



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: HELIPAD PENRITH LAKES (DA21/15298)

BLUE MOUNTAINS CITY COUNCIL MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: CHRIS WILSON (Chair)
 DR SHERIDAN COAKES

OFFICE OF THE IPC: CASEY JOSHUA
 COURTNEY COLEMAN

BLUE MOUNTAINS KIM BARRETT
CITY COUNCIL: KIRSTEN RYAN

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 2.30PM, MONDAY, 20 JUNE 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

MR WILSON: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past, present and emerging.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Penrith Lakes Helipad DA Project currently before the Commission for determination. My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel. I am joined by my fellow Commissioner, Dr Sheridan Coakes. We are also joined by Casey Joshua and Courtney Coleman from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

10

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 from which the Commission will base its determinations. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website.

20

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 transcripts. We will now begin.

So, Kim, I just throw over to you, and to discuss the first item on the agenda, which is council's submission to the Department on the matter.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. Hopefully you can hear me now and the sound's O.K.

30

So that doesn't perhaps look that it is.

MS JOSHUA: I'm just checking with the transcript.

MR WILSON: I'm receiving awful feedback on that.

MS BARRETT: The only other thing I can think of is to leave the Zoom meeting and call in via phone. Would that be better?

MS JOSHUA: Maybe we can try that, yes.

40

MS BARRETT: O.K. I'll be back.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

MR WILSON: O.K., Kim. I'll just hand over to you now to discuss Council's submission to the Department on this matter.

MS BARRETT: O.K., thank you. So my name is Kim Barrett. I'm the City Planning Manager at Blue Mountains City Council. Largely my responsibilities are around
10 strategic and statutory planning, so looking at things like council's long-term strategic direction, preparation of documents such as the Local Strategic Planning Statement, but also planning policy, so the maintenance and upkeep of the Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan, and also built heritage.

So I guess in summary, Council's submission on this matter covered two key areas, the first of which was around the film production precinct, and as explained in that submission, Council is quite supportive of that approach, and sees the Blue Mountains as playing a significant and perhaps supportive role of opportunities identified there
20 from a local film production point of view.

The second component, and the one that we're here, I guess, to talk about today, is in relation to the heliport. While, as we've articulated in that submission, there's a clear understanding of the need for economic opportunities and emergency services, those aspects are clearly understood. However, there's significant concern raised around the introduction of helicopter use at that site, be it through the rezoning process or amending the LEP to do that, to make that heliport use permissible.

So I guess a couple of the main matters that we'd raised in the submissions look at, I guess, the purpose for that use, and the noted principal purpose being for the Sydney
30 Helicopter operators as a commercial entity, to have the facility open to the public for hire and recreational flight. And there was limited information provided, I suppose, in terms of the nature of that operation, but the significant likelihood that it would be for environmental flights, or joy flights, if you like, and that the likely location of those would be over the Blue Mountains Local Government area. Things such as flight paths and other information didn't appear to be available, but based on the proximity to the Blue Mountains LGA and the likelihood that the National Park and other areas of natural significance or natural value would be the focus, that's where our concern is raised there.

40 This comes in the context also of a very recent proposal for the Katoomba Airfield, within our own Local Government Area, and that was for, I guess, a proposal similar

in nature to undertake commercial flights from that previous airfield. Both fixed-wing and helicopter flights were proposed at that location, and the community's response to that was significant, and significantly negative. So there were 1,500 objections to that particular proposal, and a petition to parliament of 12,000 signatures against it.

10 The key issues raised as part of that proposal would be comparable here, and they're, I guess, the key sub-headings or the key points of concerns that we raised in our submissions, and those relate to the potential impact on residents. So from aircraft noise and also, as we've noted there, a potential lack of a mechanism to enforce flight paths or any other flight volume controls, things like that, that may come out of any approval.

Also the potential impacts on the World Heritage Area broadly, the National Park, and in particular impacts on flora and fauna. We've listed those in the submission, and I'm happy to go into those in detail, if you like, but just by way of summary, we've listed those there.

20 And then consequential to those are the potential impacts to business and tourism. So people come to the Blue Mountains for a wilderness experience, to be in that National Park, with relative quiet, and the opportunity to experience the environment in all of its wildness, I guess, and the potential for there to be aircraft noise over the National Park in a recreation and tourist capacity is, we believe, quite significant, should this proposal go ahead, and would significantly disrupt that tranquillity or the sense of wilderness that people get from coming to the Blue Mountains, and that is fundamental to our local economy and to the local and international tourism that is experienced here.

30 And I think finally we've not the potential for such an operation to be expanded over time, and how those things are likely to affect the long-term economic viability of tourism in the Blue Mountains.

So I guess that's a summary. I can't see your faces, so I'm not sure if you want me to expand on those things - - -

MR WILSON: No, that's fine.

MS BARRETT: - - - or is that enough for now?

40 MR WILSON: Yes, look, just try and – I would like you to articulate what you think the impacts are going to be in terms of noise and biodiversity and cultural heritage, because – and this is my understanding at this stage, and we've met with the

Department, we've met with the applicant, we've met with Penrith Council today, and it's the same meetings, and a whole range of issues have been raised, and we're going to back to the Department and ask further questions. We have a raft of questions we wish to ask.

10 I guess my question to you guys is, what – my understanding is that, notwithstanding the characterisation of the development as a helipad or a heliport, that the current operations, once this site or should this site become active, it will be similar to what's occurring out of Granville, which I understand is about 20 per cent tourism and the rest is, you know, emergency or checking lines and so forth.

And it's occurring anyway, so I'm just trying to understand, you know, where the intensity or the increase of intensity of use is coming from is going to cause these significant impacts. Can you talk to that at all? I mean - - -

MS BARRETT: I guess the first thing I'd add is, in circumstances - - -

MR WILSON: I understand the location is an issue.

20 MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR WILSON: I understand, because it's eight kilometres from the Blue Mountains National Park. I understand that.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR WILSON: But is that where the course is located, so close to the National Park that, you know, there's going to be an ongoing or significant increase in intensity of flights over the mountains?

30

MS BARRETT: Yes, I think that is one of the primary concerns, so proximity to the National Park obviously makes that potential for joy flights much more likely. Also the promotion of Penrith, I guess, via this step and other mechanisms in terms of its recreation focus being a point from which – a jumping-off point, if you like, from which people can undertake those recreational activities - you know, some of those being indoors, such as the – I forget what it's called now, but the "Snow World", or whatever it is, and so I think there is significant potential for an intensification of the use from a Penrith base, and the promotion that it is within that 8-kilometre range of the National Park.

40

And based on the information that we've looked it, while it was, you know, not overt, I think that was quite clear in the application, that there's opportunity seen to expand the business to operate, you know, within this area. And so while it might be that breakdown now of 20 per cent tourism, once the business is in place and also with international tourism returning, you know, there's potential there, we believe, for that to increase significantly.

10 I think the other factor there, though, is that – and this was raised in the Katoomba example that I spoke to, once an approval is in place, the difficulty for – to monitor or look at flight paths, have any sort of regulatory component to that, is extremely burdensome for council, and it would be Blue Mountains City Council that is burdened by it, in terms of issues with, you know, helicopters flying over the Three Sisters or elsewhere, but yet the economic benefit would be seen in Penrith. So the difficulty for us is that we have both the impact on residents and potentially our tourist economy, while not seeing any of the economic return in that way.

20 MR WILSON: O.K. That's a fair point. What about – O.K., so that's the issue – what about in terms of cultural heritage, though? And noise, because I guess, you know, the Department has identified that they're compliant with noise criteria to 48 at the nearest receptor. If you were to accept that, then how could you turn your mind – I mean, just trying to get my mind around how that would impact populations in the Blue Mountains, if they're flying above their, you know – per their regulations, how would those noise impacts be felt?

30 MS BARRETT: I guess one of my key questions is that the noise information that was provided in the application – and I don't have that in front of me, so I can't refer to that, so this may be something that we'd need to come back to you on – but the noise information that was provided in the application looked at - primary focus was nearest receivers on take-off and landing at that site - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

40 MS BARRETT: - - - not on receivers within proximity to the flight paths, as there were no flight paths shown, as I understand it. So I wouldn't be able to comment in detail on that, because I don't have the information in front of me, but I would suggest that there has been no assessment for people within the proximity of the flight path. We've got no detail on how high those helicopters would fly – whether they would be circling over the three sisters, whether they would be circling over key tourist destinations, Echo Point, other places of tourist accommodation on the edge of the escarpment – there's been no information provided on that.

MR WILSON: O.K.

DR COAKES: Kim, can I just ask a question. Has frequency of helicopter flights over the Blue Mountains National Park been an issue that Council has been having to deal with previously?

MS BARRETT: Historically, yes. Not recently, no. In saying that, one of the key reasons for that is that there are no landing sites in the Blue Mountains.

10 DR COAKES: No.

MR WILSON: Not even at the hospital?

MS BARRETT: So we've made it very clear – sorry, I missed that?

MR WILSON: Not even at the hospital?

MS BARRETT: From – that's - for emergency purposes, that's correct, so Katoomba Hospital is the only site, and there are a couple of other locations in terms of when
20 there's declared state of emergency, so for bushfire and other things.

MR WILSON: O.K. All right. Yes.

MS BARRETT: But in terms of it being a permissible use or allowed on private sites, or anywhere else, it's not permitted under LEP, and that's a purposeful policy position, and so, as I referenced before, there has been significant community objection to this type of use, both recently with Katoomba Airfield - but that's been quite a long-held community position, that particular site that I referenced has come up from time to time in the last – since, I guess, its first inception, and there has been that significant
30 community response each and every time.

MR WILSON: So what was the – just in interest, what was the number of movements that was mooted at that proposal, per annum?

MS BARRETT: I don't – yes, I don't have those figures in front of me.

MR WILSON: O.K.

MS BARRETT: And to be clear, the proposal was not submitted to us a development
40 application, it was at a land-use advice stage, and the proponent was negotiating a Crown lease over the site, and so the information that was provided was simply to

secure that lease rather than the detail of the development application, so it hadn't come to the point of assessment. Those objections were from the community, in terms of the lease being issued at all.

MR WILSON: O.K. Fair enough. So just – but Sheri's question was a good one. Has there been complaints about helicopters and so forth around the Three Sisters, and in that area, in the past?

MS BARRETT: Definitely in the past - - -

10

MS RYAN: May I answer - I beg your pardon, Kim – thank you.

MS BARRETT: Sorry, did you want to – was that you, Kirsten?

MS RYAN: If I may – thank you, sorry, it's difficult - Kirsten Ryan, Strategic Planner. There have been compliance-based issues, perhaps I would say, in the capture of the last five years, where joy flights or tourist-based flights from Sydney, and I can't tell you from which base, travelling through to Wolgan Valley, have been problematic and needed to have some sort of negotiation at the compliance level, and that has been within that five-year period, but mitigated through discussion. So it's not something that we would say is extensive, to the point that it's solvable, but because we're aware – and we are aware of the impacts – we want to mitigate before it's a problem. We want to make sure it doesn't - - -

20

MR WILSON: Yes – no, I get that. I'm just trying to understand the nature of the problem, and Wolgan Valley being Emirates, is it?

MS BARRETT: Yes, that's right.

30 MR WILSON: You said flights through to Wolgan Valley.

MS RYAN: Flights, yes – moving over the mountains to Wolgan Valley, but then also having a tour around features in the National Park on the way.

MR WILSON: Yes, right. O.K. All right. What about your concerns about cultural heritage? Because that was quite extensive in your submission. Do you want to talk to that a bit?

40

MS BARRETT: Yes. So, as you know, the Blue Mountains National Park or the World Heritage National Park is declared based on its natural value, its ecological and biodiversity values. We're one of only two cities in the world that have that

declaration – Banff in Canada is the other one. And so part of – I mean, I guess I touched on it before, but part of the experience of being in this place is the wilderness aspect of it, despite being quite close to the metropolis of Sydney, being able to enter the National Park and have quiet, untouched experience that you would travel anywhere else in the world significant distance to get to, is pretty unique.

10 And so beyond that, Echo Point is – and also the valley nearby – are both declared places – declared Aboriginal places under the New South Wales Gazette, and so they're identified as very significant to both the Darug and Gandangara people, the traditional owners of this area.

And so I think, from a cultural heritage perspective, that's incredibly significant. We've just very recently opened a new gathering place at Echo Point, and there's extremely strong and significant restrictions as to what can occur there in consultation with traditional owners. And so to have a commercial operation that would have the potential to regularly fly over those areas and create that, I guess, aerial disturbance, is of significant concern to traditional owners.

20 And I think beyond that, as we've put in the submission, the declaration of the area for its biodiversity value is significant, and there is growing evidence around the impact of aircraft and aircraft noise on those natural areas, particularly bird species within the Jamison Valley particularly, and so there's been no assessment of that – there's been no contemplation that that would be an impact on such a significant landscape.

I mean, you know, we haven't obviously provided any significant papers or things of that nature, but it's – I think it's becoming more and more recognised that that is the case.

30 We've raised similar concerns with – and Council formally oppose the Western Sydney Airport for similar reasons, that having that sort of highly industrial and potential for impact over the National Park is something that could in fact threaten the World Heritage status, and that's – you know, I'm talking about Western Sydney Airport now, and we've had that raised with us already.

So in terms of, I guess, understanding the very – the significant potential of impact from an operation like this is something that I don't believe has been looked at in the application at all.

40 MR WILSON: O.K. I did read your submission on Western Sydney Airport. O.K. I think – is there any more you want to add, in terms of your submission?

MS BARRETT: I think we've covered probably the main areas there. In terms of flight paths or volume of flight, is there information on that?

MR WILSON: There's flight paths – they're – correct me if I'm wrong, my colleagues – there is the flight paths – there's no flight path beyond the take-off and landing flight paths, it's just regulated by Air Services Australia, and they have – they're not regulated like, say, take-off from Western Sydney Airport or Richmond Airport, like – they're not regulated the same. Once they get to a certain level, they've got to go above a certain level, that they're – which is a thousand feet above ground level, or I understand their cruising altitude is about 1500 feet now, but they're not bound by – they're – my understanding, they're bound by – they can't fly into the airspace of those two airports, but beyond those two airports, I understand they can go pretty much anywhere. Sheri, is that your understanding?

DR COAKES: Yes. So our understanding, Kim and Kirsten, is that, yes, the take-off and landing, there's – I guess there's been two proposed paths, to the east and to the west, but yes, as Chris has outlined, I think after that take-off and landing, helicopter flights are obviously regulated by Civil Aviation requirements. So we have asked for the applicant for some further detail around the breakdown, as Chris said earlier, so they've indicated approximately 20 per cent tourism, and, as Chris has said, they do a lot of what they call essential services, so out to the regions, monitoring, you know, checking and cleaning of transmission line and other things, so that seems to be quite a high proportion of the work they do, but obviously, you know, that 20 per cent component is tourist-related.

MS BARRETT: But there's nothing that, you know, that limits that percentage one way or the other, is that correct?

MR WILSON: No, and we did ask that question. He basically – the response will be on the transcript, you will be able to see the response on our website – when does it go up, Casey?

MS JOSHUA: Up to three days.

MR WILSON: So his response was that it's highly unlikely that it's going to increase, but he hasn't been doing it for ten months, and he's looking obviously to get approval, and he argued that that 20 per cent underpins the other work that he does in terms of both emergency service and the other work which his done – Southern Highlands, Hunter Valley, Central West – so most – well, he didn't really give us a direction on the tourist flights, did he, Sheri, or - - -

DR COAKES: No – I mean, he did speak about, you know, it's people going up and going and having – to the Hawkesbury for lunch, or the Hunter Valley or things like that, so - - -

MR WILSON: And a lot of it is along the east coast as well, so – yes.

DR COAKES: Yes.

MR WILSON: So we're trying to get that information, but from what I understand,
10 once they get in their and above a certain height, they're regulated by Air Services
Australia and their regulation, but there are no flight paths, apart from the one they've
created, which is an east-west one, at the site. But that basically finishes, I think, once
they get to a thousand feet AGL. Is that right, Sheri?

DR COAKES: Yes, that's correct. That's my understanding.

MR WILSON: That's what we gleaned today and from our current reading.

MS BARRETT: O.K. And in terms of the Australian Air Services Regulations, is that
20 largely to do with height or altitude rather than – so if they wanted to, you know, circle
over the Jamison Valley five times so that people can get good photos, that is
unregulated?

MR WILSON: That's a good question. I think it's – the answer is probably – is it
unregulated? Probably – look, I'd probably say yes, as long as they stayed - - -

DR COAKES: At a certain height.

MR WILSON: - - - at a thousand feet above ground level.

30

DR COAKES: Yes.

MR WILSON: Now, I would have thought that if you want to see the Three Sisters,
you'd have to be a thousand feet above the top of the Three Sisters. I mean, these are
questions we will continue to ask, but, yes – so it's a good point. It's difficult to find
out exactly where those tourists – we have asked the question, we will get more detail,
in terms of where those tourist destinations are and are likely to be, because we do
want to know, do want to understand the nature of the business.

40 But my understanding is, we're going to get across – some background for what they
used to do, because they haven't been doing tourism flights the last ten months

because of their relocation issues, and we've asked for data on previous flights and previous patterns and trends, and whether or not they're likely to change.

MS BARRETT: Yes. I think that would be important, obviously, in the COVID environment as well.

MR WILSON: Yes. So – well, he gave us some figures this morning which were on transcript which we'll probably get in – hopefully we'll get in writing, which were 2017-18, 2018-19. Was it 2019-20? I'm not quite sure.

10

DR COAKES: It was 2017, 2018 and 2019.

MR WILSON: O.K. Yes. So all pre-COVID, so – yes, we understand that COVID has, yes, kept us all inside.

MS BARRETT: I guess the other question there is in relation to flight volumes, so - -
-

MR WILSON: It's maxed. It's limited. O.K., I can answer that one now, because
20 that's in my head. They're limited to 1,500 movements a year, which equates to 750 – correct me if I'm wrong, Sheri – flights. So annually they do about a thousand movements. Was that right? That's it. So they average about 500 in and 500 out annually. So they're limited to 1,500, by the consent, and - - -

DR COAKES: By the EPA licence.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR WILSON: Well, it's in the - - -

30

DR COAKES: Is it in the consent?

MR WILSON: Well, it's in one of them, or both of them. I couldn't find it in the GGAs, but if it's not, it will be. So it's limited to 1,500 flights a year, which equates to about 4.1 a day – movements, sorry, so that's two in and two out – but a normal day, it doesn't – you know, they've done their impact assessment and the locational assessment based on worst-case scenario, which is 25.

MS BARRETT: 25, that's right.

40

MR WILSON: Yes. So – but in all likelihood, you know, they’ll have days when there’s none, and then they might have a day when there’s, I don’t know, so many flights – that’s how I think it works, so we’re just trying to get to the bottom of that, so that’s my understanding. So there’s a limit on how much they do, and that limit will be the same as what they were doing at Granville. Is that correct, Sheri?

DR COAKES: Yes, that’s correct. Yes, so the 25 is less case, Kim – would be worst case.

10 MS BARRETT: Yes, O.K. . Because I guess, you know, it was something that was discussed in terms of the Katoomba Airfield proposal that I mentioned before, and the potential for those flights to be - you know, if popular on weekends or there’s a sort of tourism push for those kinds of things, to be quite significant in peak periods or on weekends, and that none of that has been looked at in terms of impact on the Blue Mountains community.

And then the other question, I think, around altitude is, I think as you’re alluding to, where that’s taken from, So if it’s – you know, is it from those tourist locations, like the top of the Three Sisters, or is it from the valley floor, all of those things make quite
20 a significant difference to impact.

And then I think the challenging consideration long-term, should this be approved, is how those things – how compliance with those things is tested, and who does that.

MR WILSON: Yes – well, my understanding is, it’s Air Services Australia who regulates – once they get beyond that – the airfield and up a thousand feet AGL, it’s like any aeroplane – it’s subject to their regulation. And you’re right – I mean, we need to understand how Air Services Australia regulate them, but there’s what they call neighbourly - - -
30

DR COAKES: Neighbourly fly advice.

MR WILSON: Neighbourly fly advice. And what’s the other - - -

MS BARRETT: The fly neighbourly – yes.

DR COAKES: Fly neighbourly. Thank you. Thanks, Kim.

MR WILSON: Sorry. Yes.
40

MS BARRETT: Fly neighbourly agreement, yes.

DR COAKES: Yes.

MS BARRETT: So we've had those existing over the Blue Mountains – and Kirsten might be able to correct me here – but they've been in place historically. We currently have one in place, but we can't see how a proposal that uses the airspace over the National Park could meet such an agreement.

10 DR COAKES: So, Kim, just a clarification there. So that fly neighbourly agreement is with a commercial operator, is it? Your current one, yes?

MS RYAN: Yes, that's correct.

MS BARRETT: We have – yes.

MS RYAN: I beg your pardon. Sorry, Kim. It's difficult not seeing your face.

MS BARRETT: Yes – no, you go. Off you go.

20 MS RYAN: That's all I needed to confirm. Thank you. Back to you.

MR WILSON: So – and what does that one – and that agreement – in that agreement, you have – both parties agree that they won't go within a certain distance, or is it those types of things that are in the agreement?

MS RYAN: Kim, I'll briefly speak to that, if you don't have it at hand, but if you've got the information, please do.

30 MS BARRETT: No, if you can go, Kirsten, that would be good, thank you.

MS RYAN: Thank you. So from about the 1990s, there was conflict with a scenic flight operator - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS RYAN: - - - and residents, and that's when – that's the constraint, I guess, or the instigation of the agreement, so it does relate to the commercial use.

40 DR COAKES: And any further - based on Chris's question there, Kirsten, any further specification around what that agreement - - -

MS RYAN: The details speak about – it’s very vague, I’ve got to say, because of the age of it – the amenity of residents must be considered, and any complaints need to be managed regarding the activities of professional pilots. Not especially helpful in terms of what does that mean and how is that managed. So the date of it is tricky in that regard.

DR COAKES: Yes.

MR WILSON: O.K. That’s interesting.

10

MS RYAN: One thing we do do, with a nod to the fly neighbourly policy, we still allow some things like filming, for purposes of informational – if National Parks and Wildlife need to undertake some sort of filming in that space, we agree to it with – we set conditions under different arrangements, so it’s not a DA as such, but it’s a filming permit, that puts parameters around it, but that might be something that we do need to look at further.

MR WILSON: O.K. That’s interesting. O.K. There is another way they regulate – there was two ways of regulation. That was the non-mandatory one. The other one is – I must – it must be just safety – I think it’s safety flying, isn’t it, Sheri?

20

DR COAKES: Yes – I think – yes, there’s certain things they have to comply with in terms of CASA and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority and - - -

MR WILSON: Yes, and they relate to safety and - - -

DR COAKES: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - and I presume they’re matters like being a thousand feet above ground level and so forth.

30

DR COAKES: Yes, and I think that – again, I think there is requirements – compliance requirements with designated flight paths as well, which I think they may have to report to Air Services, Chris, as well – I’m not – I mean, and CASA. So I think there is some other around flight path as well, but we can look further into that.

MR WILSON: Look, they’re restricted in the sense that the flight paths - - -

DR COAKES: Take-off and landing.

40

MR WILSON: Yes.

DR COAKES: Yes, and once they're up and they're at a height - - -

MR WILSON: They're also restricted, my understanding is, by flight paths from both Western Sydney Airport – proposed airport – and the Richmond Airport, in terms of there's a gap between those two – they have air services fields, I think they do. Look, I – yes. So we're coming to grips with all that, slowly.

10 So, look – I don't want to put words in your mouth, but your real concern is based around, you know, impacts on - - -

DR COAKES: The National Park.

MR WILSON: - - - the National Park, the heritage, the Three Sisters, those iconic types of uses, cultural heritage, and the use of those areas in the park and so forth. Is that correct?

20 MS BARRETT: Yes, that's right. And then the – I guess the other component is the potential impact to residents, so if you know the Blue Mountains well, you'd know that - - -

MR WILSON: Yes – finds its way up.

MS BARRETT: Yes, and residential locations are right up – right on those – yes, so it's a single ridge line, or a series of ridge lines, that have, you know, villages perched on top of them, and so proximity to residential development – you know, there's houses all along those ridge lines, right on the edge of those tourist locations, so - - -

30 MR WILSON: Where does your boundary finish? It starts at around about Glenwood, doesn't it – what's it called?

DR COAKES: Glenbrook.

MR WILSON: Glenbrook.

MS BARRETT: Glenbrook.

MR WILSON: And finishes where – Mount - - -

40 MS BARRETT: Yes – so it takes in all of the mount, so Mount Wilson and Mount Tomah, and right up to Mount Victoria.

MR WILSON: Right.

MS BARRETT: So while it's largely linear in shape, because of the mount, it's actually much broader than it first appears, to the – to the north, I guess.

MR WILSON: Yes. And so to the north, it takes well and truly the Bells Line of Road – north of the Bells Line of Road, yes? Yes, O.K.

10 MS BARRETT: Yes, that's right. I'm happy to – I mean, we can send you those boundaries.

MR WILSON: That's all right. I was just thinking about the size of the LGA, and we can look at a map of the LGA, but thank you anyway. Sheri, do you have anything else?

DR COAKES: No, no – I'm all good, thank you.

20 MR WILSON: O.K. Look, that's been very informative. We're now going to go back to the applicant with a – and the Department, actually – a range of questions which we've derived from today's meeting, so that will be on our website in a couple of days, and we will be asking further questions about their intended – well, their intentions around the National Park, so – yes. But thank you very much for your time, we really appreciate it.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. That's O.K. So what are the next steps from here, in terms of - - -

MR WILSON: We have a public meeting - - -

30

MS BARRETT: I guess it's – O.K.

MR WILSON: - - - next week, Thursday week – we have a public meeting to hear from all those who have made submissions and have sought to be registered to be heard.

MS BARRETT: O.K.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. That's the next step, so – but in the meantime, we've got to go back to the Department with all our questions, and we'll seek to have them answered

before we have the public meeting, and then they'll get the opportunity to respond or to present to the public meeting as well. Is that correct, Casey?

MS JOSHUA: Yes. We're accepting registrations to speak until midday this Thursday, the 24th of June, and so if anyone from Council would like to speak at that meeting, that would be helpful as well – you're welcome to do that. The information is on our website, and then the meeting will be held the following Thursday. It will be livestreamed as well. As Chris said, we'll seek to have some questions answered and have that uploaded, so that if people want to talk to that at the public meeting, they can, and then we'll be accepting written submissions on the project for seven days following the public meeting, so the Thursday following that, which is the 7th of July. And then following that, it will be up to Chris and Sheridan to deliberate.

MR WILSON: That's been very useful discussion. We appreciate your time. Sorry about the technical glitches.

MS BARRETT: No, that's okay. Something at my end, obviously. Just one last thing, I think that's the key concern we perhaps haven't raised, and it may be unavoidable, is the lack of engagement with the Blue Mountains community on this. So it's obviously a Penrith-focused proposal, and – but, you know, the Blue Mountains community, should they become aware of it, would be quite invested in it, I imagine, so I guess that's just a point that's worth raising, because assessment or consideration has been largely, you know, on the site itself, the Blue Mountains community probably hasn't had a real opportunity to engage with the proposal or perhaps even be aware of it.

MR WILSON: O.K. I'm not quite sure about the breakdown of submissions. Anyway, there's a breakdown of submissions on our website. I think some of them did come from the Blue Mountains.

MS BARRETT: O.K.

MR WILSON: Anyway – but, look, yes, point taken – O.K. We'll take that onboard as well, and yes – thank you for your time.

DR COAKES: Thank you.

MEETING CONCLUDED