

MR C. WILSON: Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Carrington Commercial Development currently before the Commission for
5 determination. The applicant, Port of Newcastle Operations, is seeking approval to construct a commercial building at 46 Fitzroy Street, Carrington. The proposal comprises four levels of office space, a café, landscaping, car parking, seating, and communal spaces, a waste disposal area, water tanks and signage. My name is Chris Wilson and I am the Chair of this Commission panel. We are also joined by Lindsay
10 Blecher from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part
15 of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and am not in a position to answer, please, feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional
20 writing which we will put on our website.

I request all members today to introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Who is going to take the lead
25 today?

MR G. MANSFIELD: I guess that will be me in the absence of anyone else putting their hand up.

30 MS M. BISSON: Sorry. Sorry.

MR MANSFIELD: Sorry, Chris.

MR WILSON: All right, Geoff.
35

MR MANSFIELD: We haven't got our game plan together.

MR WILSON: No, no. That's all right. That's not a problem. I guess, I was just thinking about the agenda and I think the best thing to do, and correct me if I'm
40 wrong, is council made a submission to the application. It's probably best if council goes through that submission - - -

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

45 MR WILSON: - - - and talks to those heads of consideration or those matters raised and whether or not they've been resolved, or if they haven't been resolved if they

could be resolved, and I think it's probably the best way to do it. What do you think, Geoff?

5 MR MANSFIELD: Well, I was anticipating you doing that. I've got, actually, our submission in front of me - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

10 MR MANSFIELD: - - - including I've added comments to it so.

MR WILSON: So I will – I will – do you just want to introduce your team first and then – and then - - -

15 MR MANSFIELD: Well, I will - - -

MR WILSON: I know quite a few.

20 MR MANSFIELD: I will introduce my colleagues, not my team, starting with Michelle Bisson. Michelle is the Manager Regulatory Planning and Assessment. Amy Ryan is the Acting Section Manager of Development Assessment, and to the left, I guess, on the screen is David Ryner who is the Acting Coordinator of the Development – sorry – the Engineering Assessment Team.

25 MR WILSON: I think we've met all, have we, on the regional panel? Yes. Okay. All right. I will leave it to you, Geoff.

30 MR MANSFIELD: Okay. Geoff Mansfield, Principal Planner, Newcastle City Council, or, sorry, City of Newcastle. I guess our – we have two main objections or concerns regarding the proposal. One – one involved the zone objective and I will just, as you suggested, Commissioner, with our original submission. I will read briefly what it says:

35 *An objective of this SP1, Special Activity Zone, of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Three Ports) 2013 is to provide for port related facilities and development that supports the operations of the Port of Newcastle. The statement of environmental effects states that given the proximity of the site to the port the development is likely to attract tenants which include port related office based businesses. Such statement has not been collaborated by any hard evidence and infers that some of the future tenants may, in fact, not be*
40 *businesses which support the operations of the port. The statement has also not demonstrated that the development is providing for special land uses that are not provided for in other zones. The land use and scale of the proposed development is more appropriate in the B3 commercial core and B4 mixed use zones of the Newcastle City Centre under the Newcastle Local Environment Plan 2012. As the city centre abuts the harbour it is well placed to*
45 *accommodate port related office based businesses.*

The response to the submission provided by the applicant didn't provide any more compelling evidence which addressed our concern. If anything it sort of muddied the waters by, once again, suggesting that, you know, there may be tenants who may not be port related. They didn't provide any specific examples of any existing or
5 proposed port related office based businesses that possibly could use the facility. They didn't provide any information about a need for such a facility. So our concerns regarding that zone objective remain. We are still concerned in that regard. The second string to our bow is more from a strategic direction and the statement argues that the proposal was generally consistent with the various state and local
10 planning strategies effecting the subject site principally on the basis that it would support the existing and future operations of the port.

However, what we note is that none of the above strategies, including the applicant's Port Master Plan 2040, specifically identify a need for a large commercial
15 development as proposed on the subject site. Council's – Newcastle Local Strategic Planning Statement outlines that the commercial centre hierarchy in the Newcastle Local Government Area with the Newcastle City Centre servicing as the higher – highest order strategic centre. A principle of this statement, Planning Priority 14, is commercial development is concentrated in the Newcastle City Centre. Similarly,
20 the Newcastle Employment Lands Strategy 2019 states:

There is a large amount of commercial development capacity in the Newcastle City Centre particularly around the Honeysuckle precinct and in the western end of the city around the Newcastle Interstate Station.

25 It was recommended that the applicant be required to demonstrate for an economic analysis that there is a clear need for the proposed development and address potential impacts on the Newcastle City Centre and its role identified under the above strategies. The response to the planning submission did not address that requirement.
30 The other issues raised in our submissions, which I will just quickly mention, are noise, requirements for the few drink premises, Aboriginal heritage, traffic and parking, street trees, waste management, the local infrastructure contribution and some additional engineering comments that we raised have generally all been addressed or can be addressed via conditions of consent.

35 So it really leaves us with the two fundamental issues that we have which is, one, consistency with the objectives of the zone and, two, the strategic context of the development. Chris, your mic is off, mate. Sorry, Commissioner. Your mic is off.

40 MR WILSON: I've been called worse. Yes. So we raised these issues with the applicant at our meeting the other day. I don't know if you've had a chance – is the transcript up, is it, Lindsey?

45 MR BLECHER: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes. So, I mean, obviously – I guess, I don't like using the word precedent but, I guess, we did ask the issue of the applicant, the issue of demand,

where the demand was coming from, is there likely to be future demand even if we were minded to approve this application, and I guess we're waiting for a response from that. They did say that it was likely that some of their existing tenants within the area would relocate to that premises but, yes, we're considering that issue as well
5 at the same time. Is it likely to – I guess, from the LSPS – we note your LSPS and what it says and the wider strategy. Do you think it was envisaged – I mean, the fact that it was permissible – additional permissible use that it was envisaged that this might occur?

10 MR MANSFIELD: I think in the State Planning Policy in its original form I think council, and I'm speaking on behalf of someone else, certainly opposed office buildings in the policy. I think the additional permitted use was a later amendment to it. Certainly, as I said, our own strategies are suggesting, you know, that an office
15 building of this scale is something we would prefer to see or concentrate in the city centre and, I guess, on that point, too, in the department's assessment report figure 2 which shows the city centre is not correct. It actually – I think there's a statement, if I recall, saying the subject site is 1.6 from the – 6 kilometres from the city centre. It's not actually. It's a lot closer. The city centre – well, what we define as the city
20 centre can be viewed by going to the Development Control Plan, section 6.

There's a – sorry – the Newcastle Development Control Plan, section 6, which shows the boundaries of the city centre and that has been further expanded when you look at the statement which includes part of Wickham. So, in effect, in figure 2 of the
25 assessment report where the city centre is shown to the east all those other areas to the west of that, including Honeysuckle or western end of Newcastle, they are part of the city centre. So that's why we're arguing that this building is only a stone's throw from the city centre and any locational requirements that you have for that site could equally apply to a development, say, in Honeysuckle, to Newcastle West, and that's acknowledged by the fact that Newcastle Port have their office in the city centre.

30 MR WILSON: Based on proximity. Yes.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

35 MR WILSON: Okay. All right. There's a couple of other issues that I just want to briefly discuss with you. One is the hours of operation which I find – which I find interesting. It basically says that come 6 o'clock on Friday afternoon you shut down and nothing further happens over the weekend. I mean, do you have any comment to
40 make on the hours of operation that have been proposed in the conditions?

MR MANSFIELD: Well, I guess - - -

MR WILSON: Look, putting aside the strategic issues for a minute. Just in terms of site specifics in relation to the hours of operation.

45 MR MANSFIELD: You know, I think they were looking for 6 o'clock in the morning till - - -

MR WILSON: It's in the conditions. I will - - -

MR MANSFIELD: - - - 6 pm. Yes. Condition M13.

5 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MANSFIELD: Monday to Friday. Well, it's a little bit – how do you know the appropriateness of those conditions – of those hours when you don't know what the proposed use is? I mean, I think the – once again the assessment officer's report
10 suggests that's the difference between an office building on this site, or on the proposed site, and in the city centre that some of the future tenants may need to operate outside normal office hours.

MR WILSON: But I presume – I presume the restriction is – we've asked the
15 question and we haven't got – or we may or may not have had a response yet from the department because what's the evidence to suggest that they should – those hours – they should limit those hours?

MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Yes. I think it's a valid question.
20

MR WILSON: Okay. I just thought – thought, maybe, that it was – that someone had raised the issue or concern in relation to the residential interface which is obviously something we need to consider.

25 MR MANSFIELD: Exactly. It's a valid concern - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MANSFIELD: - - - that you need to have regard to also, yes, the residential
30 in proximity to - - -

MR WILSON: Well find out why though that's all because normally you wouldn't put those limitations on a commercial building, would you?

35 MR MANSFIELD: No. No.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. All right. Okay. There was another – just another in their recommended – is you're responsible for footpaths in the area: roads and
40 footpaths?

MR MANSFIELD: Yes, we are.

MR WILSON: So there was a recommendation that they build a footpath and ramps to the bus stop - - -
45

MR MANSFIELD: That's right.

MR WILSON: - - - into the street. The applicant is saying that they're already there. Is someone able to confirm whether that's the case or not? I've done a virtual - - -

5 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - site inspection but you can come back – Geoff, you can come back to us on that one.

10 MR MANSFIELD: Okay.

MR WILSON: We can put it to you in writing if that's – we just want to make sure that we're asking – if we do – indeed, we determine to approve it that we're asking for something that – we're not asking for something - - -

15

MR MANSFIELD: Don't have to reconstruct it.

MR WILSON: Reconstruct something that's not necessary. That's all.

20 MR MANSFIELD: Okay. I will confirm that for you.

MR WILSON: Yes. If you can confirm that for me I would appreciate it and street – street trees are your responsibility as well?

25 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, that's true.

MR WILSON: I think there's quite a prescriptive condition in there in terms of what they have to plant.

30 MR MANSFIELD: Mm.

MR WILSON: Do they have to go back to council? Is it something that they need to go back to council before they do?

35 MR MANSFIELD: I think generally as a rule.

MR WILSON: Okay. That's fine.

MR MANSFIELD: Is there a concern there?

40

MR WILSON: No. Well, they've asked that they just - - -

MR MANSFIELD: Whack them in?

45 MR WILSON: Well, they've raised the issue about the need to go back to council but, look, if it's normal practice I'm happy with it. That's all.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes, it is.

MR WILSON: All right. Okay. That's fine. So the contributions issue has been resolved. Where's your submission? I will just quickly go through the remainder. I
5 know you said they're basically – the noise of mechanical plant. So I think there's conditions in there that cover off on pre-compliance, pre-construction and - - -

MR MANSFIELD: That's right.

10 MR WILSON: - - - pre-operation.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR WILSON: Does that cover your concerns?
15

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR WILSON: They're fairly standard conditions.

20 MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR WILSON: Food and drink premises. Yes, I think that has been addressed. Heritage - - -

25 MR MANSFIELD: We've got a condition on that. Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes. Aboriginal heritage.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes. That's fine.
30

MR WILSON: Yes. Traffic and parking. So there was quite a bit of – well, a number of the submissions raised the issue of traffic or parking, more specifically, in relation to, is it Denison Street, Lindsey?

35 MR L. BLECHER: Sorry, Chris. I'm not sure off the top of my head.

MR WILSON: I've got my map here. Anyway, cars from adjoining businesses parking on the verge and so forth so.

40 MR MANSFIELD: Okay.

MR WILSON: And it was to – to the car park: Denison Street. Yes. So is council – council is comfortable now that provision of 170-odd car parking spaces on site is sufficient to avoid exacerbating that issue.?
45

MR MANSFIELD: My answer is yes unless my colleague, David Ryner, wants to say otherwise. David?

MR D. RYNER: Yes. David Ryner, Acting Coordinator for the Engineering Team for the City of Newcastle. Yes, we're relatively comfortable. They're actually providing excess parking on the site so in terms of the actual development themselves – itself it should be more than adequate. They – yes, I did note that the residents had made a comment in relation to the adjoining business and I can share my screen if that's of benefit. So can we all see this? I'm not too sure with this framework.

10 MR WILSON: I've got it.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I've got it.

MR RYNER: Okay. So this happens to be the site here in its entirety. So this is Denison Street. When I did do my inspection there was – so this seems to have been inadvertently utilised as some sort of pseudo parking area.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RYNER: There were a few cars here associated with this business across the road, but I don't see that – that's more or less a convenience sort of thing. There was certainly nothing stopping these vehicles either parking on the street or for that matter there is parking within – within the site here that wasn't utilised. So as part of this development we're obviously looking for the embellishment of this footway. That will take away that – that hard stand area or informal area and that should prevent that sort of activity. So, yes, to answer the question we're relatively comfortable. They are oversupplying to the tune of, I think, it's about 34 spaces so it should be more than adequate.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR RYNER: Just while I have this on the screen I will, if I can just comment on the pedestrian pathway. So this happens to be the location. There is an existing pathway that comes down here.

MR WILSON: Yes. No, no, but just here in terms of where you want to put the crossing there's very little traffic coming down here because it's a dead end, so it's an appropriate place to cross anyway.

MR RYNER: Yes. Yes. I mean - - -

MR WILSON: In terms of - - -

MR RYNER: - - - Cowper Street is – Cowper Street is somewhat unusual in that we call this Cowper Street South, this side, and north.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RYNER: So the traffic predominantly runs up and down the north side of Cowper Street then links on to the bridge. South – Cowper Street South has a dead end at either end as - - -

5 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RYNER: - - - you pointed out and, yes, there's limited traffic and in this section - - -

10 MR WILSON: All I'm saying is if you're going to – that's a more appropriate place to cross because there's less conflict with the - - -

MR RYNER: Yes.

15 MR WILSON: All right. That matter has been addressed.

MR RYNER: Okay.

MR WILSON: We just need a proper description before we're going to approve this.
20

MR RYNER: Yes.

MR WILSON: So that's it. Parking, loading and servicing has been resolved.
25 Pedestrian network has been resolved. Parking we've discussed. Boom gates. So if – if they were – one of the things that we thought that if they were to operate on the weekend is that they – that those boom gates going down to the rear car park fronting Denison Street would be locked on the weekend and that there's adequate parking underneath it and in front of the building to ensure that there's no residential – no
30 impacts on that residential interface on the weekend. Is that something that council could see or comment on?

MR MANSFIELD: David?

35 MR WILSON: So, in other words, if you didn't – if they had no access to – do you want to put the copy of the – has someone got a site plan there? Sorry. Can you share the screen?

MS BISSON: David, do you have a copy of the site plan or I've got it?

40

MR RYNER: Yes. I was just - - -

MS BISSON: Amy.

45 MR RYNER: Okay. Yes. If someone wants to – I can find it. Yes.

MS BISSON: No. That's all right. Amy has got it. So - - -

MS A. RYAN: I'm just working out how to share. Sorry.

MR WILSON: Yes, it's beyond me. I'm sorry.

5 MR RYNER: There's a little green button down the bottom.

MS RYAN: It's just different to Teams.

MR RYNER: Yes.

10

MR MANSFIELD: Yes, you get used to the other one.

MR RYNER: If you move your cursor to the bottom of the screen you will find all the - - -

15

MS RYAN: Is that working?

MR RYNER: It's happening. Yes.

20 MR WILSON: Yes. Well done, Amy. Yes. Okay. So, yes, that will do. That one. No. Go back.

MS RYAN: This one?

25 MR WILSON: Yes, that one is fine.

MS RYAN: Do you need me to zoom in?

MR WILSON: So the issue in terms of residential interface is obviously this
30 building down here: these buildings down here. These – sorry – these residences. And I think there's some over here and I think the issue is on the weekends, particularly, that, you know, this car park is going to be used. If it's not used I don't think there's likely to be any impacts on those residences. So, I guess, what we're saying is if they were able to operate – if they were able to operate on the weekend
35 there's sufficient parking at the front and underneath to accommodate any use that might be used on the weekends. I mean, in my view that would mitigate some degree of the noise or any real impacts in relation to the building.

In your experience this type of commercial building doesn't really generate a lot of
40 noise between its use during the week then take the traffic out of it, the parking out of it, is there likely to be any impacts arising from the use of that building on the – during the weekend – on the weekend that are different?

MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Sorry, David. Go on.

45

MR RYNER: Certainly from a traffic noise. Is that what we're targeting more so?

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RYNER: Yes. I mean, if we look at – if we go back to the fundamentals of just street and residential amenity, I suppose, is the issue. Denison Street itself – in itself
5 is a dead end and therefore you're only in that street if you've got an origin destination. So the traffic to start with, even without this development, is extremely low compared to a normal street that may carry through traffic. Adding this development in there will certainly – has the potential if – if they – to increase traffic and I suppose you could – you could counter that by potentially, if, of course, of a
10 mind to close that boom gate on Denison Street on weekends. You would have to introduce a condition along those lines. They would still be able to come through from Fitzroy.

You can get access right through to the full car park and the full site and it's not
15 restricting access to certain parking areas, so – but I would still feel that the numbers would be – would be such that it's not going to, certainly, impact on residential amenity. The few numbers are well below to start with. Introducing – if you assume 50 per cent which is what the traffic consultant has done, a 50 per cent spread across either Fitzroy or Denison, it would still be within what we deem environmental
20 levels or acceptable environmental levels to maintain a reasonable level of residential amenity so I don't feel that there's a need to restrict access. I think it would be within acceptable limits.

MR WILSON: I agree with you but at the moment they're only allowed to operate –
25 they're not allowed to operate on the weekend so - - -

MR RYNER: Sure.

MR WILSON: So I guess what we're saying is that – and, look, if – if they truly
30 want to – if it's port related and they want 24/7 or someone wants access, you know, if the Water Police moved in there or something, I don't know - - -

MR RYNER: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - you can't – you know, I can't see why you would build a 30
35 million dollar building and not have access to it on the weekend. You know what I mean. It's a bit counterintuitive for me so, I guess, we're thinking of ways in which if we do approve this thing ways in which we can ensure that that residential interface is – the amenity is maintained - - -
40

MR RYNER: Okay.

MR WILSON: - - - and they can have some access to the building on the weekend
45 but maintain – so what we – what we were thinking is close – on the weekends if Denison Street access is closed off and the boom gate down the side is shut and that there's, I think, Lindsey, there's upwards of 30 or 40 parks underneath the building

and at the front of the building which would be sufficient. So that's just a train of thought at this stage. That's all.

5 MR RYNER: Well, that's definitely the way you would go. If you wanted to put the issue to bed and have a degree of comfort that that residential amenity would be maintained categorically on weekends, yes, you could introduce – put a condition on that that boom gate be closed and that would work quite effectively.

10 MR WILSON: Okay. All right. Sorry to put you on the spot like that but we're just - - -

MR RYNER: No, that's fine.

15 MR WILSON: - - - thinking through these – thinking through these issues. So are you happy now with waste management the way that's – and the contributions are in there.

20 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. With the contributions, Commissioner, we have introduced a new contributions plan which commenced on 1 January.

MR WILSON: Different to the one we used for Raven Street?

MR MANSFIELD: Yes, because it was determined prior to 1 January.

25 MR WILSON: Yes.

30 MR MANSFIELD: Nothing really changes. The contribution rate is still one per cent. It's just that it's a new plan now. So I think there's a condition on there which still refers to the previous 2019 plan so that would need to be changed.

MR WILSON: I've got you. Thank you for that.

MR MANSFIELD: B5 I think it is.

35 MR WILSON: All right. New contributions plan. Okay. Lindsey, do you think – is there anything else you want to say, Geoff?

40 MR MANSFIELD: Just having a very quick look through the conditions, and just on your last comment about waste I think B14 references that council's waste management services must sign off, effectively, even if they're using a private contractor which I would question why we would need to do that. If that's a contractual obligation between the client or clients and a private firm we don't normally get involved in signing off on it unless it involves council infrastructure in some way. So if it's involving a council arrangement certainly we would sign off on it but I would just question whether we would need to be involved in a private
45 arrangement.

MR WILSON: Okay. So it's either or. It's like it's either - - -

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

5 MR WILSON: - - - private contractor - - -

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

10 MR WILSON: - - - or to the satisfaction of – if not – if it's council to the satisfaction of council.

15 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. And just in general with the conditions I think it's just – there's a reference to a number of variations on how we're referred to. I think there's City of Newcastle, Newcastle City Council and the Council of City of Newcastle.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR MANSFIELD: We just need to be consistent with - - -

20 MR WILSON: We will clean that up.

MR MANSFIELD: - - - what we're describing ourselves as.

25 MR WILSON: There's one other condition which I want to ask you about. It's – in your – I guess, in your practices when you have a – when you approve a commercial building of such in, say, the CBD, would you normally require independent environmental audits of construction?

30 MR MANSFIELD: It might be one for Amy. I'm not involved in a lot of office building construction in the city centre.

MR WILSON: As you can imagine some of these conditions have come from the implementation and the approval of state significant and state - - -

35 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. That's right. This is local.

40 MR WILSON: And they're quite comprehensive, and I'm just wondering. I mean, I'm not quite – I did ask – we do need to ask how long this is going to take to construct but I think they asked for six monthly audits of construction and I'm not quite sure whether or not that's something that would be required. Is that something
- - -

45 MR MANSFIELD: I can follow up on that. I will take that on notice. Which condition specifically - - -

MR WILSON: It is – just bear with me. Can you help me out here, Lindsey? It's
- - -

MR BLECHER: I will have a look, now, Chris.

MS RYAN: We can take that on notice and get a response.

5 MR BLECHER: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes. I just - - -

MR MANSFIELD: I think the answer is yes but I will check for you.

10

MR WILSON: I mean, there's construction compliance reports.

MR MANSFIELD: That's right.

15 MR WILSON: I have no problem with that.

MR MANSFIELD: Yes. So it was just environmental - - -

20 MR WILSON: Then there's independent audits which I – probably during construction so I will have to go through them. Look, I've marked it. I will come back to you.

MR MANSFIELD: That's fine. Lindsey, if you can just send it to us after the meeting. That's fine.

25

MR WILSON: I should have had it in front of me.

MR BLECHER: No problem.

30 MR WILSON: All right. Well, look, based on that I don't think there's anything else to add, Lindsey.

35 MR BLECHER: Just one minor point, Chris. You mentioned once or twice that we may be expecting a response from the applicant to a number of questions of notice from the stakeholder meeting. We have received a response to that which came in yesterday and it will be uploaded to the website today. Just for the record.

MR WILSON: Okay. Now, that condition was D36, Geoff.

40 MR MANSFIELD: Okay.

MR WILSON: Independent environmental audit. It's a standard condition from the department but sometimes these standard conditions aren't – you wouldn't think were applicable based on the - - -

45

MR MANSFIELD: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - size and nature of the development but, anyway - - -

MR MANSFIELD: Right.

5 MR WILSON: - - - I would appreciate your advice on that.

MR MANSFIELD: Okay.

10 MR WILSON: All right. And that's it. Thank you very much everybody. I appreciate your time.

MR MANSFIELD: Okay. Thank you for inviting us.

15 MS BISSON: Thank you very much, Commissioner.

MS RYAN: Thank you.

MR RYNER: Thank you.

20 MR WILSON: Bye bye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.40 am]