



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: 24 PARKES STREET, 26-30 PARKES STREET
AND 114-116 HARRIS STREET, HARRIS PARK –
GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW (GR-2022-9)

DEPARTMENT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: PROFESSOR HELEN LOCHHEAD (Chair)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: LINDSEY BLECHER
HEATHER WARTON

DPE REPRESENTATIVES: JAZMIN VAN VEEN
ANGELA HYNES

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 12.00PM, WEDNESDAY, 9 MARCH 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

PROF. LOCHHEAD: My name is Helen Lochhead and I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel today. But before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we are virtually meeting and pay my respects to their Elders past, present and emerging. The meeting today is to discuss the Gateway Determination Review of 24 and 26-30 Parkes Street and 114-116 Harris Street, Harris Park, which is currently before the Commission. The objective of the planning proposal is to seek an exemption from the floor space sliding-scale provision that is proposed under the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal and is currently with the department for finalisation. This proposal seeks to facilitate the site's redevelopment for three mixed-use towers that are intended to be lodged for approval under separate development applications.

I'm joined today by Lindsey Blecher, from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission, and Heather Warton, who is assisting the Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which we will base our advice. It is important for the Commissioner 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 today, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide additional information in writing which we will then put on our website.

I request that all here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we will now begin. So you received an agenda and the first part of it is really to provide you with the opportunity to give us your insight of the planning proposal and your Gateway Determination for us to consider and also you could look at some of the issues for discussion in your framing of your overview.

MS VAN VEEN: Thank you. Am I able to share a presentation or would you prefer I just verbally speak?

PROF. LOCHHEAD: No, no, no, that's perfectly all right.

MS VAN VEEN: Sorry. I'm not used to using Zoom but I'm hoping you are able to see that site at the moment?

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yes, we can see.

MS VAN VEEN: Okay. Great. So I'm just going to touch a little bit on the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal 'cause obviously that is quite relevant to this site-specific planning proposal. I'll touch a little on where that's at in our finalisation process and the controls that it proposes and then I'll just walk through a couple of our concerns with the planning proposal.

10 So I just thought it might help, I'm not sure where you are in your number of briefings you'll be doing on this but just thought it might be helpful to just pop the site up on a map. I've also included the CBDPP boundary in blue, just to highlight that this site is
10 right on the, on the edge. So it, it's not in the centre. It's on the edge. So that's relevant to our finalisation assessment. You'll also note the Experiment Farm Cottage is identified in the map. That's also relevant to the CBDPP provisions that I'll speak to and Clay Cliff Creek, which runs behind the site. So the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal has been subject to quite a long process. The Commission may be familiar with it. It's currently with the department for our final assessment. And we are doing quite a detailed assessment at the moment. We're looking at all the provisions, the heights, the densities that are proposed throughout the CBD and that assessment is still ongoing. A decision hasn't been made as yet to the making of that final plan. And it
20 may be that there would be further changes to that planning proposal as part of the department's finalisation process.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: So do you have any idea of time frame at this point?

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah, it's, it's very active at the moment, our finalisation process. I suspect we'll be able to make a decision in the next few months, but obviously it's a very complex planning proposal, as the Commission may be aware, and it will need quite a high level of briefing up in getting that sign-off for the minister's delegate. So without putting them, holding them to a date, I suspect it will be, yeah, in the next few months or so.

30 I think one of the Commission's questions was about any changes to the CBD Planning Proposal. As our assessment is still active, I can't speak to what the, the changes might be in the department's post-exhibition assessment but I can say that council didn't make any significant changes for this site in their post-exhibition assessment following submissions received.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay.

40 MS VAN VEEN: The department is also assessing the Harmonisation Planning Proposal which is council's proposal to establish an LEP for its - - -

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Sorry. Just to clarify. So when you said council didn't make any changes to this site in response to submissions - - -

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: - - - does that mean the sliding scale on this site is still in the CBD Planning Proposal that is being considered?

10 MS VAN VEEN: Yes. Yeah. There is still sliding scale that applies across the whole CBD. There were some very minor changes to the wording but that doesn't change the intent of the sliding scale. It's still to reduce FSR relative to the, the site area.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay.

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah. So there is also a separate process for Parramatta's new LEP at the moment. It doesn't propose any significant policy changes in the CBD but I thought, for completeness, I'd just note that that process is also running concurrently.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

20

MS VAN VEEN: So just to touch on the Parramatta CBD controls for the site, it is a bit of a complex planning proposal so if you do have any questions, please let me know. The proposal as exhibited has both a base and incentive height and FSR for each site, essentially. And for simplicity, we typically just look to the incentive in these sort of site-specific examples because that is typically what is being sought. So the incentive FSR for this site would be 10:1 as the mapped FSR, with the height partly determined by the Experiment Farm solar access planning but part of the site would have a mapped incentive FSR of 122 metres.

30 As we've touched on, the sliding scale is proposed to apply through the CBD. That is an existing provision. There is already a sliding scale in the Parramatta CBD. There are some small changes to the provisions under the CBD Planning Proposal. There's the introduction of an isolated site, which provides a bit more flexibility for those sites which may be unable to be amalgamated, that gives some criteria for council to consider whether it would be appropriate in those circumstances for that isolated site to achieve the full FSR.

40 There's also a number of bonuses built into the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal. Design excellence of 15 per cent can be achieved for certain sites if they're able to demonstrate that they show design excellence. And there is a competition required. There's also an additional 5 per cent for high performing buildings which relates to

energy and water efficiencies but that's not applicable to sites under 1,800, so if these sites are to develop alone, they wouldn't be subject to that bonus. The planning proposal also includes an unlimited commercial FSR provision to try and incentivise those non-residential uses in the mixed-use zone but I understand from the proponent's concept schemes that they are looking principally at a residential mixed-use development.

10 The Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal has also had quite significant consideration for flood because you may be aware, it's, it's a significant challenge in the Parramatta CBD. The CBD Planning Proposal seeks to introduce provisions which would allow for sheltering in place which is essentially an acknowledgement that because of the nature of flooding in the CBD, that it's quite rapid flooding. It may not be possible to evacuate people horizontally, so exiting the CBD and instead that they may need to vertically evacuate and be able to have that safe refuge within a future building, so that they can wait out the flood.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Sorry? How does that work? Are you talking about a helicopter or something?

20 MS VAN VEEN: No. It would be a space that would be able to have water and electricity either, I believe through a generator, potentially, and then those people could evacuate to that space and wait out the storm there.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay.

30 MS VAN VEEN: So we've kind of touched on a little through the presentation so far, the PP is seeking to exempt the sliding scale for the purpose of enabling the achievement of the full maximum FSR proposed under the Parramatta CBDPP which, as exhibited, would be 10:1 plus any bonuses that they were able to achieve. I just thought I'd touch on the purpose of the sliding scale because the planning proposal speaks a lot to its purpose being to incentivise amalgamation. And I believe that is definitely the objective of the sliding scale but I think it also has a purpose to ensure that smaller sites have a floor space that is appropriate for their size and that is why it reduces relative to its site area. So the sliding-scale provisions obviously would reduce FSR that could be achieved on these sites. Therein depending on each of the site areas. And as I mentioned there is a provision within the CBD Planning Proposal that allows for exceptions where an isolated site can demonstrate certain criteria. So there is some flexibility proposed in the new CBD Planning Proposal. But again, this is still subject to the department's final assessment, the drafting process and what that
40 final LEP would be.

So I'll just now touch on our concerns. I'm just going to be quite high level with what our concerns are. Primarily, we're concerned that the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal is actively being finalised. I believe the proponent has put in there a request that the department is taking a different approach here in that we've finalised a number of other planning proposals. But those planning proposals have principally proceeded sometime ago. And at the moment we're actively finalising the CBD Planning Proposal. So I think we've shifted to a different point and we need to bed down the CBD Planning Proposal before we start then reviewing controls and changing the outcomes for something that isn't yet determined.

10

We also have some concerns about the site's ability to accommodate the additional floor space. So that's in the concept schemes being demonstrated by compromises to the setbacks and potentially maybe unable to meet SEPP 65 principles and compliance. We did note in our Gateway Determination Assessment that flooding and heritage were a concern. And that is a concern because the way that the proponent and council are proposing to deal with that is through the CBD Planning Proposal provisions. And again, those provisions haven't yet come into place. So the CBD Planning Proposal, yes, it does introduce a solar access plan that would prohibit overshadowing the Experiment Farm. And it does propose to introduce those flooding controls. But they're not yet in place. And we could, you know, potentially condition and try and work that through the process. But it comes back to my first point that the CBD Planning Proposal is still being actively finalised. And it might be more appropriate to revisit amendments to that once the controls are introduced.

20

And so the image that I've just got on the screen there is from the planning proposal. It just demonstrates to me how tightly tuned the design concept has had to be to try to accommodate the additional floor space. That it's coming right up and potentially into the area where no additional overshadowing is allowed. And while it could be redesigned to, you know, come right up to the boundary and avoid that overshadowing, it's demonstrating that potentially the site doesn't have the capacity to accommodate that additional floor space.

30

So that's the end of my prepared presentation. I hope that has answered a couple of the questions that the Commission had. But I'm happy to - - -

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Jazmin, just talking about this – are you involved in the CBD Planning Proposal?

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah, I am, my team is leading the finalisation of that process.

40

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay. So you've talked about the solar access to Experiment Farm but you didn't pull apart the broader objective in the CBD Planning Proposal in terms of urban design. So one of it was about appropriate scale, ensuring development is of an appropriate scale at the site. Adjoining development and the wider city. Specific issues to be considered are SEPP 65, which is mentioned. Amenity for building occupants, which also comes into SEPP 65 considerations.

MS VAN VEEN: Yep.

- 10 PROF. LOCHHEAD: Protection of solar access to open spaces. Now, you mentioned the open space of the heritage item. But you don't, you didn't mention consideration of the parkland directly to the east, which is quite significant. Are you satisfied that the, has this been something that you've taken into account that adequate sun, solar access between 10.00 and 2.00 – or whatever the window is stipulated in the CBD Planning Proposal – has been, can be met or is that another consideration which maybe was not drawn out in your report but we should be cognisant of?

- MS VAN VEEN: Yep. So the planning proposal identifies those key areas where solar access is to be achieved during certain times and that would be places like
20 Experiment Farm, the Lancer Barracks, Parramatta Square. It's silent on the pieces of open space but council has done work to inform the heights and densities that are in the CBDPP which looked at the potential for overshadowing of those key pieces of open space around. And that is something that we'll have to look at through our finalisation of the CBD Planning Proposal.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: So just to be clear I understand, but you're taking into consideration other open spaces or parkland which may not have been identified in the planning proposal submitted to you in your finalisation?

- 30 MS VAN VEEN: It's not identified in the CBDPP as a control that those areas have to be protected. But the impact of overshadowing of the built form has informed the heights and densities that's council's proposed through the CBD Planning Proposal. So they've prepared an overshadowing technical analysis that has crudely modelled the CBD's maximum heights and densities and then measured the overshadowing impact on both open spaces and some of the lower density heritage conservation areas that are around the CBD. And that's how council's responded to that particular issue. We, through our assessment process at this finalisation stage will need to consider whether that's appropriate.

- 40 PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Because the next point on page 11 is "transition to lower scale areas on the city fringe." That's a chicken-and-egg thing 'cause it's not just

about the solar impact. It's really about the interface of the, you know, 30-plus storeys.

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Pretty much across the road from one to two storeys of Harris Park.

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah.

10

PROF. LOCHHEAD: And that doesn't seem to be in place. Is that something that you have reviewed as part of your work in the department?

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah, we're definitely looking at that through our finalisation process. And we've had some really good discussions with council. They would say that the planning proposal as I understand has been informed by an approach that's essentially a hard edge. So through the edges of the CBD there isn't a stepping down of height, it's a hard edge. And that was a decision that council took quite early in preparing the CBD Planning Proposal. And that - - -

20

PROF. LOCHHEAD: I was just reading the words in their planning proposal. That's in - - -

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Which they talk about a transition to a lower scale.

30

MS VAN VEEN: Yep. There is some transitioning in that area because of the sun access plane. And then also the blocks to the immediate south of Parkes Street and the area where the subject site specific planning proposal is. There is a stepping down for those blocks to the south. But for most other areas it is quite a hard edge on the planning proposal boundary.

40

PROF. LOCHHEAD: And they also say that the purpose of the sliding scale is for small sites and for areas affected by solar access and transition. So it actually draws out those two points and make the nexus between them in terms of the sliding scale, and FSR and heights. So that's, and then it goes onto say that it's controlled density and encourage amalgamation. So, yes. So, all right, so we've spoken to the council and we've spoken - I mean, the order of this is a little bit unfortunate because you're last. But it does help us frame some questions to you which you may not have anticipated. So the issues that we raised with council, they felt that there was pretty

much a lot of water under the bridge. They noted that they hadn't seen one lot tested. But they were going to take that on notice which is obviously an amalgamation of the three sites. We then saw the applicant or the proponent they showed demonstration of amalgamation of two sites, not three sites. And so we still didn't have a consolidated site development demonstrated that we wouldn't get a more optimal outcome by consolidation. They said that they would do three towers no matter what the council said. They thought three towers was better.

10 But I also made the point that amalgamation enables shared driveways, loading access ramps, you know, flexibility in the disposition of open space and setbacks and more efficiencies. And they acknowledged that and they said, oh, we can do that. But again, there was no demonstration of that being modelled or tested. And the proponent said that they would provide us some new information to show that they had done that. Whether they do or not I'm not – and I did actually suggest that without any information to validate their assertions it was difficult for us to assess.

MS VAN VEEN: Yes.

20 PROF. LOCHHEAD: They also suggested that it could meet the ADG compliance. And again, yeah, that was their assertion. But when we spoke to council they said that the further CBD DCP controls would make this site development difficult to comply. So there was, yeah, so there's some sort of competing tensions here where we need some additional information from council and also from the proponent. But we obviously are not in a position to get the – actually we didn't ask for additional information on the CBD DCP controls, did we, Heather?

MS WARTON: No. The applicant said, the council said the applicant's going to be preparing the DCP. But we didn't unfortunately ask Adam Byrnes if there was going to be one DCP prepared for all three sites. Because I didn't - - -

30 PROF. LOCHHEAD: Adam Byrnes did not say he was preparing a DCP. He said the council may want a site specific DCP but we believe that - - -

MS WARTON: Oh, yes.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: - - - a site specific competition would be tantamount to the same.

40 MS WARTON: There's actually a resolution of the council that there be a DCP prepared and exhibited with the LEP. So unless the council changes the resolution, I can't see how he's going to say we don't need to do one.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Well, but, so that's one thing. So there's a site-specific DCP which the council is anticipating which he is not. But also the CBD DCP which the council acknowledges may not enable the sort of site development which is envisaged.

MS WARTON: Yeah.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Which we don't have access to.

10

MS WARTON: Did the department envisage that from what you know of that there would be DCP prepared for this site that would go on exhibition with the planning proposal should it proceed, is that what you thought?

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah, that was my understanding, that part of council's approach in bringing the three, as you may know there was initially three separate planning proposals. And then council's concept of bringing together just this single planning proposal that addresses all three sites, I also understood that council's intention was that a site-specific planning proposal would be prepared to help facilitate the coordinated design approach for the three sites. It sounds like potentially that is, hasn't been communicated or understood by the proponent. But that was my understanding of council's resolution that there would be a DCP.

20

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Okay. So let me just, sorry, I'm just writing some notes to myself at the same time. I mean, one of, I mean the options for us are that we could reject it. We could accept it. Or we could accept it with some amendments or conditions. One of the conditions would be that a site specific, you know, a site-specific DCP would be required. The other that I was imagining, the, sorry, I've just lost my train of thought. Of course, they also talked about this as well. What, Heather, perhaps you could remind me because I've got a conditional Gateway. What was the issue that the proponent was talking about?

30

MS WARTON: Well, was it about the testing of the urban design stuff? The ADG. Let me just check my notes.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yes, Yes. Because that was the other thing that I was concerned about that, you know, there was no demonstration that SEPP 65 or the solar access and the ADG demonstrated that they could be achieved. And that they were baseline in terms of the council's own overarching urban design strategy. And that they would need to demonstrate that. It was on the condition that these things could be demonstrated. I kind of think, they were probably the main things. In terms of

40

questions that we had for you, I just want to go through and see whether there were other things that we needed. So the timeline, sliding scale, FSRs. So we don't really know if there's any changes to the FSR controls?

MS VAN VEEN: No, I couldn't say that yet.

MS WARTON: What about the issue of the heritage curtilage of the state heritage item versus the heritage curtilage of the Parramatta LEP listing, is that something that you're looking at?

10

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Because there's - - -

MS WARTON: The solar access plane?

PROF. LOCHHEAD: 'Cause there's a difference, isn't there?

MS VAN VEEN: Yes. To my recollection, the curtilage of the Experiment Farm extends quite some way beyond what the overshadowing sun access plane seeks to protect. There is always a question to the extent of post-exhibition changes that the department could make. And I think if the department was looking to extend that area that could potentially have some impact on the development capacity through the CBD. Because obviously as you extend that area that's going to require reductions in heights and densities in an extended area within the CBDPP. So that would be something we'd have to very carefully consider.

20

PROF. LOCHHEAD: So at the moment is it the listing on the LEP or is it the, I mean, which is the one that they reckon they can comply with?

MS VAN VEEN: I think they're speaking to the CBD Planning Proposal sun access plane which is a portion of the broader heritage listed site.

30

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yep.

MS WARTON: Yes, the LEP, the way that they've listed the site under the LEP is what they're using, which is a smaller area than it's shown under the state heritage curtilage, which extends into the park to the north.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yep.

MS WARTON: So it's as per the LEP, is my understanding.

40

MS VAN VEEN: Yep, that's my understanding as well.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: The building separation. I mean, obviously they're not meeting the setbacks. I understand with the road widening from speaking with council that the setbacks were reduced because of the trade-off or the concession, sorry, that they made because of the road widening being given to council. But notwithstanding that whereas the setback to the street may not be so critical, obviously the setback and the interface with neighbouring development is quite critical. And they have reduced them quite significantly. And also not only the setback to the neighbouring
10 development which is beyond the site boundaries but within the, between two sites or between two proposed towers is significantly less. One of the assertions was that the Parramatta Council accepted in the city centre that separation between towers did not need to meet the ADG separation. Is that correct in your understanding? They said it does not comply with the 24-metre separation but they've got 18-metre separation between the north-south towers and nine metres between the east-west towers, which is quite different from 24, which is in the ADG. So is that 18-metre separation that they're asserting is the Parramatta City CBD standard a thing or is there any precedent in that?

20 MS VAN VEEN: I can't speak to that confidently at this point, and so I think that would be something that potentially we could take as, on notice. Council might have been better placed to speak to that because we are typically not involved at the development application stage.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

MS VAN VEEN: My concern is that we are at the planning proposal rezoning stage and we're already compromising setbacks and, in my experience, once things get to the development application stage, there's usually further compromises that could then
30 be made. And I think it sets, sets us, sets the building up poorly for that amenity to be achieved if we're already compromising now. I, I just, yeah. I don't, I don't think that the compromises should be made and the sliding scale should be set aside.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: No, I can, one would want to have a degree of certainty that these things could be achieved because, as we know, the expectation from most proponents is that FSR and height can be achieved and then the DCP and the other controls can be massaged. But if, in fact, they can't meet what the expectations set by the FSR and height allow, they'll be pushing the DCP and other amenity controls. I mean, I think that's just, history would suggest that or precedent would suggest that's
40 the way things are. Okay. Let me just, and do you have any questions while I'm going through my list here? I think I've actually covered most of them.

MR BLECHER: I've got a quick question, Helen, if that's all right?

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

MR BLECHER: Just on the sequence of this planning proposal, the CBD Planning Proposal and the Harmonisation LEP, would the changes or the amendments made through the CBD Planning Proposal and potentially this planning proposal, would they then be carried across to the Harmonisation LEP and how would that happen?

10

MS VAN VEEN: Yeah, so we're hopeful that the CBD Planning Proposal, as I say, can be resolved in the next few months. The Harmonisation Proposal is being drafted at the moment but the, that is as a whole new LEP, quite a complex drafting process. So I imagine that will also take a few months for us to work through. You, you may be aware, we have to get executive council sign-off on a new LEP. So there's quite a few additional steps for the Harmonisation LEP. So our intent is that the CBD Planning Proposal would be finished first and then the Harmonisation new LEP would be finalised and it would adopt, it would carry over those controls from the, the CBD.

20 MR BLECHER: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MS WARTON: So can I just clarify, following on Lindsey's question, it's Heather. So if the CBD one happened first, then this essentially would be an amendment that would be wrapped into the CBD one as a separate planning proposal to amend the CBD Planning Proposal as opposed to amending as it is now LEP 2011?

MS VAN VEEN: Yes. So the, the, the CBD Planning Proposal is intending to amend the Parramatta LEP 2011. It already has Part 7, which is city centre-specific controls. And so the intent of the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal is that it would amend that
30 Part 7. While we're still drafting the new LEP, we're hopeful that we'll be able to largely take that Part 7 as is under the, the new CBD Planning Proposal and put it into the, the new LEP. We're hopeful that's quite administrative. But should the Commission and then this site-specific planning proposal continue, it would likely amend the new LEP because of the timing.

MS WARTON: Yeah. Right.

MS VAN VEEN: Sorry. That was complicated.

40 MS WARTON: Yeah, yeah. 'Cause it is really, even though it's an amendment to the 2011 LEP.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Do either of you have any more questions?

MS WARTON: Just in terms of the applicant - - -

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Everyone's frozen. Oh, no. Can you hear me?

MS WARTON: Yes, Helen. Helen's frozen for me.

10 MR BLECHER: Yeah, and me. Let's give it a few minutes. Let's see if she comes back.

MS WARTON: She's still frozen. She's gone.

MR BLECHER: I'll give her a minute or two and then give her a phone call if she doesn't rejoin.

MS WARTON: Lindsey, I forgot to ask the proponent, but can we get the slides, the department's slides and the proponent's slides that they showed us?

20

MR BLECHER: Yeah, we'll get them as a matter of course.

MS WARTON: We will? Okay.

MR BLECHER: Just bear with me. I'll give Helen a call and see if we can get her back. Helen's messaged to say that she's going to try joining on her phone, so let's see what happens.

30 PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay. I'm using my phone because there's absolutely no wi-fi. Sorry about this.

MR BLECHER: We can hear you clearly, Helen.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Great. Isn't it just amazing. Okay. All right. So, look, I do think we've actually, we've got enough information for what's, from the department. Is the department still there? I can't see everyone. I can only see you.

MR BLECHER: Yes. Yeah. We have everyone still.

40 PROF. LOCHHEAD: Okay. All right. So, probably, if you do not have any more questions or information that we, the only thing that we were seeking was with regard

to, what was the other, yeah, the, that's right, the leniency on the setbacks between buildings. I think you were going to check and see whether Parramatta Council, I mean, could we go back to Parramatta Council, Lindsey, and ask that question or should we ask - - -

MR BLECHER: Yeah, we can follow up, we can follow up in writing, yeah.

10 PROF. LOCHHEAD: I think it might be best to ask the council that, that is there any sort of assumption that the ADG cannot be met and that in the city centre the common setback is 18 metres rather than 24 on towers of this scale, okay. All right, I think we'll wrap this meeting up, we'll conclude this meeting and then the department may leave and then we can stop recording and have our post-meeting meeting. Does that make sense?

MS VAN VEEN: Thanks very much for your time.

PROF. LOCHHEAD: Thanks very much, Jazmin.

MS VAN VEEN: Thank you.

20

MS WARTON: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.51pm]