



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: OPAL ST IVES COMMUNITY CARE SENIORS HOUSING
(SSD-48028209)**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: JANETT MILLIGAN (CHAIR)
KEN KANOFSKI

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON
CALLUM FIRTH

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING
& INFRASTRUCTURE:** PAULINA WYTHES
GABRIEL WARDENBURG
MANWELLA HAWELL

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:30AM – 11:15AM
FRIDAY 4th JULY 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR PAULINA WYTHES: Morning.

MS JANETT MILLIGAN: Good morning and welcome. Can I check that we have everybody in the meeting, or are we waiting for some to join?

MR GABRIEL WARDENBURG: We're just waiting for one staff from our team.

MS MILLIGAN: Excellent. We are a little early.

MS WYTHES: Okay. I think we're all here, Commissioner. We just got – so, we've got three people from the Department here today.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. So, good morning everyone and welcome. Before we begin, I'd 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 meet virtually today, and I pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Opal St Ives Community Care Seniors Housing State Significant Development currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, Opal Healthcare, is seeking approval for the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a two to three storey residential aged care facility with ancillary services and basement parking at 285, 287, 287A, 289 Mona Vale Road and 1 Flinders Avenue, St Ives.

My name is Janett Milligan. I am the Chair of the Commission Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Ken Kanofski. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale, Tahlia Hutchinson and Callum Firth from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure a 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.

The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're 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.

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 that we have an accurate transcript.

So, let's begin. And I might start by just referring to the Department, perhaps you can just do a quick introduction of each of your team members. And I'm assuming you might have some opening statements or material you'd like us to consider.

MS WYTHES: Yes, Commissioner Milligan, we have a presentation that we'll go through, covering off your agenda items, and happy to take questions. But to kick off, I wanted to introduce myself and the team. So, I'm Paulina Wythes, Director of the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team. With me today and presenting will be Gabriel Wardenburg, my Team Leader, and Senior Planner, Manwella Hawell, from my team, who have assessed this application.

So, thank you for having us here to brief you today on the Opal St Ives Seniors Housing development at 285, 289 Mona Vale Road, St Ives. We're going to start with a bit of an introduction and overview of the site and project and move onto discussing the key matters. The project has been referred to the Independent Planning Commission for determination as Ku-ring-gai Council has objected to the proposal.

We've done a comprehensive assessment and have concluded that the proposal is acceptable and can be approved or is approvable subject to conditions. The project is permissible with consents and supports the government's priorities to deliver diverse housing.

The built form, two to three storeys, would be compatible with the character of the area, and provides an appropriate relationship with the adjoining lower-density dwellings, provides public benefits generating 300 construction jobs and 120 operational jobs. And our assessment has concluded that the development would not result in any unreasonable amenity impacts to residents or neighbouring dwellings.

I'm going to pass onto Gabriel, who will cover off on the key issues outlined in your agenda, and then we are happy to answer any questions along the way, and take your lead on that.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you.

MS WYTHES: Thanks.

MR WARDENBURG: Thanks, Paulina, and good morning, Commissioners. My name is Gabriel Wardenburg. I'm the Team Leader in the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team. So, we might just flick over to the first slide.

And yes, just to orientate everyone, the site we're talking about is marked there with the red star. The site itself which is to the right includes five lots, 285, 289 Mona Vale Road, and 1 Flinders Avenue to the south. The site's about 9,300 square metres and right now there's a mix of single and double storey residential homes on the site. And the site's fairly well-connected, being on Mona Vale Road, and there's also several other seniors living developments, nearby shown on the left.

And we might move onto the next slide. So, under the Ku-ring-gai LEP, the site is zoned R2 Low Density Residential. The key controls that we considered were the LEP, the Housing SEPP, and the Seniors Housing Design Guide in our assessment. And the site is subject to a maximum building height of 9.5 for building height and 11.5 for servicing equipment on the roof, subject to the Housing SEPP, and a maximum floor space ratio of 1:1. And I'd say generally the development complies with those controls.

So, if we just flick over to the next slide, yes, that's the – so, as you're aware, that's the development proposes demolition of existing dwellings, earthworks, excavation, remediation works, and removal of 96 trees. And then construction of a two to three storey residential care facility containing 148 beds, and a mix of communal lounge and dining areas, media rooms, ancillary facilities, I guess notably a gym, health consulting rooms, a salon and wellness centre. And I won't go through the full list; you've got it on there on the screen.

And then we've got the proposed site plan here. And just to orientate everyone, the primary access is off Mona Vale Road in the top left. And there's no real access on Flinders Avenue. So, all the site access is through that main road access.

And then to the right we've got a – sorry, just a quick overview of how the development is configured. So, it's really like a lot of seniors housing developments, based around a few different households and different buildings and connect through like a main spine with some of the ancillary uses we mentioned all situated around what the Applicant calls the "town centre". That's just the general layout.

So, then we've got the key issues that we've worked through, and these slides really follow the agenda. Feel free to jump in with any questions, I'll do my best to answer them. But we've structured this around the agenda.

So, first up is built form. If we just flick to the first slide. So, I'll just say we've got a couple of slides here talking about built form and just giving some context to how this site sits in the locality. But right here, we've got the perspective looking in from Mona Vale Road. You can see it appears as a two-storey front façade.

And then in terms of building height, which is the focus of this slide, I did say it before, it's generally compliant, which it is, with the exception of an existing swimming pool. So, I think there's established planning principles around taking the base of the pool as the existing height. And so where that pool is located, there is a small, around a 1-metre height variation, which required a 4.6 and was sought by the Applicant.

We obviously considered that quite carefully, but in the scheme of things, I think it's quite a minor area, like it's a very small area compared to the total site area, and it doesn't result in any considerable visual appearance change compared to a compliant form. So, even if the Applicant were to comply with reducing heights just for that area, it'd essentially appear the same as a compliant form.

So, and we also considered that the height was in keeping with surrounding developments. It does present as a two-storey dwelling, well, not dwelling, but two-storey dwelling as you see here, which is comparable to a lot of other developments in the locality.

5

I might move onto bulk and scale. I might sort of preface this with, it's like a good slide just showing the revisions that the Applicant made to feedback from the Department. We did work quite closely with the Applicant in providing feedback around setbacks, privacy concerns, overshadowing concerns, and I think as a result they did make some meaningful amendments to the application. So, you can see here that the setbacks have been improved overall. The courtyard size has increased somewhat, and there are additional landscaping and privacy screening placed as a result.

10

15

But just getting back to bulk and scale, I'd just say that it is compliant with the maximum floor space ratio. So, their façade is 0.97 compared the Housing SEPP permissibility of 1:1. And I would say that thanks to the site configuration, the development appears outwardly in keeping with the surrounding character.

20

So, I think, yes, that's probably the main points for this slide. We can probably move onto the next one.

25

MR KEN KANOFSKI: Can we just talk, while we're going through this here, just talk about setbacks for a second. I mean, Council remain concerned about all of the setbacks.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes.

30

MR KANOFSKI: The road and the neighbours and everything. Are there any that you have any concerns about more than others, in after the amendments put forward by the Applicant?

35

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, look, I think we do have a slide on that. So, we could jump ahead.

MR KANOFSKI: No, no, don't jump ahead; we'll deal with it when we get to it, that's all good.

40

MR WARDENBURG: Okay, cool. But we definitely do have a slide and I'll ...

MR KANOFSKI: Yes, because I think that's a critical issue for, well, from my perspective, to try and bottom out.

45

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, for sure, for sure. So, yes, these are the slides that I was talking about, they just show the perspective from both from Mona Vale and surrounding residences. But if we – and I would just say that the design itself complies with the Housing SEPP requirements. It steps back that third level in keeping with a 45-degree plane, which is a requirement from the Housing SEPP. And the

development overall complies with all relevant controls, including the DCP, so in terms of setbacks.

5 But if we move to the next slide, sorry, just forward. Sorry, Manwella, if you just go forward to the next slide. We lost the slide pack there for a sec, just bear with us.

MR KENDALL CLYSDALE: Ask Manwella to remove it.

10 **MR WARDENBURG:** Oh. Okay, cool, I will try and get the slide pack happening on my screen. Just give me a sec, sorry. Okay.

MS WYTHES: Manwella's back, so she might give it a go, Gabriel.

15 **MS MANWELLA HAWELL:** I'll just share my screen. It seems that I've just had a complete ... Yes, please let me know when you can see the screen again.

MR CLYSDALE: There we go.

20 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay, we have it, thank you.

MS HAWELL: Can everyone see that?

MS MILLIGAN: Yes.

25 **MR WARDENBURG:** So, if you just jump forward for me, Manwella. I think we might have lost Manwella again. All right. I might try and share my screen if that's no good. Okay. It's actually locked me out because Manwella's sharing.

30 **MR CLYSDALE:** Manwella, could you just possibly see if you could ...

MS HAWELL: Yes, let me stop sharing.

MR WARDENBURG: Okay.

35 **MS HAWELL:** I can try sharing again.

MS MILLIGAN: I can see the screen. It's not on full screen mode, but we can see the slide.

40 **MS HAWELL:** Okay. Share.

MR WARDENBURG: Okay. All right. So, is there something sharing at the moment?

45 **MR CLYDSDALE:** No, not at the moment. It's all right, don't panic or rush, we've got some time.

MR WARDENBURG: Are you trying to share, Manwella?

MS HAWELL: No, I've taken it off so you can, but I can try once again.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, yes, that's cool. No, no, that's all right, I'll keep trying.

5 **MS HAWELL:** Let me try – no, okay. I've got it open, I just don't know why it's kicking me out of the meeting.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, that's okay. Okay, so I just have to get my windows organised, sorry. Okay. So, now ...

10 **MS WYTHES:** Gabriel, do you want me to give it a go so then you can pick up?

MR WARDENBURG: Um, yes ... Does that share it?

15 **MS MILLIGAN:** Yes.

MR CALLUM FIRTH: Yes, we've got Gabriel's screen, and your connection seems a bit more stable, Gabriel.

20 **MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, I think that's the issue, so that's cool. Just – if you just give me a minute, I just need to get my notes back up. That's the issue, yes, it's a bit of a juggling ... All right.

MS MILLIGAN: So now we're seeing your notes – okay, right, got it.

25 **MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, yes. Apologies, apologies.

MR CLYDSDALE: That's fine.

30 **MR WARDENBURG:** Okay. So, I just need to get the – okay, now I'm set, now I'm set. So, sorry for that. So, we've just got here the neighbouring sites. So, just to give a perspective in terms of height and the forward appearance of this development, you can see it's quite similar or even perhaps less imposing than some nearby developments. So, these are three other developments within 400 metres of the site.
35 And I think when you consider the design put forward by the Applicant, it's probably a bit more in keeping with the local keeping than maybe these other developments.

40 So, I'm just taking us to setbacks. I mentioned the Applicant revised their proposal to improve setbacks, particularly – if you can see my cursor around the C mark and the H mark, and that allowed for more effective landscaping and buffering in those areas. And then another concern that Council did raise was the setbacks here, the front setbacks to Mona Vale Road and the setbacks over here around the E mark to Flinders Avenue.

45 So, I think with the Mona Vale Road front setback, we considered it to be acceptable given that the majority of that frontage is achieving a setback of between 23 and 16 metres, and it's only this very edge corner that has that narrow 5.9-something-metre

setback. And I think given the layout of the site and the irregular shape of this lot and the frontage to Mona Vale Road, that's quite acceptable in that context.

I think forcing a numerical compliance here for the sake of achieving a setback, I think would have a – would significantly impact on the design but would also probably not result in a real substantial change in the front appearance of the development.

So, I might just flick to the next slide. So, this is – and I'll get back to setbacks again in terms of privacy, so I'll just say that that is coming back up again. But just in terms of solar access, so there was concern around internal amenity, and what I'd say is that the courtyards 1 and 2 receive around 2 hours of sunlight during the winter solstice, and courtyards 3, 4 and 5 get around 4 to 5 hours, so well above the typical 2-hour benchmark.

And then internally, around 60% of communal areas get around, will get more than 2 hours of sunlight in winter. I think it's really important to note that this is a residential care facility and so typical objectives that we might ascribe to other development types like the ADG, don't apply. So, there is a need for flexibility in terms of how they're assessed.

The Seniors Housing Design Guideline does identify overlap with the ADG. But our experience dealing with this development type is that the residents really look for a variety of communal settings, so including indoor, semi-outdoor and outdoor and both shaded and sunny areas, just to suit the needs of elderly residents. So, I think on balance, this development achieves that quite well.

MS MILLIGAN: May I ask a question at that point?

MR WARDENBURG: For sure.

MS MILLIGAN: So, Council remains concerned about solar access to courtyard 2. And so, I was interested to ask, in your assessment do you make some assumptions about which residents might be using which courtyards? Because, I suppose, I'm observing that the rooms sort of near your 5 and 6 on that slide who have direct access to courtyard 2, also all have private terraces.

And I just wanted to ask you, the solar access to those terraces appears to be northeast and would seem to be good. Is that correct? I suppose I'm wondering whether we've got a situation where most of the people who would use courtyard 2 also have outdoor spaces with greater solar access.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, look, I think so, but what I would say is we definitely approached it from the overall balance of amenity provided throughout this proposal and of course, equitable access to those spaces as well. I'd have to check for sure that those – sorry, the terraces are provided clear solar access. But I suspect that they are, I just haven't run that to ground personally myself, so I'd take that on notice.

But I would say that we certainly considered access to each courtyard and the overall level of solar amenity provided throughout the development.

5 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay, so I'm going to suggest that you don't need to take that on notice. Because what you've just said to us is that you've considered all of the courtyards which are accessible to all of the residents and you've taken an overall view in your assessment. So, that's fine.

10 **MR WARDENBURG:** And including the internal amenity spaces, I'd just be clear about as well, just given the needs of residents in this facility.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay, thank you.

15 **MR WARDENBURG:** Awesome. And then we've got visual privacy. So, I think this is the slide that highlights, I guess, both where the community concern was probably strongest and also where our assessment was primarily focused. So, we did have some concerns particularly around this 283 Mona Vale Road, 293 Mona Vale Road and Flinders Avenue to some degree.

20 I'd just say that we were more concerned with these units both because the setbacks were originally quite narrow, they were then increased, but also because the aspect, like the viewpoints, will be from the north and south, and so you had more potential to be overlooking into primary dwelling spaces, as opposed to on the sides of this development where you're more likely to be facing essentially the side of a residence.
25 So, that's probably the reasoning around that.

So, in terms of those setbacks, as I said, they were increased, and that provided not just the immediate reduction in potential overlooking, but also an improvement in landscaping. So, in terms of these units 1 to 4, there was an improved deep soil
30 planting made available through that, so the landscaping's been revised to provide improved screening. And to the 293 residents, the setback was increased but the Applicant also provided additional privacy screening to prevent overlooking.

35 And the other point I'd make is that the third level is slightly more set back, so that again reduces potential overlooking. So, I think overall the orientation is fairly thoughtful. These units, in terms of what they're facing here, I'd just say that this is more of a transitional area of the development, it's not essentially dwellings looking into one another. This is probably more of a passive space.

40 And so, I think overall that the layout facilitates decent outcomes in terms of managing privacy. And then where there is some potential impact that remains, that they've employed appropriate screening through that privacy screening.

45 **MR KANOFSKI:** In your mind, where are the – were the biggest concerns 283 and 293 in your mind?

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, I think so, I think that's fair to say. I mean, Manwella, jump in if ... They're certainly not the only concern but certainly in terms of where the setbacks were closest and the potential for overlooking was greatest.

5 **MR KANOFSKI:** And can you talk us through 6 Flinders and just how you think it's impacted?

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, so I think that's more just in terms of the overall setbacks here. I think in terms of in numerical compliance, they're quite reduced there. But in
10 terms of actual impacts, I don't think there is a significant impact to that property. Again, Manwella, just jump in if ...

MS HAWELL: Yes, I'll just also note that in terms of 6 Flinders, the units that are adjacent to it actually face the courtyard, so they're not positioned to have balconies
15 facing 6 Flinders Avenue.

MR KANOFSKI: Okay.

MS HAWELL: There is a fire staircase that faces towards 6 Flinders Avenue, but it's
20 generally the units that have the balconies that actually face the courtyard and not the adjacent dwelling, or 6 Flinders Avenue.

MR KANOFSKI: Yes, so there's no balconies directly ...

25 **MS HAWELL:** Also, this plan doesn't really show it, but there is quite a few [inaudible], not to 6 Flinders Avenue, there's also some substantial trees that also provide a buffer in terms of overlooking as well on that boundary.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, and to be clear, the orientation of the balconies is north
30 to south.

MR KANOFSKI: Yes, okay.

MS MILLIGAN: So, can I ask a question. We understand the fire stairs and their
35 screening. But in the plans, there does seem to be a sitting nook, I think it's called a "sit and learn" area which occupies the little nib that is at that shortest setback. Can you talk us through that, because that does appear to be an area where people will potentially sit, maybe for extended periods of time, and it does seem to look east towards Flinders Avenue.

40 **MR WARDENBURG:** I think we would have considered the landscaping and screening that's provided. So, I think I'd need to take that on notice and compare it directly to the landscape plans. I just haven't – yes, I haven't look at that in some time, so I'll probably take that question on notice.

45 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay, all right. And we'll sort of continue to give that point some consideration too. The setback is 3 point something. We did note that there are no overlooking units along that wall, which of course is very helpful. But we did have

some questions about that sit-and-learn nook and any potential overlooking from that. So, thank you for coming back to us on that one.

MR WARDENBURG: Easy, easy. So, the next slide is on overshadowing and again I think consistent with the privacy concerns, most of the submissions on overshadowing related to those units at 283 Mona Vale Road and 6 Flinders Avenue.

So, the majority of the overshadowing is contained on the subject site itself, with fairly minimal impact on neighbouring properties. The overshadowing that does occur is typically limited in duration and falls on non-sensitive areas like the front setbacks or landscape zones or in carports, rather than habitable rooms or primary open spaces.

I think where there are some impacts, they're in very limited circumstances and typically after 2 p.m. I think 6 Flinders Avenue would be an example of that, where you do have some overshadowing in a primary space, but it only occurs after 2.

And all of the affected properties would continue to receive a minimum of 3 hours of direct solar access between 9 and 3. So, in terms of overall numerical achievement of objectives in the ADG, they still remain. So, I think on balance the overshadowing is fairly well-managed and again was improved through the increase in setbacks.

And I'd just note that there is some overshadowing shown here that is actually the result of fencing and not the result of the development itself.

And then after that, we're onto noise. So, the assessment was accompanied by a noise and vibration impact assessment, and that generally found that construction noise could exceed acceptable levels near nearby residences. And so, we have proposed conditions of consent relating to those potential impacts, and primarily through the adoption of passive mitigation measures and respite periods in terms of managing that noise. As is typical with construction impacts which are shorter term compared to the operation.

So, in terms of operational noise, we do have the wellness centre and café. I'll just point out that they are located in the centre of the site, so I think they're best located in terms of keeping that noise internal to the site. And the communal open spaces are expected to have fairly limited night-time use. So, the predicted noise levels are expected to remain within acceptable limits.

We do have a driveway, so it's where my cursor is, so that's the primary driveway that's proposed. And that did require a 1.8-metre-high acoustic privacy wall. So, that's shown over here on the right. And that's predicted to bring levels down to an acceptable level, and I'd say that the predicted noise levels fall well within the relevant guidelines. So, there's no sleep disturbance issues even with a window open for this project, so the modelling essentially indicates that those noise levels should be managed to an acceptable level.

And then we've got the recommended conditions. Generally, it was fairly standard. I won't read everything on this slide here, but we've got typical requirements around a

CEMP, an Operational Plan of Management. I think the ones that were perhaps unusual was just some conditions to ensure existing street trees and trees nominated for retention are appropriately protected through construction.

5 And also, a condition requiring the Applicant to engage with Council if there's a change to the makeup of residents at the residential aged care facility. And that just relates to Council's development contributions and how the exemptions are applied, so there are exemptions that apply to seniors housing. But that would change if, for example, some of the dwellings were switched to ILUs use or something like that.

10 **MS MILLIGAN:** And just I'll at that point ask a question.

MR WARDENBURG: Sure.

15 **MS MILLIGAN:** Did Council provide you with their suggested conditions?

MR WARDENBURG: I believe they did, and we obviously considered those carefully in drafting our conditions. So, for example, the development contributions condition is an example of where that informed conditions. And I think the tree retention, to some degree as well, informed that.

20 I think our general approach is where concerns are managed through existing conditions, because often we get, I suppose, what are standard conditions for Council provided as part of that response from Council, so we take that feedback on board and then do a cross-check against our standard conditions. And where those issues are appropriately addressed through existing conditions, then that's how we consider that feedback.

25 So, the development contributions, for sure, was not a frequent issue for us, so that's why we've certainly adopted recommendations around that.

30 **MS MILLIGAN:** Are you in a position to provide the Commission with the Council's suggested conditions? Just to help us understand the issues they're still raising and what they're thinking.

35 **MR WARDENBURG:** Yes, we'll take that on notice and we'll just check the correspondence that we provided and make sure you've got a full account of any feedback provided by Council.

40 **MS MILLIGAN:** Thank you, thank you very much.

MR WARDENBURG: And then I think we've just got some slides on Council's concerns. And I understand these issues relate to concerns raised by Council during assessment of the application, not from recent discussions you may have had. So, there could be some overlap here or you might have an updated understanding.

45 But one of the concerns was that this tree K shown on the slide would be impacted during construction. I'll just clarify that the proposal doesn't propose removal of

tree K, and that the Arborist Report indicates that the construction footprint encroaches on around 10% of the tree protection zone. So, there's ample opportunity, I think, to retain that tree. They note that that species has a good tolerance to root impacts and so it would be unlikely to be significantly impacted by that construction. So, I think that the tree could be retained without unacceptable impacts and landowner's consent isn't required for its removal.

And then another issue was stormwater design. So, I believe there was an initial concern from Council, which I think has been worked through and resolved, but the basement, that there were no design drawings indicating how the basement would be pumped. So, I'll just clarify that the basement doesn't to be pumped, that the site is actually on a fairly steep fall, so it does slope, and the basement level is 157 RL approximately, or 158, whereas Flinders Avenue is at about 154. So, there's significant fall on the site that enables drainage through gravity.

And just another concern was pedestrian safety, which we looked at. So, I've just got some plans here. They essentially show the site triangle, shown on the left slide there, which shows that those sight lines would meet the Australian Standard. We've also applied a condition of consent that would require that the Applicant submit a report to the certifier demonstrating how the site distance requirements are achieved in accordance with the relevant Australian Standard.

And lastly, it's just the example condition that we placed on the consent in regards to development contributions and, I guess, any potential change in the type of residents at this facility. I think Council's concern was just that, if for some reason, the residents change from a high-needs resident, that they would be required to pay development contributions. So, that's picked up in the consent now.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay, thank you. I think you're right, in our conversations with Council I think a number of those issues had been resolved. However, they did talk to us about the pedestrian safety, and they remain concerned about that. They talked about potential other pedestrian access points to the site. At the moment, it's at the northern end of the site, as you know. Did you have any comments on pedestrian access to the site, both in terms of safety and perhaps just ease and amenity?

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, maybe Manwella, would you mind clarifying the access to Flinders Avenue? My understanding is that there is no access.

MS MILLIGAN: Oh no, sorry, sorry, I wasn't clear. They're talking about the main access off Mona Vale Road.

MR WARDENBURG: Oh, okay. So, they still have concerns around pedestrian interactions there or ...?

MS MILLIGAN: Yes, they did talk to us – there was an ongoing conversation about the pedestrian access points. At the moment, it's at the north, and they talked – you'd be familiar with this – about the concerns that some people would be walking across the driveway. So, yes, that's sort of a safety issue.

And they did talk about whether in fact there were options for alternate pedestrian access before you got to the driveway or maybe in the middle of the site. So, I'm just wondering if you have any particular comments or views on that, beyond the fact that you don't consider walking across that driveway to be particularly problematic, given the sight line analysis you've done.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes, I think we certainly considered pedestrian safety in our assessment and essentially felt that through the additional work there clarifying the sight lines, that the safety issue had really been resolved. I'd just also make a note that the predicted traffic movements for this site, they're not very high, so they're quite low numbers that we're talking about.

So, the risk that is probably already very low is made even lower through those low traffic numbers and movements. And it's not a high speed interface either, this is a low speed driveway access. So, I think it's appropriate for the type of development.

MS HAWELL: And if we go to slide 13 as well, there is pedestrian access provided before getting to the driveway. So, if someone wants to enter the site, the pedestrian access – there's a pathway, so they don't have to go through the driveway itself to access the site.

So, if you look right at the top corner, you're on Mona Vale Road, yes, so there's a pathway that's specific for pedestrians to enter the site, rather than having to do so through the driveway itself.

MS MILLIGAN: Right. No, I don't think they were suggesting people would come – although, who knows how people will access the site – I think they were sort of saying could there be – you referred to the northern access point; they were sort of asking, they were wondering if there could be access points lower down the site. But, yes ...

MS HAWELL: Oh, okay.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. Okay. So, that brings you to the end of the information you wanted to share with us.

MR WARDENBURG: Yes.

MS MILLIGAN: So, let me just go – Ken, can I ask you if you have other comments or questions?

MR KANOFSKI: No, I'm happy, Chair, that we've dealt with it during the discussion.

MS MILLIGAN: All right, okay. So, can I just say thank you to the Department for your assessment, for the discussion today, for clarifying. I think we might have ended up with one issue that you're coming back to us on, so we'll sort of just clarify that with you. And thank you very much for your time.

MS WYTHES: Thank you, commissioners. Have a good afternoon.

MR WARDENBURG: Thank you, all. Catch you.

5

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED