



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-1251766

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: NEWPORT GATEWAY

PANEL:

**ILONA MILLAR
ADRIAN PILTON
STEPHEN BARRY**

APPLICANT:

**DAVID FURLONG
GREG BOSTON
GEOFF BUTCHER**

DATE:

2.07 PM, WEDNESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2020

MS I. MILLAR: So without further ado, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past, present, and emerging, and the elders from other communities who may be here with us. Today, I would like to welcome you to
5 our meeting. As you know, the Northern Beaches Council has lodged a request to review the Gateway determination for a planning proposal which is seeking to amend the Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014 to permit seniors housing with development consent as an additional permitted use on land at numbers 2 and 4 Nooal Street and number 66 Bardo Road, Newport.

10 My name is Ilona Millar. I am the chair of this IPC panel. And joining me today is my fellow Commissioner, Mr Adrian Pilton. The other attendee of this meeting is Stephen Barry from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. So in the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information,
15 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 consideration of this matter, and it will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. In that regard, we have spoken with the council and with the department, and we have also undertaken an
20 inspection of the site.

For the purposes of the meeting, it's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. But if
25 you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer it today, please feel free to take the question on notice and you can provide any additional information in writing. Anything that is provided additional will be then put up on our website. Given that we are meeting via this Zoom platform, I would ask that everyone today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time for the benefit of the transcript and also just to be conscious not to speak over the top of each other so we
30 can capture everything that people are saying for the transcript.

So with that introduction, we will now begin. I understand that the office has provided you with an agenda of the areas of – that are of interest to the Commission in our consideration of this matter. And so with that, what I propose is handing over
35 to your team to just provide us with an overview of what is proposed and why you consider the – you know, the proposal to be of strategic – sort of, of strategic merit and required in this area.

MR D. FURLONG: Madam Chair, David Furlong. While Greg is the planner for the application and Geoff Butcher is obviously the proponent, I've been assisting
40 them strategically for a long time now, unfortunately, or fortunately, whichever way you look at it. Obviously, we believe that our proposal is reasonable. For many years, prior to the zoning change in 2014, seniors living developments in this part of the world and, indeed, on this land, were permissible, and the proposal that we've
45 developed in terms of a guiding plan satisfies all of the requirements of both the council's LEP in terms of height, FSR, etcetera, and also it's DCP for seniors living,

which, strangely, despite the fact that there's no land in the area, residential land, upon which these things can be built at the moment, the council retains its DCP.

5 The design has been set up so that the building is no more than two storeys. It's set well back from the waterfront. You've been down there. You've seen, it's a very busy waterfront with lots of boats, lots of structures in the waterway, very much a mixed use land use pattern and an eclectic built form outcome from houses to blocks of units and the commercial aspects of the marina itself. There is without doubt a need for seniors living in the Northern Beaches area of Sydney, and one of the questions that Callum provided us was in that regard. And I'll just take you to a couple of documents. Firstly, the 2016 quick stats for Newport from the census is very interesting. It shows that in the age groups from 40 to 69 at the time, the percentage of population related to the state and national average was greater in Newport. While that trend continues up to the years of 70 to 74, once you get to 75
10 to 79 and 80 to 84, that percentage drops rapidly to being all of a sudden below the state and national average, and that's simply because there's nowhere for those people to go.
15

20 Now, in conjunction with that, the Northern District plan put out by the Greater Sydney Commission confirms those figures insofar as it says:

Between 2018 and 2036, the age coefficients for years 65 to 84 will grow by 47 per cent. The age coefficient of 85 years and over will grow by 85 per cent.

25 When you link those back to the census, by the time you get around to 2028, the people who are currently in the age bracket of 40 to 44, up to 65 to 69, guess what, they will have aged into those categories of 47 per cent and 85 per cent increase. So, clearly, the state plan, the regional plan, and the Northern Districts plan contemplates the fact that there is a serious need on the Northern Beaches, and also included in
30 those, the councils of Ku-ring-gai and Willoughby as well as the old Warringah and Pittwater, a serious need for ageing facilities and the services that go with them in locations that are within the acceptable standards of proximity to services and to transport, and this site ticks all of those.

35 The department, in its numerous reports and advices have confirmed that in responding to the council's submissions. And it's interesting that the council and local panel has said no to this proposition twice. The regional panel and the department have continued to say yes, it's not only a reasonable proposal, but this sort of facility is needed in the area. We have a Gateway, and we have that Gateway
40 because what we're asking for is simply an additional permitted use on the land. And the department said, yes, this is reasonable based on the advice of the regional panel. So we now still find ourselves back in this around and around because every time a decision is made and the council has an opportunity to put a roadblock in the way, it does so, and we don't understand why. As I said, the guiding development
45 plan satisfies all of the council's criteria as well as if it applied the seniors living SEPP.

So I've been doing this sort of stuff for a long time now as a planner. I don't understand why there is this objection. As Geoff Butcher will explain to you, this is, effectively, a development by the locals, for the locals, because they want to age in place. So in terms of statistics and numbers and the need for the thing in Newport, that's all I'd like to say. Greg and Geoff are going to answer any other of those – those other two questions. And, of course, we're here to provide any other advice or assistance that you need.

MS MILLAR: Thanks very much, David. I think just on that last point, I mean, are you able to point to any seniors living facilities within the Newport area at present? I mean, certainly, we didn't see any when we did our site inspection, but, you know, are there any facilities that you're aware of within that Newport area?

MR FURLONG: Not that I'm aware of, Madam Chair. But, obviously, Greg and Geoff know the area better than me. They can probably give you a more definitive answer. But I know from my own experience having sat on the IPCs predecessor and also the Sydney East JRPP, we used to get a lot of applications for seniors living, and I don't remember a single one in the Warringah or Pittwater areas in those years from 2009 to 2016 that were actually recommended for approval. Some in the old Pittwater area – in the old Warringah area ended up being Land Environment Court approvals.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much, David. Greg, was there anything that you wanted to add or continue with in respect of the proposal and, perhaps, talking us through exactly what is proposed and how it fits both that strategic and site specific planning merits?

MR BOSTON: Yes, sure. Look, all I'd add in terms of whether there is other seniors housing within the Newport area is that the ability to develop a site pursuant to the state policy requires the site to be relatively unconstrained in terms of, you know, both topography, but also in terms of accessibility to a bus stop or a centre, whereby, that path of travel needs to be by way of an accessible path. So that, straight away, depending on the location of bus stops and the topography, generally, in the area, will knock out a large amount of properties, particularly from the more hilly suburbs, including Newport, Bayview.

Now, the subject site prior to the council's rezoning in 2014, seniors housing was permissible on the site, pursuant to the state policy. And it was permissible because it not only satisfied the 400 metres accessible path of travel to a bus stop, but there weren't any constraints pursuant to the SEPP which would knock the ability to develop the site for that purpose. Schedule 1 of the SEPP does exclude certain land. And one of those exclusions in relation to, for instance, flooding, is if you are in a floodway or a high risk flood area which the subject site is not. So to that extent, the fact that you don't see a proliferation of seniors housing in Newport is also to do about the fact that there simply isn't – there aren't many sites which are suitable for the land use, such as the subject site, the subject of this planning proposal.

So the department has come back and made it clear to us that the turning off of the SEPP by way of the E4 zone was an unintended consequence of the E4 zone. And what the application before you, does, simply seeks to reinstate seniors housing, not pursuant to the SEPP, but under council's LEP. So the – any application lodged
5 would be under the LEP, so the 8.5 metre height control will apply, the foreshore building line will apply. And as David said, the council's DCP already anticipates a raft of controls applicable to seniors housing within the Newport locality. That is, the assessment of this application will be under exactly the same controls as which would apply to a single dwelling house on the subject site. So it gives everyone
10 certainty that in terms of character and height and setbacks, that the development will need to satisfy council's DCP controls.

The plans that were submitted as concept plans, in a way, with the planning proposal prepared by a local architect, Richard Cole. Those plans comply with the state
15 planning policy, but more importantly, comply with the council's own LEP and DCP controls. Now, the form and massing of the development as it presents to Crystal Bay has been broken into two distinct pavilions consistent with the rhythm of dwelling houses, generally, to the bay, and as it presents to the street again, a well-articulated building form compliant with the height standard.

20 The – in terms of site specific planning merit, we went towards identifying the fact that the E4 zone is ordinarily applied to sites which are significantly constrained. And there was a number of criteria that originally applied, and those constraints go towards topography, being close to the ridgeline, bushfire affectation, biodiversity
25 affectation. None of those affectations apply to the subject site. It's relatively flat. It's got no biodiversity layer. It isn't bushfire prone land. There is a slight flooding affectation, both in terms of the Estuarine Planning Level, and also the – a flood planning level caused by localised flooding which traverses down adjacent to the southern boundary of the property. But, again, the state policy would not have
30 knocked this particular site out in terms of that level of flood affectation.

And, in fact, the plans that have been submitted as concept plans satisfy the levels that were provided to – by council back in 2017, in terms of the estuary and planning level, and the requirement to satisfy the 2100 or 2100 planning sea level rise, and
35 also able to satisfy the PMF. And, of course, the PMF only applies to the portion of the land upon which the – which is flood affected. So there's an ability, simply, to locate the development outside the area affected by the PMF and have no restriction on the site at all. So to that extent - - -

40 MS MILLAR: So just in that respect, just to quickly jump in and clarify then - - -

MR BOSTON: Sure.

MS MILLAR: - - - that assessment was based on council's information as at 2017.
45 Have you done any revisions, sort of, following the Newport flood study and the – that I understand council has subsequently adopted?

MR BOSTON: Sure. Yes, look, the reference to the 2017 advice from council was in terms of the Estuarine Planning Levels, so that's the flood affectation coming from the bay, if you like, associated with the – with sea level and wave inundation. So that particular policy hasn't changed. The Newport Flood Policy is dealing with the
5 overland flooding caused by the water coming off the hill, if you like, and going into Newport. So in terms of the Estuarine Planning Level, council has said, look, you need to establish your floor levels at the 2100 sea level rise levels, and we can certainly satisfy that. In terms of the 2019 flood study, council wrote to the owners of 66 Bardo Road the week before that flood study was to be adopted, and they
10 provided site specific advice in terms of the level of affectation.

Now, that advice was that in the one in 100 year flood, that the property actually wasn't affected. However, when you applied the freeboard, the 300 freeboard for the flood planning level at the site was slightly affected, just in that south eastern corner.
15 They've also identified the need pursuant to their policy to adopt the PMF level, the probable maximum flood level, as a minimum floor level for sensitive uses on the site such as seniors housing. And, again, we are able to satisfy that provision quite readily, noting that there's no doubt an opportunity to simply locate the development entirely outside that PMF affected area of the subject site.

20 MR A. PILTON: Can I just ask a question while on the subject of the flooding, if you look at the plans that we have which are pretty basic, it looks like the water runs down Bardo road. And I'm looking at the site specs that's your architect's plans, it looks like the garage entrance would be possibly affected by the flood water running
25 into the garage area. That's a bit of a detour which is probably not that relevant, but it just looks that way to me.

MR BOSTON: Yes, sure. I was just – what plan were you looking at? I'm just not sure if we can screenshare, but was it one of the flooding plans?
30

MR PILTON: Of the plan that – I'm looking at the sections your architect's drawing A05 - - -

MS MILLAR: I think this is the concept design plans from - - -
35

MR PILTON: Sure.

MS MILLAR: - - - Richard Cole and dated July 2017.

40 MR BOSTON: Yes, got you. Okay. Yes, look, in terms of the driveway entrance, certainly, the PMF flooding doesn't extend up to the boundary where that driveway comes out, but I take your point that if the driveway, for instance, was excavated so you dropped straight down into site, there might be a need for a crest level at the PMF level. It's probably more a design detail than anything. Now, the plans were
45 provide – provided for a conceptual, sort of, idea of what could potentially be accommodated on the site and those sorts of detail would certainly be something

which would fall back detailed assessment during the DA assessment process, but certainly take your point in relation to that.

MR PILTON: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you.

5

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great. So the – sort of, just been briefly touching on the parking and access, but is there anything more that you can elaborate on in terms of the site access and traffic management issues, particularly, as we understand it, Bardo Road, at that point, is, essentially, a private road and an unformed, sort of –
10 from a – so a private road, and that further works would be required to address the intersection with Nooal Road in the corner and, you know, planning for access down Bardo Road. Is there anything that you're able to elaborate on in terms of what you would expect for managing traffic and access?

15 MR BOSTON: Yes, sure. Look, the – we certainly anticipate council imposing some conditions requiring works to that unmade section of Bardo Road. It's certainly public land. There is a driveway down there, but the driveway provides access to, I believe it's a Sydney Water pump station - - -

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MR BOSTON: - - - which is located at the end of the road. And so the roadway there currently, certainly, is intended to provide maintenance access to that facility as well. The subject site, 66 Bardo Road, currently has it's vehicular access off this
25 unmade portion of Bardo Road. And, ordinarily, council tries to get developers to – or proponents to upgrade facilities on the public domain with applications such as this. But in terms of traffic management per se, these types of developments aren't significant traffic generators. Bardo Road is certainly just a local road. And our preliminary advice is that the road certainly has the capacity to accommodate the
30 additional traffic generated.

The – in terms of carparking generally, the state policy requires .5 spaces per bedroom. Pittwater Council's own DCP controls will require two spaces per dwelling. And we are certainly prepared or have provided for the ability to
35 accommodate two spaces per dwelling plus any required visitor spaces. So we can accommodate all of the carparking demand on the subject site. And, again, the initial advice is that the – in terms of traffic generation, it's not going to create any issue. I don't recall that being raised as a specific issue from council, but, you know, currently, there are three properties. The application proposes additional apartments.
40 But this is not a large scheme, this is quite a small boutique seniors housing development.

MR FURLONG: I think it's also reasonable to note that the concept design is just that, and as Greg has suggested, if this thing ever moves to a development
45 application, then those detailed infrastructure designs become conditionable and more discussable at that point. But also we have two accesses. We don't rely on Bardo for all of the carparking. It's split between Nooal and Bardo. And that's been

done to limit the amount of traffic going in one way or the other. So I think, you know, as Greg has - - -

MS MILLAR: So - - -

5

MR FURLONG: - - - there are three properties. You could have two to three cars each, and they could be coming – one could be coming off Bardo, although, they all have frontages to Nooal. So the traffic spread is not going to that much different to what it currently is.

10

MS MILLAR: And from your – you haven't identified any potential, sort of, site constraints in terms of side access as a result of that road being unformed. It's – you're telling me that – us, that there – this is something that can clearly be managed through the detailed design 2.32.34; is that right?

15

MR FURLONG: Yes. Whether the council chooses to maintain it in more of a formalised driveway, I don't think it's ever going to need to be turned into a dedicated public road in terms of its constructability, but, clearly, there needs to be access down to the Sydney Water facility, but also, I think it's two properties, Geoff, or three, I haven't been down there for a while, on the southern side that get access. And it effectively is a battle axe style driveway circumstance, it's just it's never been formally made.

20

MS MILLAR: Okay.

25

MR FURLONG: If there was a requirement – sorry, Commissioner, if - - -

MS MILLAR: No, go ahead.

30

MR FURLONG: - - - if there was a fundamental issue with doing works along that particular portion of Bardo Road, then an alternate whereby all access came off Nooal, you're certainly, you know, not something which would be fatal to the application. But, simply, we're utilising the fact that the subject site currently obtains access from both frontages, and we were simply adopting that as a reasonable proposition moving forward.

35

MS MILLAR: Great, thank you. Adrian, any, sort of, questions on these issues or anything more with respect to the site and the site constraints?

40

MR PILTON: Yeah, I just have a simple question at which you may need to take on notice, but the council pointed out yesterday, that their requirement from the DCP is for 60 per cent site landscaping, where you've only got 38 per cent. I'm just wondering if it's feasible for you to comply the respective

45

MR FURLONG: Sure. Commissioner, there was a – there's some compliance tables attached to the plan.

MR PILTON: I know there's

MR FURLONG: I'm just trying to – have you got a copy of that?

5 MS MILLAR: Are you referencing, I think it is, sheet A24, perhaps?

MR PILTON: Yes.

10 MR FURLONG: Yes, page A24, A24 of the plan bundle, you'll see down in the bottom left-hand corner, an analysis in terms of landscaped area. And there is assessment there against the provisions of both the state policy which requires 30 per cent landscaped area and the council's DCP which requires 60 per cent landscaped area. And then down the bottom, you'll see the breakdown of the various landscaped areas proposed, and a total of 63.8 per cent landscaping. So we certainly have
15 designed the concept plans to comply with the current DCP control being 60 per cent, in fact, it exceeds the 60 per cent. And any application lodged to council would need to satisfy that provision. So we haven't relied on the lesser SEPP provision. We've gone, all right, if this application is made pursuant to the DCP, we need to comply with 60 per cent, and we do.

20

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR FURLONG: I think, also, once again, I'm not aware of the council having raised this before, but these are matters for a DA. They're not matters for a planning
25 proposal, but we're happy, as you can see, as Greg has taken you through, if you look at that particular plan in terms of compliance, we comply. And it's been laid out very carefully to make sure that it does comply.

30

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS MILLAR: Thank you. Now, I'm just looking through our agenda items. We've, I think, dealt with the proposed form, access and traffic management. We've touched on flooding and sea level rise. Look, I think as an overarching question which, you know, is really, from your perspective, you know, why are council's
35 existing planning controls inappropriate in this area, from your perspective?

MR BOSTON: Look, I think the – as they relate to seniors housing or - - -

40

MS MILLAR: That's right.

MR BOSTON: Yes, look, I - - -

MS MILLAR: So on the basis that this is looking at an application to have an additional permitted use as seniors living, not, sort of, changing the E4 zoning per se.
45 I know earlier, you mentioned the unintended consequences of the rezoning in the 2014 plan, but could you, perhaps, speak on it a little bit more to that and why you consider the existing controls inappropriate?

MR BOSTON: Yes, sure. Look, in terms of the current controls as they apply to seniors housing, so the DCP controls, we think they're entirely appropriate, and the concept scheme that's been prepared comply with them. So in terms of the controls, we believe they're fair and reasonable. In terms of why we believe that an additional

5 permissible use should be allowed on this particular site is because there simply aren't many sites in the Newport area that seniors housing, pursuant to the SEPP, is able to be carried out. And if that were the case, you would've seen a lot more seniors housing development around.

10 We say that this particular site is ideally suited to seniors housing, not only because of the inherent amenity benefit associated with its location, you know, what a better place to retire, but it will enable existing residents within the Newport area to stay and age in place. And as I said, it would – if the application was made in 2014 pursuant to the SEPP, there wouldn't be any issue in terms of the suitability of the

15 site for the development. There aren't many sites in Newport as suitable as this one, and we say that, for that reason, the proposition for an additional permissible use is entirely appropriate. And by doing it this way, we aren't relying on a state policy to override council's own controls.

20 We are happy to accept council's controls which would apply, otherwise, to any other permissible form of development on the site. And to that extent, we believe that the – what is being proposed is fair and reasonable. That was agreed by the Sydney North Planning Panel. That's been agreed and adopted by the Department of Planning through issue of a Gateway determination. And we believe that the

25 documentation that was prepared and submitted with the application also demonstrates that to be the case.

MR FURLONG: I think also, Madam Chair, in answer – in addition to Greg's response, the council has continually suggested to us that agreeing to this proposal

30 would set a precedent. I think as Greg has pointed out, that's just not right, because this is one of the very few sites anywhere in Newport that can meet all of the accepted standards of location, access to services, access to transport, access to shops, all of those things that have been guiding this form of development throughout the state, and prior to 2014, within the Pittwater – then Pittwater Local

35 Government area. So it can't be a precedent if a development can meet all of the standards that are set. And not only do we meet them, we actually better quite a number of them.

So for the council to keep saying that if this gets agreed to and approved, there's

40 going to be a flood of applications for seniors living in Newport, well, from a statutory planning perspective, if they meet the requisite standards, and we have demographics shown through the census and other planning documentation that confirm the rising in the number and percentages of those age groups, then how is it a bad thing, and why is it considered to be a precedent outside of the statutory

45 planning principles that go with liveability?

MS MILLAR: Okay. Look, thank you, thank you for that. This is probably a question to take on notice, and that it may be, sort of, beyond the area of your immediate knowledge, but you did mention, as I said before, that this was an unintended consequence of the 2014 plan making. Are you aware of any
5 submissions or considerations in the documentation around making the 2014 plan that highlighted and drew to the council's attention that this would potentially prevent, sort of, the seniors living developments to continue on these sites?

MR BOSTON: Yes, look, the – there was some documentation appended to the
10 back of the original planning proposal, the applicant's planning proposal, which identified some community submissions which were made in regards to, effectively, the downzoning of the land. And council's response was, you know, constantly, that this wasn't a – in any way, a downzoning of the land. In fact, you might be aware of the ministerial direction, one of which is that in terms of planning proposals, there
15 shouldn't be any reduction in residential densities associated with that. And also in terms of correspondence in regards to the deferred lands area, which was in the Greater Northern Beaches area, the Minister for Planning had written, at that stage, back to a disgruntled proponent, saying that they would consider reintroducing seniors housing as a permissible use.

20 So we certainly had meetings with the Minister in regards to this. We were directed to liaise back with council, and, potentially, apply for a planning proposal. The Department of Planning suggested that a schedule 1 additional permissible use type approach might be the most appropriate. We engaged formally with council through
25 that process. We had pre-lodgement meetings, council, obviously, identified some issues. And we believe we've comprehensively dealt with all of those issues. So, look, there's certainly been a history in terms of public concern about the effective downzoning of land which was created through the adoption of the E4 zone, generally, in the – within the state planning template.

30 MS MILLAR: Okay. Look, thank you for that. And if it's possible for you to, perhaps, provide us with that supporting information from the original - - -

MR BOSTON: Sure.

35 MS MILLAR: - - - planning proposal, that would very helpful.

MR BOSTON: Sure. Yes.

40 MS MILLAR: Okay. Look, that is the extent of the questions that we had today. Adrian, was there anything else that you wanted to ask of the proponent and

MR PILTON: No, I'm fine, thank you very much.

45 MS MILLAR: Okay. Stephen, is there anything that I have missed that we need to raise in this meeting?

MR S. BARRY: No, I don't think so.

MS MILLAR: Okay. So then in terms of, sort of, follow-up material, if you could provide us with that supporting material, that would be very helpful. And I think that
5 was it, in terms of questions on notice. I'm just checking my notes. Okay. Well, with that, unless – is there anything, sort of, final that you would like to say from your perspective?

MR BOSTON: Look, I'm not sure whether Geoff wants to say something, but just for clarity, the documentation that I'm going to forward to you, what was the specific question; was it whether there had – where the council was aware of concern regarding the loss; is that right?
10

MS MILLAR: Exactly. You know, and as you say, whether there was an active consideration of the effect of what you're calling downzoning by the council as part of its consideration in the making of the 2014 LEP.
15

MR FURLONG: Yes. So, look, it was always in – with the standard template coming in, it was always about translating the current controls into the new template without losing, you know, development potential. Now, unfortunately, you know, the unintended consequence was a specific quirk in the wording in the state policy turned off the SEPP as it related to the E4 zoned land. But, yes, look, we'll – I can certainly get you over some documentation in regards to that.
20

MS MILLAR: Thank you for that. So if there's, sort of, no further comments or closing remarks from your side, then I'd just like to thank you very much for your time this afternoon. As I mentioned at the outset, this is, you know, one - - -
25

MR BOSTON: Sorry, Commissioner, yes, look, the client would just like to say something just before - - -
30

MS MILLAR: Absolutely.

MR BOSTON: - - - we finish up.
35

MR G. BUTCHER: Thank you, Commissioners, my name is Geoff Butcher. I speak as the proponent for this proposal. And I'd just like to touch on a couple of issues that I'd like you to have in mind. I believe that we would be a prime example of seniors who have lived in Newport for many, many years, and, in fact, decades, and have a strong desire to age in place. We're not developers. This proposal is borne from local residents taking an initiative to provide appropriate housing for seniors in their local area. This proposal involves, at the moment, three families, together with their children, who have lived in Newport for over 25 years.
40

All of these three families are in, coincidentally, are a 25 year plus members of the Royal Motor Yacht Club which is a 10 minute walk to the west of our proposed site. And, personally, I'm also a member of the Newport Bowling Club and a major
45

5 sponsor of the Newport Surf Club, where my son is a long-term member, competitive
boat rower, and both these clubs are a comfortable 10 to 15 minute walk to the east
of our site. This walk also incorporates our favourite restaurants and cafes which we
walk to at least four or five times a week. I would add that we've been very
pleased with the inquiry and support of the likeminded residents in our local area.
And look, that's pretty much all that I wanted to say, and I just thank you very much
for the opportunity for speaking today.

10 MS MILLAR: No, look, thank you very much. And we do appreciate those
comments and that personal perspective about your objectives for the development
and your relationship to the local area. Look, as I was going to say, thank very much
for your time today. This is one of a number of meetings that we're having, to
consider our advice on this review. And we have now met with yourselves, the
15 council, and the department, and undertaken our site inspection, and we're in the
process of, you know, considering the submissions made through that process and
the various documents and applicable planning instruments. We will now be taking
our time to carefully consider the matters that have been raised. And, you know, if
we have further questions from you as we go through that process, the office will be
in touch to seek additional information. So with that, I will formally close the
20 meeting for the purposes of the transcription and hope you all have a very nice
afternoon.

MR FURLONG: Wonderful, thank you, Commissioner.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you

MS MILLAR: Thank you.

30 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[2.50 pm]