



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1461589

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**GLEBE ISLAND CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT AND AGGREGATE  
HANDLING FACILITY – STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS**

**INNER WEST COUNCIL MEETING**

**SSD 8544**

**IPC PANEL:**

**ANNELISE TUOR (Chair)**

**DR PETER WILLIAMS**

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:**

**CASEY JOSHUA**

**JULIAN ARDAS**

**INNER WEST COUNCIL:**

**DANIEL EAST**

**TOM IRONS**

**DENISE BENGER**

**SYDNEY**

**1.02 PM, THURSDAY, 6 MAY 2021**

MS A. TUOR: So everyone's here and the meeting will now commence. So good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the different lands from which we meet today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging.

5

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD 8544 for the proposed Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant and Aggregate Handling Facility project currently before the commission for determination. The applicant, Hanson Construction Materials Proprietary Limited, is seeking approval for an aggregate handling facility and concrete batching plant at Glebe Island. The project would have the capacity to produce up to one million cubic metres of concrete per annum and operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. My name is Annelise Tuor, and I am the chair of this commission panel. I am joined by my fellow commissioner Dr Peter Williams. We are also joined by Casey Joshua from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission and Julian Ardas who is assisting the commission.

10  
15

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.

20

This meeting is one part 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 whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website.

25

To ensure the accuracy of the transcript we request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other. So we'll now begin with introductions. So who wants to introduce themselves first.

30

MR D. EAST: I'll go first. My name is Daniel East. I am the manager of strategic planning at the Inner West Council.

35

MS TUOR: Hi, Daniel.

MR EAST: Hi.

40

MS TUOR: Tom.

MR T. IRONS: Hi. Yes. I'm Tom Irons. I'm a senior strategic planner at the Inner West Council.

45

MS TUOR: And Denise.

MS D. BENGER: Hi. I'm Denise Benger. I'm the acting team leader of planning policy at Inner West Council.

5 MS TUOR: All right. Well, thank you very much for giving up your time to attend. So we've sent out an agenda which presumably you've had time to look at. So the first thing was just getting your response to the department's assessment and recommended conditions.

10 MR EAST: Yes. So I will start off, and then Tom, who's been reviewing the actual proposal, will give some more detailed comments. So we've had the benefit of having a look at the department's assessment and the draft conditions, and I have to say we believe that there have been some positive changes from our submission that we submitted in 2018, such as restricting access from the heavy vehicles to Robert Street in Rozelle. We are going to focus on about 10 conditions, and we'll go  
15 through each of those in attempts for council officers to reduce the traffic and amenity impacts from our local residents as well as the cumulative impacts of the ongoing construction that's happening in WestConnex and for the Western Harbour Tunnel as well, and we've got some clarifications on a few of those conditions as well. So I'll just hand over to Tom in the first instance, and he'll go through our  
20 detailed comments for each of those conditions.

MS TUOR: Right. Thank you.

25 MR IRONS: Sure. So I'm really just going to start from condition 1 all the way down to the bottom. That's the way I'll be structuring this. So the first condition we'd like to make a comment on is A1, which is to do with the approved documents. This is more just a note the – so the quality of drawings is quite poor given the actual size of the development. We do note that a roof plan hasn't been provided, nor is a roof plan required by any of the conditions. That might be something that the – that  
30 you might want to consider requiring.

I also do note that the planner's report makes numerous references to the batching building itself being partially enclosed, but if we look at the floor plan as provided, there is an annotation saying it's a fully enclosed building. The annotation is in  
35 green, which we presume corresponds to the green line near it. Further clarity might be necessary around that matter. Also on condition A1 – just let me know if I'm going too fast if you've got any questions.

40 MS TUOR: No, no, no. That's fine. That's fine.

MR IRONS: Okay. Condition A1, part (c), it says that the proposal has to be:

45 *In accordance with the EIS, Response to Submissions, Supplementary Response to Submissions and additional information.*

Look, I'm not sure if this is a normal way of conditioning ..... development, but that's a lot of – there's a lot of content in those documents. You know, the EIS is

hundreds of pages, the Response to Submissions are 60 pages each. There's a lot of information in that. We think it's important, and this is what we would do in development assessment at a local level, is to pull out the requirements and commitments and put them into conditions. It's just not reasonable to expect that  
5 somebody is going to be looking at these documents and ensuring that compliance is met with. You'd pull out the main commitments and requirements and put them into conditions of consent. That's that condition.

10 Condition B9, this is about the final schedule of material and finishes. Given the prominence of the building and the size of it, we think this condition should be approved – submitted to and approved by the planning secretary, not the certifier. You know, there's just – there's no material off the finished information provided on the plans at the moment.

15 Condition B26, which is in relation to the public art strategy, while this is very much welcomed it's – do note that the visual impact assessment, which is a supporting document of the application, does note that the visual impact of the building will be high from nearby infrastructure corridor, which is the Anzac Bridge essentially, and also high from the areas of public open space mainly around the foreshore. So the  
20 impact assessment recommended some several mitigation measures which were a landscape plan, which is conditioned – I have a further comment about that later – green wall and also some public art. Again, while these are supported, I just note that it is acknowledged that the visual impact is going to be quite high. They are relying on a seven metre high green wall, which is the three containers stacked upon  
25 each other for screening. I'm a little bit dubious about how much that's actually going to screen the 35 metre silos and the effectiveness of that.

It's council's opinion that, given the prominence of the facility, it's essentially gateway to the west once you're passing out of the city, this condition needs to be  
30 worded in a more stronger fashion. So it should specify that the artwork needs to provide visual interest, is commiserate with the size of the silos, has long term durability and interprets or reflects the local setting or cultural setting. These are standard words that we would probably put in a public – sorry – a public artwork condition in our council. And while we're at it, consideration could be given to  
35 requiring the contents have some sort of connection to country. We just think there's a great opportunity here, given these silos are 34 metres high and very prominent, to really make sure this condition hits home.

40 Condition C19 is the Construction and Traffic Management Plan. So the supporting documents all essentially acknowledge that the area is suffering very high congestion, some intersections are operating at above capacity at the moment, and that the proposal is going to make this worse. All the documentation is kind of based on the – sorry – it's 260 vehicle movements per hour give or take, and they say the  
45 conclusions to that essentially that in some intersections this is going to be extremely bad. So they've come to the conclusion at the end of all the supporting documentations – and I'm talking mainly about the traffic impact assessments and the supplementary reports – that 182 is acceptable. We can't seem to find any clear

link or any justification as to where that number came from, that 182. This is a pretty important thing. It just seems like a number has been picked out. There might be valid reasons to why that number was decided upon in the end, but we can't find anything in the supporting documentations that would support that.

5

There is also – the Transport for New South Wales also – we note that they've made – subsequent to all the supplementary documentation being provided, they still recommended that there's a vehicle cap on morning peak periods particularly. We note that they have implemented something along these lines in the Construction and Traffic Management Plan but there's nothing of the such in the ongoing Traffic Management Plan. So I'm not sure if you are going to speak to Transport for New South Wales. It would be interesting to hear – you might want to put this question to them. It just seems that the suggestion that Transport for New South Wales have – recommended hasn't been implemented in the ongoing Traffic Management Plan which is arguably more important than Construction and Traffic Management Plan which is obviously for a limited period of time. Yes.

So just on the same vein, car parking, we just note that a condition hasn't been included that specifies the number of car spaces that are required or that designates those car spaces to their particular uses. So they're proposing 50 truck parking spaces, 40 parking spaces, 35 of which are for employees, four for visitors and one accessible. Normally you'd spell that out in a condition and designate those spaces accordingly.

Condition C40 is about the landscape plan. The landscape plan should also encompass the green wall that is being proposed, and it also should require the preparation of an ongoing maintenance plan for landscaping and the green wall, and then another condition should be provided to – prior to OC that – no, sorry – an ongoing condition requiring ongoing compliance with the maintenance plan obviously for various reasons, to make sure the landscaping is kept to a high level.

Condition D2 is about the construction hours. We note that condition – so condition D2, 3, 4, 5 are kind of a sweep of construction hour conditions. We note that condition D4 permits works outside of prescribed hours, which is not unusual, but it does say that works cannot be above five decibels above the rating background level. I guess we would just raise the point that there's a lot of background noise at the moment with the WestConnex construction. We would just want to be sure that that is – that cumulative effect is being accounted for. There appears to be a typo in condition D2. So if you read:

40

*Construction, including the delivery of materials to and from the site (with the exception of deliveries), but excluding may only –*

I think the “but excluding” shouldn't be there. It's just a minor thing. Might just want to confirm that. We also note that condition D5, which says:

45

*Notification of such activities –*

which is – sorry – the works outside of hours –

*must be given to affected residents before undertaking the activities or as soon as it is practical afterwards.*

5

That doesn't seem appropriate or acceptable. You'd think you need to inform those residents before the works are done, not after the fact. I'd look at rewording that condition. Condition E32, which is about the public art strategy, this is just about ensuring compliance, that it's been fulfilled. I think this should be signed off by the secretary, not the certifier.

10

Condition F3, this is about the operation and the intensity of the use, so this is one that caps it to the vehicle movements and the output. I note that F3(a) says – so this is the maximum of delivery of 100 million million tonnes of concrete aggregates per annum. Just to make sure this – because it says “1,000,000” in numbers and it says “million” in letters. I know what they're trying to say, but just to make sure this can be construed as one million times one million, which is one trillion, probably just get rid of one of those one millions just to be sure.

15

20

Again – so, yes – this is – this is where the 182 vehicle movements per hour is documented in the conditions. Again, we can't really find any rationale for that number. It's a pretty important thing to get to the bottom of. We do – sorry – I'm just going through my notes. Yes. And the cap on vehicle movements should really be based on data by a qualified person.

25

And, lastly, in terms of conditions, this is a condition that hasn't been opposed but we strongly believe should be. There should be a time limited consent, possibly for 10 years. This is particularly because the area's due to undergo a significant amount of change in the next 10 years, obviously with the Bays West redevelopments and the Metro Station coming online.

30

I do note that in their report they have addressed this concern, which has been raised before, by saying that the duration of the use is going to be controlled through leasing agreements by the Port Authority of New South Wales. I'm not familiar with that mechanism, but it's not clear that this process requires a comprehensive review or reassessment in relation to the operational performance and the changing surrounding context of the site. It could just be a matter of, you know, sighting it again. I'm not really sure about the process, but I think, you know, if they were to – need to lodge another application again this would require stakeholder and community involvement once again, you know, updated reports, supporting reports, noise, traffic. So, yes, perhaps comment from Port Authority about the process would be beneficial.

35

40

45

And there's only one additional comment in the report which kind of ties into the conditions. Again, they've made some suggestions in their Response to Submissions mainly to do with air pollution and noise pollution. They say that they're committed to fitting air release silencers on concrete trucks and also committed to using low

sulphur fuels for all their water vessels. Again, these haven't been reflected in the conditions at all, so, again, it's all well and good to say these in the documentation but these are pretty important things that probably should be reflected in a condition themselves.

5

Look, so that's all our comments on the conditions and the report. I'll just jump ahead to, I guess, comments – no, sorry. I guess I'll follow up on the comments we've made previously about the proposal. There's kind of two or three outstanding matters that we feel haven't been adequately addressed yet. So this is in response to our 2018 submission to the EIS. We did state that pedestrian and residential amenity needs to be protected by restricting heavy vehicles from travelling through Annandale, Leichhardt and Forest Lodge. Now, we do notice that the proposal still identifies The Crescent as one of the main track routes. So it's council's opinion that all the track movement should be restricted to the arterial road network.

15

The Crescent's Estate Road eventually turns into Minogue Crescent and Ross Street as you head to the south east. It's got very much a local and residential character. It's fronted by dwelling houses. There's a large day-care centre on it. There's a primary school and a school zone as well on the road. Sections of the road get quite narrow down to two lanes, and there's kerbside parking along it all. The road's also quite frequently used by cyclists, and there's cycling signage on the road to indicate that that's – you know, that's an area that is earmarked for cycling. There is also limited pedestrian crossings in terms of either signalised or zebra crossings, particularly at the north-western end closest to The Crescent, so you're going to have people dashing across when they can get a break in traffic. We just don't think it's an appropriate road for these trucks to be going down.

20

25

We think the same restriction should apply to Johnson Street as well which is – if you're familiar with Johnson Street in Annandale, whilst it's a lot wider than The Crescent, it's still got that same low density residential character to it and two schools and two school zones that it goes through.

30

Also the other issue with The Crescent is it all leads to Parramatta Road. There's not really any opportunity to turn off The Crescent onto Bridge Street. There's a limitation on six metre trucks can't turn left and right, so really the only way that trucks can move is all the way through to Parramatta Road, and if anyone's familiar with that intersection at Ross Street and Parramatta Road, it's bit of a nightmare at the best of times, so funnelling all the trucks down there is not a great solution we think. Trucks could join A22, which is Parramatta Road from City West Link, which is an arterial road, although it's a bit more of a convoluted route I do acknowledge.

35

40

The other matter is The Crescent and City West Link road intersection. So this kind of feeds into our argument that trucks shouldn't be going down The Crescent. So they do note that it is operating at near capacity in 2018 when they did the first studies which was prior to WestConnex. They acknowledge that it's already operating at capacity now.

45

So – sorry – let me just get my notes. Yes. So it's already operating at above capacity, and that during the design year, which is 2022, it's clear that both under with development and without development scenarios the intersection is operating at a F category during the morning AMs, and that during the opening year the average  
5 delay will deteriorate by about 55 seconds with the development as opposed if the development didn't exist. So that's a 45 per cent increase in delays due to development, and this – sorry – this is outlined in page 5 of the supplementary traffic report. So they acknowledge that's a pretty dramatic increase in congestion, 55  
10 seconds in that intersection. And I guess this is all hinging on the conclusion that once the M4/M5 link is open all these problems are going to be alleviated. You would hope so, but it's a bit of a leap of faith as well. So that's that point there.

Cumulative impacts, which has been something we've noted that a lot of people have raised, and they've gone a long way to addressing these matters in their Response to  
15 Submissions. We just would also like to make the note and – that the Glebe Island silos, the ones that are there currently, there's a SEARs at the moment. They're proposing to increase their capacity from 600,000 tonnes to 1.2 million tonnes per annum. We do acknowledge the SEARs was issued on the 11<sup>th</sup> of August 2020, a long time after this proposal is on the way, but, yes, I mean, we're just foreseeing  
20 potentially a big issue for the proposal for the Glebe Island silos mainly in terms of traffic.

And then the last matter is really the Glebe Island Bridge. Again, this has been raised, we've noticed, by a lot of other people – a lot of bodies and stakeholders –  
25 sorry. It's just – I guess concerns are just raised about the location of the facility and the associated berthing location that'll impact upon the ability and the practicality of reopening the Glebe Island Bridge which is identified as an active travel link, and so this is obviously identified in the Bays West Place Strategy. So this – and this may also preclude the possibility of duplicating the bridge which, again, was hammered  
30 home in the Bays West Place Strategy that if reinstating the existing bridge is not feasible for whatever reason the idea was to duplicate the bridge to make that active link. My first assumption it would go to the north of the bridge, but obviously this is where the development's going now, so I'm not sure if that precludes that – the possibility of that happening.  
35

And the last point is really that the active travel link is going to intersect with James Craig Road, which is the main in and out for the facility, so you're going to have this great conflict of very big trucks and what is meant to be, you know, an active link  
40 connecting the city to the west at that particular intersection. And thanks for your time, and that's all the points we wanted to raise.

MS TUOR: Okay. Thank you very much for that. So in terms of the conditions, I sort of took down notes, as I'm sure Casey and Julian probably did as well, but can you actually send through those comments to us so that we've got a record of your  
45 - - -

MR EAST: Yes. We can do that.

MR IRONS: Yes.

MR EAST: Certainly.

5 MR IRONS: Yes.

MR EAST: Not a problem.

10 MS TUOR: And then just specifically some of the matters that you raised in your conditions. So, first of all, you said about the quality of the drawings. So you've got, what, particular concerns about them not clearly articulating how the development will actually – yes – whether it's definitely not clear enough to describe the development; is that your concern?

15 MR IRONS: Yes. I mean the level of detail for the size of the development, if this was lodged as a DA in our council we would probably turn it around. I'm surprised it got this far with this level of detail.

20 MS TUOR: When you say "turn it around" you mean send it back.

MR IRONS: We would send it back and request for more details. There's very, very minimal measurements – dimensions. There's obviously no material – indicative materials or anything like that. It's just – yes – it's just very light on. I mean there's – you can understand what they're proposing, but it's obviously – you know, they don't have a roof plan for example. You know, if – yes – look, just general lack of detail given - - -

30 MS TUOR: Yes. So when you say that that's – if you had a DA for an industrial building. You're not just saying if it's DA for residential type building, you're saying a DA for an industrial building would require more information than has been provided.

35 MR IRONS: Yes. Particularly because there's 634 metre high silos. At the minimum probably we would want all the public art and landscaping and materials and schedules up front. We're really leaving that to post determination which is unfortunate.

40 MS TUOR: Okay. And then further on you mentioned about visual impact being high and it relied on sort of the public art strategy and the landscape plan, green wall, public art – sorry. So just following on from what you said before that you think that those things should be provided up front, have you had a chance to just contemplate the feasibility of those things, such as the landscape plan, green wall, public art mitigating the visual impact of high to being less than high? Just any comments on that.

45 MR IRONS: Well, I mean, like, I guess it – yes – I mean, I guess it's reliant on the quality and the success of the public art. There are examples of – I mean silos are

pretty much big blank canvasses, so something really interesting could be done there, something more interesting than perhaps the Glebe silos currently have. So, yes, it would go some way to mitigating it. There's no way of getting around there's still going to be 34 metre high silos right next to the bridge, but, well, I guess, what I want to point out, or we want to point out more so, is this a great opportunity that shouldn't be passed up. Yes.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then the Transport for New South Wales, just specifically their comments about the cap. We can obviously look that up, but if you have a reference to where that came from.

MR IRONS: Yes. So it was their most recent comments they did the 17<sup>th</sup> of February 2020. So it's in response to the applicant's Response to Submissions documentation. So it was – yes – so it was obviously after they'd proposed the 182 vehicle cap. They presumably read that, digested that, but still recommended a specific cap on the morning peak periods. I don't want to presume but, you know, it might be to do something with The Crescent and the City West Link congestion in the AM period which we mentioned before.

MS TUOR: Yes. And they're the only questions that I have on the conditions. So just clarifying this about The Crescent. So I'm just – does The Crescent – actually is part of the City West Link known as The Crescent? I'm just trying to work out exactly the intersection that's being talked about when you talk – I think it's mentioned in the department's report as being the intersection between The Crescent and James Craig Road. Is that your understanding or - - -

MR IRONS: Yes. It's a little bit confusing because The Crescent does kind of turn into City West Link and then change name. So I'm talking about the one that is – so be to the west of the James Craig intersection. It's the one that you would go – if you were going to Annandale - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR IRONS: - - - it's the intersection with City West Link. So it's 90 degrees with City West Link. It's a T-junction. That's the intersection that we're talking about. Yes.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR IRONS: And I think in their reports they refer to it as the City West Link/The Crescent intersection, just because it's so hard to – yes – it's hard to label because it's – it is technically still The Crescent.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR EAST: The one that's near the light rail station.

MR IRONS: Yes, that's right.

MS TUOR: Yes.

5 MR ARDAS: And it's fair to say - - -

MR EAST: And it's currently being added - - -

10 MR ARDAS: It's fair to say that the intersection you talk about, Tom, is probably about, what, 300 metres west of the James Craig Road/The Crescent intersection. Is that about fair?

MR IRONS: That's about right.

15 MR EAST: Yes.

MR IRONS: Yes, yes.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you. And your understanding is that in the AM peak there would be trucks coming down The Crescent to access the site. Is that what the traffic movement would be?

25 MR IRONS: Yes. Well, they seem to have just identified that is one of the main routes that trucks will be using inbound and outbound presumably if they're delivering or receiving deliveries from the south of the facility and the inner west. So I'd probably refer you to page 5 of their supplementary traffic impact assessment. That's where it has the conclusion that it says that the average delay will deteriorate by about 55 seconds with the development as opposed to without it. Yes.

30 MS TUOR: Okay. So we need to look at that in more detail.

MR IRONS: Yes.

35 DR P. WILLIAMS: Sorry, Annelise. Just on that point – sorry – if I may.

MS TUOR: Go on. Yes. Keep going.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry. Tom, that's – yes – sorry. That 182 movements, Tom, vehicle movements, that's during their operational peak, isn't it, not the – not the AM peak which is, I think, 7.30 to 8.30 am. The cap they're looking at is for that 10 am to 12 pm period.

45 MR IRONS: Yes. They do say that their operational peak is 10 till 12, but let's just have a look at the – the wording of the condition I don't think specifies that. Let me just confirm that. Sorry.

DR WILLIAMS: No. I don't think it does. It doesn't actually say .....

MR EAST: It just says “per hour”.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

5 MR IRONS: Yes. I think what Transport for New South Wales is saying is that there should be a more specific cap in the AM peak period, and I think it’s AM peak, not their peak – not the facilities’ peak movement time.

MR EAST: Not their .....

10

MR IRONS: Yes.

MR EAST: Okay.

15 MR IRONS: It’s AM peak that everyone is peak hour.

MR EAST: Yes.

MR IRONS: And I think their solution to that was, well, why don’t we just cap it  
20 the whole 24 hours a day at 182 per hour. While that may address less busy periods of the day, just not sure if that’s going to address the issue of that, you know, 50, 55 second delay – additional delay in the AM peak.

MS TUOR: Yes. I mean my understanding is the operational peak is the 10 o’clock  
25 to 12 and that was, I think, something like 260-something vehicles per hour.

MR IRONS: That’s – yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

30

MS TUOR: I don’t know what the traffic generation was in the AM peak, but the condition seems to limit it to the 182 throughout a 24 hour period, which is presumably addressing the operational peak and issues to deal with the AM peak, but it’s something we need to explore further.

35

MR IRONS: Yes. Coincidentally it seems like that 182 – if you look at the traffic impact assessment, they had 182 am movements and 92 pm movements, and that – put those together and that made that 260. So it seems like they’ve maybe just cut out the pm movements and then stretched the am movements across the whole day.  
40 It just leaves me to think that this number wasn’t formulated with any hard data. It just seems to be pulled from the original report. I could be wrong but, yes, it would be something – it would be worthwhile investigating I think.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then on your cumulative impact you mentioned that the  
45 Glebe Island silos are currently 600,000 tonnes and they’re seeking to increase that to 1200 tonnes; is that what you’re saying?

MR IRONS: 1.2 million tonnes per annum.

MS TUOR: Yes.

5 MR IRONS: Yes.

MS TUOR: Sorry. 1.2 million tonnes.

MR IRONS: Yes.

10

MS TUOR: So they're the silos that are right next to the site.

MR IRONS: Yes. The big old heritage listed ones. And we're anticipating an EIS  
Easter – just shortly after Easter, so it's going to be out any day now for that. The  
15 SEARs was issued in August of last year. So, yes, it's still relatively early days for  
that.

MS TUOR: Okay. So presumably that assessment in the EIS will have considered  
the cumulative impact of this proposal and other proposals in the .....

20

MR IRONS: Yes. That's right.

MS TUOR: Yes. I think that was all the ones that I had. So, Peter, Julian, Casey,  
any questions?

25

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Annelise. Thanks, Tom. That was really, really helpful.  
As Annelise said, it would assist us greatly if we could get something in writing - - -

MR IRONS: Sure.

30

DR WILLIAMS: - - - particularly with the details of suggested conditions or the  
changes to suggested – suggested changes to conditions that you've just gone  
through with us so that we can – while – I know it's on transcript, but we'd  
obviously get a fuller picture of what's being – what you've suggested if we can  
35 actually see it in writing. So that could basically be a submission to us following on  
from this meeting if that's okay. Would that be okay, Casey, to get that to us?

MS C. JOSHUA: Yes.

40 DR WILLIAMS: I'm just inferring by the fact that you've gone straight into  
beginning by saying that – as well also, Daniel, that you have – a number of issues  
have been originally addressed from the original submissions on the EIS back in  
2018 but you still have some outstanding issues that you feel can largely be  
responded or resolved through conditions, and you also mentioned you had a few  
45 other outstanding matters which we've noted as well, but – so basically council's  
position now is that it's not formally – no longer formally objecting to the

application, it's more concern with mitigating the impacts. Is – would that be per the  
- - -

5 MR IRONS: Well, no. Look, I mean, we've provided our comments to try and  
minimise any impasse if the panel does decide to approve it, noting the fact that we'd  
still like to register our objection to the overall proposal.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

10 MR IRONS: So we'll still still treat that as our position, but we acknowledge that,  
you know, we don't have jurisdiction to approve or determine the proposal, so we'll  
still register our opposition to the proposal.

15 MS TUOR: And that's for the reasons that you put in your 2018 submission.

MR IRONS: Yes, absolutely.

MS TUOR: Okay.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks.

MS TUOR: Other questions.

25 MR ARDAS: I have a question.

MS TUOR: Yes, Julian.

30 MR ARDAS: If I can just ask, around Blackwattle Bay there on the other side of –  
on James Craig Road, there are some quite large buildings there and they seem to be  
quite well – sort of reasonably well designed and articulated. So my question is can  
you allude – make us aware of the design principles that were used in helping design  
those buildings, whether they're from council or they're State Government or a  
combination of both, but if you could shed some light on that, or if you can't answer  
that if you're able to respond and take that on notice, that would be great.  
35

MR IRONS: Yes. Look, I'm not aware. There's many design provisions for  
industrial buildings. Our DCP would call that general good design requirements.  
We could feed that to you guys, but obviously I'm not aware of anything, any  
relevant steps or anything that would require, you know – you know, in terms of high  
40 architectural quality or anything like that.

MS TUOR: Okay. Other questions?

45 DR WILLIAMS: No, that's fine. Thanks.

MS TUOR: All right. I think that's it. So, again, thank you very much for your  
participating in this meeting and for your feedback on the conditions, etcetera. And,

yes, if you could just forward your comments on the conditions to us in writing, that would be appreciated, and if that could be done, you know, within the week.

MR IRONS: Sure.

5

MR EAST: Yes. So, Casey, I'll email you the comments that we have by the end of the week. How does that sound?

MS JOSHUA: That sounds great.

10

MS TUOR: Terrific.

MS JOSHUA: Thank you.

15

MR EAST: Great.

MS TUOR: All right. So thank you very much.

MR IRONS: Thank you, all.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Carl.

MS BENGER: Thank you.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Denise.

MS BENGER: Thank you. Bye.

30

**MEETING CONCLUDED**

**[1.39 pm]**