



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

RE: MUNDAMIA RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION MOD 3 (STORMWATER  
BASIN, LAYOUT, STAGING AND CONDITIONS CHANGES)  
(SSD-7169-Mod-3)

### **APPLICANT MEETING**

PANEL: SIMON SMITH (Chair)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRAD JAMES  
CALLUM FIRTH

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES: RYAN HOWES (Allan Price Pty Ltd)  
REBECCA LOCKART (Allen Price Pty Ltd)  
GORDAN OPACIC (AVID Property Group)  
MATTHEW SOMERS (Regional Land)  
RICHARD ASH (AAP Capital)

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:30AM – 11:30AM  
WEDNESDAY, 1<sup>st</sup> APRIL 2026

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

**MR SIMON SMITH:** Good morning, all. Good morning, Gordan, Richard and Rebecca. Are you there?

5

**MR GORDAN OPACIC:** Good morning, yes, I can hear you. How are you, Simon?

**MR SMITH:** Yes, good. I just can't see any of you. I can now. Oh, hello. How do you do, Richard and Rebecca?

10

**MR RICHARD ASH:** Well.

**MR OPACIC:** I'm just having issues with my camera. I'm just on my phone, so sorry guys, I may not be able to turn my video on, but ...

15

**MR SMITH:** Okay. Thanks, Gordan. I can see you, Ryan. So, we can see Richard, Rebecca and Ryan, and welcome, and welcome to you, Gordan.

20

Just before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Dharawal land, and to pay respects – and I also acknowledge the traditional owners of the land where you are, and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

25

Welcome today to the meeting to discuss the Mundamia Residential Subdivision Mod 3 currently before the Commission for determination. The mod seeks consent to expand the site development area and the stormwater drainage basins, undertake additional veg clearing, reduce and reconfigure lots, consolidate public open spaces, amend road layouts, development staging, timing of works, bushfire requirements and associated amendment to conditions.

30

My name is Simon Smith and I'm the Chair of this single-member Commission Panel. We're also joined by Brad James and Callum Firth from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

35

And 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.

40

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.

45

It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. Following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers require a formal response to. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

I ask that all participants 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.

5 So, we'll now begin. Thank you very much for joining in this morning. So, I understand that you received an agenda of the sequence of the matters that we'd like to raise with you. Are you happy for us to proceed with those agenda items? Great. Thank you.

10 All right. So, I'd like to start with stormwater. Clearly, this is the larger part of what's driven this mod. And I just wanted to ask, a bit of background, because previously the project was given consent with stormwater conditions and they proved unworkable for one reason or another. I just wondered if you could explain how that happened. The reason is not to find fault but to make sure that this doesn't happen again.

15 **MR RYAN HOWES:** I'll take that question. So, I'm Ryan Howes, Director of Engineering for Allen Price. So, I was involved as the engineering consultant for that original approval. There was a basin format that was proposed. The actual treatment measures haven't greatly changed. It's still wetlands. It's still –

20 **MR SMITH:** So, Ryan, I'm finding it a bit hard to hear you. Could you move closer to the microphone at your end, please?

25 **MR HOWES:** Is that any better?

**MR SMITH:** Much better. Thank you.

30 **MR HOWES:** So, the actual treatment mechanisms haven't changed greatly. What changed was when we moved through to an SWC phase [unintelligible 00:03:54] the consent, Council made it quite clear that they [unintelligible 00:04:01] with that format of the basins, the retaining walls that were proposed, the space that was available, etc.

35 So, the large amount of the amendments was around making the space workable for Council's maintenance staff. Making sure there was sufficient access around the entirety of the basin, acceptable tiering of walls instead of sheer walls. And as a part of that, because the site's quite steep on the perimeter, it's occupied more land, which then led into needing to do a [unintelligible 00:04:34] adjustment.

40 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, it was a matter of perhaps not enough detailed design already done and discussed with Council before the conditions [cross-talk 00:04:45].

45 **MR HOWES:** There were sections done at the time in the approved [unintelligible 00:04:55], I'm not sure ... But yes, Council claims that they just haven't really appreciated what that was going to look in [unintelligible 00:05:07].

**MR SMITH:** Right. This has been going for a long time, this development, obviously.

**MR HOWES:** The start, they've changed standard [unintelligible 00:05:14] have changed. We've been chasing tails somewhat for the last couple of years but, yes, so

it's taken a long time to get here. We seem to have the support of the Council officers who are [unintelligible 00:05:30].

5 **MR SMITH:** Right. So, what's your level of confidence that the design that's been now put forward is going to meet Council's requirements is going to work?

10 **MR HOWES:** We've gone through a lot of this with them and they've [unintelligible 00:05:45] revised even these basins a number of times to address all of their concerns. They're really at the point where you could almost push print on seeing a set of plans for the basins, they're very detailed.

15 **MR SMITH:** So, we just interviewed the Council earlier today, and I want to talk about stormwater and staging, because you raised this in your correspondence as well. So, the impression that Council is under or what they said to us is that because of the way the staging is intended to work that there may well be a need for temporary sediment detention basins for early stages of the works. And that the construction of the substantive works may be delayed until quite a long way through the stages of the project. Is that correct?

20 **MR HOWES:** Yes. So, the first water quality basin of the three major [unintelligible 00:06:45], the first one doesn't appear until Stage 4. Stages 1 to 3 don't have a wetland [unintelligible 00:06:53] as yet. Now, as part of any earth disturbance, we are required to provide sediment basins [unintelligible 00:07:01] once you disturb them [unintelligible 00:07:03] metres, which Stages 1 to 3 certainly would.

25 So, we would imagine that temporary sediment basins would absolutely be required at the site with Stages 1 to 3. And then even on into the later stages, we still need to control the sediment in the short term.

30 **MR SMITH:** Okay. And so, what were you saying happens at Stage 4?

35 **MR HOWES:** For Stage 4, the first of the water quality basins is constructed at that stage. And that then can – my understanding of the consent as proposed is that it becomes operational, in that water flows into it, [unintelligible 00:07:47] providing any OSD and providing any water quality measures or anything of that nature. So, it has to be online.

40 The question that we largely have is around, there's two consent conditions, one after the other. One which said the basin – I'm going off memory here – but I think it said it's not to be operational or it's not considered operational till we have 90% [unintelligible 00:18:12] developed, but it needed to be online and constructed and function.

45 So, I'm assuming the intention for Council in that is when they say not operational, it's because they don't want to take ownership of it until the upstream catchment is developed in [unintelligible 00:08:34] to that.

**MR SMITH:** So, when the first water quality basin is constructed, is it serving only the lots in Stage 4, or is it serving any of the lots in Stages 1 to 3?

5 **MR HOWES:** Yes, yes, it will pick up Stages 1 to 3. The first basin to be constructed is the largest one, from memory, in the north, northeast corner of the site. That picks up drainage from parts of Stages 3, it picks up future Stages 6, 7. There's, yes, I could draw you a map [unintelligible 00:09:12] better, but it picks up drainage from the stages.

10 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, it doesn't mop up all of Stage 1 to 3; they would need to continue on temporary detention basins for some time?

**MR HOWES:** There are portions of the lot that don't drain it.

15 **MR SMITH:** Right. Okay. And you had a question about this – the word, the phrase, 90% of the area served. So, in your letter you were kind of expressing concern that a sort of dark interpretation of the condition might mean that you don't hand over anything to Council until all of the stages are complete.

20 **MR HOWES:** Yes, yes, and that 90% of the housing stock has been delivered. And then there's another condition that requires maintenance be borne by the developer for a further three years beyond that.

**MR SMITH:** Yes.

25 **MR HOWES:** So, it seemed pretty onerous.

30 **MR SMITH:** Right. So, I suppose looking at it from Council's perspective, they don't want to take ownership of an asset until it's proven that it's working and stable and that it won't be overwhelmed by a much larger inflow, you know, might be working perfectly well for only a small amount of area served, but perhaps when the full area is served, problems may emerge and that'll be their problem if the asset has been handed over to them.

35 So, have you – I mean, I hope you can see what their risk is. I can see your risk, which is that you'll be looking after it for a decade, even when it's all fully settled down and you don't believe that's your responsibility anymore. Are you confident that in your letter that you've recommended a path through that's fair to both sides?

40 **MR HOWES:** I think we recommended 12 months beyond the [unintelligible 00:10:54], which is quite in line with other council areas and the experience of elsewhere. Three years, considering at that point that would have been there and operating for, as you say, probably close to a decade by the time we deliver all the stages.

45 **MR SMITH:** So, when you say Stage 4 begins you construct the first basin, it's served in Stage 4 and parts of Stages 3, 6 and 7, that means it's not going to be 100% utilised for many years after its constructed.

**MR HOWES:** Yes.

**MR SMITH:** So, there is a risk that if it's ... You know, that, if you were wanting to hand it over after a year of some level of service, that that hasn't really proven its capacity and effectiveness for the full service, has it?

5 **MR HOWES:** I would agree that 90% of the catchment being delivered ... So, the requirement for 90% service actually comes out of the Melbourne [unintelligible 00:12:01], and the way they operate down there is that 90% of the lots need to be delivered, so that the land is drained into it, but not that housing stock needs to be built. Because the interpretation there is that once the land's handed over to a buyer,  
10 once it's sold, management of sediment of the site falls to the individual builder, it falls onto Council to make sure that they're complying with [unintelligible 00:12:31] etc, etc. So, asking the developer to continue on maintaining for that [unintelligible 00:12:39] is really passing the buck.

15 **MR SMITH:** Is the Melbourne approach 90% of the lots created or 90% of the lots sold?

**MR HOWES:** They have lots created. So, it's ready to be developed.

20 **MR SMITH:** Okay. And so, that's what you would think is reasonable?

**MR HOWES:** That's the industry approach from down there. As far as reasonable, that's reasonable from our perspective. Once 90% of the catchment for, let's take [unintelligible 00:13:11] example, if you've got 90% of the lots have been created,  
25 they can be, you know, they're eligible to be sold to homeowners, that should be the point where the, you know, be it a 12-month or a 3-year requirement starts, to hand it over to Council ownership. Because if an individual builder does the wrong thing and –

30 **MR SMITH:** I understand, right, yes.

**MR HOWES:** It's a bit unfair to push all [00:13:45].

35 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, the other thing Council is concerned about is that some of the basins require a removal of a lot of rock, and this is going to be very costly, and that if the first three stages get going with some temporary measures, that there's a danger that the permanent measures may never get built and may prove too expensive.

40 **MR HOWES:** That's getting into the feasibility and the construction cost balance side of the project, which I don't have a hand on directly. But it's not like delivering the first three stages makes the whole development profitable and the developer could walk away. It's a long-term project that the developer's committed to, so I don't see that as a [unintelligible 00:14:42]. I'm looking at Richard ...

45 **MR ASH:** Richard Ash, Jemalong landowner, been involved with this for 13 years. It's been 13 years to get this far for 300 lots. I mean, the Council to say that is just – it's just offensive.

**MR SMITH:** Yes, well, I'm just sharing what [cross-talk 00:15:06].

**MR ASH:** Yes, I mean, and I think that the single biggest risk to this project is Council. It's not the market. It's not construction costs. It's Council.

5 **MR SMITH:** Okay. Thanks, Richard, I'm sure that this has been a long journey for you too.

10 **MR ASH:** Oh, look, and there's an active history here and the drainage basins are the current topic de jour. There's been things on fire that Council wanted, the RFS didn't. There's been all sorts of things on this journey. And ultimately, where we've ended up is a design which is not substantially different from where we started 13 years ago. And it's just been delayed because Council's delayed it.

15 **MR SMITH:** Okay.

**MR ASH:** That's, you know, you can look at the previous design from 13 years ago, yes, we're a few lots down, but not substantially, and that's entirely due to the drainage basins, which Council decided not to like after 10 years.

20 **MR SMITH:** Okay. All right, well, that's been very helpful from both of you on the stormwater. There were some other matters I wanted to discuss with you. So, one is about the safer place, the refuge and (slash) community hall. So, I understand that you've lodged and obtained approval for the construction of the community hall, but that you would still need to fulfil the approval condition for a neighbourhood safer place, you'd have to get development consent for that use. Has the building been  
25 designed ...

**MR ASH:** This is the fire thing I refer to.

30 **MR SMITH:** Yes.

**MR ASH:** So, this is a neighbourhood safe place first and a community centre second.

35 **MR SMITH:** Yes, understood.

**MR ASH:** Right. It was designed as a neighbourhood safe place.

**MR SMITH:** Yes.

40 **MR ASH:** Right. We wanted to turn it into something useful. I'm sure you're aware that the requirements for a neighbourhood safe place are not that big and full of concrete and that's that. And we decided to turn it into a facility that was somewhat useful. We provided Council with a series of designs. The design we've ended up is the one that Council chose, and to be clear, I know Council believe they wanted a  
45 community centre. You can go back to the documentation from a decade ago and there was no mention of a community centre here.

The neighbourhood safe place came from the State Government. The RFS did not feel it was necessary. The Rural Fire Service actually haven't changed their approval since

the beginning, because they believe were adequate from day one. We're happy to build it. I believe we have a DA for it. My understanding is the DA is to build it as a neighbourhood safe place standard.

5 **MS REBECCA LOCKART:** Rebecca Lockart from Allen Price. So, in order for it to be a neighbourhood safer place, it has to first be constructed and that's why the DA is just for the community centre, and then it's second that we then get approval for it to be a neighbourhood safer place, once it's constructed.

10 **MR ASH:** That's right.

**MS LOCKART:** Is the process.

15 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, it's just they have to follow ... Because when I looked at the suggestions from Council about the conditions, they suggested that none of the home builders can gain an occupation certificate until that safer place consent has been obtained.

20 **MR ASH:** That's probably true.

**MS LOCKART:** The wording for that is that they – it originally was they needed to be constructed until ... We couldn't sell any lots until the NSP was in place. However, it's a better approach to allow the lots to be sold and construction to begin at the same time as the NSP approvals process with the occupation certificates aren't able to be obtained. Otherwise, you're delaying things further than what's really – you don't need an NSP in place if people aren't living there. That's the common-sense approach.

25 **MR SMITH:** Okay. Okay. I'm just making a note. It's an important distinction. I guess, what concerned me a little was – I'm sure this wouldn't happen, but considering delays that have been experienced with this project, was that somebody may well have bought a lot, built a house and then they can't move in because there's still an unresolved issue about the neighbourhood safer place. And that would be in no one's interest.

30 **MR ASH:** Particularly ours. Yes, and look, I think that's right. I mean, let's be clear, as developer we're very happy to build it, we want it built. You know, we turned it into something useful for a reason.

35 **MR SMITH:** Yes.

40 **MR ASH:** We'll do what we can. I can't talk to the approval processes we're going to have to go through.

45 **MR SMITH:** Yes.

**MS LOCKART:** And at the moment, I think it's F13 says that it's prior to release for subdivision certificate, we must have the NSP in place. But you'd need the lot to be created and for to let it be registered and all those processes to occur at the same time, before the NSP process has gone through. So, I think the conditions of the community

centre DA, which I'm not sure if Council or the Department's provided, it has terms around needing the lot to be registered as well, or in place, and a survey –

5 **MR SMITH:** So, what you see is that the proposed condition is better than what was there before because it provides, enables you to get on and create lots and people to start building homes.

**MS LOCKART:** Yes.

10 **MR SMITH:** That has to be done.

**MS LOCKART:** It allows those two processes to occur together rather than them having to happen separately.

15 **MR SMITH:** Okay. Thank you. Another question wanted to ask you about was the provision for community open space and a playground. So, I'm not sure if it's the right – is that the right term – is it called a playground? Anyway.

20 **MS LOCKART:** Open space.

**MR SMITH:** ... talking about. So, Council says it's been developing a policy on playgrounds of a local character and of a district character, but they haven't finalised the policy, and we've asked them for more information about that. And they want the playground on your development to be of a district scale rather than a local scale. Are you aware of that and have a feel about that?

25 **MS LOCKART:** There was originally a condition that was proposed in the set of conditions we reviewed in December/January this year that included reference to a draft Community Infrastructure Strategic Plan. That plan hasn't yet been exhibited or made public and so we questioned how we could comply with a condition of consent that hasn't – we have no idea what that actually means or what it will look like. And we asked Council for that information, even in just breaking down what is it that you would be after, and they couldn't provide that to us.

30 **MS LOCKART:** The Department has then since deleted in their recommended conditions to delete that condition of consent because it's something that we – if we were to lodge our subdivisions certificate upon receiving [unintelligible 00:22:11], we couldn't comply with it because that report and plan hasn't been made public yet.

35 **MS LOCKART:** What we do have though is under the EP&A, we have to dedicate the open space and embellishment works to the value of the contributions project, so that does provide the mechanism for Council to have the overarching review of what the embellishment looks like.

40 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, the VPA incorporates within it a contributions schedule, and that is intended to cover in part whatever you have to do for the playground equipment etc.

5 **MS LOCKART:** We're currently preparing a landscape plan that needs to go back to Council as part of the VPA. And Council is preparing that draft agreement at the moment. We need to deliver the central open space at Stage 1A under the application, and it will have – I'm just reading – soft landscaping elements and other pathways, furniture, play equipment, and that has to be maintained until 12 months following practical completion.

**MR SMITH:** Right. Okay. That sounds –

10 **MS LOCKART:** That's under the terms of [unintelligible 00:23:11].

**MR SMITH:** So, I think they have just very recently exhibited that draft plan, but it's still a draft and it's not going to be finalised before your matter is dealt with. So, that's a helpful clarification. Is everything to you, satisfactory about the VPA?

15 **MS LOCKART:** There were some points that we raised concern with when it went to Council. Part of it is the extent of time that the community centre and childcare centre has to be maintained for following completion. That was something that the Council staff and councillors weren't willing to budge about, that it has to be maintained until the release of the final subdivision certificate relating to the development. So, that could be 10 or more years away.

20 Part of the VPA was to come up with a monetary value that could instead be provided, but that still seems ... The reason Council had that position was that they won't be collecting rates from a rate base of residents in that area to pay for the maintenance of it until that point. But at the same time, it will be available, and they will be collecting some rates to pay for the maintenance.

25 At the moment, what was reported to Council and endorsed by the councillors was that it's maintained until the release of the final subdivision certificate, which it's still a concern and of considerable expense, but it was something Council wouldn't budge on.

30 **MR SMITH:** Right, okay, but it sounds like, notwithstanding that, you would sign the VPA in its current form as resolved by Council?

35 **MS LOCKART:** That's a question for the landowner.

40 **MR SMITH:** Sorry?

**MS LOCKART:** I'll pass it onto Richard.

45 **MR OPACIC:** I might step in here, but yes, Simon, I think we've crunched the numbers with Council and we've agreed to a yearly figure. And that figure was fair and reasonable based on our recent discussions with them. So, that was, and yes, to Rebecca's point, hopefully the development, we're not expecting it to take 10 years, if it takes 10 years, we'll all be in trouble. So, that's one that we are happy to wear, but like I said, it could have been a lot worse, but that yearly maintenance cost has come down quite a bit after some lengthy discussions. So, yes, in short, yes.

5 **MR SMITH:** Okay. So, while we're on maintenance costs, I forgot to discuss maintenance of temporary detention basins during, prior to the completion of the longer-term works. Is that something that you've budgeted for, that you expect to have to do, to make sure that those temporary basins are kept in good order and up until they're replaced by permanent structures?

10 **MR OPACIC:** Yes, that is something that we have budgeted for and that we're aware of and that we've allowed for. So, yes.

15 **MR SMITH:** Okay. That's very good. I'm referring to my notes to make sure that I've got everything. Okay. So, were there any other matters that you wanted to – we got your letter, so we'll definitely consider all of those issues that are in there. Are there any other matters you wanted to raise with me today?

20 **MS LOCKART:** No, other than what it's in the letter, I think they were our final points of concern.

25 **MR SMITH:** Okay. Anything more from you, Richard or Ryan or Gordan?

30 **MR OPACIC:** Nothing on my end. I think, yes, further to Rebecca's comment, just whatever it's in the letter. The rest of it was, I think, as the guys have touched on, in essence it's – the proposal is similar, the modification is mainly to do with the basins, there's been a few other conditions and the VPA's been rehashed, but aside from that, it generally remains largely unchanged. So, yes, nothing further from my end.

35 **MR SMITH:** Okay. Sorry, there was one I forgot, which was about bollards and asset protection zones. So, we've asked Council for information as to why there has to be a physical delineation of an asset protection zone.

40 My understanding is the situation we're talking about is where there's development on one side of the road and where the asset protection zone for those lots extends across the roadway and partly onto Council land on the other side of the carriageway. And the conditions that were there before required timber bollards to delineate the edge of the asset protection zone, and the Council is worried about the cost of whipper-snipping around all of those bollards.

45 So, I've asked the Council why did they have to be bollards, why does there have to be anything there. So, they're going to provide us with some information about whatever calls that up, because I would have thought it's a lot cheaper to maintain that without any – if there were no bollards at all. Do you want to comment on that situation at all?

50 **MS LOCKART:** I think our main question was the [unintelligible 00:28:11] were requiring it to be steel bollards. So, reading through the Department's Assessment Report, it seems that they've taken one of our response to submissions points which pointed out that bollards are an acceptable means, to mean that we were proposing steel bollards, and that wasn't the case. It was Council who wants steel bollards from a maintenance perspective.

The consent has timber bollards, which we had accepted, but changing to a steel bollard is – we haven't proposed it and there's no [unintelligible 00:28:41] changing, and the requirement to upgrade it to be steel, which is at considerable more cost.

5 **MR SMITH:** Right. Do you happen to know offhand what linear dimension we're talking about? I mean, how many metres of bollards are involved in your development?

10 **MS LOCKART:** I don't know the linear dimension. Ryan, has that been something that we've looked at yet in the ...

15 **MR HOWES:** We haven't calculated exactly the number of bollards but it would be over a kilometre [unintelligible 00:29:17] going down that eastern edge of the site. So, when you're spacing them every, sort of around 2 metres, there'll be a lot of bollards.

20 **MR SMITH:** Yes. And do you know often how wide is the section that is to the, you know, further away from the homes than the road carriageway? And presumably there's a sealed road, then there's a gutter on the edge of the sealed road, I'm guessing, and then there's an area where you wouldn't have a footpath if there were people who had homes there, but there's no – there wouldn't be a footpath, it'll just be native vegetation of some form which needs to be kept low for the purpose of the asset protection zone. Do you know how wide that strip is that would have to be maintained?

25 **MS LOCKART:** We'd have to measure on the plan.

**MR HOWES:** Yes. It varies with the APZ. The APZ [unintelligible 00:30:12].

30 **MR SMITH:** Right. Would it be possible for you to just, after the meeting, just quickly look up the plan and just give us the min/max range for that width? I'm just trying to get a sense of how much we're talking about, and the length would be helpful. Because I'm just trying to find a practical solution for all parties.

35 **MR OPACIC:** I mean, Simon, from our point of view, we'd be extremely happy if we didn't have to put them in at all. I mean, [unintelligible 00:30:39]. But on that point, where – Rebecca, do you, where did the bollards come from – was that an RFS requirement or was that back in the day, or was it a Council requirement?

40 I would have thought that if you put timber bollards there, you're providing an obstruction to a hazard in an emergency situation. That's sort of my thought scenario, and I think that's a stance that RFS has in generally, or has on another development that we're working on. So, I just don't know, who did that requirement actually come from? Does anyone know or was ...

45 **MS LOCKART:** I'd have to go back to the original assessment.

**MR OPACIC:** Okay. It might be worthwhile having a look at that.

**MR ASH:** Yes, I would think it's come from Council, not from the RFS.

**MR OPACIC:** Yes.

5 **MR HOWES:** My recollection of that, it was many years ago, but my recollection is that it was a Council [unintelligible 00:31:32].

10 **MR SMITH:** Okay, well, leave it with us, we'll ask Council for its information about that. We'll see what we get. Anyway, you've explained your position on that, which is helpful. Now, back to is there any other issues? Richard –

**MR ASH:** I just say get this done.

15 **MR SMITH:** Of course. Yes, if what the State Government wants is housing supply, so I understand that. Any further points from you?

**MR ASH:** No.

20 **MR SMITH:** Great. All right. Well, I'd like to thank you all very much for your time this morning. And if you could just get through to us quick, don't spend a lot of time on it, just the minimum and maximum width of where the APZ extends past the road carriageway, and the length, that would be very helpful.

25 **MR OPACIC:** No problem. We'll get that through. Thank you for your time, really appreciate it.

**MR SMITH:** Okay. Excellent. Thank you very much.

[Multiple people say thank you etc.]

30 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**