



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

**TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

RE: TRINITY LIGHTHOUSE BUILD-TO-RENT, NORTH RYDE  
(SSD-55844212)

**DEPARTMENT MEETING**

PANEL: SUELLEN FITZGERALD (CHAIR)  
MICHAEL CHILCOTT  
BRONWYN EVANS

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRADLEY JAMES  
GEOFF KWOK

DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING, HOUSING  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE: GABRIEL WARDENBURG  
PAULINA WYTHES  
JUDITH ELIJAH

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 3:00PM – 4:00PM  
MONDAY, 16<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2025

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

**MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD:** Hello, everybody.

5 **MR GABRIEL WARDENBURG:** Afternoon.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Hi. Have we got everyone from the Department? I think we have, have we?

10 **MS PAULINA WYTHES:** Yes. It's Paulina Wythes here. Hi. I've got Gabriel and Judith here as well with me.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Great. Okay. Well, look, I've got a short opening statement to read out, and then we'll introduce ourselves and get started. So, thank you.  
15 Thank you very much.

First up, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Wangal land here in the inner west, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we're virtually meeting and pay our respects to their Elders.  
20

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Trinita Lighthouse Build-to-Rent, North Ryde, and the SSD number 55844212, currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, Stockland Development, is proposing the demolition of the existing hardstand, fencing and the construction of 510 build-to-rent units and ground floor commercial tenancies across three buildings with a shared podium ranging between 8 to 20 storeys high, as well as car parking and pedestrian links.  
25

My name is Suellen Fitzgerald and I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Michael Chilcott.  
30

**MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT:** Good afternoon.

**MS FITZGERALD:** And Bronwyn Evans.  
35

**DR BRONWYN EVANS:** Hello.

**MS FITZGERALD:** We're also joined by Brad James and Geoff Kwok from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.  
40

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.

45 The meeting is only one part of the Commission's consideration and there will be several sources of information upon which we make our determination. It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues wherever it's considered appropriate. If you're 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 will then be put up on our website.

5 I'll ask everybody to introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and try not to speak over the top of each other, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript.

So, let's get going. Would you like to introduce yourselves, please.

10 **MS WYTHES:** Yes, good afternoon, commissioners. I'm Paulina Wythes, Director of the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team at the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. With me today is Gariel Wardenburg (Team Leader) and Judith Elijah (Senior Planning Officer), both within my team, the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team.

15 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you. So, we're in your hands, Paulina. How would you like to play this? You've seen the agenda. Have you got a presentation?

20 **MS WYTHES:** Yes, we do. So, I wanted to just kick off with an introduction and then I'll hand over to Gabriel to sort of run you through our presentation and we can – we've also looked at the agenda and we have slides to assist on the key issues you've addressed as well. So, we can take a moment to pause once we get through a bit of the intro. But mostly it's to answer your questions. Does that sound okay?

25 **MS FITZGERALD:** It sounds great, yes. We've read all the material, so a quick intro and then into questions would be great.

30 **MS WYTHES:** Great. Thanks for inviting us here today to brief you on the proposed build-to-rent project, Trinit, Delhi Road, North Ryde. The application has been referred to the IPC primarily because Council, the City of Ryde, have objected to the project and we had 50 or more submissions.

35 In terms of undertaking our assessment, we consider the project to be acceptable and is in a state to be approvable, subject to the following. The project does support a housing type that relates to build-to-rent and is located in a location close to public transport. It's permissible with consents and provides relevant high-density housing development that's consistent with the zone objectives. And it is envisaged with the strategic intent of the locality.

40 In our consideration, we also consider that the external and internal amenity of future residents has been addressed and proposes no unreasonable impacts. And we consider the proposal to provide significant public benefit with the production of 400 construction and 196 operational jobs.

45 Finally, there has been a voluntary planning agreement that has been executed with Council for the proposed dedication of the New Link Road. So, on that note, I was going to pass on to Gabriel, who will just run through the site context, the strategic context, and we can pause there for any questions. Thanks.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you, Paulina.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Thanks, Paulina. And good afternoon, my name is Gabriel Wardenburg, I'm a Team Leader in the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team.

So, we've just got a site context up the slide. The site's shown in red, it's located on the southern side of Macquarie Park Cemetery and has an existing commercial development referred to as the Trinita Business Park on the northern portion of the same site, so that's just flagged there for your benefit. The proposed development is located on the southern portion of that site and has large frontages to New Link Road, Rennie Street and Rivett Road.

Just surrounding the site, the built form is characterised by high-density residential developments ranging in height from around 11 to 22 storeys, and they generally surround the North Ryde Metro Station to the west of the site, and to the east and south you have those larger lot commercial premises.

We might move to the next slide. So, the statutory context for this project – I suppose I should start off by noting that build-to-rent is permissible in the E2 zone under the Housing SEPP. Under the Ryde LEP, the site is zoned E2 Commercial Centre and benefits from bonus height and FSR incentives, which equate to 65 metres height and 3:0 FSR respectively. And that's because it's located within the Macquarie Park Corridor.

The bonuses are conferred on the basis that there will be adequate provision of recreation areas and access networks. Then I'll just point out that I believe that 6.9 clause which applies through transitional arrangements. So, if you look it up now, it won't be there, but the transitional arrangements are means that applies.

And then if we go to the next slide, we've got the strategic context. So, as you'd know, Macquarie Park's gone through a State-led master planning and rezoning process to move Macquarie Park from a single-use business technology park into a contemporary innovation precinct.

It's important to recognise that the Macquarie Park TOD rezoning envisages the precinct as a mixed-use area. In particular, it introduces residential uses to mix with the existing commercial floor space to enhance the attractiveness of the precinct. And to really capitalise on the high growth potential that's available from those three metro stations.

So, the proposal is consistent with the strategic vision for Macquarie Park centre neighbourhood, as set out in the recently finalised TOD rezoning. That provides for a cluster of residential development, including build-to-rent on this site around that metro station. The residential development then extends to a new area of open space to the east, with lower-scale commercial uses at the fringe.

We'll just acknowledge that the site is zoned for commercial uses and the Play Strategy and Master Plan identified that the site is a commercial centre. However, build-to-rent remains permissible in the E2 zone within the precinct via the Housing SEPP and it's compatible with the future desired character of the precinct, subject to that TOD rezoning.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Gabriel, are you happy to take questions as we go through?

**MR WARDENBURG:** I think so, yes, that's fine.

**MS FITZGERALD:** While you're on this map, the strategic context, I know that the open space and recreation areas on the site itself is what's critical to our considerations. But I'm interested to know what you think is the delivery pathway for the open space immediately east of the site across Rivett Road, I think it is, given that the building design was modified, the building layout was modified specifically to accommodate that open space. So, what's the delivery pathway for that open space?

**MR WARDENBURG:** So, could I clarify what you mean by "delivery pathway"?

**MS FITZGERALD:** I mean who owns the land, how is the government going to go around delivering it?

**MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, I think I'd have to take that on notice, given it's more of a strategic question and we're probably more focused on the actual development application. So, delivery just is a little bit outside of my remit, I think, so I'd have to allow others to speak to that.

But what I would say is, that open space was obviously a key focus through our assessment, and the strategy did identify its location, and that location has been subject to change for that exact reason. So, just in terms of land ownership, feasibility and the different constraints around that site. So, yes, it's something I'd have to take on notice.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, look, if you could, just some idea, get back to us with some idea about what the likely implementation timeframe for that is, given that it did have implications for your assessment of this particular site.

**MR WARDENBURG:** For sure.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Any other questions on that strategic context from panel members before we move on?

**MR CHILCOTT:** Just quickly from me, Suellen. Gabriel, just so I'm clear in terms of the pathway. The current LEP has savings provisions that push you back to the version when the application was made, which was back in 2023. At that point, 6.9 was in the LEP and it then referred specifically to some particular

mapping for – that provided the uplift and that’s the basis for the uplift in the land as it was zoned back in that time. That’s correct?

**MR WARDENBURG:** That’s exactly right, yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thanks, I just want to make sure I understood that clearly. Thank you.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Bronwyn?

**DR EVANS:** Nothing from me, Suellen, thank you.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Okay, well, Gabriel, take it away.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Great. So, I might flick to the next slide, thank you. So, yes, so the Applicant is considering development consent for a build-to-rent development comprising of demolition of existing hardstand concrete, fencing and excavation, and then construction of three buildings with a shared podium ranging between 4 to 20 storeys in height, containing 510 build-to-rent units, a supermarket, other commercial and retail tenancies, and a basement level for the provision of 155 new car parking spaces. There’s a publicly accessible through-site link and the Applicant proposes to dedicate New Link Road to Council through a VPA.

And if we flick to the next proposal. We’ve essentially got the – oh sorry, the next slide – we’ve essentially got the key matters ... Sorry, the next one. Yes, just the key matters that were in the agenda. So, we’re happy to talk to each one individually or I do have some slides prepared for each of these, so I can keep going or answer those questions.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Why don’t you keep going, Gabriel, and we’ll jump in with questions as you go along.

**MR WARDENBURG:** No problem. So, I think the first one is building height. So, the proposal seeks a maximum building height of 65 metres and doesn’t breach this height and is compliant within incentive provisions provided under the Ryde LEP for development within the Macquarie Park Corridor.

The Department is satisfied that the height of this proposal meets the requirements of providing generous open space areas, a suitable access network, which is supported by the New Link Road dedication, and carefully considered communal open space areas. And I’ll just point out that the sort of open space offering within the development itself is relatively substantial and of high quality.

I might flick to the next slide where we talk about density. And feel free to ask any questions on each of these slides. So, the proposal complies with maximum FSR of 3:1 under those provisions. The Department’s satisfied that the FSR of the proposal is – sorry, the Department’s satisfied that the FSR of the proposal is

appropriate, given that build-to-rent is permissible within the E2 zone and under the Housing SEPP that allows for the uptake of relevant provisions under a local environmental plan.

5 The density on the site is reflective of, I suppose, a development that provides a high level of strategic merit. And the bulk and scale is compatible with the nearby developments. So, in terms of just looking at this plan, you can see that the nearby residential developments are of a scale that is comparable or greater than what's proposed.

10 Additionally, the development provides for the dedication of New Link Road and contributions exceeding 18 million to support infrastructure and service needs.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** Gabriel, again, just to be clear. The land on which this development is being undertaken forms part of a bigger lot, and that lot is already housing the Trinita Business Park as constructed and it's the combination of GFA on the space within the lot that this proposal is being constructed together with the existing development that satisfies the GFA.

20 **MR WARDENBURG:** That's correct.

**MR CHILCOTT:** And FSR controls.

25 **MR WARDENBURG:** That's correct. That together they remain below that 3:1 and that is the reliance as well, yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, because they're on a single lot. Thank you.

30 **MR WARDENBURG:** Correct, yes. So, if there's no more questions on this slide, I might flick to the next one.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, sure.

35 **MR WARDENBURG:** So, the application itself has benefited from review by the State Design Review Panel and advice during prior to lodgement. We consider it's addressed the key design issues, particularly in terms of solar access, materiality and public domain integration.

40 And I'd just make the point again that we considered the open space offering in the centre of this development to be of relatively high quality and would provide a high level of amenity. And that generally the ADG requirements demonstrated some strong solid performance building separation and access to communal open space.

45 I might just flick to the next slide, which is overshadowing. So, I'd say the – one of the key considerations here was the future public open space to the east, and an objective under the Macquarie Park strategy that essentially set the objective of 50% solar access between 10 and 2. So, that's the slide that we have showing here,

shows that overshadowing. And then I'll just point out that residential developments are typically located to the north and west and therefore are largely unaffected by overshadowing. To the south and southeast are those commercial buildings, so they'll be assessed differently to those residential buildings.

And then I'll just move onto the next slide, which is view loss. So, ultimately, we looked at this issue quite carefully. We consider that the proposal provides a reasonable view sharing, as it aligns to the plan and character of Macquarie Park TOD and complies with the relevant FSR and height controls for the site.

Most impacts are minor or moderate, but there are a few properties which we have considered in greater detail within the Assessment Report, such as 1 Network Place. And I would make the note that the design revisions have improved view sharing by adjusting the roof form of Building A and the massing of Building B and C to sort of enhance those long distance visibility towards the Sydney and Chatswood CBDs.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Gabriel, while we're on this topic, because it's obviously one of the prime concerns of the community in their submissions is the impact, particularly from 1 Network Place, which is reflected in that image in the bottom right-hand corner of your slide.

Can you just talk us through in high-level terms, we don't need detail in this forum – but talk us through the way you've thought through the Tenacity steps here. This is something that the community's really concerned with.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, so I suppose, I guess I'll keep my comments quite high level, and we can certainly take this on notice if you'd like more clarification. But we were looking at the overall impacts from this building and generally found that for a significant portion of these views, there was an acceptable level of impact, I would say, just noting the FSR and height controls for the site.

So, we've got a range of views here shown in the slide, and you can see for the upper levels, that impact is really substantially less than, say, the mid-level. And I suppose there'd be a reasonable expectation that as you go lower down in a building, that the greater impact from adjoining development ...

I think another important point of consideration is the consideration of reasonable alternatives. I don't think it was clear to us that, without a substantial rethink of this proposed scheme, that you could really minimise the impacts to those views to a level that the community would accept. I think irrespective of the configuration for this site, there's some level of impact and that's reflective of the sort of strategic zoning for the area of Ryde and just being within an urban context.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Yes. Your Assessment Report talks about achieving solar access for the apartments on site versus perhaps the visual impacts for surrounding residential. Is that fair to say?



**MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, and I think it's around looking for an overall net benefit here, it was sort of hard to realise, I suppose, an option here that would provide the intended benefits to view sharing without sort of drastically impacting on the future viability of the site as opposed to a particular design.

**MS WYTHES:** May I also add that I think in considering the reasonableness of the proposal, as part of our consideration it was thinking that the proposed development is compliant with the maximum building height and FSR. So, that was taken into consideration as part of the reasonableness test under the Tenacity.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Sure. Thank you.

**MR CHILCOTT:** So, just to summarise, Paulina and Gabriel, would it be fair to say that the way you've addressed it is that whilst acknowledging there, I think it's up to severe impacts in some cases to the amenity of residences in Network Place, and particularly 1 Network Place, given the controls, those impacts don't form a reason for refusal, in your view.

**MR WARDENBURG:** I think that is accurate, Michael, yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right, thank you.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Anything else before we move on from that point? No? All good? Thanks, Gabriel, you've got further slides.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Yes. So, the next one is building separation and visual privacy. So, we considered this with regards to the Housing SEPP and the Apartment Design Guide. With regards to the maintenance of visual privacy to surrounding residential properties to the north and west, we'd note that the building separation exceeds the ADG criteria, so between units across all levels.

So, we found generally there's substantial building separation and setbacks within this development. And so we were satisfied on that basis. They've also – yes, this slide probably shows it quite clearly, they've appropriately responded to potential privacy issues through either a lack of window openings, landscape screening, balcony and window design, to sort of minimise those interactions. And I'd say it's fairly limited in terms of where you do have a reduced building separation, and where that occurs it's appropriately mitigated.

We'll probably move to the next slide. So, the proposal provides a total of 319 car parking spaces, and that includes the reallocation of 164 parking spaces from the existing development and the construction of 155 new car parking spaces. But acknowledge Council's concerns regarding the submission of a clause 4.6 statement to vary the parking rate in the Housing SEPP. But we considered the NDDS, so the non-discretionary development standard, and the applicable rates override DCP and consider that the proposed quantum of car parking fairly and reasonably relates to the development.

So, yes, did you have any questions around that reallocation or ...?

5 **MS FITZGERALD:** Only to confirm that you're seeing the, I think, 0.2 figure under the Housing SEPP for car parking to be a minimum only, without a maximum – is that what you're saying?

10 **MR WARDENBURG:** I think we formed the view that they don't meet that standard. So, the standard's 0.2 and we consider that they don't meet that standard and that there is a fair and reasonable quantum of car parking proposed under this development.

15 **MS FITZGERALD:** So, they don't meet that standard. Isn't that a [flaw or floor? 00:26:34] on the number of car parks that should be provided per dwelling unit or ...?

**MR WARDENBURG:** Suellen, what do you mean by [flaw/floor 00:26:46], if I can just clarify?

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Look, I might be wrong here, but my understanding was that the Housing SEPP provides a minimum amount of car spaces that should be provided.

25 **MR WARDENBURG:** Sure. I think – I could probably take that question on notice. I think there's some reflections around the wording in that clause [cross-talk 00:27:13].

30 **MS WYTHES:** I think we can definitely take that one on notice, but we can probably infer that it's taken as a minimum. But in this case, we haven't made the conclusion that it's necessarily met the NDDS. So, as a right, we don't consider we could – sorry, stepping back, in terms of the role of meeting a non-discretionary development standard, it would mean that the consent authority can't refuse a matter on that particular item.

35 In this case, because it's been over and above, well over and above, we have acknowledged the NDDS, but really need to assess the proposed quantum of car parking, so over 300, and whether it's a reasonable requirement, as Gabriel sort of talked about.

40 **MR CHILCOTT:** Paulina, just to follow on from that, and we're happy for you to provide us with your written response to the question. But it's where the parking rates are is in the Housing SEPP. It sets to 0.2 line.

45 It would appear to me that if you say that the number beyond that is acceptable, you are indeed interpreting it to be a minimum. And if you were to interpret it as a maximum or that they have to hit exactly on, the implication of that interpretation would be that you would indeed need to have a clause 4.6 variation request in. My understanding from the Department's correspondence to date, and Assessment Report, is that your interpretation that it is a minimum.

But if you'd be good enough to confirm your view, because it is a jurisdictional matter potentially for us to ensure that we're dealing with the correct interpretation of the law and be satisfied on that, such that there is not a requirement for a clause 4.6 variation request under the LEP.

So, please by all means, take it on notice, but it's an important question jurisdictionally for us.

**MS WYTHES:** Yes. We'll do that.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Sorry, Suellen, I thought I'd throw that in.

**MS FITZGERALD:** No, thanks, Michael, that was clarifying.

**DR EVANS:** Suellen and Department, I'm sorry I had to go and put a blind down because I was being blinded by the sun. But I did have a question in relation to the privacy, and I just wanted to understand if you considered the requirement for any other privacy treatments in addition to just separation. You said that they'd met the separation between buildings and therefore nothing else was done. Did you consider at any point any other privacy treatments?

**MR WARDENBURG:** I think at a high level, we considered whether we thought that would be necessary. But I'd say we didn't investigate particular treatment options such as additional screening, given the substantial building separation and the fact that most of those interactions sort of occur between non-habitable rooms or balconies or areas that were perhaps less sensitive than, say, if we had habitable rooms facing each other. But that was part of the consideration, yes.

**DR EVANS:** Thanks, Gabriel.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Okay. Moving on.

**MR WARDENBURG:** So, then we've got operational traffic. So, during operation the proposal's estimated to generate approximately 110 vehicle movements. And we found that to be acceptable, given that it would only result in a minor increase in traffic compared to existing conditions.

And we also found that the traffic modelling at the nearby intersections essentially showed no discernible loss of intersection performance. So, those intersections would continue to operate at good levels of service during peak times.

And then we've got the final sort of summary of recommended conditions. So, yes, they're just on the screen, but we've got a CEMP, we've got some operational requirements around car parking and loading. And I'm just going through this list, I think the one that probably stands out is the existing commercial consent to be surrendered, the VPA and contributions, and just a sort of standard condition around the tenanted component of the building to be managed in perpetuity.

5 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thanks, Gabriel. We'll be coming back to the Department with any thoughts or amendments we've got on the conditions of consent. Just wondering, we've received conditions from Ryde Council. Have you been party to those requests from Ryde Council as well?

**MR WARDENBURG:** Not the most recent, so if you've recently received that, then I don't believe that we have been copied into that correspondence.

10 **MS FITZGERALD:** So, okay, Brad, that might be something that we could do post the meeting.

15 **MR BRADLEY JAMES:** Yes, sure. Thanks, Suellen. Yes, I can just confirm it just came direct to us, the Department weren't copied in, so we can share that.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Okay, great. So, other questions from Bronwyn, Michael for the Department?

20 **MR CHILCOTT:** I don't have any at this point, Suellen, thank you.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Bronwyn?

25 **DR EVANS:** No. I think that's been very helpful to complement the Assessment Report.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, great, thank you. Brad, Geoff, anything you wanted to cover off in this meeting with the Department?

30 **MR JAMES:** Nothing from me, Suellen.

**MR GEOFF KWOK:** Thanks, Suellen.

35 **MR CHILCOTT:** Oh, sorry, there was one other thing, Brad, we talked about, which was just the requirement to amend the application.

**MR JAMES:** Sure.

40 **MR CHILCOTT:** And Gabriel, you may want to just take down the screen, if that's possible, while we ...

**MR WARDENBURG:** Sure.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Our understanding is that the application that is as now it – not the application, sorry, what is being sought by way of a consent – differs from the original application. And just as a matter of law, the application ought to be amended to reflect what is currently being sought for consent. And we did raise this with the Applicant on site – they were on the view that they'd written to the Department and had formally sought to amend the application for that purpose.

And we were just wanting some clarification from the Department or perhaps confirmation from the Department at an appropriate point that the application has been amended to reflect the current plans, so that what's in the application is what is being sought by way of a consent – reflects what is being sought by way of consent.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, I suppose I'd just identify those – there's a bit of flexibility in terms of what's considered a revision versus an amendment. So, DA's can be revised through their application. In this case, the Applicant – so, I'd probably clarify the process that's occurred to date, which is the Applicant elected to include these current revisions in their Response to Submissions Report. So, that's how they were received and treated by the Department.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Yes, and so they ought to be dealt with by way of a request to amend, and indeed by the Department under delegation by the Commission, agreeing to amend the application. Just from a formal sense, that's the way it ought to happen. And we've dealt with it previously, Brad, there's a couple of projects we've needed to do this on with the Department in the past. There was the Dubbo ...

**MR JAMES:** Dubbo Firming Power Station.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Dubbo Firming Power Station. And the other one was the ...

**MR JAMES:** The Dee Why Mixed Use, which was in September.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Gabriel, so if you'd be good enough, just from a procedural point of view, to ensure that we are in a position whichever way it goes, to make a lawful decision in respect of the application that is actually being – should be the subject of our consideration, that would be great.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Absolutely. And there'll be some documentation that accompanies that, so we'll send that through as part of our response.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thanks. Because I know it's a formal process that's just required under law.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Correct, yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** So, if you'd be good enough to facilitate getting it all appropriately lined up, so that we've got the right matters before us, that'd be great. Thank you.

Sorry, Suellen, that was one I wanted to make sure we covered out.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, no, thanks for reminding me of that one, Michael, that's great. Okay, well look, if that's everyone's questions, I wanted to thank the

Department, Paulina, Gabriel and Judith, for the time this afternoon, that was very helpful for you to go through the submission and for us to be able to answer questions. So, thank you for taking the time.

5       **MS WYTHES:** Thank you.

**MR WARDENBURG:** Thank you.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you all.

10

**MS JUDITH ELIJAH:** Thanks.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Cheers.

15

**DR EVANS:** Bye.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Good afternoon.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**