front of me, but – in fact, quite – in quite a few areas within the city, they are quite visually prominent. Clearly, the further you get away, the – the impact is less, but from, I think, including from the waterfront park even, there is the – they are fairly prominent, though I would – I will acknowledge that there are other buildings that will be built in front of them eventually.
- 5
- 10 MS WARTON: Thanks.
- MR WASSON: That's all right.
- MR WILSON: Just in terms of design excellence – I mean, and I think Council may have confirmed it last time we met, but Council is now a fully-fledged member of the Design Advisory Panel; is that correct?
- 15
- MS E. GOODWORTH: Recently, we have been invited – Andrew Roche is now sitting on it, is my understanding.
- 20
- MR WILSON: Okay. All right.
- MR EYRE: But he wouldn't have been involved in this application.
- 25
- MR WILSON: No, we understand that. We appreciate that. I think he might have been an observer at best, was he?
- MR EYRE: If that.
- 30
- MR WILSON: If that. Okay. Just in terms of – well, have you got any more on that Heather or Wendy?
- MR GREEN: I think one – one of the visual impacts - - -
- 35
- MR WILSON: Yes.
- MR WASSON: I – I didn't hear that.
- MS WARTON: It wasn't me.
- 40
- MR GREEN: can you hear?
- MR WILSON: Not really. It's Steve, is it?
- 45
- MR GREEN: Yes, it's Steve. Can you hear me?

MR EYRE: Steve, they can – I can hardly hear you so I assume the others can't hear you.

MR GREEN: Okay. If you can't hear me

5

MS WARTON: I can hear you, but it's not that - - -

MR WILSON: We can hear you. It's just not - - -

10 MS WARTON: It's not that loud.

MR WILSON: We'll all be quiet.

MR GREEN: Hang on. Is that better?

15

MR WILSON: Much better.

MS WARTON: Yes.

20 MR GREEN: Sorry about that. I – I think one of the things that – that is important for this site is the visual impact of the street activation, like the frontages along Henry Parry Drive and William Street.

MR WILSON: Yes.

25

MR GREEN: We're quite concerned about whether there can be – street activated.

MR WILSON: What about Donnison Street?

30 MR GREEN: Yes, it's the same because it's – there's also that bit of a – a hill there; that it does make it a bit more challenging.

MR WILSON: But the argument is that the sites are somewhat separated from the CBD, although it's a CBD key site.

35

MR GREEN: Yes.

MR WILSON: Does that sound right or is that challenging; is that a challenge for the site to get more retail and commercial - - -

40

MR GREEN: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - along those active fronts?

45 MR GREEN: Yes, I – I guess, it is challenging because – but there is a lot of parking in – in that area at the moment so it's - - -

MR WILSON: That's a good point.

MR GREEN: If parking – if parking is available, then there will be greater demand for retail and commercial.

5

MR WILSON: That's another thing. I guess that there's – and help me out here, Heather, is they're proposing the activation with SOHO units, is it?

10 MS WARTON: Yeah, they have SOHO units on part of the frontage of Donnison Street.

MR WILSON: And then townhouses.

15 MS WARTON: And then – and then townhouses.

MR GREEN: Yes.

MR WILSON: So does Council have a view on that?

20 MR EYRE: It's Robert Eyre here, Chris.

MR WILSON: Yes.

25 MR EYRE: Basically, just a few things on the activation of Donnison Street. At the moment, it's almost a no man's land in there because the original shopping centre that was on the site was one of those ones they built four walls around it and everything's in – orientated internally.

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: You've got the courthouse and TAFE on the other side of Donnison Street. There was an argument at one stage, "Well, what's the point in street activation when it's still going to be no man's land when it's finished," but that's the whole purpose of the DCP, is to try and get some activation up that street.

35 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: Because once you go up Donnison Street and turn left into Albany Street North, you've got a lot of professional doctors, offices and so forth.

40 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: You've also got on the northeast corner of the site, which is not part of their site, the – all the medical and radiology, I think, that's still there.

45 MR WILSON: It is.

MR EYRE: So, really, if we don't do something with the activating that section of Donnison Street, it's always going to be the back – back end of town.

5 MR WILSON: Okay. Just on Donnison Street, and I raised it earlier, that there's a reasonable amount of overshadowing of the TAFE site. I guess – and that's zoned B4, isn't it?

MR EYRE: I couldn't be sure, but I think it would be.

10 MR WILSON: Okay. Yes. So that's a potential site and that may – should that become surplus to government needs, for instance - - -

MR EYRE: Yes.

15 MR WILSON: - - - that could be a development site as well.

MR EYRE: It could be, but there has been talk in the past of trying to get the university into the TAFE site.

20 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR EYRE: And there has been a lot of talk about getting the university into the city centre to help revitalise its student accommodation and so forth.

25 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR EYRE: And we've got a medical centre coming into Gosford Hospital, which is going to be in the future they're building, still, a medical training facility, so it could be part of the – I'm not sure what university, but part of a medical school for
30 one of the universities. So there was always talk about where such a university would go and, obviously, one of the sites would be you improve the existing TAFE site.

35 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR EYRE: But if the TAFE site was declared surplus and it went to something else, obviously, that would be subject to further investigation, but the option could be, once again, residential. I don't know.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. No, that's – I guess we're just trying to understand the overshadowing impacts of the five towers in that part of – and which is to the south of the site.

45 MR FAVETTA: I've just checked the zoning on council's mapping and the TAFE is zoned SP1.

MR WILSON: Is it? And that's - - -

MR FAVETTA: Special use.

MR WILSON: Okay. All right. So - - -

5 MR EYRE: Yes, and that would change, obviously. The State Government has declared it surplus, that obviously changes zoning.

MR WILSON: Yes. No, that's okay. Okay. Quantum of – do you want to – Heather, do you want to talk about - - -

10

MS WARTON: Yes. We've touched on the activation to Donnison Street, but does Council think – I think there's overall seven and a half per cent non-resi floor space, compared to the total GFA. Does council think that's enough or should there be more, or I notice Council raise concern that there may be an impact on existing retail, the viability of existing retail. Do you have any comments on how much commercial
15 floor space there should be, noting that to get the uplift, the consent authority under clause 8.4 of the set has to be satisfied with the amount of commercial GFA?

MR EYRE: It's Robert Eyre here. I'll make a comment on that to some degree. I
20 think the original floor space they had for commercial retail in there was less than what it is now. I think the advisory panel or body, I think, asked for them to put more in, from memory.

MS WARTON: Yes.
25

MR EYRE: It's difficult to answer, because the site has been used for – over a number of decades for different purposes, shopping centres, and none – and except for the earlier days before Erina Fair opened, it really didn't work as part of the CBD shopping area, and that's why, obviously, the supermarkets move in and out and so
30 forth, so it's going to be very difficult to say what commercial space should go in there compared – without affecting the other commercial areas in the city centre and so forth.

It's going to – obviously, it's an economic argument, but the biggest challenge
35 you've got there is, like Steve Green was talking about, is that whatever you put in there, commercial, residential, if they all want to get to the other part of Gosford CBD between Mann Street and Henry Parry, they've got to get across Henry Parry Drive, and the biggest challenge you've got for the CBD, which has always come up every time we do things for the CBD is that, effectively, the city's divided into
40 almost three parts: west of the railway line, between the railway line and Henry Parry and then east of the – Henry Parry, because the railway line and Henry Parry are two major transport routes that, really, cut the city, and it's always been the connection across those that really creates some of the issues in the past. Yes.

45 MR WILSON: It's a point taken we discussed this morning. We discussed this morning the – someone suggested a pedestrian overbridge over, is it William Parry? Anyway - - -

MR EYRE: I think that was probably me for the last 20 years. Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

5 MS WARTON: What about lowering the speed limit along there? Has Council ever tried to lower the whole speed limit in the CBD to 40 ks?

10 MR EYRE: It was 40 ks, I think – I'm not sure it was 40 ks in that section, but it was 40 ks further south along Henry Parry Drive. It went back to 50 kilometres and they put Jersey Kerb in the middle so people didn't skid from one side of the road to the other. I think you'll find – I'll be very surprised if people can do 50 through there, given the traffic lights, pedestrian movements and everything else, so I don't think lowering the speed limit is really going to solve the problem.

15 The big issue you're going to have with commercial there, and if you've got 1,300-odd people living in there is if they all want to go to the Imperial Centre as it is now, the railway station, whatever the case may be, they've all got to cross Henry Parry Drive. So one of the options in the past that have been looked at, well, could you do a tunnel under the road, a bridge over it, but it's an issue that, obviously, everyone
20 has a different opinion on and there's that many authorities involved, it's probably in the too hard basket, I suspect.

MR WILSON: Okay. So in terms of car parking, do you think there's sufficient residential car parking proposed?

25 MR EYRE: Robert Eyre here again, Chris. I think we made comments on the previous one – others ones in the city centre that, essentially, if they comply with the DCP requirements, they need more than what they're proposing.

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR EYRE: If they comply with the RMS requirements, then they're proposing more than what they require. So they're picking somewhere in-between. For that size development, it's going to be difficult to say, "Well, you need X number of car
35 spaces".

MR WILSON: Yes.

40 MR EYRE: It's going to be – the car parking calculations, the RMS guidelines, DCP guidelines, they've all been based on similar smaller developments, I would suspect. It's going to be suckers and see-ers as to whether the car parking works, but I think, basically, given – what we've said in the past is that given the size isolated on the other side of Henry Parry Drive, you're not going to park in Baker Street and walk up to this side or vice versa, so, really, it should have more road than less, is my
45 view.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: It's Wendy here. Does Council have a view on community uses that would be possible or desirable in this development?

5 MR EYRE: Robert Eyre here again. Not that I'm aware of. They're proposing a childcare centre and a few other things in there. They're more commercial operations, rather than community uses, I think. The Council's looking at different – a new library in the city centre and a few other things. To my mind, community use, to me, should be trying to make public area or public park place available in the area. That's what's really needed, I think.

10 MR WILSON: Communal open space.

MR EYRE: Communal open space, yes.

15 MS LEWIN: Yes. Okay.

MR EYRE: And it may be something that could be shared by everyone, not just the residence of the complex.

20 MS WARTON: I think the Department's recommended consideration of the future community centre, which I took to be a public community centre within the development. That's a recommendation – a condition, and the applicant said they're happy to provide a childcare centre, and I think they also said and a community centre.

25 MR EYRE: Well, that'll come back to the demand for those sorts of facilities. Usually you find, like with schools, childcare centres are in demand where you've got young people with children that are still working. Now, it depends on what sort of demographic groups are going to be living in this complex whether they need a childcare centre or an old – an aged health centre.

30

MS WARTON: What about a community centre? Is Council interested in a community centre in that location?

35 MR EYRE: I couldn't say right off the top of my head, unless anyone else has got any feedback that they might've come across.

MS GOODWORTH: Emily Goodworth, I don't believe there's been any discussions with Council asset owners or the like in relation to the proposal.

40

MR WASSON: No. Well, Council is working – as Robert said, we are – we've sketched plans on the way for a library on the southern side – or in – southern side of Kibble Park. It's next to the Commonwealth Bank, I think it is, so that would contain Council – library plus whatever other Council community facilities they think is appropriate, so I can't see Council providing its own community centre and then providing - - -

45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WASSON: - - - public use something else - - -

5 MR WILSON: And that's covered by your section – the contributions plan, yes?

MS WARTON: Does that reduce the area of the park for open space?

MR EYRE: Sorry, say that again.

10

MS WARTON: Does what – if you provided the new library there, does it reduce the actual open space area available in the park?

MR WASSON: No - - -

15

MR EYRE: Not the whole area, it's on the southern side of Donnison Street, not the park side.

MR WASSON: Yes.

20

MS WARTON: Okay.

MR WILSON: Stage 1 works and draft conditions. I understand Council had some concerns with the Stage 1 works? No?

25

MR EYRE: Robert Eyre here, Chris. I think they were mainly to do with engineering water sewer drainage or something.

MR WILSON: Okay. All right.

30

MR EYRE: Whether Tony wants to come in on that.

MR WILSON: We've picked up an issue this morning, Heather, do you want to just talk to that in relation - - -

35

MS WARTON: Yes, the applicant said yesterday when we were onsite that they're going to fill – take fill from the Albany Street side, I think that's where we were standing, Albany and William Street side where it's higher, after they've demolished the car park and put it – fill in a hole, as they put it, to create the temporary car park. Is that Council's understanding?

40

MR EYRE: Sorry, say that again, just trying - - -

MS WARTON: They're going to fill in part of the – they're going to take fill from one part of the site and where there's a hole, as they put it, to be filled in from where there's been demolition in another part of the site, they're going to use the fill from

45

one part of the site to use on the other part of the site to create the car park, the temporary car park.

MR WILSON: Okay.

5

MR EYRE: I would assume they'd be trying to use some of the material to provide some sort of base for a car park, a temporary use, rather than bringing in material, but they're going to have a lot of excavation of material to be removed from that site, because – did you go down into the basement areas of that site?

10

MS LEWIN: No.

MR EYRE: It's like Jurassic Park underneath there, because of all the waste and other waste storage areas and car parking they had underneath. They've got a lot of concrete to take out of that site.

15

MR WILSON: They did say they're going to hard stand the temporary car park, though.

20

MR EYRE: Yes, but - - -

MS WARTON: Yes.

MR EYRE: - - - if they break up the material onsite and then use that as some sort of paving for a temporary car park, that's going to involve noise issues, dust issues and other issues.

25

MR WILSON: Yes, of course.

30

MS WARTON: Yes. We may have to clarify that with the applicant, then.

MR WILSON: After you, Heather.

MR FAVETTA: Anthony Favetta. I was just going to ask on item 8 – we're into item 9 now on the agenda, you had stormwater works, relocation of sewer.

35

MS WARTON: Yes.

MR FAVETTA: Did you want to ask anything on that?

40

MS WARTON: I think there was some mention of Council of the need to consider easements that come from other properties that run through this site.

MR FAVETTA: Yes.

45

MS WARTON: How is that being catered for, or can you explain that issue to us?

MR FAVETTA: Yes. Okay. What I might do, I might just share the screen.

MS WARTON: Okay. Hold on. I'll make you host.

5 MR FAVETTA: Okay.

MR WILSON: Sorry, I skipped over that.

10 MR FAVETTA: Do I hit share screen?

MS WARTON: Yes, it should work, because you're the host now.

15 MR FAVETTA: Okay. I think it's this one. Okay. All right. So here's the site – let me know if you can see it.

MS WARTON: I can't see it yet, no.

MR WILSON: No, I can't see it yet.

20 MR FAVETTA: Okay. All right.

MR EYRE: It's not coming up, Tony.

25 MR FAVETTA: Hang on. Share.

MS WARTON: Okay. We're getting there.

MR WILSON: Closer. There we go.

30 MR FAVETTA: Yes.

MS WARTON: Yes.

35 MR FAVETTA: We've got it?

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS WARTON: Yes.

40 MR EYRE: Yes.

45 MR FAVETTA: Okay. All right. So as you can see, at the moment when you look at the stormwater, over here at the top end of Albany Street we have a Council stormwater pipe that runs through these props diagonally till you meet the actual subject site, where it then traverses the site back to Henry Parry Drive. Okay. As part of the recommendations, because of the impact of what you've got here, Council currently has an easement to drain water over this. What I was looking at doing is to

free the site of this public stormwater system, back up here in the top end of Albany Street North to collect at this point, run it down William Street, block off this system here, and run this system down William Street and a new system down here to connect to Henry Parry Drive around here to cater for one in a hundred year.

5

Now, what you can see, you see a dashed line running across Henry Parry Drive. That is a trunk drainage system that Council put in, but that's not actually taking the stormwater from the one that traverses the site. So that's why I've put in an extra condition that when the stormwater is diverted down Albany Street, this system that runs – then runs across Henry Parry Drive is also upgraded to accommodate the one in a hundred year flows to get all of that water across the road to that recurrence interval.

10

Now, back up here at the interface with number 37 and the subject site, I've put in conditions that – what's unknown is whether or not these developments here, because these actually do grade towards the rear of the site. So there is, potentially, an area of these slots here which aren't picked up, and there are pits shown on that stormwater line.

15

Now, what I was saying was that – this is actually blocked up at the top here at Albany Street North and decommissioned as a Council line. This would then become an inter-allotment drainage line and then to connect it from where it enters the site here back up to the new line that's running down Williams Street. So you'd have an interim – or, potentially, a permanent inter-allotment drainage line connecting back into the new Council system. So that's where I was trying to clarify through requirement for easements and diversions to free the site of Council water, but at the same time collect storm water from the neighbouring properties.

20

MS WARTON: And have they included your conditions in the draft conditions of consent?

25

MR FAVETTA: I had a quick look. I can see – I'll just see if I can find it. Just bear with me a minute, please. Okay. I did see some conditions talking about the drainage works themselves. I think it may have been in the B section. Okay. So under B27 it's talking about capturing those – the stormwater from those four lots and discharging it back to Council's stormwater system in William Street and having that cater for one in a hundred. So that's an inter-allotment drainage system, which was heading along that interface with number 37 back to William Street.

30

Then further down in B29, in part A is where they've talked about constructing that trunk drainage system on the alignment I just talked about a minute ago, and part 2 of that talks about upgrading the stormwater across Henry Parry Drive, and part 3 was talking about blocking off that redundant pipe, also, that runs across Albany Street North. So from what I can see, they have actually considered and included those conditions in the proposed conditions.

35

40

45

MS WARTON: So is there anything else that you think needs to go in there, or you think that's – they've covered it all off?

5 MR FAVETTA: I think they did cover it. The only thing – I don't know if we talk about it now or later, but the only thing I didn't really talk about was in the future when they talk about upgrading the footways, et cetera, with the future development applications that come in. I had made recommended conditions that that be undertaken as requirements as part of the master plan for the future development, but I couldn't really see too much talking to that in the conditions.

10 MR WILSON: So just in general on the conditions, Council – has Council had the opportunity to comment on the conditions? Were the conditions forwarded to council for comment?

15 MS GOODWORTH: No.

MR EYRE: It's Robert here. This is the first time I've seen them, so I'm not aware that they were forwarded - - -

20 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR EYRE: Unless someone else has looked at them. Yes.

25 MR WILSON: Would you mind looking – I think we asked you last time in relation to Mann Street to look at the recommend draft conditions. Are you happy to provide comment on them to us again?

MR EYRE: Yes.

30 MR WILSON: Because we'd appreciate your input.

MR FAVETTA: Sure.

35 MS WARTON: Particularly in regards to the Stage 1 works, because that's a real DA that's actually going to construction to the next stage.

40 MR FAVETTA: Yes. Yes. Anthony Favetta here again. Yes, look, as Robert and Emily have said, yes, look, to be honest, the first I've seen these conditions is in preparation for this meeting.

MS GOODWORTH: Emily Goodworth here. Heather, the first we, sort of, knew that this was going to the IPC and any report or conditions have been prepared was when you made contact with me.

45 MR WILSON: When was that?

MS WARTON: Last week, probably.

MS GOODWORTH: Yes, I think - - -

MS WARTON: When we started to organise the meeting. It doesn't sound like that
5 there is a normal process for stakeholders to be identified that it's been referred to the
IPC. There doesn't seem to be a step in the process.

MR WILSON: But you knew it was going to the IPC at some stage. It had so.

MS GOODWORTH: Emily Goodworth. We knew it was going to the IPC.
10

MR WILSON: Yes. Yes.

MS GOODWORTH: We didn't know when, then.

15 MR WILSON: Okay. All right. Well, we would really appreciate your comments
on those draft conditions. Can we request that that be, if possible, given to us by
next Tuesday close of business? Is that possible? Emily?

MR EYRE: Emily?
20

MR WILSON: You're thinking about it?

MS GOODWORTH: Sorry. No. Emily Goodworth here. Sorry. I was trying to
25 work out my mute. I'll just - as long as I have no - - -

MR WILSON: Look, just - - -

MS GOODWORTH: - - - serious objection from the other staff.

30 MR WILSON: Yes. Yes. Okay.

MS GOODWORTH: I just have to be mindful of other staff - - -

MR WILSON: Yes. Sure.
35

MS GOODWORTH: - - - that are here, if they're on leave, but does anyone have
any other concerns with meeting that timeframe?

40 MR WILSON: Look, we'll leave it with you. We'll leave it with you, and if you
need extra time just give us a call, okay.

MS GOODWORTH: Okay. We can do that.

45 MR WILSON: Because that's the same timeframe we've given the applicant and
the Department to provide additional information to us, as well.

MS GOODWORTH: Okay.

MR WILSON: So – but if you – obviously, if you need extra time, we’re happy to give it.

MS GOODWORTH: Thank you.

5

MR WILSON: All right. Yes.

MR FAVETTA: Yes. Anthony Favetta. The other one was the relocation of a sewer, which I believe Johnson’s on the meeting for. Maybe you can talk to Johnson about that.

10

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR ZHANG: In terms of the sewer, before the demolitions – or when the demolitions happen, the applicants will need to relocate the sewer out of the proposed development site, and then divert it around – depends on the design, around William Street and then connect down to the intersection between William Street and Henry Parry Drive, where the existing Council sewer manhole is, and then which is – will gravitate into the existing system.

15
20

MR WILSON: So do they need to update – do they need to augment that system? I mean the shopping centre wouldn’t have had that many people, and now we’re looking at 750 dwellings or something, I mean - - -

MR ZHANG: Yes. In terms of that, Council have done the, sort of, what was it called, the Gosford CBD servicing strategy a few years back, and it was identified a further augmentation downstream to the development site, which is Council is currently seeking State Government funding - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

25
30

MR ZHANG: - - - in order to do the upgrade.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35

MR ZHANG: Which is more down that – the laneway into Kibble Park. So – and from the strategy, the – there’s no augmentation been identified from this development site.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40

MR ZHANG: As long as they can – well, as long as they need to relocate it outside of the development footprint - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

45

MR ZHANG: And then that will be satisfied the water sewer.

MR WILSON: Okay. Yes.

MR ZHANG: Well, at the same time, they just can't interrupt the upstream people.

5 MR WILSON: Sure, but that would need to be a condition on the Stage 1 – if there's a Stage 1 approval - - -

MR ZHANG: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: - - - that would need to be a condition, yes?

MR ZHANG: Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

15

MR ZHANG: They still need to lodge a – what we call a section 305 application.

MR WILSON: Sure.

20 MR ZHANG: Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. Well, can you include that in your comments on Tuesday?

MR ZHANG: Sure.

25

MR WILSON: We'd appreciate that.

MR ZHANG: Yes.

30 MR WILSON: Okay. Any last comments?

MR ZHANG: No.

MR WILSON: Okay. Sorry?

35

MR GREEN: It's Steve Green. I just wanted to make a comment about the traffic and parking side of it – or the parking side of things.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40

MR GREEN: With the latest Central Coast parking strategy, they talk about there's too much long stay parking in the Gosford CBD, and there's 535 spaces that are currently in – being used by everybody, so it'd be good to reduce the all-day parking. Perhaps all day parking should be limited to four hour parking, or two hour parking, so there's a bit of a turnover, because at the moment overall there's a – we have too much all day parking across the city centre.

45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR GREEN: But that's a broad, sort of, strategy. We're trying to incrementally reduce the long stay parking.

5

MR WILSON: Okay. It's not being replaced, it's just being reduced, yes?

MR GREEN: Yes. There's away too much long stay parking, and the Council is taking steps to incrementally increase the parking turnovers by introducing parking restrictions, and around the hospital there's a huge amount of on street parking, and it's all day parking, and it should be, like, four-hour parking - - -

10

MR WILSON: Right.

15 MR GREEN: - - - so customers can go to the hospital.

MR WILSON: So you're doing that, and you need to offset that with all day parking, though. Where is that being provided?

20 MR GREEN: Well, the strategy is to provide more long stay parking on the outskirts of town.

MR WILSON: Okay. Yes, yes, yes. That's right.

25 MR GREEN: And have a shuttle bus.

MR WILSON: And get the shuttle bus. Yes. I got you. I remember that.

MR GREEN: Yes.

30

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

MS WARTON: Does that mean for the temporary car park, you'd seek that to be time limited to two hours?

35

MR GREEN: Well, the casual – the commercial parking and retail parking, that they should be a turnover. We shouldn't have all day parking for those spaces. If it's possible to have a turnover, that's appropriate for the location.

40 MR WILSON: But what's the parking now in the old – if that's all it's used for, isn't it, parking?

MR GREEN: It's 535 spaces all day parking.

45 MR WILSON: All day parking.

MR GREEN: Yes.

MR WILSON: So - - -

MR GREEN: And it's free.

5 MR WILSON: Yes, yes, I know. So it gets utilised.

MR GREEN: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: But – so but you – the temporary car park that's going in, the – I think it's 177 spaces - - -

MR GREEN: Yes.

15 MR WILSON: - - - after Stage 1. You would – is it Council's view that that be all day or short stay, or shorter stay?

MR GREEN: Well, shorter stay. I haven't consulted with anyone about that one.

20 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR GREEN: It was just something that needs to be discussed, and incorporated in a future, sort of, parking - - -

25 MR WILSON: DAs. Yes.

MR GREEN: - - - controls and DAs.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

30 MR EYRE: Robert Eyre here, Chris. Just to make a comment on that, if they're building this thing in stages, when they eventually do build it, they will probably need a lot of workers' parking anyway, so that actually may get taken up by that.

35 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GREEN: Yes.

40 MR WILSON: Yes, that's true, too. A lot of – 177 spaces will probably go up with construction workers.

MR GREEN: Yes.

MR EYRE: Otherwise they'll be parking in the side streets.

45 MS WARTON: Yes. That's true.

MR GREEN: Yes.

MS WARTON: Just getting – on this parking theme, I remember with Mann Street there was some issue about the water table, so that was the reason why the parking had to be above ground. This site isn't – it hasn't got flooding impact - - -

5 MR GREEN: No.

MS WARTON: Well, it's not close to the water mark. Is there any reason why the car parking isn't underground, or what – is this accepted that parking in Gosford is going to be above ground or what's the Council's view on that?

10

MR EYRE: It's Robert Eyre here. First of all, basically, the main reason for requiring car parking underground is to reduce the visual impact of it.

MR GREEN: That's right.

15

MR EYRE: But if car parking can't go below ground level for water table or other issues, then, essentially, it needs to be screened by residence, shops or whatever the case may be.

20 MR GREEN: Yes.

MR EYRE: The waterside development on the – in front of Council there, part of their basement car parking area was going below the water table, and they would have to bund it to keep it, basically, float free or water free. Given that this site is – has a major drain – used to be on a water course that went – that now still goes through the middle of Kibble Park, there could be some water table issues there, but if you look at – if you'd gone underneath the building, you'll find that the current building, not just the shops, the current basement car parking for garbage and everything else goes well below ground level.

30

MR WILSON: Okay. We did ask – have – we did ask – was it the Department or the applicant we asked that question this morning and they took it on notice?

MS WARTON: Yes, I think so.

35

MR WILSON: I think it was the Department.

MS WARTON: One of them.

40 MR WILSON: Yes.

MS WARTON: Yes.

MR WILSON: We were just trying to work out whether it's just commercial convenience or whether there was a geotechnical or a structural reason why they weren't going lower.

45

MR EYRE: I think they will find that when they demolish the existing building and remove everything, they're already going to have a nice area below ground, anyway.

5 MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. All right. Heather, Wendy, any further questions?

MS LEWIN: No, I'm right, thanks.

10 MS WARTON: We didn't really touch on the through site links, or did we? The shadowing.

MR WILSON: That's true. No, we didn't. No we didn't.

15 MS WARTON: The overshadowing of the through site link is – I think the applicant, it finds that it's in sun in the middle of the day from, I don't know, was it 12 o'clock onwards, this is the new south link.

MR WILSON: One and a-half hours, I think.

20 MS WARTON: One and a-half hours in all south link. Their explanation was that it's inevitable that the east-west link is going to be overshadowed, and the north-south link is in sun in a, you know, important part of the day. Is there anything that council – or is Council happy with the configuration, the width, the amount of overshadowing in the through site links?

25 MR WASSON: Mark Wasson here. I would like to – personally, I would like to see a wider link; however, I – my main concern was that their pool area, which is on the podium on one of the – I think it's the building – one of the southern towers, it's on the podium, was going – largely going to be overshadowed during the day. There is a cut back on that tower, so I think it does get – probably, it gets sun from,
30 probably, about – till 1.30 ; 2 o'clock, but to me, again, a pool area should be an area which is getting adequate sun and I don't know if there's going to be another pool.

They did mention further communal spaces on top of the tower, I think it was, but I don't know if there's going to be a pool there, but I – that was an issue which should
35 have been addressed, and it hasn't been addressed with these latest drawings, either. I mean, again, I – personally, I would like – I understand that, clearly, the more public space they have, the less they're losing out on liveable area, and they will get sun during midday of – I'm not quite sure, midday and in mid-winter down in that north-south through site – yeah, the north-south through site link, so they will get
40 some, but, again, I think it is preferable that you get more sun, rather than merely saying, you know, "We're getting sun between 1 and 2 or from 12 to 1", or whatever the case may be.

45 MS WARTON: And what would you have to do to get more sun north-south?

MR WASSON: Well, you'd have to widen that through site link slightly. I mean, it's – certainly on the northern site of that clearly you're going to get more sun. The

further south you go, there's going to be reduced sun, because you're – simply just the - - -

5 MR WILSON: The angle changes, yes.

MR WASSON: The angles of it.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MS LEWIN: Mark, it's also the – the width of the podium, the height of the podium and - - -

MR WASSON: Yes.

15 MS LEWIN: - - - also the profile - - -

MR WASSON: Yes. Yes.

20 MS LEWIN: The profile of the towers, especially the towers 1 and 3, and the adjacent corners that would, if reprofiled, allow more sun to - - -

25 MR WASSON: Yes, the towers are stepped back from the podium, so you certainly will get – I don't think it'll be the towers actually blocking the sunlight. It will be the – largely, it would be the podium blocking sunlight through there, but, as you say, if they were profiled in some way, it would include the solar access there, too.

30 MS LEWIN: That's true. Also the pool is a private open space in that, sort of, collective development, and I think we've been concentrating on what will be largely understood to be the public open spaces, which are the cross site links or through site links.

MR WASSON: Yes.

35 MS LEWIN: The north-south one, particularly, being a shared zone for two-way cars, parking for drop off, pick up and some landscaping and public, you know, footpath use. So I suppose the question must – might also be broadened out to whether Council had any preferred uses that could be adjacent to the link that – the commercial or had some - - -

40 MR WILSON: Ideas on how to activate those through site links.

MR WASSON: Yes.

45 MS LEWIN: Because - - -

MR WASSON: I'm not – I would imagine that they would be more likely to be commercial spaces along there, offices or things like that. I may – could well be

wrong. There may well be areas that are for retail or cafes, or something like that, but I would imagine that the – those sort of retail areas would be – more likely to be located within the existing shopping centre and I can't imagine that, as Robert has said in the past, the shopping centre was a bit of a – didn't work very well, and I
5 would imagine that the retail, food, places like that will be more likely to be on the other side of Henry Parry Drive where people can buy something and sit in the sun at the park, but - - -

10 MS LEWIN: You're also aware that the cross through site – site – cross site links or through site links are intended to be open 24 hours a day?

MR WASSON: I believe so. I think that's – yes, I believe that's very - - -

15 MS LEWIN: at commercial - - -

MR WASSON: Yes, they should be public spaces. They should not be – not, like, a shopping mall that's closed at midnight.

20 MR WILSON: Yes. No, we agree with that.

MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR WILSON: All right. Okay. I think, unless you guys have got anything more to say, we're happy to hear it, but otherwise I think we'll wrap up. Emily, do you think that's it or is there anything further?

MS GOODWORTH: I think that's it, unless any other staff have any other key issues that they can think of that haven't been covered at the moment.

30 MR ZHANG: I'm sorry, I just want to raise that as – just looking at the plan, the proposed development will be, sort of, building new kerbs and gutter along the roads. The water main in the area, it's 100 mil, and it's cast iron, which is old and really brittle material. They might – the development will trigger the replacement of the water mains.

35 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR ZHANG: Yeah.

40 MR WILSON: Well, we can - - -

MR ZHANG: In terms of the pressure, the – we'll recommend the applicant to seek Council for the pressure statements for their internal hydraulic design. That sort of
45 thing.

MR WILSON: Okay. Can you add that on, maybe - - -

MR ZHANG: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - your comments on the conditions, because that's important.

5 MR ZHANG: Sure.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR ZHANG: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: Anything else?

MR ZHANG: No, that's it. Sorry.

15 MR WILSON: No, you're right. All right. Look, again we thank you very much. It's been valuable and, yes, we look forward to getting your comments on the conditions. Thank you very much for coming.

MS GOODWORTH: Thank you very much Chris, Wendy, Heather.

20 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS WARTON: Yes.

25 MR WILSON: Thank you. Bye everybody.

MS GOODWORTH: Bye.

MR EYRE: Bye.

30 MR GREEN: Bye.

MR WILSON: Play safe.

35 MR EYRE: Yes. Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.09 pm]