



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: 21 ALPINE ASH WAY AND 5 MELLIODORA PLACE, TRALEE
(PP-2024-1370) – GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW GR-2025-16

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL:	DUNCAN MARSHALL AM (Chair)
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	BRAD JAMES ISAAC CLAYTON
QUEANBEYAN PALERANG REGIONAL COUNCIL:	CR KENRICK WINCHESTER (Mayor) REBECCA RYAN PAT WILLIAMS ANNIE SHUMAKER
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	2:00PM – 2:45PM MONDAY, 18 th MAY 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR DUNCAN MARSHALL: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mayor. Good afternoon, officers. I think we have everybody who is going to attend this meeting – is that correct, from Council’s side?

MR PAT WILLIAMS: Yes, it looks to be.

MR MARSHALL: I can see nodding. All right. Well, that’s terrific. Well, welcome, and thank you for making time to meet with us today. I’ve got a little bit of opening statement to make and to provide some of the ground rules, and so, let me work through that and then we’ll turn to whether Council wants to make an opening submission or start making some general comments of the like. Is that acceptable?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, yes.

MR MARSHALL: Terrific. Well, just to explain, I am Duncan Marshall, I’m the Commissioner undertaking – oh, I’m probably, well, I’m going to explain that in a second. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Gadigal land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all lands from which we meet virtually today and pay my respect to Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Gateway Determination Review for 21 Alpine Ash Way and 5 Melliadora Place, Tralee (PP-2024-1370) currently before the Commission for advice.

My name is Duncan Marshall, and I am the Chair of this single-member Commission Panel. We are also joined by Bradley James (who waves there) and Isaac Clayton from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today’s meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission’s website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission’s consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice.

It is important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate to do so. If you are asked a question and are 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 and that the Panel considers requires a formal response to. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

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

5 So, we will now begin, and may I ask each member joining from Council to please introduce yourself and, if applicable, provide a verbal declaration of any actual or potential personal interest that you may have in the project. Thank you very much.

10 **MR WILLIAMS:** All right-y, I might start. My name is Pat Williams, Acting Manager of Strategic Planning here at QPRC. I have no conflicts.

MR MARSHALL: Thank you.

15 **MS ANNIE SHUMAKER:** I'm Annie Shumaker, Senior Strategic Planning with QPRC, and I also have no interest.

MR MARSHALL: Thank you very much.

20 **CR KENRICK WINCHESTER:** QPRC Mayor, Kenrick Winchester, and I have no conflicts.

MR MARSHALL: Terrific, all right, thank you very much.

25 **MR WILLIAMS:** Just one more, sorry, Duncan. And Rebecca.

MR MARSHALL: Oh, sorry.

30 **MS REBECCA RYAN:** Thank you. I'm sorry, I was just in the lobby for a bit. My name is Rebecca Ryan and I'm the General Manager, and I have no conflict of interest to declare.

35 **MR MARSHALL:** Okay, thank you very much, and welcome, and thank you for joining us. So, we might begin substantively and I guess provide an opportunity for Council if it wishes to make an opening statement to the Commission about this matter.

MR WILLIAMS: I think I will start. I do actually have a presentation that kind of takes us through the agenda, if you don't mind.

40 **MR MARSHALL:** Sure. I'll just check, do we have that – a copy of that?

MR ISAAC CLAYTON: No, I don't believe so. That can be – following the meeting, if you can just send that through, that will form part of the transcript for this meeting.

45 **MR WILLIAMS:** Sure.

MR BRAD JAMES: And Duncan, sorry, I think I should have sharing on, so Pat should be – let me know if there's any problems, but it should be over to you to share.

MR MARSHALL: And just to reiterate that that will become part of the public record of the meeting, so it will be publicly available as well.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm happy with that. Yes. Wonderful.

MR MARSHALL: Whenever you're ready, Pat.

MR WILLIAMS: Sorry, we're a Teams organisation, so just bear with me here.

MR MARSHALL: That's all right. Technology come sometimes create interesting moments.

MR WILLIAMS: All right-y, everyone can see a lovely PowerPoint presentation title screen there?

MR MARSHALL: Yes.

MR WILLIAMS: Wonderful, wonderful. So, I'll move on through the introductions but essentially, we're here to review a planning proposal by Village Building Company at the address as mentioned, 21 Alpine Ash Way and Melliodora Close, down Tralee.

So, just a quick recap to everybody about the planning proposal. So, Village Building Company were looking at doing an LEP amendment to add an additional seniors housing and multi-dwelling housing as a use within an area that was currently zoned RE1 or a Recreational area, jacketed as a buffer for the site, which we'll talk about soon.

In the slide here, you'll see just a bit of the proposal history and process down the bottom.

MR MARSHALL: We haven't yet moved on. We're still on the title slide.

MR WILLIAMS: Interesting.

MR MARSHALL: Is somebody else driving, I mean, I wonder if –

MR WILLIAMS: One moment. How's that?

MR MARSHALL: Thank you, now we're on 'Quick recap'.

MR WILLIAMS: Beautiful. Apologies.

MR MARSHALL: That's all right.

MR WILLIAMS: As I mentioned, here is just a brief run through the history of the proposal, which I won't take up much time on because I'm sure you've got the summary there.

So, for visual context for the visual learners like myself, you'll see here an aerial image to the left showing the Hume Industrial Estate which lies in Canberra, and then what is the beginning of the Tralee residential development there on the right side of the yellow line, and then the red oblong being the subject site that we're talking about today. On the right-hand image here, this is the current zoning at the moment, showing that RE2, again the zoning that reflects the buffer that's been strategically in place, and the residential zone to the extent of the actual full land release development.

In terms of brief strategic context, this has had a lot of strategic planning and is ingrained in our kind of council; here are two of the pillar documents for this development, being the South Jerra Structure Plan and also the Queanbeyan City Residential and Economic Land Strategy. Now, they're both showing the corridor here, the buffer corridor in the residential just in the – again, these are high-level strategic documents just being generic kind of locators also showing the ACT and Hume.

Now, with my presentation today I am going to do it in a certain way that is that you would have read in the documentation that Council staff put forward a proposal at the Council meeting to refuse or not to proceed with the planning proposal, and then Council lodged a contrary motion to put it through to the Gateway Determination. And then subsequently during the gateway opportunity to provide comments, Council again provided a letter in support that was endorsed by the Council.

So, for the point of this presentation, I'm going to put the two arguments together; that is, my planning officer context, and then we'll jump into the actual Council context in there, and we'll discuss at the end of the presentation.

So, I'll begin with my professional Council Officer assessment here. So, in here I've just tried to break down as easily I can for this presentation, and again, this will be provided publicly, a kind of ministerial directions and regional plan consistencies and inconsistencies that we flagged during our assessment of the planning proposal.

So, generic kind of consistency with bushfire protection, contamination, and transport. Again, highlighting this inconsistency kind of with business and industrial zone direction, talking about the conflicting uses. In there as well, we're also having down here in the bottom, second-last dot point here, around the sensitive receivers around industrial land – we'll talk about that a bit further in the presentation.

So, for this site here, there was really no specific strategic context for this area of the Tralee development to be developed into something like this. And that was mainly noting that distance to the Hume Industrial Estate and maintaining that minimum 250-metre buffer that is to the industrial land. The 250-metre number comes from the minimum standard of the EPA guidelines, noting that we have next door in Tralee the Downer and Capital asphalt plants as well as a concrete batching plant, but we do realise as well that the site also has some lower intensity industrial uses such as large-scale logistics, removalists, and some kind of radio signal facilities of lower impact.

So, I've been talking about the buffer zone and that really is one of the pillars to this area down here, and that is to do with the impacts to the residential so close, and it's

also protecting kind of the – not eroding the way the industrial development that is in Canberra. So, the permitted uses in there include heavy industry uses, again, such as asphalt plants, and can look at chemical manufacturing and things like that. Us as a planning authority didn't want to build anything there that would go, "No, you can't actually use the site as it's zoned for," and it's vice versa where we'd be pretty upset as well if we had an industrial area in Canberra put resi on the other side.

So, we thought that the RE2 Recreation zone, which does permit some uses within the zone, and that includes the town centre and the small commercial core a little bit south, was the most appropriate kind of buffer use between the resi and industrial.

So, ultimately we decided that whilst there was some positives out of the planning proposal, that is increasing housing within the area, seniors living, the site itself just wasn't suitable and didn't stack up strategically, noting the inconsistencies with the strategic merit there at the top left. And yes, it's around that kind of – the seniors living being that vulnerable population, putting them closer to the hazardous industry was a concern.

As well as – I didn't mention further on in there – is the actual land release has a dwelling cap at the moment due to servicing constraints. That is, that there is one road in and out at the moment until a second access, which we're calling Dunns Creek Road, is resolved. So, at the moment, 1,500 dwelling cap put on there, this planning proposal didn't really consider the cap because the urban release area had already been kind of designed to reach that cap already.

Apart from that, the recommendation from us was, yes, to not support, and then we went to Council, and then that's pretty much the officer's brief assessment there.

Now, on the other side is the councillor/elected official decision. They noted a number of very reasonable comments around the current housing crisis at the moment, our need to provide housing, we've got our state targets that we're required to meet. Noting that we haven't had many new senior housing developments recently in the Queanbeyan area. What else have we got ... There was also the intent of the developer to provide 10% of the yields of this as community housing in accordance with the SEPP, that is the 15-year timeframe, and it would also provide ...

Tralee would be at a more competitive price point for the Canberra region as well, and Village has explained that throughout all their documentation that, yes, they sit in that kind of smaller lot size, a bit more affordable for the pricing out that's going on at the moment, and we acknowledge that.

So, our elected officials made some comments around the impacts of the industrial land and noted that, yes, there are asphalt plants in the vicinity but they're quite a way away, a bit over 400 metres away from the actual site itself. The developer, Village, providing some studies to justify that the impact would be reasonable or low if the development application were put in and there were some design considerations towards this. This is also the case around the noise from the industrial area. So, the industrial area at the moment could operate 24 hours a day, noting that the asphalt plants, some of them do in peak periods. So, that's a consideration to make, but again,

our Council noted and as well as VBC noted that acoustic impacts can be considered as part of a DA and there can be built changes made to help that impact.

5 As well it's in here that it was noted that the zones are prohibitive, that site-specific uses where well-justified can go in the use, that that kind of isn't a reason in itself to refuse the development. The future of Hume was also put into question, that having a look at around all the existing and new developments within the Hume industrial area, there's this transition away from the heavy industry, things like a saw mill closed recently, really the only heavy industry is the asphalt plants and a concrete batching
10 plant, but otherwise mostly logistics and some smaller-scale metal fabricators.

The ACT didn't really provide too strong of evidence to show that this is the only area that can hold heavy industry. Whilst, I guess my professional planning opinion is that things like Fyshwick and Mitchell in the middle and the north, they are heavily
15 watered down and aiming towards the more light industrial kind of thing, and this is really their only area for heavy industrial, or they'll have to jump over the border.

There was also some questions around kind of the master planning of this area. There wasn't really too much detail, nothing to say that the 250 metres should be fully
20 achieved in the ACT context. And also, it's shown that the ACT does allow residential development closer and, as I say, would in their directorate with an example up at Mitchell and Beard with roughly around 135 metres distance, but again it's that – the Mitchell is skewed towards the lighter medium industry, so there's probably a planning justification as to why.

25 I know the Mayor's in here at the moment, but Kenrick there was just the kind of the summary from the Council meeting, just really putting a practical eye over it, noting that it just seems like ACT have the problem and noted that there was large support from our side of the fence of what have we got down here to the left. We have Steve
30 Whan who wrote the letter of support, the actual Tralee Community Association themselves providing support, and also of course the Property Council of Australia strong advocate for increasing housing in the region.

35 So, that's the, I guess, our elected officials' point of view and what has happened and is the reason why we are here today.

Other matters for consideration, I guess, for yourself, Commissioner, is that we recently ... All this stuff has been happening in the background, us in the Strategic
40 Team understand that housing is the hot topic at the moment and we're wanting to encourage developers to think of different ways to provide housing, different types of housing within the constraints and within a reasonable strategic context.

45 So, we've been working with Village at the moment reviewing this whole Tralee urban release area, and we've actually reviewed the minimum lot sizes with what they've approved. So, this image here to the left is the existing minimum lot size map, and to the right is a proposed minimum lot size map which has recently received a gateway approval.

5 So, we're calling this planning proposal the densification planning proposal for Tralee, and that is that the developers are looking to provide all the way down to 250 square metre lots, where they hadn't really before, to provide for more townhouse-style development, smaller dwellings to provide a little bit cheaper price point but also increase yield to really make most of this urban area down here, as well as walking away from things like thousand square metre lots, yes, moving down to more something that's a competitive price point for the market they're trying to capture.

10 **MR MARSHALL:** Mr Williams, could I just interrupt you for a moment there. Am I right in thinking – sorry, oh ... If you go back to the previous slide, am I right in thinking to the middle-left side of those maps we see the buffer zone preserved in planning arrangement?

15 **MR WILLIAMS:** Correct.

MR MARSHALL: Thank you.

20 **MR WILLIAMS:** Yes. As the Acting Manager here at Strategic and for this area, I always advocate that this buffer area is a foundation to why this development got approved, the 250, we don't want to erode the capability of our neighbours in the ACT from a professional planning point of view.

25 And now we also have within the buffer area is this town centre, that is the E1 that's approved and about to get built. And then to the south of the town centre, we have some additional permitted uses over the landfill, so like some commercial-type development, which we're tweaking a little bit as part of the densification PP to improve some development controls to allow your big box retailers to go in there – your JB HiFi, your Pet Barn, things that are just that nice transition from the heavy industrial to some easily managed commercial and then some –

30 **MR MARSHALL:** Sorry, Mr Williams, can I just clarify what you're saying there, that in that RE2 zone to the southwest, you've got some permitted uses, big box factory or big box warehouse or whatever, yes, but they are permitted and they are consistent with the RE2 zoning.

35 **MR WILLIAMS:** Yes, they would be.

40 **MR MARSHALL:** Okay. All right. Thank you. So, does that conclude your presentation, Mr Williams?

MR WILLIAMS: It does, it does, sorry, I made a little bit brief just so that we could have more of a chat

45 **MR MARSHALL:** No, no, that's perfectly fine. Well, are there others from Council, Mr Mayor, is there anybody else who wants to at this stage make a brief opening comment? Yes, Mr Mayor?

CR WINCHESTER: Thank you, and I will just keep it brief. I just want to reiterate the fact that all but one councillor in our Council supported this going to a Gateway

Determination. Mr Williams has just gone through a number of the, you know, a lot of the issues that came up in the Council meeting. I'm sure you may even review the footage of that Council meeting, if you wanted to, to run through, so I don't need to repeat all of that again.

5

Just one of the things that I talked about a fair bit or I found it a bit galling that, it just seems as inconsistencies in some of the planning advice that came from the ACT Government in relation to what they'd like to see in New South Wales and not actually implementing it within their own – on their side of the border, and what's good for the goose doesn't seem to be good for the gander. And the fact that literally the only negative feedback this proposal had received at that point in time was coming out of the ACT. It was supported by the RFS. It was supported by Transport for NSW, and, yes ...

10

15

So, I just want to reiterate it has a strong support of the elected councillors as well as our state member, Steve Whan, who put in a letter of support as well.

20

MR MARSHALL: Thank you very much. I don't think we'll be straying into the consistency of the ACT Government's planning, but anyway. Actually, Mr Williams, there was one immediate question which springs off your presentation – and thank you very much to all of the Council for that presentation which I found a very helpful summary of the situation. But there was one question which arose out of the Gateway Review Report by the Village Building Company, and I think I'm remembering correctly, where it asserts (rightly or wrongly) that Council wrote a letter asserting that the Council Officer Assessment was flawed, or some words to those effect. Do you recall such a statement, if I'm remembering correctly, and do you have any response to that idea?

25

30

MR WILLIAMS: I'm sure a developer thinks every decision that doesn't go their way is flawed. I think that's my comment. I don't directly the comments in there, no, water off a duck's back, I think. But I can take it on notice if you like, then do a bit more of a search.

35

MR MARSHALL: Yes, let us check again and see whether it's an important question to ask, and if I think it is helpful, then we will put that in writing and ask for a more formal response.

40

So, if I might turn to questions from my side. And we're still in the midst of working through the material, we've done a fair bit of reading and reviewing, and of course we'll be on site on Friday, myself and Mr James, and we'll have a look at the site at that point. But for the moment, there are some questions bubbling around in our mind, so if I might just work through those and see whether you have any thoughts or responses now. And again, if you need to take your answers or the questions on notice, please do, we don't expect perfect answers at this moment.

45

So, the first question. Does Council have any comments on the proposal's consistency with the – I've got SJRMP 2025, which I can probably convert for you.

MR CLAYTON: South Jerrabomberra Regional Master – sorry, South Jerrabomberra Regional Jobs Master Plan.

5 **MR MARSHALL:** Thank you, yes. So, does Council have any comments on the proposal's consistency with that document?

MR WILLIAMS: We'll have to take it on notice. We've got multiple layers of master planning and regional documents in. Yes, I'll take that one on notice and I'll get that back to you by Friday.

10 **MR MARSHALL:** Actually, I'm going to jump slightly in my questioning because that provokes me to ask a general question. I mean, as with all matters, there are quite a lot of documents to get your head around in this matter. I'm wondering whether you have a view about, of the many planning and strategic documents which are available, 15 which are those that formally apply to the planning proposal. I wonder if you have a view or a response to that?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes. It would be the main two, I guess, documents would be the South Jerra Structure Plan, is the main one, and then it would be the South 20 Jerrabomberra Master Plan which is within the DCP itself. So, the South Jerra (or SJ) Structure Plan 2013, South Jerra DCP Master Plan 2015. They're kind of the main more, I guess, most recent documents, more live (on a strategic level) documents that we're using practically. And I think Village would agree with that as well.

25 **MR MARSHALL:** Okay. I mean, some people put a lot of document references into their comments, and some are called draft or whatever, and so it's just interesting to see what people regard as the formal basis for decision making space.

30 To move on, does Council have any comment on this proposal causing land use conflict with the possible intensification of the Hume industrial area, and I mean intensification in terms of consistency with current zoning.

MR WILLIAMS: Intensification of the industrial area or intensification of the ...?

35 **MR MARSHALL:** I'm thinking the industrial area has a certain zoning at the moment and we're being told that the current character is not necessarily as intensive or polluting or creating problems as it might be. What would happen or would there be land use conflicts if development took place to fully develop in accordance with the zoning master plan in terms of the type of industry that's allowed by that zoning?

40 **MR WILLIAMS:** All right. I'll answer it from both perspectives. That is, I'll start if Tralee, oh sorry, if the Hume Industrial Estate were to change character in that that more intense use be ...

45 **MR JAMES:** I think more intense industrial uses, Pat. I know you mentioned asphalt plant and concrete batching, but if that was to become more intense, more use, longer hours, more noise, etcetera.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes. Well, it'll just impact on the amenity and also the health issues of the site itself, and that's why we have that 250-metre buffer. Now, a buffer area increases depends on the intensity of the use. So, things like a batching plant within New South Wales case law, you'll see that these buffers go up to 1,000 metres square, depending on hours of operation and intensity. Now, I'm not saying these uses in the Hume industrial area are that intense, but that's kind of the sliding scale which is determined by consultants, usually during the PP, the zoning or the DA.

So, what that would mean is that the development, yes, it can, new seniors living, the new townhouses can accommodate some building design, double/triple glazed windows, better quality efficiency – yes, they can do all those things that might help. But if there was to increase intensity in an industrial area, it only helps to a certain point and then there'll just be impacts.

MR MARSHALL: So, it would be fair to say that there's the potential for land use conflict.

MR WILLIAMS: Absolutely. Yes.

MR MARSHALL: All right. I wonder if Council have any comments on the suitability of the Proponent's Air Quality Report as a justification for the suitability of the proposal?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes. So, it is – well, they're professional consultants, so we have to – we're not professional air consultants here, so it does have a heavy weight in the decision, but it's all a slight bit of guessing work and it also is the context as it is at the moment. So, I believe the report didn't put in context, say, if it was to increase, the uses were to come closer, the batching plant was to be closer and the impacts of the air quality from then, I don't think was modelled. It was just modelling the existing development at the moment, which looks quite favourable, and I can't argue with that.

MR MARSHALL: All right. Thank you. I mean, other Council officers and Mr Mayor, if you wish to add further comments, please wave at me to indicate that you wish to do so.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, I would put on that, yes, the Council is the ... I'm coming from the professional planning point of view, and the lovely Mayor here is advocating for the community, so ...

MR MARSHALL: Yes. And I mean, the Commission fully appreciates that Council has made its elected decision in this matter. I suppose we're taking that as one piece of information and burrowing behind it a bit and getting the professional staff view a little bit as well.

Mr Clayton and Mr James, at this point do you have any comments, any questions that ...?

MR JAMES: Ah, yes, just a couple of quick ones, Duncan, if that's all right.

MR MARSHALL: Yes, please.

MR JAMES: Pat, you mentioned that there's that space, I think it was E1 to the south with some commercial potential mixed-use development happening. Are there any other – are you aware of any other planning proposals or applications for development in that buffer?

MR WILLIAMS: Ah, no. No. Just the current densification PP as I mentioned before was introducing these, yes, large box retailers as another use in there. Yes. In the same area there, not the full context, yes.

MR JAMES: Yes, thank you. And one of the reasons for the Department making the decision that the planning proposal shouldn't proceed past Gateway Determination was the planning proposal sets an undesirable precedent for proposals via the sensitive uses within the buffer area that would erode the effectiveness of the buffer. Do you have any comments on that?

MR WILLIAMS: It's a great point by the Department. It is obviously the precedence in planning, that is, once one thing gets approved the doorways open, the floodgates open as precedent is set. So, we're just, again, I drive back to that 250-metre buffer, we are holding a hard line as we always have for this site here. No to residential development and no to uses where that can't accommodate that kind of sensitive receiver.

MR JAMES: Thank you. That's it from me, Duncan. Isaac?

MR MARSHALL: Thank you.

MR CLAYTON: Oh, and nothing from me, no.

MR MARSHALL: All right. I mean, my profession is not a planner in this space, so forgive me if I look at it from a fresh eyes perspective, but it seems to me that a lot of the issues being raised here are arguing for a performance approach to the assessment or the agreement to the planning proposal.

And I'm wondering what is your view about whether the planning system allows for consideration of ... On the other side you have what perhaps others would argue is the prescriptive zoning, the prescriptive buffer zone in that location. I'm wondering if you have a view about whether the planning system allows for a performance approach or a performance assessment in this particular case or not?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, it does. Yes. And that's what they're trying to go for here. I think my comment would be, is that we're providing that hard line on that residential again and uses at sensitive receivers. But other uses we would be open minded to, it just isn't the type of development they're after.

MR MARSHALL: Right, right, okay, good, thank you. Well, that pretty much exhausts my questions and I am looking at Isaac and Brad to –

MR WILLIAMS: I think I might make just one summary comment if I could please just to drive home –

5 **MR MARSHALL:** Let me come back to summaries. I'm just checking that we've got all the questions asked from our side?

MR JAMES: Nothing more from me, Duncan. Just that question on notice, we'll send something through in writing. But over to you, Duncan and Pat.

10 **MR MARSHALL:** Okay, thank you. And so, let me invite Mr Mayor, council officers, let me invite you now, because we have a few minutes left in the allotted time, if you wish to make any closing statements or observations. So, Mr Williams, you may be the first cab off the rank.

15 **MR WILLIAMS:** All right-y then. So, we work very well with Village Building Company. At QPRC, I guess, we like to maintain our relationships both with the ACT and our developers in the area. We note that housing is needed in the area and when we work together, better planning outcomes happen. And that's what we're trying to achieve here with Village. We're working together and we've gone, "Oh, actually no,
20 this isn't a good outcome, we're disagreeing on this one, but we'll move on professionally, we'll move on." And that's why we've done this new planning proposal, the densification PP, again, we were talking about to go ...

25 It's not here, we're not endorsing, let's look elsewhere, let's look at other avenues to achieve what both we want here as Council – more housing, more diverse housing – and obviously the money for the developer. And, yes.

MR MARSHALL: Ms Ryan, I think you put your hand up, so ...

30 **MS RYAN:** Thank you, Commissioner. Yes, look, buffers are certainly important, and precedents of our planning system are important. The South Jerrabomberra Regional Jobs Precinct Master Plan of course is significant, however, this area of South Jerrabomberra and Tralee has always been for residential, and to support that Regional Jobs Precinct area.

35 The industrial area of Hume for ACT will never become a major industrial area of the ACT, it is too close to other residents and residential areas, let alone the Tralee area. I appreciate we're working with Village and working to accommodate the growth needs of the region, which already in that area have been constrained by the airport landing
40 areas, and so that's sort of constrained by that as well. But anyway, your consideration of the matter is certainly appreciated.

MR MARSHALL: Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr Mayor, I think you were waving, so ...

45 **CR WINCHESTER:** Yes, I guess, obviously I'm an elected councillor, I'm not a planning professional, sometimes what the staff put forward isn't always exactly what the councillors agree on, and perhaps that's why the Planning Minister is going to take our planning powers off us, but we've still got some for now.

I guess, just with this one, and I said during the Council meeting, in my 15 years on Council I've never seen a proposal for seniors housing in our area. It's sadly lacking. We always talk about the housing mix in our Council area and the need for affordable housing and for those that have grown up and raised their families in Queanbeyan, this is the first opportunity I've seen in nearly 15 years on Council for it to actually happen. And yes, it has the support of the elected Council and our state member. I'm not sure if that's going to carry much weight, but it does.

MR MARSHALL: We certainly, or I certainly note elected Council's support for this planning proposal, so thank you very much, that's appreciated. And Ms Shumaker, I haven't given you the opportunity to speak so far, but I'm just wondering in terms of completeness whether you wanted to say anything or not.

MS SHUMAKER: Ah, no, thank you. I think everything's been covered. Thank you.

MR MARSHALL: Thank you very much. Well, I think we're bumping up against our allotted time. So, I think we will now conclude this meeting if we may, and as I look for confirmation, we will follow up with a written question it seems, just to frame that formally for you and give you timelines and things like that. So, thank you very much for your time today. Thank you all.

MR WILLIAMS: Thanks, Commissioner.

MS RYAN: Thank you. Commissioner.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED