

MR C. WILSON: Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we virtually meet and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting for the Pitt Street South Over Station Development. Pitt Street Developer South Proprietary Limited is seeking
5 planning approval to construct a 39-storey residential tower above the Pitt Street South metro box including retail and communal residential spaces within the approved metro box. They are concurrently seeking approval for a modification to the concept approval. The site is located in the Sydney CBD at the corner of Bathurst and Pitt Street. Sydney Metro City and Southwest metro line is currently
10 being constructed on the site.

At the completion of the metro line works the Pitt Street metro station will occupy the site. The proposal is located above the southern entrance of the Pitt Street metro station. My name is Chris Wilson. I am the chair of this commissioned panel. I'm
15 joined by my fellow commissioner, Professor Helen Lochhead. We are also joined by Casey Joshua and Kate Moore from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

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
25 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. I 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 to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin.
30 Anthony, I think it's appropriate that we go around and introduce ourselves first up because not everyone may speak.

MR A. WITHERDIN: Yes, sure. I'm happy to do some introductions, Chris. My name is Anthony Witherdin. I am the director of Key Sites and with me today I've
35 got Annie Leung who's the team leader of the Transport Assessments Team. I've also got James Groundwater. He's a senior planner in the Transport Assessments Team. And we also have Natasha Harras and Natasha is a consultant in the Department engaged to under the assessment of the proposal.

40 MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR WITHERDIN: If it's okay - - -

45 MR WILSON: Sorry.

MR WITHERDIN: I'm now happy, Chris, to go to the second item on the agenda.

MR WILSON: Okay. Just – just the way I thought the agenda would work today is that - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

5

MR WILSON: - - - you just give a brief – brief overview of the – of the development and the recommended conditions before we move in – further through the agenda because there were some – obviously, specifically items which we want to discuss in more detail with you.

10

MR WITHERDIN: Yes, that’s fine. So this afternoon I’ve asked Annie just to give a – a brief background on the proposal and just run through the Department’s clear assessment issues and findings. So if everyone is happy with that, Annie, may start with a brief overview of the Department’s assessment.

15

MR WILSON: Yes, please.

MS A. LEUNG: Sorry. So I’m Annie Leung. I will just quickly run through an overview of the Department assessment. I do need to point out that the Department has referred its assessment of a modification application to the Pitt Street South Over Station Development to – together with a stage 2 design and construction of the residential tower at both the southern entry of the Pitt Street metro station. The modification elements seeks to permit architectural embellishment awning balustrade to encroach upon the upper roof building envelope and also include a retail premise as a permissible use within the podium. The SSD application for design and constructs seek development consent for design construction and operation of 39 level residential tower comprising 234 dwellings and including a retail foot entering premise within the podium level.

20

25

The development is an Over Station Development which is located above the southern entry of the proposed Pitt Street metro station which is one of the seven metro stations that has been approved as part of the Critical State Significant Infrastructure Approval we refer to as CSSI7400 for Sydney metro city and southwest metro between Chatswood and Sydenham. The relationship between the Over Station Development and the infrastructure and more details about the CSSI approval are provided in section 1.3 of the Department’s assessment report. I will now quickly move onto a quick overview of some of the key items and covered by the Department assessment. I will try to run it most aligned with the written tender that has been provided to us. But if there’s any practical issue that you want to point out to me that you want me to cover, please, let me know.

30

35

40

The Department’s assessment found the proposal fully complies with the key development standard and that the Sydney LEP 2012, more specifically the building height, is an access plain and also the floor space ratio development standard. A summary of the LEP consideration is provided in the appendix of the Department’s assessment report. The Department also considered the proposal is consistent with the concept approval as set out in the Department’s report. The concept approval

45

does include certain condition and requirement which are referred throughout the assessment section of the report as well including matters such as build form consideration, design guideline and design excellence.

- 5 As I pointed earlier the application also is concurrently assessed with a modification application. The proposed building does encroach or includes encroachment as proposed by the modification on the approved building envelopes. The encroachments were amended throughout the assessment process but they are depicted in figure 19 and 20 of the assessment report. I understand the maximum
- 10 encroachment is up to 450 millimetres and that is on the northern elevation of the proposed building which is facing onto Bathurst Street. So the development is subject to SEPP65 and the apartment design guide which has been considered in the Department's report. Respect to the design of the building itself a key assessment issue as considered in our report with respect to ADG and SEPP65 is solar access.
- 15 We do note that there is solar access to the proposed building on the proposed apartments. Only 49.6 per cent of the proposed apartments will receive two hour solar access at mid-winter between 9 and 3 and it's below the ADG guidance of 70 per cent.
- 20 The Department's consideration of the issues generally for internal amenity is in the section 6.4 of the report and, more specifically, for solar access at 6.4.7. A assessment of the proposal against SEPP65 and ADG is also provided in the appendix of the assessment report as well. I will now quickly move onto some of the key themes of the Department's assessment. I will, firstly, deal with the amenity
- 25 impacts to Princeton Apartment which is mostly covered in section 6.3 of the Department's report. I understand the commissioners have already been out to the property and the site and note the specific relationship between the site and the apartments.
- 30 So Princeton Apartment is built to the common boundary between the site and their property as directly to the of the site. Figure 24 of our report provides a fairly good image of the northern elevation of Princeton Apartments. Building separation is covered by section 6.3.5 of the report. The approved building provides for a 12 metre setback from the southern boundary being the common boundary with
- 35 Princeton Apartments. Subject of the modification application. The proposal would encroach on the approved building envelope and the approved 12 metre separation with Princeton Apartment by up to a maximum of 150 millimetres.

I will refer you to figure 25 in the report for details as to encroachment on the 12

40 metres do varies along the boundary. The encroachments are mostly dealing with the façade element of the proposed building. We do note the glass line of the windows along the southern elevation of the building would still be 12 metres from the common boundary with Princeton. The Department generally consider the proposed minor amendment does not materially change the impacts or relationship between the

45 site and Princeton Apartment then what would have been considered in the concept approval which assessed the 12 metre setback from that boundary.

The Department has also further considered the proposal's privacy impact to Princeton Apartment and that has been detailed in 6.3.12 of the report and that deals with both visual and oral privacy as well as a section that deals with any external noise stimulating from items such as plant room from the – from the proposed building. The Department notes there – a number of amendments has been made through all the assessment process to – in respond to submission particularly on privacy concern and that include a deletion of the eight outdoor terrace and recreation area above the podium that is between Princeton Apartment and the proposed building.

5
10
15
20
A number of other mitigating measures and design development were also reviewed by the design review panel and a lot of details has gone through as proposed by – in the latest plans including some of the louvres and the like which has been considered in the Department's report. And in addition to the proposed measure the Department is also recommending conditions to have additional louvres of glazing for the windows at either end of the southern elevation which is referred to in condition B9A. And there are also other standard condition that deals with any noise impacts. The next item I will deal with is also still on the amenity impacts to Princeton Apartment.

25
30
A very key concern that has been raised in the public submissions deals with overshadowing impact from the proposal to Princeton Apartment. As earlier mentioned, the Princeton Apartment is built to the boundary of the site and is directly south of the proposed development. So any build form that will be otherwise constructed on that site would have some level of overshadowing impact and is quite significant reduction of the solar access that Princeton Apartment currently receive because, obviously, the proposed development is blocking out the northern side of Princeton Apartment. The approved building envelope as identified in the Department's pre-assessment would reduce the solar access to Princeton Apartment by more than 20 per cent.

35
40
But the Department in its previous assessment did found wherein adjoining property does not currently receive the solar access they ADG recommend that it should not be reduced by 20 per cent. However, due to the lack of setback of Princeton Apartment and – from its northern boundary and the permissible density at this CBD location the Department at the time consider strict compliance with the ADG would not be a reasonable expectation in these circumstances. In considering the – in the concept approval there were additional build forms consideration that were recommended at the time which is provided in condition B3E of the concept approval which asked for the design of the proposed building should have further consideration of additional setback especially at articulation of the Pitt Street elevation to further improve on solar access to Princeton Apartment.

45
In that regard the applicant has submitted various analysis that compares – to look at different options of additional setback in – from the Pitt Street site. But the applicants ended up with the analysis that identify an increased further setback from the eastern side being the rear elevation rather than a setback from Pitt Street would

actually provide more solar access benefit to Princeton Apartment and that has been set out in the assessment report as well - the details of those analysis. I will now quickly touch on build form and design excellence as per the agenda the – today. Just let me quickly go to those for – so as earlier mentioned the proposed
5 development building does fit within the building envelope with the exception of those encroachment.

The – we also note that the proposed building does not fill up the entire building envelope. The applicants have state in their application that the proposed build form
10 will only fill up about 87 per cent of the building envelope. Most notably there are reduction in build form on the podium levels and also the increased setback from the eastern side and both of those reduction in build form has resulted in improvement to solar access to Princeton Apartments that we have earlier mentioned. With respect to design excellence during the concept approval a design excellence strategy were also
15 approved at the time which requires the design of the proposed building to go through a design review process.

It's either a state Design Review Panel or an alternative panel in endorsed by the government architect. An alternative panel has been approved and endorsed by the
20 government architect and that's the Sydney metro Design Review Panel. The panel has review on the Pitt Street South design for many occasions as detailed in our report and they have found to – happy to support the current proposal recommendation that deals with the future detail and specification of the building façade which we have – the Department has incorporated as recommended
25 conditions. So I think that's pretty much a quick overview of the Department's assessment. Happy to take any questions or any other issue that you may want me to cover.

MR WILSON: Thanks, Annie. Appreciate it. Sorry, we just had some technical
30 issues here. I guess I would like a – just a brief overview. I understand that the – the control – the controls are set in, is it, Sydney LEP 2012? Is that correct? Is that the right year? Anyway – and the concept plan generally mirrors those controls. Is that correct?

MS LEUNG: That's correct. So that's including – it's an access plan which the
35 building envelope do reflect.

MR WILSON: So then we had – I just – I would like to – I mean, we will get onto solar access, obviously, to discuss in a little bit more detail. I guess, you know, the
40 conditions in the concept plan sought to scrutinise or ensure better outcomes for – particularly in relation to solar access and setbacks. Setbacks and solar access. Are you satisfied that those conditions have been – I'm presume in what you say of your recommendation you're satisfied those conditions have been met. I think those two conditions are B3E and B3G.

45 MS LEUNG: That's correct. So with respect to 3BE which deals with a consideration of options particular the consideration of articulation of the build form

from Pitt Street the Department's assessment does set out that we have received various analysis from the applicant that supports an increased setback from the eastern side will deliver a better outcome in terms of solar access improvement to Princeton Apartment and the overall amount of solar access that Princeton Apartment
5 will receive based on the proposed building is an improvement as detailed in our report from the concept approval or the approved building envelope.

MR WILSON: Okay. Okay. Just – we would just like to – obviously – obviously, solar access is a key issue and it's raised in a majority of submissions. The 20 per cent – can we just have a bit more discussion about the 20 per cent and why it's
10 considered the 20 per cent is not applicable or is less applicable in this instance as to other circumstances.

MS LEUNG: I think it's not a matter of applicability. It's whether it's achievable and a reasonable expectation in the circumstances of the site. It is a CBD location. If a tower is developed to the northern side of Princeton Apartment which has the northern façade built to the boundary common to the site the building proposed
15 development on this site will overshadow Princeton Apartment.

PROF H. LOCHHEAD: Okay. So in terms of – that's obviously a given. But the mitigation is – there are many ways to mitigate that – those impacts. One of those could be to the setback. It could be further articulation. So the modifications to the – modification – other amendments to the modification are very minimal
20 tweaking at the edges. Setting back a balcony. The modulation of façade. Detailing. Are you satisfied that everything has been done within the scope considering that the envelope has not been fully utilised to maximise the potential benefits in terms of
25 solar access?

MS LEUNG: So as you have mentioned there's the approved building envelope. I may give a bit of background on the upward building envelope when it was set. There were a couple of things that were already done through the concept approval process. One, is the exploration on the building separation distance between
30 Princeton Apartment and the site. Whether any increase in that separation distance would actually make a material improvement. The analysis that was done at the time because of the direct north south orientation between the two site – an increased
35 separation between Princeton and the proposal will not delivery a material improvement to the solar access outcome for Princeton.

And at the time exploration were consider on the Pitt Street setback as well as the eastern setback. The building envelope at the time was actually modified to increase
40 to have a three metre setback from the rear – the eastern side – because the analysis would support that that – that would materially increase the number of apartment with increased solar access. The design of the current proposal is a further exploration on considering options within the parameter of the building envelope to
45 see where we can further improve the solar access outcome to Princeton Apartment and that's where the – the analysis support that that further increase or articulation

from the Pitt Street site is not as beneficial as the proposed increase of setback from the eastern boundary.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Can I just ask another question?

5

MR WILSON: Go.

PROF LOCHHEAD: And what about the solar access to the actual proposal? One thing I'm conscious of is that the – I mean, obviously, like any of these sites – anything on the south side of the site is going to be limited in terms of the solar access. But there's something very profound about the articulation which is modelling in terms of the design excellence – the GRC element – the – and there's a very light structure very close to the exterior envelope of the building in all the balconies and living spaces which further impacts the solar access to the proposed development, and I'm just wondering have you – did you consider balancing light and access to sun and articulation of the façade? I probably could refer to specific plans to explain that. But without having them

MS LEUNG: That's all right. I'm happy to reply to you. Apologies that I probably have focussed a bit too much on the Princeton site. I missed your earlier question in relation to solar access to the proposal itself. So the Department's report does consider the solar access to the proposal itself. It's provided in section 6.4 of the Department's report which looks at, firstly, the impacts of the – the site circumstances so to speak. We are located in Sydney CBD where the site is identified to be affected by existing overshadowing from a number of other building. The GRC element or the façade element has a – collectively as identified in the Department's report would result in a three per cent reduction in solar access. The balance of the solar access to the apartments and the façade design were subject to much deliberation through the DRP process. But the DRP recommended the design changes to the façade element is not supported, as in, reducing the depth of the GRC element was not supported and they accepted that the – that would result in a minor solar access reduction.

PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean, not just the GRC element but in key locations on two south – the south eastern and south west apartments – they've got quite significant columns which the GRC element are attached to which also impact the balconies or living spaces adjoining them which, of course, is the primary living area of those two south facing apartments. Do you – can you see that on the plan if you've got them accessible? So - - -

40

MS LEUNG: on me. Natasha, will you be able to fill that in a bit more on the actual details?

MS N. HARRAS: Yes, my understanding is that – and maybe James can – we had a discussion about this as well. Those columns are structural columns and they - - -

45

PROF LOCHHEAD:

MS HARRAS: And they relate also to – their location is – is set in stone, I guess, for want of a better word due to the – the way that the metro station has been developed.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: No, I appreciate that. However, because they are very significant columns – I mean, if you look at a normal residential flat building they wouldn't have columns or anything of this – like this scale. So I can appreciate that they are critical because of the, you know, podium condition of the other station development. But because of that they do tend to – in the south facing apartment in
10 the location plus the – the GRC façade treatment which is shown in grey on this Bates Smart package of drawings – really does actually impact those southern apartments more than maybe optimal in terms of balancing design excellence and amenity for those two apartments. And I – and so – yes, maybe – yes, you can't necessarily move the columns but you can reconfigure those apartments or you can
15 consider the GRC element on the façade because there's quite a few apartments other those 39 levels in that – in those locations.

MS LEUNG: Yes, I may actually fill you in a bit more about – more so from the south eastern apartments. I understand some of the changes has been amended to
20 that corner as a balancing act between privacy impacts to Princeton Apartment versus internal amenity to the proposed apartments themselves and that has also lost some solar access as well. So a number of options were, I understand, presented to the Design Review Panel and the Panel recommend that there will be a bit of balancing between those and that has been referenced in our report in the
25 overshadowing section to Princeton Apartment which identified some changes to the south eastern corner apartment would have resulted in a reduction of solar access or amenity to the apartments themselves but is a balancing act between managing impacts to the next door property.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: I thought the main amendment were the reduction in the balcony on the south east corner apartment.

MS LEUNG: Yes.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: So is that what you're talking about?

MS LEUNG: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, I don't think – that's not really what I'm talking about.
40 I'm talking about more the full vertical element – the GRC cladding - - -

MS LEUNG: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - and the – the column location.

45

MS LEUNG: Yes.

MR WILSON: So we're happy to take that on notice if that's – if that's okay. If you – I guess, we're just looking for an answer in relation to the balancing between those structural elements of the – of the proposal and how they affect internal amenity.

5

MS LEUNG: Yes, I understand.

MR WILSON: And whether or not there's any alternative.

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Can – I mean - - -

MR WILSON: So - - -

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: I think we've all acknowledged that this apartment building and the adjoining apartment building which is pre-existing will have compromised amenity because of the CBD location. But notwithstanding that we're talking about buildings which will have a 50 year lifespan and the ongoing amenity of the residents during that period that – and trying to optimise and balance design excellence and also residential amenity over that, you know,

20

MS LEUNG: I understand.

MR WILSON: It's a question we will also put to the applicant, obviously, who we're meeting today as well.

25

MS LEUNG: Yes. I think other than what I should put to you which is we understand the structural columns may have limitation on where they can go due to their integration with the station box below. So, obviously, if – we will take that on notice. But if you do put that to the applicant they may also be able to elaborate on the constraint and limit on the location of the structural column better than we do.

30

MR WILSON: Yes, that's correct.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: Another question with regard to residential amenity was the plant. So we talked about, you know, there's visual and oral privacy between the two apartments and that's, like, I don't want to hear you talking in your kitchen. That sort of privacy. The privacy. But there's also the oral privacy between external noise impact such as plants and we know there's plant on the now non-trafficable podium and it will just be a landscaped area. But there doesn't seem to be any details of the plant on that landscaped podium. So is it fully enclosed? Is it vented? What – what is done to battle the noise from the plant at podium level and level 6?

40

MS LEUNG: Natasha, I may pass that onto you as well.

45

MS HARRAS: Yes. I think the applicant advised that – that subject to appropriate attenuation it would be able to meet acoustic requirements and so we put conditions

onto – in the recommendation requiring that the plant be designed to comply with the project noise levels established by the acoustic report and then following that to also undertake a noise monitoring program to verify that those noise levels have been met.

5

MS LEUNG: So those matter is covered in - - -

MR WILSON: So - - -

10 MS LEUNG: - - - the report.

MS HARRAS: Sorry?

MR WILSON: But you're confident that those – those noise levels can be met.

15

MS HARRAS: Yes. Yes, it's – it's a fairly standard issue that we have with plant in these type of situations and in – when – I've not come across a situation and the acoustic consultant was quite clear that – that there would be mitigation measures that could be used to mitigate plant noise.

20

MR WILSON: Okay. So in the – in the event that it is shown that they – they cannot meet those levels then there's mitigation measures available to ensure that they will meet them in the future.

25 MS HARRAS: They would – they would have to demonstrate that they can meet them through the design process – through the detailed design process and then following construction they would have to confirm that they've met those requirements. So – with appropriate enclosures and attenuation measures.

30 MR WILSON: Can I just ask a question as the – on how that detailed design process works because the – the report does refer to the detailed design process quite a lot. How does that work? Is it – it's conditions, is it?

35 MS LEUNG: Yes, a standard condition of concern that are recommended on the concern that details with noise. Normally, some of these buildings surfaces matters would not be designed until through the construction the documentation process. But we understand through amendments of the proposal the plant has already been located resulting it being located further away from the common boundary with Princeton Apartment and the support submitted acoustic assessment establishes that
40 the proposed plant will be able to – capable of complying with relevant noise standard.

MR WILSON: Okay. Is there anything else to

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: No. Actually, no, I do have a question about the louvres – yes. The louvres on the south elevation. Are they moveable? Are they adjustable by the resident?

MS HARRAS: My understanding is they're fixed.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Fixed. And I note - - -

5 MS HARRAS: But - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - that they're - I mean, I can't - - -

MS HARRAS: I will come back to you.

10

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - okay. We can also ask the applicant, I guess.

MR WILSON: Yes.

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: I also - I note that they are in front of the dining area. But not the living area. I can understand why they're in front of the bedroom. But, like, is there any reason why the louvres are in front of the kitchen - or the dining area and not the living area? I'm not quite sure of the logic of that.

20 MS LEUNG: So the Department actually recommended a condition that louvres or obscure glazing to be provided to the dining and living area at the end where they don't have louvre proposed along that southern elevation.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: Right. Okay. So if they haven't got louvres one should query whether there is obscure glass. Is that what you're saying or - - -

MS LEUNG: So if they don't use louvre they have the option to have fixed obscure glazing. And that's a recommended condition by the Department.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. And that's because you think the proximity to the Princeton Apartment is too close and, therefore, is required from the privacy perspective. Is that your information?

35 MS LEUNG: I think as considered in our assessment report the dining room and the living rooms still has the opportunity to overlook back to the balconies of Princeton Apartment on both the Pitt Street estate and as well as the eastern side. The recommendation to provide louvres or obscure glazing is to basically limit that opportunity.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean, I can understand if it's a bathroom or a bedroom. But a balcony is a fairly public place anyway. It just seems, again, these apartments on the south side have a seriously compromised amenity and you're putting louvres and obscure glass in addition to fairly limited solar access. It's - it's really contributing to, yes, quite a compromised outcome for the resident of those apartments.

45

MS LEUNG: So the recommended - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD:

MS LEUNG: Yes. Yes. They recommended condition deals with the two rooms at the end along the southern side and those windows are secondary windows to the same room. So those room have alternative window on either the Pitt Street side as well as the eastern side.

PROF LOCHHEAD: No, I understand that. But there is a spacial – a spacial experience that one has by looking out beyond a surface. So if you've got a surface – if it's translucent you can't see through it. If it's transparent you get a lot of borrowed space. So there is a perception.

MS LEUNG: I understand.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Anyway – yes. Okay. I don't have any more questions. Do you have any more questions?

MR WILSON: No. No, I'm – do you have anything – if you could just probably just run through the design excellence process for this development. We understand it was – the SRDP was established for station boxes. Is that correct? And the Over Station Developments.

MS LEUNG: So the DRP was originally established for the process of this station and the infrastructure and then as the CSSI approval. There were – with respect to the concept approval for the Over Station Development it was required that they go through the state Design Review Process or an alternative endorsed panel. Through the – prior to the government architect endorsing the Sydney metro Design Review Panel amendments were made to the terms of reference of the Sydney metro DRP to include the government architect to be chairing that panel and also to include independent secretariat as well as a member or a council nominee to be on that panel. So that has then subsequently got endorsed by the government architect which then now looks after both the Over Station Development as well as the station and infrastructure below.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you. Do you have any related issues?

PROF LOCHHEAD: No.

MR WILSON: No. Anthony, are there any other issues that you would like to express to the panel? Yes. Sorry, some of the SRDP notes to answer – there's redactions throughout those. Is that because they refer to another development or what was the reason for the redactions?

MS LEUNG: So the redaction is when they refer to the CSSI which is all the station infrastructure which is not subject of this approval.

MR WILSON: Yes. Although, they're integrated.

MR WITHERDIN: And, Chris, there was nothing else – there was nothing else that we wanted to add today. But just to – just to mention that if you – if the Commission had any further follow up questions that you would like us to provide further information on whether it be the plant or the GRC columns or the privacy screens
5 happy for you to send through those questions and we can give you some more details on those.

MS HARRAS: Just confirming those privacy screens are fixed, that's all.

10 MR WILSON: Yes, they're – they are fixed.

MS HARRAS: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Thanks, Chris.
15

MR WILSON: Look, there may be questions that come out. We've obviously still got a meeting with the applicant and the council and there may be questions that come out of that – out of those meetings. So we will let you know. So I think – but I think that's it from us. Okay. Thank you very much. We appreciate it.
20

MS HARRAS: Thank you.

MR WITHERDIN: Thank you.

25 MS LEUNG: All right. Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[1.47 pm]