



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1390653

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: SAINTS PETER AND PAUL ASSYRIAN SCHOOL (SSD 9210)

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN (CHAIR)**
ADRIAN PILTON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: **KATE MOORE**

DEPARMENT: **ADITI COOMAR**
KAREN HARRAGON
INGRID BERZINS

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **1.00 PM, FRIDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 2021**

THIS PROCEEDING WAS CONDUCTED BY VIDEO CONFERENCE

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to
5 acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we meet, and pay my
respects to the elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today for
the Saints Peter and Paul Assyrian School Project. Assyrian Schools Limited
proposed to construct a new primary school for up to 630 students and 35 staff in six
10 stages. The site is currently a vacant pasture located in Cecil Park, approximately 10
kilometres west of the Fairfield central business district, approximately 16 kilometres
south-west of the Parramatta CBD, and approximately 10 kilometres north-west of
the Liverpool CBD. The Western Sydney Aerotropolis is located seven kilometres
west of the site.

15 My name is Peter Duncan. I'm the chair of this commission panel. I am joined by
my fellow commissioner Adrian Pilton. We're also joined by 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
20 recorded and a full transcript will be provided and made available on the
commission's website. The 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
25 issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not
in a position to answer, please feel free to take the answer on notice and provide any
additional information in writing, which may also then be put on our website. Could
I also request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for
30 the first time and all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each
other to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

With that, we will now begin. Karen, we've sent through some discussion points,
which I'm sure you've covered or will cover in your presentation. From Adrian and
my point of view, there's one key area we do want to talk about, and that's traffic, so
35 if we've got a few minutes at the end, if – if you haven't already covered that, we
may – may come back to the traffic issue, but please proceed.

MS K. HARRAGON: Thank you. We have included traffic, but we're more than
able to provide a much deeper analysis of that following our – our formal
40 presentation. So I'll start off. Good afternoon, I am Karen Harragon, director of
Social Infrastructure Assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and
Environment, and I'm here with my colleagues Ingrid Berzins and Aditi Coomar to
outline the Department's approach to the assessment of this application and in
reaching the Department's recommendation.

45

The proposal as revised by the applicant's response to submissions report seeks approval for the staged construction and operation of a new school for K to 12 aged students with associated playing fields and a multipurpose hall, within the suburb of Cecil Park in Fairfield Council. When completed there will be 630 students and 35
5 to 42 full-time equivalent staff. The site is unique with a number of constraints, as it is located in a semi-rural area surrounded by large semi-rural allotments, a riparian zone along one boundary, flood prone land, and bushfire prone land to the west. The school is declared to be SSD and is for the purposes of a new school.

10 The proposal has been referred to the commission due to an objection made by Fairfield Council during the exhibit of the EIS. During the assessment process the Department has engaged with a range of public authorities on a number of occasions, including the council, to resolve challenges and issues that arose from the review of the original EIS application. As a result of the Department's engagement with
15 stakeholders and the applicant, multiple sets of supplementary information, including updated traffic reports, flooding, wastewater, noise related information, were submitted following the original response to submissions report, and these were submitted in response to resolving the majority of the key issues in relation to this application. All of this information is provided on the Department's portal and is
20 referred to in our assessment report.

The assessment has also – the Department has also engaged an independent traffic consultant to provide advice regarding the traffic impacts associated with the proposal. In part, this was also to ensure that traffic capacity issues that were
25 associated with the consideration of a – a court case matter on the adjoining land, were being able to be assessed to the depth by this application.

The Department's detailed assessment report covers a large number of key issues that speak to a range of matters that were raised during the assessment of the project and mitigated via supplementary information or conditions of consent. The key
30 issues, however, that we're going to focus on today includes matters of concern predominantly relating to council's issues, and that includes suitability of the site, traffic impacts, and bulk and scale. To assist today, we've prepared a small abstract of the diagrams from the application, a copy of which we've made available to the
35 IPC, but we're going to be moving through that as a PowerPoint today in the relevant locations. We've provided it, should anyone have issues regarding accessing that through the Zoom meeting.

I'm now, firstly, going to ask Ingrid to provide a snapshot of the site and the
40 development before Aditi speaks to the key issues of the project, and I can continue with the remainder of our presentation. Ingrid, if you could start, and announce your name in full before you commence.

45 MS A. COOMAR: Ingrid, we cannot hear you.

MR DUNCAN: Ingrid, I think you're on mute.

MS I. BERZINS: Can you hear me?

MR A. PILTON: Yes.

5 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS BERZINS: Good morning and thank you for the introduction. Just double checking, everyone can see their screen?

10 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS BERZINS: Yes. All right. We'll get started. I'm Ingrid Berzins and I'm a planning officer within Social Infrastructure and the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. I will provide a high level overview of the proposal, the site, and its context within the Cecil Park locality. The current slide provides regional context for the site. The site is located within a rural residential area in Cecil Park, approximately seven kilometres east of the Aerotropolis and adjacent to the Western Sydney Parklands, 10 kilometres west of Fairfield CBD, and 10 kilometres north-west of Liverpool CBD. The site, as depicted, is located at the cul-de-sac end of Kosovich Place, and comprises of two lots – lot 2320 and lot 2321. The school site is outlined in red, and majority of the building construction is contained within lot 2320.

Kosovich Place is a local road which connects to Wallgrove Road in close proximity to the M7 intersection. The site and the surrounding areas are zoned RU4 – rural residential, with a small portion along the western boundary zoned E2 – environmental conservation. A riparian corridor and flood prone land affects the western portion of the site. This area of the site, contained wholly within western lot 2321, also includes contaminated land. The site is currently not serviced by utilities, but water and electricity are able to be provided, however, sewerage is not expected to be available in the foreseeable future.

The current image demonstrates the local character surrounding the site, which includes the Saints Peter and Paul Parish Church, and Ropes Creek to the north, the adjacent rural residential dwellings to the east, and a riparian corridor running along the western boundary of the site. When you travel out to the site you will notice that it slopes from the eastern boundary down to the western boundary, a fall of about 10 metres across the site. By way of background, this site was created as part of a subdivision of a larger allotment at the same time as the creation of Kosovich Place. During the time of that subdivision application, consent conditions imposed by council required the placement of a restriction on title on lot 2321 due to contamination and flooding issues. This restricts any development on lot 2321 until the contamination and flooding issues are resolved to council's satisfaction.

45 It should be noted that the adjoined church to the east was the subject of a court case which was dismissed a few years back. The proposal was to increase the capacity of the church. From our review of the judgment, it appears that the main reason for

dismissal was due to unresolved traffic issues, lack of information with regard to traffic management, and impacts on Kosovich Place due to overflow traffic.

5 In the strategic context, the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the Western Sydney District Plan designate the rural areas on the western side of the Fairfield LGA, where the site is located, as an urban investigation area in recognition of its proximity to the future Western Sydney Airport and the Western Sydney employment lands. Although the area is currently low density rural development, the area is expected to transition into a more urban environment at some point in time in the future. The draft urban capability assessment for rural areas, as included in council's public-facing documents, includes the eastern part of the site as potentially urban capable land, but the majority of the western side as non-urban capable land, mainly due to the constraints of the riparian zone and the flood prone land, as well as contamination.

15 The school proposes, in part, to accommodate the existing overflow enrolments from St Hurmizd Assyrian Primary School, which is about five kilometres east of the site, however, the school would also cater for the future increase in population in the wider and immediate area if rezoning occurs. The site plan depicted demonstrates the built form proposed for the site. In response to the site's constraints, the school has been designed with the buildings contained within the eastern portion of the site, including a driveway along the eastern boundary and a considerably high retaining wall creating the eastern boundary. The new school would comprise of buildings between one to two storeys, covered outdoor learning areas – identified as COLAs on the plans, open space sporting facilities, recreational courts, playing fields, and an outside amphitheatre and civic heart for student use.

To manage the constraints of the site appropriately the applicant proposes to deliver the school in six stages. The ultimate development would cater for 630 students and 30 35 to 42 full-time equivalent staff. The proposal would include access off Kosovich Place on the western side, as shown on the slide, with 30 onsite drop-off/pick-up spaces and 39 car spaces proposed to be serviced by an internal loop road. The school proposes to integrate community use within the site. The applicant has advised that the adjoining church is likely to use the school's car park on the 35 weekends, and the internal playing fields are also likely to be used by the community in the future.

This slide depicts the construction stage, and that the majority of the building works, car parking and bus stops on Kosovich place are all proposed to be constructed in 40 stage 1 of the development, as outlined in yellow, which would cater for up to 210 students. The applicant has acknowledged that lot 2321 includes a restriction on its title. To respond to this restriction the applicant now proposes to undertake the site remediation upfront, concurrently with the stage 1 works. Once these are completed the applicant proposes to then construct the playing fields, etcetera. Stage 1 of the 45 development will also include upgrades to the intersection of Kosovich Place and Wallgrove Road to cater for the development. The applicant also proposes to widen

Kosovich Place with kerb and gutter and footpath to provide for safe pedestrian access to the site.

5 Given that the site is not serviced by any sewerage, the applicant proposes a pump
out system with a tank under the car park for stage 1. In the subsequent stages a
sewerage treatment plant is proposed for the site, with subsurface irrigation under the
playing fields within lot 2321. This would only occur after the remediation of that
allotment is completed. I would now like to pass on to Aditi to talk about the key
10 issues in relation to the proposal.

15 MS COOMAR: Thank you, Ingrid, and hello everyone. I hope everyone can hear
me.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

15 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS COOMAR: So I would like to start with the key issue of site suitability. I note
20 that in the agenda the commission has passed on a few key things that you would like
to discuss, so we will go through the main focus key issues and we can talk about the
remaining bits once we've completed these focus issues. So the key – the first key
issue that I'm going to talk about is site suitability. As highlighted in the
Department's assessment report, one of the main reasons that council objected to this
development was due to the site suitability, based on the proposed built form being
25 inconsistent with the rural character of the area, lack of adequate wastewater
infrastructure, and the adverse traffic impacts on the nearby intersections.

The Department has carefully considered the site suitability and the applicant's
30 response to the concerns. The Department recognises that while the prescribed land
use may be permissible with consent, consideration must be provided as to whether
the site is suitable for the proposed size and capacity of the development, and
whether the proposal complies with the zone objectives. The Department's
assessment of the proposal against the zone objectives concludes that the proposed
35 development would not compromise the agricultural production of the adjoining
lands. It is noted that, as such, agricultural activities are not being undertaken on the
site or on adjoining lands at the moment. The construction and operation of the
school would diversify the economic opportunities available for the site, as it is
currently not utilised for primary production. Given that the council's and state
40 government's strategic documents suggest that the area has the potential to be
urbanised in the future, the use would be compatible with the desired future character
of the area.

The Department also considers that the design of the development responds well to
45 the site's constraints, including minimising hazards on the site by proposing an asset
protection zone, proposing all buildings above the PMF line, ensuring no final
landscape works on the western portion prior to remediation of the land being
completed, and providing satisfactory measures to mitigate traffic impacts and the

5 lack of wastewater infrastructure. Consequently, the Department considers that the development can be progressed to stage 1 occupation, however, a number of conditions are required to be met, including lifting the restriction on – restriction on the title of lot 2321, with council’s agreement, prior to the school progressing beyond stage 1 student numbers of 210.

10 I would now like to talk briefly about the traffic impacts of the proposal, and this is also being raised as a key issue in council’s objection. This slide shows the local and regional networks and the nearby intersections that are likely to be impacted by the development. The key intersections being Kosovich Place and Wallgrove Road, which is circled in red on the slide, and Wallgrove Road/Elizabeth Drive to the south, which is also circled in green. The Department recognises that the proposed school would generate a large number of private vehicles, which is currently not the case in Kosovich Place. To ensure that the traffic movements during peak school hours do not impact on the overall traffic in the surrounding locality, the applicant proposes to upgrade the Kosovich Place/Wallgrove Road intersection, as shown on this slide, as well as widen Kosovich Place. The applicant has also proposed all of the required car parking within the site, including an onsite drop-off/pick-up zone to manage and mitigate all sorts of offsite impacts.

20 The Department notes that council in their objection to the EIS refers to the previous court case on the church site, which was dismissed due to inadequate traffic management measures, resulting in – in forecast overflow traffic on Kosovich Place. Council has also raised significant concerns regarding the proposed prohibition of right turns on to Wallgrove Road from Kosovich Place, which has been proposed by the applicant. However, based on the independent traffic peer review by the Department’s traffic consultant Bitzios and the comments from Transport for NSW, the Department considers that the updated traffic modelling and associated assessment of traffic impacts provided by the applicant are suitable. The proposed upgrades to the nearby intersection, which – would ensure that operational traffic due to this development can be appropriately managed.

I would now like to take you back to that network plan again - - -

35 MR DUNCAN: Aditi, before you go on from that - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes.

40 MR DUNCAN: - - - if there’s – if there’s no right turn, is the concept you turn left, go to the roundabout further up the road and then come back if you want to go right; is that - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes. Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS COOMAR: So the Department notes that Transport for NSW future upgrades intersections would be needed to accommodate the future growth in traffic volume by 2028 due to likely developments in the area. The Department is satisfied that the delivery of these upgrades, which has been forecast by Transport for NSW, would accommodate the forecast school traffic in the final full built stage. Then we find that stage 1 of the school is, however, not reliant on the Elizabeth Road – Elizabeth Drive/Wallgrove Road intersection upgrade, which we have shown – circled in green, therefore, the school can commence operation of stage 1 after upgrading Wallgrove Road/Kosovich Place intersection only.

However, beyond stage 1 the applicant needs to provide adequate evidence that the intersections have been delivered by either the applicant or Transport for NSW, in this case, before student numbers can increase, otherwise further assessment of the traffic impact would be necessary to facilitate the future stages of the development. The adverse impacts on Kosovich Place due to the traffic generation would be only for short periods of time during the school peak hours, and that has been considered as acceptable.

Prohibition of the right turn out of Kosovich Place into Wallgrove Road would not have a significant impact on the residents of Kosovich Place as to warrant it not to be delivered or to warrant refusal of the application, as there is a nearby roundabout where the residents can turn right. However, its delivery would result in a safer traffic environment for the locality in the future and, as such, all of these upgrades would need to be endorsed by council's local traffic committee.

The proposal would provide for a bus bay on Kosovich Place, which may be used by the public in the future and is considered as a positive social – social outcome of this development. The Department has assessed the internal car parking areas to be satisfactory as well, however, the Department is concerned about the operation and safety of the internal drop-off/pick-up zone, as discussed in the assessment report. To mitigate the concerns, a condition of consent recommends – recommends a road safety audit to be undertaken to assess the safety of the internal pedestrian crossing and the drop-off/pick-up areas, and include mitigation measures if needed to overcome any residual safety concern. Council has reviewed the Department's conditions and have to agreed to this approach.

Before I pass on to Karen, who will discuss the next key issue, I would just like to note that we do not have any specific discussion today as part of this briefing on flooding or stormwater management or wastewater infrastructure, as you have mentioned in your agenda, but we can take your questions as we go. I would now pass on to Karen, please.

MR PILTON: Excuse me, can I just ask a question, please?

MS COOMAR: Yes.

MR PILTON: I don't know if you've seen the – the council sent through this morning a – a plan showing the upgrade of Wallgrove Road attaches through to the M – I think it's the M12 to the Aerotropolis, and they said it's a major concern. I'm just wondering how that will affect Wallgrove Road. I don't know if you've looked at that. There's quite a at the end of the road towards the south.

MS COOMAR: Council – yes. So we have not looked at – has not looked at – we have not looked at this submission from council, I'm sorry - - -

10 MR PILTON: I'm just wondering where – where the roundabout is supposed to be. I don't know how far up the road it – I know there's one up to the north, I've seen that, but is there another one southwards?

15 MS COOMAR: I have not specifically seen council's submission which you have – which would have come through this morning, as you're saying, because nothing came through to us, but we can obviously take this question on notice.

20 MR PILTON: Yes. They – they – they just sent a copy of the RMS plans for the connection through to – between the M7 and the M12. I don't know what their specific concerns are – they just said it's major consequences. So we'll hear that later this afternoon.

MS COOMAR: Okay. We can have a look at it on the IPC website, I'm assuming? And we can - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR PILTON: Yes.

30 MS COOMAR: And then we can take that question on notice. We have not - - -

MR PILTON: If you could, please. Thank you.

35 MS COOMAR: We have not viewed this plan yet.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS COOMAR: Thank you.

40 MS HARRAGON: And I think we'll probably also look to involve our independent traffic consultant as well.

45 MR PILTON: Yes. It'd be good to get the council's comments because I – I don't know what they're referring to. They just said it's major consequences.

MS HARRAGON: We're happy to reach out to council to get that clarification as well.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen.

MS COOMAR: I will now pass on to Karen to discuss built form. Thank you, Karen.

5

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. We're going to move back to that original aerial view of the existing property to – to talk about built form. I would like to discuss built form as this has been one of the key issues raised in council's objection in relation to site suitability. The Department recognises the urban built form is not
10 entirely compatible with the existing character of the semi-rural environment which currently surrounds the site. Whilst the Department agrees that the built form will cater for the functions of the school, we have concerns with the intensity of the bulk form, particularly along the northern boundary, and the views of the extensive
15 from the north and north-east. The Department also recognises that the built form can not be relocated further away from the northern boundary due to the existing flooding site constraints that occur along the riparian corridor and into the western adjoining allotment.

The Department is satisfied that the future landscape works will, however, provide
20 appropriate and sufficient landscape screening from the north-east, east, west, and south, and a landscape setting that mitigates the visual impact of the built form will be delivered through the landscape plan and the conditions of consent. In response to the Department's concerns with the intensity of the built form along the northern boundary and the consequential visual impacts, in particular to the property
25 immediately adjacent, the applicant advised that due to the slope of the land the roof of the building would be the main visual element from the neighbouring properties to the east with existing unobstructed views of the Blue Mountains. This is primarily due to the significant cut that is proposed along that boundary. However, the Department considers that the significant extent of roof form should also be further
30 screened from the adjoining dwelling to mitigate visual impact and impact on character.

So this slide here that we're just looking at – the next one, thanks, Ingrid – yes – depicts the extent of that cut which is proposed along the boundary to provide the
35 driveway. The Department does not consider adequate and sustainable landscaping proposed along that very high planter box immediately adjacent the boundary. It's – it's actually shown as a width of .75 metres. It's obviously sitting at the top of a retaining wall, and I'm imagining there could also be some significant backfilling of that with material that might not be conducive to growth. So we consider that there
40 are concerns regarding the height at which this is also located and the ability to maintain and service that landscape strip to ensure that its longevity and purpose and objective of screening the roofline is achieved.

We recommend that the landscape setback at the top of the retaining wall should be
45 increased to 1.5 metres to provide improved access and width for planting, and the overall built form depth reduced accordingly to ensure an adequate landscape setback be contained wholly within the development site that would appropriately mitigate

5 impact on current and future adjoining owners. So, in effect, our condition is asking for that – that high landscape box to be widened, and that the compensation for that increase in setback actually be taken from a reduction in the amount of built form that, I guess, intrudes into that on the other side of the – the property into the playing fields.

10 MR DUNCAN: Karen, while you're at that point, we had a discussion about this when we were onsite, particularly Adrian raised that the higher wall, not the lower one, but – it says it's a shotcrete wall, but is – it looks like it's faced with something. Did you – do you have any details on that?

MS HARRAGON: That – were they – yes. So the diagram refers to it as being concrete blockwork.

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MS HARRAGON: So we probably don't have any more information other than that. And obviously the intention is that they speak about it being a green wall, although what I can tell from the vegetation, it's – it's simply plants that are planted at the base to – to grow up along it.

MR DUNCAN: And you're quite right to point out that the strip there is very narrow to get any substantive landscape there - - -

25 MS HARRAGON: Yes. And, I guess, what we hold quite dear is that the – the – the – the requirement to screen the development shouldn't have to be satisfied by an adjoining owner. A development should come with the expectation that you've made provisions within your footprint to enable you to provide the landscaping to screen your building. We totally accept that this is a fairly substantial, you know, cut and there will be a fair amount of, I guess, loss of view of that lower level of the building, and there is a reasonable distance, but we still believe that there – there should be some provision of this additional landscaping which the applicant's willing to accept. We're also not just looking at the current – the current character. We're looking to the future character.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

40 MS HARRAGON: It's highly likely that property and houses close to the boundary.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Adrian, did you have a comment on that while we're here?

45 MR PILTON: Yes. It all looks too thin to me planting bed at the bottom of the wall doesn't look wide enough to support the plants that they're indicating, so it'll all be on whatever they plan for this supposed green wall - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes. And particularly – that depth of that vegetation is – is – particularly, you need to ensure that you have no impediment of pedestrian movements, because this is a critical pinch-point in pedestrian safety along that driveway entry. It's critical – crucial - - -

5

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - for site distance, and that's actually part of – what happens in that setback between the landscape wall and the building face is part of that site audit that we're talking about to ensure that pedestrian sightlines and parked cars and obviously landscaping are not going to impinge upon the outcome of priority for – for pedestrian safety.

10

MR PILTON: Yes with a rendered shotcrete wall. It could look hideous.

15

MS HARRAGON: You know, and obviously we're looking for the long-term. It's - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

20

MS HARRAGON: - - - a great outcome to have it planted out in that first year and it's maintained. You know, it's really critical that that's something that has that sustainable – and a commitment for it to be there for an enduring period of time.

25

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So that – so are you happy for me to just - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35

MS HARRAGON: - - - complete the presentation? And we're – we're happy to take much more detailed – invite questions on the other matters, because we've actually – we believe that some of the slides that we've also got we can speak to you on contamination and site servicing as well. So this ends our presentation on the main issues. In summary, the Department concludes that the development is permissible with consent within the zone. The Department has assessed in detail in its assessment report: built form and character, acoustics, contamination, riparian impacts, riparian rehabilitation, visual impacts, flood zone management, traffic impacts, pedestrian safety, open space, wastewater treatment, utility servicing. Overall the Department concludes that on balance the impacts of the development are acceptable, and any residual impacts can be appropriately managed or mitigated through the implementation of the recommended conditions of consent.

40

In relation to traffic, which in addition to – to character are probably the – the more longer key issues for us. The Department considers that the surrounding road

45

network has capacity to accommodate the forecast traffic and parking demand generated by the school, subject to recommended conditions regarding onsite traffic management and student numbers being specifically linked to the timely delivery of intersection upgrades. Thank you for providing the Department an opportunity
5 today.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

10 MR DUNCAN: So we – you picked up on the landscaping issue, which was one that we actually talked about out onsite. The contamination one, I think we – you know, I think we have a clearer picture now, and showing the lot boundaries I can see why they’re developing the site the way they are.

15 MS HARRAGON: Can I perhaps just comment on the contamination? Because obviously the word “contamination” sort of can capture quite a lot of issues.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MS HARRAGON: It’s probably appropriate to mention here that the – what has been recognised from the investigations to date, it is some fill that was brought into the property. It is asbestos. So we’re not talking about either – organics from agricultural pursuits. So we - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Right.

MS HARRAGON: We do believe that the remediation of the site is very – able to be achieved in a reasonable period of time and cost.

30 MR DUNCAN: Okay. And the – the traffic issues, it sounds like we need to probably talk a little more to council about that to understand the objection. I’d imagine the M7/M12 and the Aerotropolis, that would provide better access off the motorway, so I’m wondering what the impacts are along Wallgrove Road. And I’m
35 – I assume that’s – we could probably get some more information on that if we need to from Transport.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. I was - - -

40 MS COOMAR:

MS HARRAGON: Sorry, Aditi.

45 MS COOMAR: And if you can provide us that information – I could not view that on IPCs website at the moment, however, if you can provide us with access to that information, we can get some answers for you that - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS COOMAR: - - - you might need.

5 MR DUNCAN: We – we might need to come back to you on that, but we – we haven't got a long time, but that's – that's something that we'll – after we talk to council we may come back to you with. Adrian, have you got further questions at this stage?

10 MR PILTON: Not really. Yes. We've covered the main issues there I think. The other things are just detail – I need to do a lot of reading on the wastewater - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

15 MR PILTON: - - - and so on.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Karen, you've covered that quite well. Flooding and stormwater, you said that you didn't cover there. Is there anything – any comments you want to make about that?

20

MS HARRAGON: There's a – a fairly detailed condition that speaks to a much more high level flood investigation quite comfortable with the approach to that. Obviously the – the need to actually resolve that is dependent upon the restriction, as to user, that's been placed on the property. Though, fundamentally council's going to be very keen to understanding whether that site flood modelling is appropriate, because they have obviously the base model. So we're – we're very comfortable that it's within the parameters of the sort of preliminary information they've given us.

25

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Adrian, I – I'm pretty comfortable. That was a good - - -

30

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - presentation. I think it's covered everything we asked for, including, you know, referring – referring to stormwater. Nothing more from you?

35

MR PILTON: Nothing. No. I'm happy with what we've seen. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Kate, is there any – any comment you want to make from the office's point of view?

40

MS K. MOORE: No. Nothing further. Thanks, Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All right. Karen, I think, you know, that was very – very good. Very – very much on the – on the mark. So thanks very much for the presentation and - - -

45

MS HARRAGON: No worries. We'll – we'll seek to try and turn that additional information around for you as soon as we can. And I – I – we may need to consider whether it might even be more efficient in actually getting Transport to – to speak to you, rather than written advice.

5

MR DUNCAN: I think – I think that would be good, particularly if – if traffic is the issue – is a big issue. And also we're not having a public meeting on this one, so our timeframe's a bit tighter, so we're - - -

10 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: by the end of February. So if you wait on that one, and we might come back to you after – after – at the end of today and see if we can arrange something with Transport.

15

MS HARRAGON: Yes. And I'm probably – what I could also suggest is that potentially an option could be to see whether there's an – an engineered solution, where if there is still these concerns about the ability to turn right, whether there's even a restriction that's only placed – and the intersection's re-engineered so that the restriction is only during school peaks.

20

MR DUNCAN: School hours. Yes.

MR PILTON: Yes.

25

MR DUNCAN: There are different ways to do this, so, yes, you're quite right. You know, you can even have a turning bay further up and all that sort of thing. So - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

30

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS COOMAR: And the – and the way Transport for NSW got back to us, even during all our discussions with them, they would like to see a final design of this intersection because they are not 100 per cent confident on the length of the storage lane that has been provided at the moment.

35

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

40 MS COOMAR: And – and they obviously do want to ensure that the do not extend beyond the centre line of Wallgrove Road to the other end so that that then compromises the lane with – on the other side. Therefore, all of that needs to go through Transport for NSW in detail, but we have a team who has been in discussion with us, so if you do need to talk to Transport for NSW, we can try and get in contact with them.

45

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Appreciate that, Aditi.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks very much. All right.

5 MR DUNCAN: Adrian and Kate, we might stay on the line for a bit, but we'll let you go and – and enjoy the rest of the day. Thank you very much.

MS COOMAR: Thank you very much.

10 MS COOMAR: Thanks, Peter. Thanks, Adrian.

MR DUNCAN: Close the meeting. Thank you.

15 **MATTER ADJOURNED at 1.34 pm INDEFINITELY**