



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: MINGARA RECREATION CLUB SENIORS HOUSING, TUMBI UMBI
(SSD-63475709)**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

PANEL: SUELLEN FITZGERALD (Chair)
ALEX O'MARA

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRAD JAMES
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING, HOUSING
& INFRASTRUCTURE:** PAULINA WYTHES
PETER MCMANUS

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 11.00AM – 12.00AM
WEDNESDAY, 10th JUNE 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD Great. Well, let's kick off. And I've got a short statement to make at the start of this meeting, as you'd ... Good morning and welcome. I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Wangal land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

Our meeting today is to discuss the Mingara Recreation Club Senior Housing state significant development currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, the Trustee for Pariter Mingara Unit Trust, proposes to construct and operate a seniors housing development comprising 215 independent living units and a 39-bed residential care facility in the Mingara Recreational Club precinct at 14 Mingara Drive, Tumby Umbi in the Central Coast LGA.

My name is Suellen Fitzgerald. I'm the Chair for this Panel and I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Alex O'Mara, and also by Brad James and Tahlia Hutchinson from the IPC office.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure 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 only 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 Alex and I to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, you can 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. Any subsequent response or information provided 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 they don't speak over the top of each other, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript.

So, let's get going. Paulina?

MS PAULINA WYTHES: Yes. Good morning, commissioners. My name is Paulina Wythes, Director of the Social and Diverse Housing Assessments Team. With me today is Peter McManus, Team Leader from my team. Thanks for inviting us here today to brief you on the Mingara project. We'll start with a brief introduction and overview of the site, if that's okay, commissioners, and then move onto the key matters in the agenda.

MS FITZGERALD: Thank you.

MS WYTHES: Just to recap, as you're aware, changes were made to the Planning System SEPP last year, such that the Independent Planning Commission is no longer

the consent authority for seniors housing where there are more than 50 objections, and the Minister is the consent authority. However, as this project was exhibited before the changes were made last year and would have typically been referred to the Independent Planning Commission for determination, the project has been referred to the IPC for determination under Minister's delegation, so this is similar to other recent projects of this scale.

As outlined in the Department's Assessment Report that we provided to the Commission, we've assessed the project on its merits in accordance with the requirements under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, and we've carefully considered the issues and submissions from members of the public and the Applicant's response to issues.

On that basis, we've concluded the proposal is acceptable and recommends the proposal to be approvable, subject to conditions. We consider the project supports the government priorities for well-located housing, delivering 215 independent living units and a 39-bed residential care facility meeting the changing needs of the population in that particular locality.

The development is permissible with consent and compatible with the existing land uses in the existing Mingara Recreational Club and area. There will be high residential amenity for future residents, as part of our assessment. In terms of the issues that we'll cover in our presentation, in terms of the ability for the Mingara precinct to efficiently function in terms of existing parking demand, we consider that the existing demand can be met and car parking for other events that may happen in that precinct are also able to be met in the precinct. But we can cover this off later in the presentation.

We've also assessed other issues, including flood impacts, landscaping, drainage corridors, and from that perspective, we also consider the project to be acceptable.

So, on that note, I think you sent through an agenda with a number of issues, so we've – Peter's framed a brief presentation where we can cover off each of those key issues and perhaps pause for any questions you may have on those issues. Does that sound okay?

MS FITZGERALD: Sounds great. Thanks, Paulina. Thanks, Peter. And we might, if it suits you, Peter, just ask any questions as we go along your slide pack.

MR PETER MCMANUS: Yes, that's fine, thanks Commissioner.

MS FITZGERALD: Okay.

MR MCMANUS: Okay. So, just a very quick overview of the site context. So, as you might be aware, the site forms part of the existing Mingara Recreation Club precinct, which comprises the Mingara Recreation Club, which contains the restaurant facilities, club facilities, aquatic centres and a bowling area, a five-storey hotel, the Mingara Recreational Athletics Centre, and a future childcare centre which was recently approved by the Central Coast Council.

The development is located in the southwestern corner of the broader precinct and is currently used as grassed overflow car parking associated with the athletics track. Within the immediate context particularly to the south and west lies low-density housing, including the Glengara Retirement Village which actually has an access through into the Mingara precinct along its northern boundary into the southern boundary of the Mingara precinct.

The site is just under 3 hectares in size. The development area itself is roughly about 4,800 square metres and – oops, sorry, I’ll move on. So, it’s just under 3 hectares in size and is currently void of any vegetation along the main development area except for the drainage corridor along the western and southern boundaries.

In terms of the flooding, the site is currently subject to 1% annual exceedance probability flooding and probable maximum flood events. And the western and southern boundaries are actually registered for drainage easement purposes.

In terms of the statutory context, the site is zoned RE2 Private Recreation under the Central Coast LEP. And seniors housing is permissible with consent on the land under both the Housing SEPP and the Central Coast LEP. But the Central Coast LEP does not prescribe a maximum building height or floor space ratio. So, just in terms of the proposal ...

MS WYTHES: Sorry, Pete, did you have a presentation up or did you want me to try and ...

MR MCMANUS: I can find that. Sorry, I just immediately remembered about a presentation as I was speaking to nothing, I apologise for that.

MS WYTHES: All right.

MR MCMANUS: I’ll just get that now. [Pause 00:08:33 to 00:08:52] Okay. [Pause]

MS FITZGERALD: How’s it going?

MR MCMANUS: Just got it now.

MS FITZGERALD: Oh, great. Mm-hm.

MR MCMANUS: Can you all see that?

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, we’ve got it. Thanks, Peter.

MR MCMANUS: Sorry about that.

MS FITZGERALD: All good. So, we’ve gone through the general site, gone through all of that. Great.

MR MCMANUS: Location. So, just quickly on the statutory context, as I said, it’s RE2 Private Recreation under Central Coast LEP. There is no maximum height or FSR

prescribed under the LEP. Just important to note the Seniors Housing SEPP has some requirements regarding seniors housing on land zoned RE2 Private Recreation and where there's an existing club as well.

5 Okay, so just a very quick brief overview of the proposal. As we're aware, the site is relatively void of any vegetation, there is the grassed overflow car park at the moment. For the proposal, there will be some site preparation works and minor excavation and earthworks as well as broader landscaping, internal car parking and roads, minor roadwork within the seniors and to the club precinct.

10 The development primarily will result in 13 two-storey villas along the southern and western boundaries of the site, with four 6–7-storey residential flat buildings proposed central to the site, and that will comprise in total 215 independent living units and a 39-bed residential care facility, as well as some ancillary wellness, multi-function spaces and food and drink premises. As well as a temporary sales suite which will be located adjacent to the development area in between the site and the existing hotel, and that will deal with some marketing and sales, and then the subsequent division of the development itself after the fact.

20 Okay. So, we'll just go through the key assessment matters that came through and were outlined on the agenda. So, I won't necessarily repeat them there, but that's what we'll go through.

25 So, in terms of the first matter. So, for car parking and access, under the Housing SEPP the development requires, in terms of the non-discretionary development standard under the Housing SEPP, the proposal met and provided all the parking required wholly within the boundary of the proposed development. In terms of what was required, 283 spaces were required under the non-discretionary development standards, and 309 spaces in total will be provided, including 8 spaces for the residential care facility and 301 for the independent living units.

30 The Department acknowledges the proposed development would result in the loss of the existing grassed overflow parking area currently used by the athletics track users. Notwithstanding, the Department is satisfied that the parking requirements of the athletics track can be satisfactorily accommodated by the existing parking provided across the Mingara precinct, specifically the parking demands for all users across the precinct, excluding the seniors housing, has a peak demand of 778 spaces, and that is less than the total number of spaces currently available across the precinct, being 802 spaces.

40 Management of larger events held at the athletics track are proposed to be managed by an Event Traffic Management Plan. This includes the management and use of the proposed 169 space overflow parking area. The Department notes that the proposed overflow parking area is subject to low flood hazard during the 1% AEP event, however, these parking areas are intended to function as informal short-term overflow parking during these events and would be managed through the Event Management Plan.

45 Were there any questions about parking?

MS FITZGERALD: Just looking at that plan you've showed us, Peter.

MR MCMANUS: Yes.

5

MS FITZGERALD: I assume that that parking, that sort of nose-to-curb parking from the left-hand side of that map, that's sort of the ambulance, disabled, etc., etc.

MR MCMANUS: Correct.

10

MS FITZGERALD: Yes.

MR MCMANUS: So, they're – sorry.

15

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, go on, please.

MR MCMANUS: I was just going to say, so those works are what we refer to as the new public domain interface upgrade works that have been proposed by the Applicant to, I guess, re-vitalise that interface at the athletics track, because it obviously will be disturbed during these works. As part of that, they propose to formalise and provide more formal spaces, in particular disabled spaces, formal drop-off spaces for parents for track users, and improved bus parking area as you can see there with the turning bay at the interface there.

20

MR MCMANUS: In addition to that, they're proposing upgraded pedestrian access including pedestrian crossings and things like that, which don't currently exist out there on site.

25

MS FITZGERALD: Right.

MR MCMANUS: And that will help provide access to the broader precinct car parking within the locality.

30

MS FITZGERALD: Okay, thanks Peter. And I presume that those works are at the start of the development program as well too, because they'll fence off the development site so that parking will be lost right at the start ...

35

MR MCMANUS: Immediately, correct, yes. So, quickly moving onto access. As noted, there were the public domain improvements proposed. So, broadly speaking, Commissioner, these works include amending that existing access loop as well, so that will be reworked and improved. And as we mentioned previously, the five disabled parking spaces will be relocated closer to the main entrance of the athletics track.

40

MR MCMANUS: And there's improved loading and servicing area for the athletics track maintenance vehicles. As you can see, the road continues along, finishing in a cul-de-sac head. At the moment, that's quite an informal access area. The bus bay turning area, which we noted, general improvements from a landscape and interface perspective as well as those improved pedestrian connections across the site.

45

We note that this obviously does impact on the overflow car parking for the athletics track users, and they have predominantly used the grassed area for parking, broadly speaking. Notwithstanding, the existing parking within the Mingara precinct, both to the east and to the south is only approximately 150 metres from the main entrance of the athletics track.

And as we mentioned before, the total demand of parking across all the site of all users can be satisfactorily accommodated by the existing car parking within the precinct. In addition to that, the Applicant's proposed the 169 additional overflow spaces which will be used when needed when the Event Traffic Management Plan is enacted for those larger events.

MS ALEX O'MARA: Can you just point out where the parent – they mentioned a parent drop-off point?

MR MCMANUS: So, it's just the two red highlighted spaces, Commissioner.

MS O'MARA: Oh, okay.

MR MCMANUS: Just the adjacent to the disabled spaces.

MS O'MARA: Okay. And can I just ask a question about the Event Management Plan condition?

MR MCMANUS: Yes.

MS O'MARA: Is your expectation that it kind of, it's broadly going to replicate the Event Management Plan that they've prepared as part of the application?

MR MCMANUS: The Event Traffic Management Plan that they've prepared primarily deals with the use of the athletics track, more so than other events that may occur within the broader Mingara Recreation Club precinct.

MS O'MARA: Yes.

MR MCMANUS: So, our expectation and based on the information provided by the Applicant would be that the Event Traffic Management Plan would be acted on in those larger events outside of normal day-to-day operations of the athletics track, and they would be governed by the existing approval in terms of what larger events they can hold.

MS O'MARA: Thank you.

MR MCMANUS: Okay. I'll just move on. Okay. Flooding and emergency evacuation. The proposed development would be flood-free during all events, and there would be no change to flood levels under the post-development scenario during the 1% AEP on site or off site.

5 The Department acknowledges that there would be a minor increase in off-site flooding during a PMF event. And this has been modelled between approximately 21 millimetres and 89 millimetres. Specifically, residential properties to the north of the site beyond Wyong Road would experience a 21 to 48-millimetre increase in PMF flooding, and industrial properties again beyond Wyong Road would experience 23 to 89-millimetre increases in PMF flood levels.

10 Importantly, the modelled flood levels do not change the flood hazard category of the affected properties, nor will it result in any additional properties becoming flood affected. The Department notes that Council raised no concerns and were satisfied with the flood impacts of the proposed development as well as the finished floor levels. And the proposed shelter-in-place strategy for the emergency response is considered satisfactory for the development, noting surrounding roads – sorry, noting roads surrounding the Mingara precinct become inundated and the club is currently an established refuge centre.

15 Were there any questions on flooding or ...?

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Not from me. Thanks, Peter.

MR MCMANUS: Okay. I'll move on.

MS FITZGERALD: Mm-hm.

25 **MR MCMANUS:** Pedestrian safety and connectivity. So, the Department acknowledges public submissions, particularly from the athletics track users, raised quite a number of concerns regarding pedestrian safety and the use of the athletics track, particularly for the children.

30 The Department is satisfied that the proposed development and associated athletics track interface works and the pedestrian connectivity works across the precinct would deliver a safer pedestrian environment that is better connected and provides a safer outcome for all users.

35 We note that the works currently associated with the future childcare centre to the east of the athletics track will also, I guess, re-formalise the car parking area in that north of the bowling greens. There's a new pedestrian crossing, or, sorry, footpath network proposed that will link back to the athletics track. And as I mentioned before, the parking areas are about 150 metres from the athletics track and there will be pedestrian crossing infrastructure installed across the precinct to improve connections and safety.

40 **MS FITZGERALD:** Mm-hm. Thank you. Thanks.

45 **MR MCMANUS:** Vegetation management and the riparian corridor. We note Council raised concerns regarding the Vegetation Management Plan and that it did not meet its flora and fauna guidelines or demonstrated best practice standards for riparian ecological restoration, and recommended it be updated and conditioned as a mandatory document with a five-year maintenance period.

The Department acknowledges the concerns, however, notes that a full ecological restoration of the area could compromise the corridor's ability to not only carry the flood waters but would be at conflict with bushfire management requirements, including the risk of increasing fire loads for neighbours adjoining to the west.

The Department is satisfied that the proposed Vegetation Management Plan would achieve an appropriate balance in terms of improving ecological outcomes while minimising bushfire risk, and has recommended a condition of consent requiring the implementation of the management plan and for that to be undertaken in perpetuity.

Okay. Bulk and scale. Public submissions raised concerns with regards to the heights and bulk of buildings 1 to 4 and generally had concerns around the over-development of this site and the appropriateness of the proposal given the context of the locality.

While Council raised no concerns with the height or density, it did recommend a Precinct Master Plan be prepared to guide the development of the site. The Department notes that, as we mentioned before, the Central Coast LEP does not prescribe a maximum building height or FSR control for the site. And the LEP contemplates seniors housing development at the site or within the precinct grounds itself.

The proposal includes a range of building heights up to 27 metres or 7 storeys, and an overall FSR of 1.09:1 following the finalisation of the subdivision and lot consolidation. The proposed bulk and scale of the development is considered satisfactory and appropriate for the site, noting the large urban setting and size of the Mingara precinct has allowed for a campus-scale master plan design approach.

The proposal includes varied building heights and densities, and the new seniors housing development has been purposefully located to provide a more balanced built form and legible precinct while minimising potential bulk and scale and amenity impacts by providing a sympathetic transition with taller buildings located towards the centre of the site, transitioning down to the lower two-storey villas at the interface of the adjoining one to two-storey residential development and Glengara Retirement Village.

Okay, I'll move on. Traffic impacts. Excuse me. Public submissions raised several concerns throughout the assessment with respects to increased traffic generation from the proposed development and the potential safety and congestion impacts associated. The Department notes that Council and Transport for NSW raised no concerns.

The Department notes that the modelling presented in the Applicant's traffic impact assessment demonstrates that all intersections currently operate at a level of service of either A or B, except for Mingara Drive and Tumby Road intersections which vary between the level of service of C to F. The proposed development would contribute minor increases in intersection delays, including a 12.8 second increase at the Wyong Road–Tumby Road–Watsons Avenue intersection. However, the existing level of service of nearby intersections would be maintained and would not change.

The post 10-year growth scenario shows a reduced level of service of signalised intersections at Mingara Drive and Tumby Road, but the Department considers this to

be more consistent with continued growth in the Central Coast region and not directly related to the proposal. The Department considers the proposed development would not result in an unreasonable traffic generation and that the surrounding network is capable of accommodating the proposal with minimal impacts.

5

MS FITZGERALD: Peter, just looking at that map, it's helpful. There's a lot of – everything's hanging off that Main Boulevard, isn't it?

MR MCMANUS: Of Wyong Road, yes.

10

MS FITZGERALD: Well, I'm sort of thinking of coming into the site ...

MR MCMANUS: Oh, sorry, okay, yes.

15

MS FITZGERALD: You know, the traffic circulation within the site. Everything's hanging off that Main Boulevard, I think they've called it, that leads to the club, the hotel, the childcare centre, the proposed retirement village, and the athletics track.

MR MCMANUS: Mm-hm.

20

MS FITZGERALD: Do you, you know, I mean, is some traffic going to be slipping into this site and out to the south there? It seems to go into that residential area, there's a road into that residential area.

25

MR MCMANUS: Do you mean, sorry, I'll just circle, do you mean –

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, where the cursor is.

30

MR MCMANUS: So, as I mentioned a couple of slides a little bit before, so that's actually an access-controlled gate that borders the site and Glengara Retirement Village.

MS FITZGERALD: Mm-hm.

35

MR MCMANUS: We understand that to be a, I guess, a gentlemen's and ladies' agreement between the club and the retirement village, whereby they're able to drive their vehicles from Glengara Village through and into the club. It's not for general day-to-day vehicular access or anything like that.

40

MS FITZGERALD: Right.

MR MCMANUS: In terms of any vehicles or anything like that accessing the site, they would be, I guess, locked into maintaining travel along that boulevard or that central spine along the base of the club and then out past the athletics track.

45

MS FITZGERALD: Right.

MR MCMANUS: So, there's no ability for them to exit the site to the south there via into Glengara Village at all.

MS FITZGERALD: Right. And ditto, onto Wyong Road as well too, that's just a turning circle at the end, hey?

5 **MR MCMANUS:** At this point here?

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, that point, yes.

10 **MR MCMANUS:** So, that's just a – oh, I would have to double check, but my understanding is that's a left-in/left-out onto Wyong Road. I can take that on notice for you and confirm. But it would only be traffic accessing the precinct that would enter the site, so I would assume if there's Glengara Village residents moving through the site, they would again be restricted to the same movements as patrons of the club or the seniors housing or the athletics track would be restricted to as well.

15 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thanks, Peter, and no need to come back to us with that information. It'll be in the documents.

20 **MR MCMANUS:** Okay.

MR JAMES: Suellen, I just had a quick look on Google Maps and, yes, Peter, it is a left.

25 **MR MCMANUS:** Okay.

MS FITZGERALD: Great. Okay.

MR MCMANUS: All right.

30 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you. So, that's traffic. Mm-hm.

35 **MR MCMANUS:** Residential amenity and open space. The Department undertook a detailed assessment of the residential amenity in the proposal against the relevant provisions in the Housing SEPP, the Seniors Housing Design Guide as well as the Apartment Design Guide.

40 The Department is satisfied the proposal is generally consistent with the key criteria and design guidance, including apartment sizes and layouts, ventilation and storage requirements, and will satisfactorily provide 70% of all independent living units with 2 hours of solar access during the mid-winter, in accordance with the Housing SEPP. The Department also notes that Council raised concerns about communal open space. Just on that point, the proposal would provide future residents with just over 8,000 square metres of communal open space, and this includes 827 square metres of dedicated communal open space for the residential care facility residents.

45 In addition to that, the provision of communal open space exceeds the non-discretionary development standards required under the Housing SEPP and which sets out a minimum of 10 square metres of communal open space for residential care

facilities, equating to 390 square metres. So, we are more than double than the requirement under the SEPP for the residential care facility residents.

While there is no requirement in the Housing SEPP relating to the quantum of communal open space for ILUs, the Department is satisfied that the future residents would be provided with good amenity through the provision of the 8,000 square metres of communal open space throughout the development. We also note that each ILU will be provided with private open space areas that satisfy the minimum requirements under the Housing SEPP, exceeding the ground floor requirement of 15 square metres for private space as well as the minimum 10 square metres for balcony areas with the ILUs.

MS FITZGERALD: Mm-hm.

MR MCMANUS: Construction impacts. We note public submissions raised concerns regarding construction impacts. To address the construction impacts (excuse me) – sorry. To address construction impacts, the application was supported by a Preliminary Site Construction Management Plan which nominated hours of construction as well as no work on Sundays or public holidays, Preliminary Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan, a noise impact assessment as well as Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan.

The Department has recommended its conditions of consents to ensure construction does not cause unreasonable impact to the amenity of adjoining residents and is satisfied the construction impacts associated with the proposal can be appropriately managed. We also note the construction is proposed to occur over two stages, with Building 1 to 3 and Villas 1 to 6 being constructed first, and Building 4 and Villas 7 to 13 being constructed second.

MS FITZGERALD: Thanks, Peter. And presumably, that in Stage 1 in the conditions it'll require them to have dealt with all the access issues for the community to the athletics track.

MR MCMANUS: Athletics track?

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, before they start fencing the whole site off.

MR MCMANUS: Off the top of my head, I can't recall exactly, but we can certainly, happy to, for that type of condition to be certainly imposed on the consent.

MS FITZGERALD: Yes, yes.

MR MCMANUS: I think that's an appropriate outcome for the development and the community.

MS FITZGERALD: Thank you. We'll have a look at that when we get to the conditions in detail.

MR MCMANUS: Okay. Thank you. Community consultation. So, prior to the lodgement of the state significant development application, we note that the Applicant advised that stakeholder consultation engagement was undertaken between approximately November 2023 and February 2024. This included letter drops, a community drop-in session, presentations – a presentation, sorry, to the Glengara Retirement Village, as well as a briefing with the athletics track stakeholders and the Central Coast Academy of Sports.

A summary of the consultation and actions taken was also presented in the Applicant's EIS. Once formally lodged, the application was publicly exhibited between November 2024 and January, 50 days in total, and was placed on the NSW Portal. Relevant government agencies, Council and occupiers and landowners in the vicinity of the site were also notified about the public exhibition.

The Applicant's Response to Submission and their Amendment Report considered and responded to the submissions received during the exhibition period. The Department published the Response to Submission and the Amendment Report on the NSW Planning Portal and forwarded those to Council and Transport for NSW for further comment and review. We consider the requirements for community consultation for the application have been undertaken.

And I think the final item related to condition, I think it was B18, relating to the Housing SEPP and Schedule for Compliance. So, in accordance with Section 85 of the Housing SEPP, the Department undertook a detailed assessment of the proposal against the accessibility standards for independent living units.

The Department's assessment found that the proposal was capable of compliance, and recommended condition B18 to ensure verification of compliance is provided for the detailed design prior to the issue of any relevant Construction Certificate. This is considered a standard condition for our seniors housing developments to ensure the developer builds in accordance with the accessibility standards.

MS O'MARA: Thanks, Peter. That question was from me.

MR MCMANUS: Okay.

MS O'MARA: My question was just, like, do the standards – because I know in the report, you kind of went through that in quite a lot of detail, like each kind of standard and what they needed to do, and the condition is pretty high level.

MR MCMANUS: Yes.

MS O'MARA: And I suppose my question is, is that because they have to comply with everything in Schedule 4, or are there only some bits of it that are relevant and do we need to specify? So, it's more just me understanding how it works.

MR MCMANUS: No, yes. So, Commissioner, the difficulty with Schedule 4, I think, is their very, very detailed and prescriptive requirements.

MS O'MARA: Yes.

MR MCMANUS: It's something that in my former life I have tried to change and make it a little bit different. Unfortunately, it's not something that we got to. But the approach at the moment is that obviously applications are submitted with an Accessibility Report that goes through how the design complies with all of those standards. They are by virtue of Section 85 in the SEPP A development standard, so if they don't comply, it's a non-compliance and we'd have to deal with the 4.6 or something of that nature.

MS O'MARA: Okay.

MR MCMANUS: So, we do require them to go through in quite a lot of detail as to how they comply. The difficulty comes to, I guess, some of the more prescriptive ones where it's very, very, you know, covered X amount of millimetres from the wall and things like that. So, they're the ones we're more looking for how it can comply.

MS O'MARA: Okay.

MR MCMANUS: And hence, the requirement for this condition to go on, so that once the detailed design phase is completed, they are certifying that everything does comply, I guess, with the requirements.

MS O'MARA: Okay. Thank you for that. It's really helpful.

MR MCMANUS: That's okay. And I think that is it for us.

MS FITZGERALD: Thanks, Peter, that was great. I've got a question about ongoing communication channels within the precinct between Mingara and particularly the athletics community.

MR MCMANUS: Mm-hm.

MS FITZGERALD: Are you aware of how they structure that communication now and how they plan to in the future?

MR MCMANUS: I am not explicitly aware of how the communication structures occur. I understand the management of the club, or sorry, of the athletics track is quite a complex arrangement whereby it was funded jointly between the State, Council and I think Mingara Club, and I think with Council primarily under control of which that management has been leased back to the club. So, primarily my understanding is that all communications should be going through whoever the club manager is with the main points of contact with the athletics community.

Through general conversations and discussions with general community members over the course of the assessment, we understand there to be a number of main stakeholder groups within the athletics community, and that sometimes they don't see eye to eye on everything, and I think that's probably leading to a little bit of not disinformation

but I think there's just different agendas or different priorities at hand. So, it's soccer, athletics users, different events. So, it's quite a complex used facility at hand.

5 But we understand the primary concern to be driven by the core athletics track users, particularly around safety for children that are attending training late in the evening and things like that. And I appreciate that the site can become quite dark over that area, there isn't really any development or any activity on that side of the site at the moment; this is the broader club and the club facilities. So, I can appreciate the concerns from the parents and the carers in that regard.

10 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, thanks, Peter. We'll pursue that with the Applicant at our next meeting.

MR MCMANUS: Okay.

15 **MS FITZGERALD:** Alex, have you got any questions for the Department?

20 **MS O'MARA:** Just on the sort of consultation, I note in your Operational Plan of Management sort of condition that that they have to set out what they're going to do in relation to consultation. And there's a specific requirement about pedestrian connectivity.

MR MCMANUS: Yes.

25 **MS O'MARA:** And look, I know, I understand you haven't been that involved, so feel free if you want to take some time to have a look at this. But I suppose my question is, like, say, for example, you know, the people using the overflow car parking or the parent issues, is that condition around the pedestrian connectivity plan meant to address that, or do you ... I suppose my question is, do we think there's a need for
30 consultation more broadly as the precinct ...

MS WYTHES: Sorry, Alex, is that in respect to the development of some of these plans of management, was that the line of questioning ...?

35 **MS O'MARA:** Well, I mean, there's no sort of general requirement that they have to do a consultation plan. I mean, there's something in the Operational Management Plan that says it has to address consultation, but the way I read that, it wouldn't require them to do much other than sort of layout what they were going to do.

40 **MS WYTHES:** Yes. That's definitely a matter that we could potentially look into to adjust conditions. I know that for other conditions where construction impacts was quite of a concern, one option – I don't actually think we have it here, because that wasn't the issue – was sort of to add an element of community consultation in preparation to the plan of management.

45 **MR MCMANUS:** Is the idea that you'd like the athletics track users to have input into the best pedestrian connectivity layout or whether it will meet their needs or something like that?

MS O'MARA: Well, I just, all I'm saying is, at the moment that condition does require them to consult with the users in relation to the development of that plan. But then once they implement the plan ...

5 **MR MCMANUS:** What takes place post that.

MS O'MARA: Yes, exactly.

10 **MS FITZGERALD:** Ongoing.

MR MCMANUS: Yes.

15 **MS O'MARA:** I'm not saying I have a firm view. I was just keen to sort of understand, given the level of community interest in how this is going to work operationally, because I think it's good to consult them on the plan, but it's more like how they implement it.

20 **MS WYTHES:** Yes, I think I can see a condition (E34) that talks about the plan being reviewed and updated annually. So, one thing we could potentially, as part of that, elaborate on what that review could include.

25 **MS O'MARA:** Oh, yes. I mean, if you have suggestions about – because I don't want, I wouldn't want to impose anything unnecessary, but if there's some light-touch way of ...

MR MCMANUS: Mm-hm. Improving.

30 **MS O'MARA:** Well, of just sort of ensuring that the community continues to have a voice. I don't know, what do you think, Suellen?

35 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, well, that was sort of where I was going with this question about how they engage with the community ongoing during operations. Because the event scheduling, you know, plus the minor school carnivals and so on, all of those require quite a lot of coordination between the event organiser and the precinct manager.

MR MCMANUS: Mm-hm.

40 **MS FITZGERALD:** So, how that's going to happen. I think it's a good idea if we can incorporate it into the determination. And I'd be interested to know how they do it now on site when we speak to them, how much coordination there is.

45 **MR MCMANUS:** Okay. Happy to, yes, happy to look at other conditions or anything like that to help formulate something.

MS FITZGERALD: It will be a source of angst for parents if they've got to drop their kids late afternoon and then go and park and then come back, you know, that will be a little bit of an issue, I suspect.

MR MCMANUS: I appreciate that, yes, yes.

MS FITZGERALD: Okay. Anything else, Alex?

5 **MS O'MARA:** No, thank you for that, it was really helpful.

MS FITZGERALD: Brad, anything from you?

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

MS FITZGERALD: Okay. Paulina, is there anything else you wanted to cover off before we close out the meeting?

15 **MS WYTHES:** No, I think we covered off the key issues from the agenda. It was just we're here to take any questions, taken on board some of the comments relating the Operational Management Plan or even Event Traffic Management Plan or just sort of thinking of some of the conditions following your conversations with community members or the Applicant, we're happy to take that on notice in terms of looking at any of the conditions.

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Great. Okay.

MS WYTHES: Thank you.

25 **MS FITZGERALD:** Well, with that, we've got a bit of an early mark. So, thank you for taking us through that.

MR MCMANUS: Thank you.

30 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you. Cheers.

MS WYTHES: Thanks. Bye.

MR MCMANUS: Bye.

35 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**