



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: 310 TERRIGAL DRIVE, TERRIGAL – PLANNING PROPOSAL
(PP-2023-1899) – GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: JULIET GRANT (CHAIR)
SIMON SMITH

OFFICE OF THE IPC: TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING &
INFRASTRUCTURE:** ANGELA HYNES
JAZMIN VAN VEEN

**DEPARTMENT OF CLIMATE
CHANGE, ENERGY, THE
ENVIRONMENT AND WATER:** STEPHANIE LYONS
NEIL KELLEHER

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 1:30PM – 2:30PM
FRIDAY 23rd MAY 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MS JULIET GRANT:** Perfect, okay. Well, good afternoon, everybody. And before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Gateway Determination Review of the planning proposal for 310 Terrigal Drive, Terrigal, currently before the Commission for advice. The proposal seeks to facilitate the redevelopment of the site for mixed use purposes, comprising approximately 38 residential units, ground floor café, retail premises, basement parking, and green space.

15 My name is Juliet Grant and I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Simon Smith. We're also joined today by Tahlia Hutchinson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

20 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.

25 This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It's 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 not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

30 I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

35 We will now begin. I note we still don't have Neil.

MS TAHLIA HUTCHINSON: He's just arrived. He's coming now.

40 **MS GRANT:** Okay, perfect. Welcome, Neil. We just did the brief introduction and now we're just about to kick off. So, thank you for joining us. Angela, are you going to lead the discussion or is –

MR NEIL KELLEHER: [Unintelligible 00:05:42]

45 **MS ANGELA HYNES:** That's okay, I think there might be some connection issues on your end, Neil, you're frozen. But thank you for joining us. I note you're only available for the first half of the meeting, so I'll give a brief overview of some of the key matters before us, and invite yourself and Stephanie to talk to flooding matters a bit earlier in the meeting in the interest of time.

Thank you, Juliet. So, Angela Hynes from the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. I am joined today by my director, Jazmine van Veen. We work in the Local Planning and Council Support space. I'm the Manager for the North, East and Central Coast in Jazmine's team, primarily looking after the Central Coast, and have considered the gateway review package for this matter.

I'd like to share a presentation if possible. Let me just see if I can bring that up. Is everyone able to see that?

MS GRANT: Yes, thank you.

MS HYNES: Unfortunately, I can't see you at the same time, so just bear with me.

I'd also like to acknowledge country. I'd like to acknowledge the Darkinyung people whose land we're discussing today. I extend my respects to Elders past, present and emerging, and acknowledge it through the collaboration and approaches to our work.

So, I'll begin by just providing an overview of the site context, noting also that further detail has been provided in the package of information we sent to the IPC. I'll just be highlighting some key points, and perhaps we can delve into further questions towards the end or when we get to the flooding issues.

So, noting the general location of the site here marked in the red.

MS GRANT: Sorry, Angela, we're still on slide 2. Oh, there we go. Perfect. It's caught up. Sorry.

MS HYNES: Sorry, it might be a bit slow. So, the location of the site highlighted here on the left, and a bit of an aerial overview of the immediate surrounds of the site as well.

Some further context on the subject site. So, the street view from the corner of the site. Also looking at the zoning context, with no proposed key changes to the zone but rather looking at provisions of FSR and height changing.

So, a general overview of some of the key changes that have been sought by the planning proposal. I guess, with key discussions primarily around FSR and potential density outcomes for the site. Noting that the current FSR and the site is 0.5 is to 1, but there is a provision under the Central Coast LEP permitting an FSR of 0.7 is to 1 for an RFB or multi-dwelling housing. The site's greater than 1,000 square metres. The planning proposal seeks a permissible FSR of 1.3 is to 1 under the LEP. And that will facilitate approximately 38 dwellings on the site.

So, I'll just briefly touch over the strategic framework and then we can jump into the Section 9.1, Direction 4.1 on flooding. So, we highlight on a high level that the

Central Coast Regional Plan primarily focuses on growth in areas that are considered appropriate, being areas close to centres and employment areas, with access to essential infrastructure and relatively few environmental constraints. And I can speak to these aspects in further detail later on.

And this is [audio glitch 00:09:56] with the priorities highlighted in the local strategies, so primarily the LSPS, which talks about housing supply to be focused within centres and low-risk areas. Noting that the site is flood affected and is some distance away from some of the existing centres, being 4.6 kilometres from Erina strategic centre and 2.1 kilometres from Terrigal centre.

In regards to the Local Housing Strategy, we do note that the proposal is potentially consistent with the objectives of the strategy, to increase both supply and diversity of housing. However, one of the overarching principles of the LHS is noted in the impact to diverse environmental qualities across the LGA and how that has impacts on the availability of land for urban development. And also then through highlighting that existing centres probably less constrained and are more optimal locations for residential growth.

Bushfire, we can come back to this and go over in more detail if there are any questions but just noting there are vegetation buffers for bushfire-prone land on both the northern and southern parts of the site.

And now to discuss or start discussing one of the key focuses of our report and assessment, which is flooding. I'd like to begin by noting as part of the gateway assessment, we did have some ongoing consultation with Council and our colleagues at DCCEEW. And one of the key positions in terms of consistency with the 9.1 Direction, in the end, Council advised that, I guess, to demonstrate that the proposal was consistent with the terms of the direction, it was a decision of the Department in consultation with DCCEEW.

And so this is the two key diagrams provided for an overview of the site and its flood constraints. Noting the image on the left here shows the floodway areas, the flood fringe and flood storage areas. So, noting that the red is the floodway area. And the direction primarily talks to development occurring in the floodway area. You can see there is a bit of overlap here that's occurring with that overlay of the development scenario.

Of interest as well, so we model and assess on PMF. There are different flood categories of PMF. With the development scenario, noting that H5, which is a high hazard flood area, is the yellow highlighted here.

Perhaps I might take this opportunity to maximise Neil and Steph's time and allow them the opportunity to speak.

MS STEPHANIE LYONS: Thanks, Angela. Was there any particular aspect of the development that you would like me to speak to? Is it more around the risk at the site or, I guess, how we've undertaken our assessment in line with that local

planning direction?

5 **MS GRANT:** I think just probably the elements for Simon and my benefit, if you could run through the characteristics of the flood impact, the nature and extent of the impact in terms of time and severity, and whether how the response fits in then with the government's approach to either shelter in place or particular design requirements, or whether that rules the potential uplift out altogether.

10 And I'm mindful that this site is already zoned and although on Angela's slide, there was a zero dwelling yield at present, there is actually a dwelling capacity that this site currently has. So, interested in understanding – we're talking about that additional yield in terms of your assessment.

15 **MS LYONS:** Yes, thanks, Juliet. So, the site at the moment it is subject to quite high hazards during a 1% AEP event and rarer events up to the PMF, as shown on the screen. What we see to be the issue with the flooding at the site is the flash flood warning, flash flood nature of the flooding. So, it comes on very rapidly with limited warning, roads will become un-trafficable at around the 1% AEP. So, that's seen to be quite hazardous for future residents of the site either coming and
20 leaving during the flood event, because they may not know that those conditions are impending and they'll be out and about trying to either leave or come home.

25 So, increasing the number of people on a high-hazard flood plain area is not ideal. They've also, as Angela has shown in that figure, up to that PMF which we are required to assess under the local planning directions, because Central Coast Council have adopted special flood considerations clause in their LEP, that's clause 5.22.

30 We do need to look at the PMF and as indicated there, it's H5/H6 hazard on the site but also on surrounding roadways during that event. Although the peak duration of inundation is quite – oh actually, I'll just get some details up for you, if that will be helpful ... So, I think during a 1% event, the conditions would be reached around 50 minutes following the onset of flood-producing rainfall. And the site would be un-trafficable for around just under an hour. So, it is short
35 duration. And then during the PMF, those conditions would happen a lot quicker. So, un-trafficable for 75 minutes, but also would occur around 25 minutes following the onset of flood-producing rainfall. And noting that these conditions are likely to get worse with, you know, with climate change as well. So, this is based off current rainfall predictions.
40

MR SIMON SMITH: Stephanie, can I just ask a question about that?

MS LYONS: Yes, for sure.

45 **MR SMITH:** When I read through the material, it seemed to address a couple of different questions. So, there was one question about: is this development going to cause/make flooding worse elsewhere? And then there was another question, which was about will people who are occupying or seeking to enter the building be

harmful or put at risk? And those two things seem quite separate to me.

So, is the Department's view that, you know, led to its rejection of the gateway review, is it mainly concerned with potential risks and impact to residents? And does it accept what the proponent's consultant says, which is that the building, the construction of the building won't make things worse for anyone else. Is that the situation?

MS LYONS: Yes, Simon, that's correct. So, we're satisfied that the proposal and the flood modelling that's been provided demonstrates that there will be no adverse impacts off site, or those impacts are within an acceptable level. It's more around the risk to life and that aspect of the proposal when looking at those local planning directions, up to the PMF.

MR SMITH: Okay.

MS LYONS: So, I guess the crux of it for me is that under the current zoning, as Juliet said, there is an allowable yield of dwelling on the site. In line with the principles of the Flood Risk Management Manual, you know, it essentially supports shelter in place within existing zoning if the risk is tolerable. But it doesn't suggest – sorry, but it says you would be, it would be appropriate to restrict development types and provide additional controls.

So, if this was a greenfield site, shelter in place wouldn't be endorsed or supported, based off the flooding constraints under the principles of the manual. But because it is already zoned for a level of development, you would expect shelter in place is appropriate. But where I'm seeing the issue is, that in line with that Ministerial Direction, we shouldn't be allowing for significant development density increases in these higher hazard areas.

So, it's a little bit of a challenging one, because yes, the site is zoned in a way that you could put something on there. But should we be increasing the density only to allow potentially double the amount of residents living there, in an area that if it wasn't currently zoned this way, you wouldn't be supportive of shelter in place.

So, that's I guess where I'm coming from with my recommendation that it's perhaps not consistent with that Ministerial Direction. That's the – sorry, I'll get the exact number for you – but it's the ... Sorry, I should have had this up in front of me. It's for ...

MS GRANT: 4.1, the flooding.

MS LYONS: Yes, 4.1, but then it's Direction 4(c). Yes.

MR SMITH: That's really helpful, Steph, that sort of clarifies where the Department's views are coming from.

MS GRANT: And just on that as well, you were mentioning that it was

potentially double the yield. Did the Department do any modelling or analysis to work out what the difference in yield would be?

MS HYNES: I can speak to that. So, I must share my screen again because I did prepare a slide.

MS GRANT: Thank you, Stephanie.

[Audio gap 00:20:17 to 00:20:41]

MS GRANT: You're on mute, Angela.

MS HYNES: Thank you. So, as you mentioned previously, in relation to 4(c) under Direction 4.1, which states that, "A planning proposal must not contain provisions that will permit a significant increase in the dwelling density of that land." We note that there's no guidance about what "a significant increase in dwelling density" means, and I guess from our sentiment, we're not satisfied that it is doesn't represent a significant increase.

In terms of the actual numbers, I primarily would probably talk to one of the views that have been put forward by the proponent is that, you know, a significant amount of FSR is available to be developed on the site today potentially through affordable housing bonus provisions under the Housing SEPP. And as such, if they were to go down that pathway, it would only present a 14-apartment increase with a planning proposal compared to what they could potentially build under the Housing SEPP.

MR SMITH: And how many units would that be?

MS HYNES: So, 14 additional, I think it'll probably be in a range of about 20 to 25 under the Housing SEPP.

MR SMITH: Thank you.

MS HYNES: And I guess more so to that point then, if we're talking about considering the full potential of the site assuming it can meet all the affordable housing provisions and provisions of the Housing SEPP, then that also needs to be a benchmark to consider potentially, if this rezoning does go through, what will the actual development outcome be? I guess, the argument's kind of circular because if you can build it today, you can build it tomorrow if the site's rezoning.

So, rather than talking about perhaps just what the planning proposal is seeking, which is the FSR of 1.3 is to 1, if you were to apply that same thinking, with the 30% bonus under the Housing SEPP for affordable housing, then the highest potential density potentially that could be achieved on the site would be approximately 1.69 as to 1, and 35.5 metres in height.

So, I guess considering that that could be the overall outcome of development on

the site, we're not satisfied that doesn't represent a significant increase in the dwelling density of the land.

MR SMITH: Would you say that the 14-apartment version is significant?

MS HYNES: So, by the 14-apartment size, that will just be what the planning proposal is seeking without any affordable housing bonuses. I would probably consider that, yes, that is significant.

MR SMITH: Right.

MS GRANT: And could it potentially be a – if this was to go ahead, this is obviously a site-specific amendment – does the Department have any experience with them requiring potentially requiring crafting a clause that said, that turned off the Housing SEPP bonuses in lieu of –

MS HYNES: I guess in – sorry, Juliet – in general, there have been requests previously, I'm talking in more general terms where sites or councils and LEPS have sought exemptions from the 30% bonus of the Housing SEPP, for that to be turned off. And the Department so far has not been receptive to exemptions under the Housing SEPP.

MS GRANT: Okay. Thank you. Did you want to invite Neil – I know your time is limited, Neil, so before we moved off flooding, would that be appropriate?

MR KELLEHER: Yes, sure. I don't have much to add. Can you hear me?

MR SMITH: Yes.

MS GRANT: Yes, thank you.

MR KELLEHER: Yes, I don't have much to add from what Steph was saying. We've got these provisions that we've assessed the proposed development against, and the risks etc. that we've sort of considered, and the flooding affectation etc. So, I'm confident that Steph's assessment of those things is accurate. And also that it does represent a significant increase in the flood – the FSR (floor space ratio) etc. So ...

MR SMITH: So, Neil, could you – sorry.

MR KELLEHER: It's okay.

MR SMITH: I was just going to ask, could you just ... Parking the compliance with the direction and the potential for the 30% bonus to apply and all that stuff, just for a minute. And just could you just tell us more about your view on – because no doubt the proponent would say, "Well, if it's safe enough to stay in place for the currently permitted number of residents, how can it be more unsafe for a larger number of residents to stay in a larger building?" Because there's no

doubt they'll put that view, so I just wanted to know what your response might be.

MR KELLEHER: Well, you know, is it safe for the number of residents are there at the moment? I'm not sure. Should it be zoned in its present state? Probably not. It's probably an artefact of planning decisions made a few years ago. And just, you know, it's hard to change the zoning once it's there. And this is the decision that's in front of us. Do we change the zoning to allow even more people in a flood-affected place when we've seen that way lies – it's a bit of a folly.

So, I'm of the opinion that we shouldn't be allowing more people to be put in harm's way, even if the structure is sort of going to stand up there. There's potential for it to cause more emergency spend, which again is against some of the tenets of some of the Ministerial Directions. So, I'm, yes, I'm a hundred per cent behind Stephanie's assessment of the proposal, and her interpretations of those Ministerial Directions as well. So, yes.

MR SMITH: And the Council nevertheless supports the proposal in having formed its own view on flood risk. Would you – because I'm not a flood expert, so it would be really helpful if you were able to sort of point me towards the key differences in view that are between what you're telling us and their decision to support it.

MR KELLEHER: Well, I am not a flood expert either, that is why Stephanie is in the room, because she is a flood expert and far smarter than I am. So, Steph might be able to unpack that a bit better than I. But I have full confidence in her ability and the assessment that she's made. It's been peer reviewed by all of our flood team and we're all pretty comfortable with where it's landed.

So, Steph, do you want to jump in?

MS LYONS: Yes, thanks Neil. I can't speak for Council; I'm not sure how they've undertaken their assessment. But I suspect it may – I think that often what comes up with Central Coast Council is that a lot of their roads are quite significantly flood affected during large flood events. So, they – yes, I probably should – yes, I'm just speculating so maybe I shouldn't go down that path.

But I see the main concern with the proposal is that there will be, given the flash flooding nature of inundation at the site, people moving around the site. So, it's not around the number of people who are sheltering in place at the site necessarily because it is such a short period. You know, the likelihood for medical emergencies and things is quite low. It's more around people will get caught unawares by this really intense heavy rainfall, which we've seen recently, and be moving around the catchment trying to get back to their house through dangerous floodwaters on the road.

So, I see the increase in risk around having more people in this dangerous part of the flood plain, as opposed to having more people sheltering in place in the building for an hour or so or whatever the period was. So, that's what I've based

my assessment on.

MR SMITH: Okay.

5 **MS LYONS:** And yes, I can't speak to how Council have assessed but ...

MR SMITH: Thank you.

10 **MS GRANT:** Can I – sorry, can I just follow on from that. So, if we're saying that it's not the cumulative off-site impact that's a problem, or the primary concern. And the site would be suitable for shelter in place, given the rapid nature of the flood, that it comes rapidly and then recedes rapidly. So, you've got those shelter in place criteria.

15 The concerns that you were just kind of highlighting about more people being caught in the vicinity. Is that more likely to be generated though by general population increase rather than increase in population on this site? Because from my understanding of the shelter-in-place guidelines, there's some quite specific requirements for what would have to be provided to those residents on site, and
20 both in terms of the structural integrity of the building itself as well as the opportunity to stay safely.

So, I'm just not quite sure how those two elements inter-relate.

25 **MS LYONS:** Yes, so – oh sorry, Neil.

MR KELLEHER: Sorry, Steph, if I can just jump in quick. I've got to take off to my other meeting. But it's more around people getting in and out of that building and being caught out and, you know, them being mixed in with all the traffic that's
30 generated around people trying to get their kids out of the school which is right next door. There's a whole lot of – yes, the less people that we put there, in a dangerous situation like in a flood, the better. Does that sort of join in with what you were thinking, Steph?

35 **MS LYONS:** Yes, yes, that's right, Neil. I don't know if you need to head off, but ...

MR KELLEHER: I do.

40 **MS LYONS:** Yes.

MR KELLEHER: I'm really sorry, folks.

MS LYONS: Thanks for your input.

45 **MS GRANT:** No, thank you for your time, Neil. Thank you.

MR KELLEHER: No worries. Bye.

5 **MS LYONS:** Yes, I think it's around, yes, as Neil suggested, people coming and going from the building. You mentioned, Juliet, the shelter-in-place guideline, that was finalised in January of this year, and that does include sort of suggested guidance that is a site is H5/H6 hazard, it isn't suitable for shelter in place. And I understand that that is because those parts of the flood plain have been determined to be the highest risk part of the flood plain.

10 And back to your point, if you're going to put more people in the flood plain, put them in the lower hazard areas, don't put them in the high hazard areas. So, I think the shelter-in-place guideline does speak to that a little bit in saying that if, you know, understanding that that residual risk is there and you can't preclude development across the whole flood plain. But trying to avoid intensifying it and having people trying to enter and leave these particularly high hazard areas is what we're trying to avoid.

15 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. Simon, do you have any more flood related questions? No? Okay. Thank you. Angela, sorry, we kind of cut into your presentation. Do you want to keep going?

20 **MS HYNES:** No, that's fine, thank you. Well, I've already gone over sort of all the slides that I had prepared in relation to the agenda items. But I'm happy to maybe go through the agenda and then we can talk to the specifics if there are any further questions.

25 **MS GRANT:** Okay, terrific, thank you. I think in large measure, we've probably touched on, that we tried in the agenda to split it to sort of look at the strategic merit considerations and then the site-specific, being mindful of the strategic being the threshold issue. I'm not sure whether flooding sits in strategic or site-specific, but either way.

30 You've sort of – the Department's taken, I guess, a slightly different perspective in terms of whether it fits in with that strategic planning framework versus what the Council has said. I guess, the key hinges on that housing supply context. Is there, given that's such a strong government priority at the moment, is there something maybe you can talk to us about that?

35 **MS HYNES:** Yes, thanks Juliet. I guess the key focus of the strategic framework is housing in the right locations. So, they are centres that are accessible, well-serviced, and also areas that aren't subject to significant constraints or environmental constraints. So, I think the environmental constraints we've already touched on with the flooding in the key consideration. And the other aspect in terms of the location of where that growth is.

40 So, looking at the Regional Plan and also LSPS and LHS, it doesn't really foresee this part of Terrigal being like an area for much growth. And noting that it is part of the general growth precinct, but that, we would anticipate, is closer situated to the town centre and strategic centre of Erina and Terrigal. And, I guess, given the

environmental constraints, we don't think it's an appropriate site for significant growth.

5 **MR SMITH:** So, can I say, so, I think it said it's 2.1 kilometres from Terrigal.

MS HYNES: Mm-hm.

10 **MR SMITH:** That doesn't seem like a long way away, to me. Like, it seems – the Council's made the point about this 15-minute vision, and I think their material suggests that it's within a 15-minute walk to Terrigal and within a 15-minute bike ride to Erina. But that's not – you think that's still too remote to be considered proximate to those centres?

15 **MS HYNES:** Yes. So, I think more so in terms of just general accessibility, so it's not really a walkable area. And also given the constraints of the site, yes, we touched on that it's already zoned for residential development, other perhaps for the amount of growth that they're proposing for the site is not appropriate in terms of the location and response to the environmental considerations of the site.

20 **MS JAZMIN VAN VEEN:** Hi, it's Jazmine van Veen, sorry, that's for the transcript. If I could just jump in there. I think it would actually be more than a 15-minute walk to Terrigal from that site. I think it would be a touch over 20 minutes. So, just to kind of give that clarification, it's a bit of a further distance.

25 **MR SMITH:** Thanks.

30 **MS GRANT:** Okay. We've probably talked, we've probably covered those agenda items in terms of the environmental constraints. Possibly we've also probably covered the density and those bonuses provisions, unless there's anything else that you wanted to add in that space.

35 **MS VAN VEEN:** I think the only thing I would add is, we've talked a little bit about the capacity the existing planning controls have on this site. But I don't know if that's they've been tested through development application, and obviously that's the only real way for us to determine what would be accepted on site. And that goes a little bit to what Steph and Neil were speaking about earlier.

40 Obviously, this does have a residential zoning, and I don't know if Angela or myself are across the background in how that happened, but I imagine as is often the case, it might have been part of a bigger piece of work and not looking at the specifics of this site. But just because it's zoned residential doesn't mean that that outcome would be supported through a DA. That would obviously be determined through that process.

45 **MS GRANT:** And presumably there's also, for the Ministerial Direction that's saying, "consider flooding," there's another one that says, "don't down-zone residential land."

MS VAN VEEN: Yes, exactly, yes.

MR SMITH: So, does this – can I just ask on the strategic question. The earlier version of this proposal that was – where the local planning panel recommended against it, raised the issue of the height of the development. And I think the submission from Council said that even at that height, the Council officers were not concerned with the height. But nevertheless, the height has been reduced, and the Council itself has supported that lower height. Does the Department have concerns about visual impact and height at that site?

MS HYNES: So, I would say that there isn't significant development in the near vicinity of the site, there are vegetation buffers, so it's kind of looking at the scale of development around it, it is quite a significant increase on the site in isolation. And noting that this site isn't marked as a gateway site or entry point on approach to the Terrigal centre within the context.

I mean, we haven't assessed it in that much detail, but I would perhaps allude to there was a previous development application for the site looking at a higher density scheme. I think that's noted in our documentation, and I think that was in a way of about 50 units ... I don't know if my connection has just dropped out and you can hear me clearly.

MR SMITH: No, you're good.

MS HYNES: Okay. So, that was in line of about 50 units. And then that was subsequently withdrawn from Council.

MR SMITH: Okay.

MS GRANT: Perhaps that's something we can ask the Applicant. Okay. I don't have any other questions. Simon, is there anything else that you would like to explore with the Department?

MR SMITH: Yes, just one, which was about bushfire risk. On your slide that you showed that the bushland area to the north and to the south was noted in some form within the bushfire planning framework. And I saw the response from the RFS talked about the controls that it thought should be required if the development goes ahead. It had that the canopy could only be a certain density, that there shouldn't be shrubs, that the grass should be mown and all this kind of stuff. Which sort of implied that the risks were manageable if those mitigation efforts were implemented.

Am I reading that correctly? Is your department okay with the bushfire risk if those controls were implemented?

MS HYNES: I guess in terms of our gateway assessment, we note that there was that previous commentary which primarily related, I think, to the previous DA or the previous planning proposal. It was not so much in relation to the same

footprint and the same scheme.

5 But in consideration of the 9.1 Direction, we do require consultation with the RFS, and that's to satisfy, I guess, to do with the direction. So, we haven't investigated the proponent's response and Council's position or [unintelligible 00:41:42] position previously stated.

MR SMITH: Okay, thank you. No, that was all from me, Juliet.

10 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. Tahlia, is there anything from your side of the fence that you would like to ask?

MS HUTCHINSON: No specific questions, just if we can get a copy of that PowerPoint emailed through to us.

15 **MS GRANT:** Thank you. And we are meeting with the Applicant this afternoon and we have site visit scheduled in a week or so. So, we'll get more of a feel for the site.

20 So, thank you so much for your time. Is there anything else you want to add and let us know before we rap up?

MS VAN VEEN: Nothing from me.

25 **MS HYNES:** Not today, thank you.

MS LYONS: Nothing from me either. Thank you, Juliet.

30 **MS GRANT:** Terrific. Thank you so much for your time, we really appreciate it. It's always great to get your expertise and to hear firsthand, so thank you for your time. And I look forward to seeing you again next time.

MR SMITH: Yes.

35 **MS VAN VEEN:** Yes, and we are happy to answer any questions if anything comes out of your further briefings. Happy to have another session.

MR SMITH: Appreciate that. Thank you very much, Jazmine.

40 **MS GRANT:** Terrific. Thank you.

[All say thank you and goodbye]

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED