



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**RE: PYMBLE LADIES' COLLEGE SECONDARY INNOVATION  
PRECINCT (SSD-79146716)**

### **COUNCIL MEETING**

|                      |                                                                                                                                                                     |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COMMISSION PANEL:    | CLARE SYKES (Chair)<br>JULIET GRANT                                                                                                                                 |
| OFFICE OF THE IPC:   | KENDALL CLYDSDALE<br>ISAAC CLAYTON                                                                                                                                  |
| KU-RING-GAI COUNCIL: | SHAUN GARLAND<br>SELWYN SEGALL<br>RATHNA RANA (apologies)<br>BONNIE YUE<br>JOANNA ASSAD<br>CONSTANZA BOTTAZZINI<br>SAYANA SOROURIAN<br>JOSEPH PICCOLI<br>JOHN WHYTE |
| LOCATION:            | ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE                                                                                                                                                |
| DATE & TIME:         | 10:00AM – 11:00AM<br>THURSDAY, 2 <sup>nd</sup> JULY 2026                                                                                                            |

## THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MS CLARE SYKES:** Well, good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Cammeraygal 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.

10 So, welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Pymble Ladies' College Secondary Innovation Precinct state significant development application (SSD-79146716) currently before the Commission for determination.

15 The Applicant, Pymble Ladies' College, proposes to demolish four school buildings and construct a six-storey building in the centre northwest portion of the Pymble Ladies' College campus. The project includes demolition and earthworks, tree removal, construction of the part four/part six-storey new building, minor changes to car parking and landscaping works. No increase to student or staff numbers is proposed.

20 My name is Clare Sykes. I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Juliet Grant.

**MS JULIET GRANT:** Hi.

25 **MS SYKES:** We are also joined today by Kendall Clydsdale and Isaac Clayton from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

30 So, 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 determination.

35 It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify any issues raised, whether it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. And following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response to. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will also then be published on our website.

40 So, 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.

45 So, we will now begin. So, you would have received the meeting agenda. So, the first side of the agenda is really just to – and for the purpose of transcript as well – is to provide some introductions. So, if we could quite quickly go around the room today and just introduce yourself by name and title, we will sort of almost do a roll call, we've got quite a few on the call today, and also note any absences.

So, over to you.

**MR GARLAND:** Thank you, Clare. My name is Shaun Garland. I'm the Manager at Development Assessment Services.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, Shaun.

**MR SELWYN SEGALL:** I'm with Shaun, I'm Selwyn Segall, the Team Leader, Central Team.

**MS YUE:** Yes, I'm Bonnie Yue, Senior Development Assessment Officer.

**MS SYKES:** Joanna?

**MS JOANNA ASSAD:** Yes, I'm Joanna Assad and I am the Coordinator for the Environmental Health Team.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, Joanna. Constanza?

**MS CONSTANZA BOTTAZZINI:** Yes, I'm Constanza, the Senior Landscape Officer in Ku-ring-gai.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, Constanza. Sayana?

**MS SAYANA SOROURIAN:** Sayana Sorourian, Senior Development Engineer.

**MR PICCOLI:** I'll jump in. I'm Joseph Piccoli, the Strategic Traffic Engineer and Transport Planner for Ku-ring-gai Council.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, Joseph. And John?

**MR WHYTE:** John Whyte, Council's Ecological Assessment Officer.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, John. And we'll note that Rathna Ranah is unable to attend today. Great. Well, I think that's everyone in terms of the introduction. Now, we understand that you don't have any formal presentation that you wish to present today, but would certainly welcome, and I'll hand over to you to, I guess, provide any context or to raise any matters in the Council's submission against those agenda items. If we could follow those through, and certainly Juliet and myself may jump in at any stage and seek clarification or ask any questions as we go through. So, over to you, Shaun.

**MR GARLAND:** Thank you, Chair. We might start with Bonnie. Bonnie, if you don't mind just going through your issues, and we'll just touch on the key issues, if you don't mind, Madam Chair. The first one is urban design, so I'll hand over to Bonnie, and then we'll just go through – there's six issues that we've raised in our Response to Submissions, and I think if we go through that logically, that will hopefully help the Commission as well.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you.

**MS YUE:** Thank you, Shaun. Hello, thank you for your time to listen to Council and with our outstanding concern. With these urban design issues, so looking at the building which faces one of the façade, western front faces Avon Road. So, that road is immediately adjacent to R2 Zone, which is a low-density dwelling along Avon Road.

So, with that low-density residential zone, what's usually – what we usually see is one or two-storey buildings with garden setting and trees. So, this proposed building is about 40 metres from the northwest boundary which is Avon Road. If you went out on site to have a look, it's immediately adjacent to an existing Science Building, which you can see from Avon Road. That building is, I think, approximately four-storey high and this building is six-storey high. So, while there are trees and heavy vegetation within that lower riparian zone, you can see the building.

With the design of the building, they did a beautiful job with articulation, using different materials on the side which faces the school. But with the western side which faces Avon Road, it is lack of articulation and it creates a visual bulk on the northern façade of the six-storey building which fronts Avon Road, and that's one of Council's outstanding concerns in regards to the design or the visual impact from the building.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you, Bonnie. So, to clarify that, so you still consider that the western façade or the northern façade, is that ...

**MS YUE:** Sorry. So, basically, the façade that faces Avon Road.

**MS SYKES:** The façade, yes. So, I think it is the northern façade that is under-articulated.

**MS YUE:** Yes.

**MS SYKES:** And could, I guess, could I, I guess, clarify that it appears that the Department has concluded that the visual screening retained by vegetation on that side in the longer term is reliable. And so, could we infer from that you're suggesting that the visual screening should not be the – or it should be not dependent on vegetation in terms of that northern façade?

**MS YUE:** That's right. I guess, vegetation, they are to help or mediate the visual impact, but it should never be relied upon because trees, they could die, depending on weather, how they maintain those trees. Yes, so it should really be on the design to provide articulation instead of one blank wall faces the street. This is quite important because on the other side of Avon Road is immediate to R2 Zone, and those houses are usually one to two storey, so that's important.

I also would like to point out that with the Vegetation Management Plan, there are, I understand, in the plan that requires removal of some of those weeds on that zone, so, which probably Johnny and Constanza can talk about. But with those being removed is actually open up that vegetation, so some of those will be removed, and you can see the building from Avon Road.

**MS SYKES:** Thanks, Bonnie. And in terms of the aerial drone visualisation, so that position stands even with the, you know, your view remains even with that additional aerial drone footage.

**MS YUE:** Yes, yes.

**MS SYKES:** Mm-hm, okay. Juliet, did you have any ...?

**MS GRANT:** I was going to ask a similar, along the same veins that you just have, Clare, and Bonnie's picked up on the fact that there's a Vegetation Management Plan that may in fact result in the removal of some vegetation. Presumably there's also a requirement for that Vegetation Management Plan to supplement and enhance that corridor as well.

And your point, Clare, about the drone footage, I understand from the pictures that we saw that it's, yes, the building's visible, but it's glimpses and components. So, in terms of what Council would like to see in terms of articulation, given that the façade is not seen in total, so are there particular elements of the façade or particular provisions or design amendments that Council thinks would satisfy that requirement?

**MS YUE:** I mean, usually with those building, which they did a beautiful job on the other side of the building which faces the school, so what they did was they – the top one, two, three, top two level is actually stepped back, so it's gradually stepped back as the building goes up. I think it will be beneficial if they could do that on the Avon Road frontage of the building as well.

**MS GRANT:** And would that change the sight lines? I mean, if it's setting back, would that actually change what was visible behind that vegetation screening?

**MS YUE:** I think so, yes, it is a six-storey building so you can see it, yes.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you.

**MS SYKES:** Well, thanks very much, Bonnie. Did you have anything, anymore items to raise on the built form and scale?

**MS YUE:** No, that's the only outstanding issue that Council has in terms of urban design.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you.

**MS YUE:** Thank you.

**MS SYKES:** So, I guess, you know, we did touch on it, but we perhaps move to the next item around tree removal, landscaping and biodiversity.

**MR GARLAND:** Thank you, Chair. Constanza, do you want to start and then Johnny, could you jump in as well where your area of expertise comes into play?

**MS BOTTAZZINI:** Yes. Well, most of the landscape items have been addressed. There are some minor things that can be improved. It's basically a practicality of some trees that are – I don't think this was written in the last assessment – but some big trees are too close to buildings, particularly the *Eucalyptus saligna*, planted very close to the buildings. That's something to note.

What has been raised is the removal of six significant trees within the site. This is probably something that they tried to avoid but couldn't, but there are six significant trees within the site that is within the footprint of the building, or very close to footprint of the building and needs to be removed. The proposal includes some offsets to replenish the site with other trees, but that would be it.

I don't know if you have any questions.

**MS SYKES:** So, I guess with the removal of those six trees, so, Constanza, do you – is that saying that you accept their avoidance analysis, that those trees, that there is a feasible option except to remove those six trees?

**MS BOTTAZZINI:** we were briefed from day one and they always included as like something they could not avoid, that that was the best site to develop, the best place to develop the site. So, I guess there is not other options. I didn't go to the design or the opportunity of doing it somewhere else, probably somewhere else there will be some other constraints. So, I guess that it is acceptable to remove some trees, yes, but it is something that we needed to raise as there are six significant trees.

**MS SYKES:** Yes, yes. Thank you, Constanza. Were there any other items wish to be raised by Council beyond tree removal for landscaping and biodiversity?

**MS BOTTAZZINI:** No, this all, yes. Landscape is, yes, that's it. I don't know, maybe Johnny has something to say.

**MR WHYTE:** I do. So, you guys can all hear me, can you not?

**MS SYKES:** Yes, thank you, John.

**MR WHYTE:** Great. All right, just bear with me, I'm going to just pull up my commentary on the BDAR. So, I'm not sure how much everybody in the room are familiar with the Biodiversity Assessment Method that's to be complied with, with regards to the preparation of a BDAR (Biodiversity Development Assessment Report) which has been prepared in this instance.

The criticism of the BDAR from Council relates to avoidance and the alternative options that they've presented by way of the BDAR with respect to avoidance on the site. If I can just talk to the particulars. There are three large mature Blue Gums that are sought for removal, and the BDAR talks to those trees as being trees 61, 71 and 85.

Now, what we would typically expect to see with feasible alternatives being explored under a BDAR, is a detailed site analysis, so detailed plans showing the tree protection zones, the building alignment or alternative options and the analysis of those options.

5 What we've got in the BDAR at the moment under section 6.12 of that document is a very light-on commentary where it refers to other disciplines such as environmental engineering and architectural and has basically just a few comments around why they can't comply with that option. For example, study 3 option, which is to shift the building to the southeast, basically states under a dot point, "Relocating southeast  
10 would again affect the Main Oval on Ring Road, would also require deeper excavation due to slope constraints and cause additional conflicts with drainage and service alignments."

15 Now, whilst I appreciate that comment, it would have been very helpful to see that visually, to basically demonstrate it from – again, it can be from a top-down, a visual representation is the best way to demonstrate it. So, I'm basically trying to allude to, by removing three large significant mature trees, two of which would probably be approaching greater than a hundred years old, they're in good health and good condition, and the justification under that study option 3 option which is to shift to  
20 southeast, basically, is that there's conflicts, but they don't demonstrate the conflicts.

Now, under Stage 2 of the Operational Manual, which is the manuals that support implementation of the Biodiversity Assessment Method, it clearly states under section 3 that the applicant or the accredited person has to demonstrate genuine, robust  
25 avoidance demonstration. And how you do that typically in a BDAR scenario is to provide those visual representations.

What I'm basically trying to say to you today, there's not enough been done to demonstrate that they could not avoid the loss of those significant trees on this site.  
30 The justification is not there, and it hasn't been presented within the body of the BDAR.

Now, you're more than welcome to go to those documents, but the Stage 2, section 3 of the Operational Manual clearly sets out what an accredited person must do to  
35 demonstrate genuine avoidance. And yes, you can consider things like economics, and you can consider other impacts, engineering outcomes, etc., but those disciplines should have fed their genuine correspondence into the BDAR, so it was well documented. And I have no alternative options analysis in section 6 of that document. So, I say that's a fundamental failing of the BDAR.

40 And if Council is to accept or the Department is to accept the loss of these critically endangered trees, I think that that analysis should be comprehensive when dealing with the entity, this is an SAI, which means it's subject to consideration under serious and irreversible impacts – it's the highest threshold of assessment under a BDAR. And I  
45 say to you today that it's not well document and well founded within the BDAR.

Yes, with respect to the other issues, we can revegetate the corridor that's in front of the building. As Bonnie suggested, we shouldn't be relying upon that. I'll say the criticism of the management plan that's been presented is that it proposes assisted

regeneration rather than revegetation. Council sought to combat that issue through the implementation of a condition of consent.

5 What I'm trying to say is, there's a number of Camphor Laurel trees in front of that building, from viewed from the streetscape, there's a number of large mature Camphor Laurels. If you remove those Camphor Laurels, the visual bulk of the building will become more obvious from the streetscape. Over time, you will obviously reduce that bulk impact through the planting, but planting isn't proposed; they're relying on assisted regeneration. That is when parent trees dropping seed and then those trees  
10 establish from seedstock and then they come up over time.

Depending on how you do the removal, there will be an impact. If you remove the Camphor Laurels, there will be like a visual impact from the streetscape in the short term, but over time you would expect that to decrease as those trees mature. But at the  
15 present point, the criticism of the VMP is it doesn't propose planting, it proposes assisted regeneration which is likely to be slow in the context of this site due to the Camphor Laurel presence and the weed presence in that front setback.

I'm more than welcome to take comments, questions if you've got anything for myself. But yes, they're the two issues with this site. One, avoidance – and I say to you today, it's insufficient and they should really go back and revisit that avoidance before  
20 knocking over those three large mature significant trees.

**MS SYKES:** Yes, thanks very much, John, that's very, very helpful for our considerations. And did you have any comment at all on the monitoring program proposed in terms of the commitment around formal monitoring for the corridors and the –  
25

**MR WHYTE:** No, the monitoring intervals are sufficient in terms of reporting and feedback. The performance criteria of the monitoring is all fine. It's just this idea that you're going to actively regenerate that site. I say that the Camphor Laurels, being dominant in that aspect to the building ...  
30

I'll give you a little biology lesson. Camphor Laurels emit allelopathic chemicals into the soil. And what that means is they prohibit the establishment of native trees beneath those canopies. So, even though you poison the trees, it's still a time – there's still a time gap between poisoning and re-establishing vegetation or recruitment of vegetation in that area. Hence why we've conditioned the revegetation because that will facilitate and speed up that revegetation in that area.  
35

But no, there's no other criticism other than the fact that they were not planting in that area. But we've combatted that through the condition of consent. So, if you implement the condition as it's written, I don't have concern about the restoration of that area. But I should say to you that minimisation or, in this case, mitigation, should never be put  
40 above avoidance.  
45

The hierarchy is avoid-minimise-mitigate. So, please do not consider mitigation in the first instance. The first point of call is avoidance. And once you've satisfied yourself that enough avoidance has been done, then you consider minimisation, that is like

alternative design methodologies to reduce impacts on trees. And then the last resort is mitigation. Some people think, oh, we can spruik mitigation and say we're going to do all these great things under the VPA, we're going to plant this, we're going to enhance this. That's all well and good, but the first principle is avoidance. And I'm sure you're all familiar with those concepts.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you very much. Juliet?

**MS GRANT:** Yes, can I just ask. So, Constanza mentioned that there were six significant trees. John, you've talked about three.

**MR WHYTE:** Yes, I focused on the –

**MS GRANT:** The other three, do they not have a biodiversity question, they're more of a landscape ...

**MR WHYTE:** That's correct. So, from a biodiversity perspective, my focus has been on the trees that form part of critically endangered vegetation, which are those three trees that I mention.

**MS GRANT:** And to clarify those trees, T61, 71 and 85.

**MR WHYTE:** That's correct, yes.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you.

**MS SYKES:** Juliet, did you have any further questions?

**MS GRANT:** No, that's all, thanks.

**MS SYKES:** And any other comments or questions or issues to raise on that agenda item – tree removal, landscaping and biodiversity? We're happy to move on? Thank you. So, we'll move now to traffic, access and parking, including Avon Road operations particularly at school peak periods. Do you have any matters to raise on this one?

**MR PICCOLI:** Yes, thanks Panel members. Look, the previous Response to Submissions and the updated transport impact assessment addressed most of my traffic and transport related issues. So, it might be just relevant then to hop over to the construction traffic management issues, that's where Council's outstanding matters are. Look, that's in relation to the construction work, the parking. So, in our submission we mentioned that in the assessment example of the Rozelle Interchange Project was used, where they had 40% mode share for driving for construction workers.

Look, I mean, that is probably an example but probably in the context of this site, maybe not quite relevant because our view is that in the Rozelle Interchange Project, the on-street parking would have been quite constrained so wouldn't be easy to achieve that 40% mode share target. Whereas in this area here, the majority of the on-street

parking is unrestricted, normally used by commuters, but given that construction staff usually arrive much earlier than commuters, they would basically have easy access and not face competition or constraints from parking.

5 So, our view is that the 40% mode share for driving is quite ambitious and, you know, we think there will be impacts to on-street parking where, you know, local residents use for commuting to work by parking around the station and travelling to their workplaces. So, that's why we have requested that some more aggressive monitoring of the travel mode and carpool arrangements, because if you want to try and achieve  
10 anywhere near that 40% mode share, it's going to take a bit more than what they've proposed in their Construction Traffic Management Plan.

**MS SYKES:** So, Joseph, with that, so it's effectively saying that you are not – you couldn't really rely on a 40% sort of mode share assumption. Could you outline  
15 typically what specific monitoring or enforcement measures could be enacted or could be built into, to sort of ensure that happens or to prevent worker overflow parking onto the residential streets?

**MR PICCOLI:** I guess we'd be relying on the Proponent to come up with some of  
20 those strategies. Look, and I guess because it would be difficult to enforce the workers to use other modes when there is such a plentiful supply of parking on street that's unrestricted, that there's no disincentive for that. So, that's our basic concern there.

And look, yes, carpooling, even that's tricky. But look, if they manage to, for example,  
25 to get, say, four workers per vehicle and they prioritise on-site parking for high occupancy vehicles that have three or more passengers, well then that could be an incentive for them to promote that and try and enforce it.

So, that if you're driving, then you'll get kind of prime position, because there are up  
30 to 50 spaces available on site for construction workers, which is good, like it's a start, but I think, yes, to achieve the best use of that, they'd probably need to ensure that the workers arriving either carpool heavily or use public transport. And even that might be – public transport might be possible, particularly if, for example, I hear that some sites, for example, allow workers to come in initially to drop off tools and materials and  
35 store them on site, then they can come by public transport for subsequent trips to work. So, there's just some of those strategies that could be implemented.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you. That's very helpful.

**MS GRANT:** And Council did – sorry, the Applicant did mention that that's what they  
40 were intending to do, to have those drop-off areas so that they could free up staff for public transport use. Out of interest, did Council get a lot of complaints, or was there an issue with their construction parking for the significant redevelopment that they've just completed on campus? Did you experience a lot of issues with that?

45 **MR PICCOLI:** Yes, I guess, I'm not in the Traffic Operations Team that might get those day-to-day contacts from the residents. But I guess through the life of the school, there has been a lot of construction activity and so it seems, I guess, we're just trying to preserve the amenity for the residents by trying to minimise those impacts. And yes,

because construction seems to happen at the school and various schools for that matter on a fairly regular basis, then we're at least trying to get the best outcome for some of our residents.

5 **MR GARLAND:** Juliet, I might be able to supplement what Jo was talking about. Although I'm in Development Assessment, we share the directorate with our rangers who are often called out. So, as a general comment, not specifically for the site and I know your question is about specifically the site, we do get a lot of complaints about construction vehicles and the impact that those have on local streets and street  
10 networks, and the ability for people – you know, of course they've got to obey the road rules, but quite often the complaints come about parking across driveways, the noise at the various times, and the inability to park and things like that, especially around commercial areas.

15 I know obviously it's a bit different. But yes, instead of people being able to park there which they usually do to go to the shops or do their commuting, for commuting and the like, that becomes a big complaint for us if we need to investigate every concern. So, that's just a little bit of a supplement anyway, sorry, thank you.

20 **MS GRANT:** Yes.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you.

25 **MR PICCOLI:** I suppose, sorry, Chair, I was just going to add just as an extension to that. I understand that in the draft conditions that were prepared regarding the Construction Traffic Management Plan, we have requested as part of a condition that a copy of the final approved Construction Traffic Management Plan be provided to Council. But it seems like this is not supported by, I think, the Department, was it.

30 I guess the reason why we're asking for that, even though the Construction Traffic Management Plan is prepared in consultation with Council, I guess if we have a final copy of the approved plan, then we can have a document that we can go out and enforce, rather than relying on something that was only in evolution. So, that's the reason why we've requested that Council be provided with a CTMP once it's been  
35 approved or adopted.

**MR GARLAND:** Can I – sorry, Juliet and Panel Chair, can I just supplement that and reinforce the importance of that being a condition, if the Panel is of a mind to support the application. It really helps our rangers in applying those provisions that are, you  
40 know, they've committed to in relation to any determination. It's whether it's this application or another one, it does become vital because then they can show and support their basis in terms of the complaint management and managing of the actual site as well, so I think it's very important. But thank you.

45 **MR PICCOLI:** Thanks, Shaun.

**MS GRANT:** Are those documents not automatically loaded on the portal for your – once they're approved by the Department? Do those documents, are they not made publicly available?

**MR CLYDSDALE:** They are, Commissioner. There's a post-determination section on the portal typically, and those documents should be available.

5 **MS GRANT:** Yes, okay.

**MR GARLAND:** That would remedy the issue, yes.

**MS GRANT:** Perfect, thank you.

10 **MS SYKES:** Thank you very much for that. Joseph, was there anything else to raise?

**MR PICCOLI:** No, that's all at this stage, everything else has been resolved.

15 **MS SYKES:** Okay.

**MR PICCOLI:** Thank you.

20 **MS SYKES:** Great. I'm just having a look at the time, so we might move onto the next agenda item which was contamination. Was there any elements of that that Council wish to raise?

25 **MS ASSAD:** Hi there. I had a look at the draft conditions, and they seemed suitable to me. The only typo that I could see was with condition E24, it references condition C26, which should be C31. So, that was something that ...

**MS GRANT:** Joanna, could you just say that again. So, 26, not ...

30 **MS ASSAD:** Yes, so condition E24 references condition C26 and it should be C31.

**MS SYKES:** Okay.

35 **MS ASSAD:** And then the only kind of suggestion that I had as well was in relation to noise. So, there's some noise conditions surrounding the construction hours and the activities, and condition D6 says that, "Notification of any works outside of the approved hours can be undertaken," and it talks about notification to neighbours. It's quite a general condition and I just thought that it could have a little bit more detail about maybe that they notify residents 48 hours before any out-of-hours works that are undertaken or whatever, you know, whatever the kind of should be supported. It's just  
40 that although that condition references the condition above, which is D5, and talks about generally the any out-of-hours work would generally be associated with something that's inaudible or relatively low noise.

45 Given where the proposal will be and the number of residents that back onto it, it would be kind of, it would eliminate kind of them just advising those residents an hour before, say, or any of that kind of thing, which might also impact with lighting, if there's any lights on while they're doing this inaudible work inside.

**MS SYKES:** Okay. Thank you, Joanna, that's very, very helpful for our consideration. So, does that cover off the lighting item as well, Joanna, or were there any further items that wished to be raised around, well, both contamination or lighting?

5       **MS ASSAD:** Yes, I didn't raise any lighting issues, but I did have a look at those draft conditions, and they seemed suitable to me, so I was happy with those.

10       **MS SYKES:** Okay. Well, thank you, thank you very much for going through in detail of each of those items. I would just like to invite whether there were any further comments on the Department's Assessment Report as well as any other specific items around the conditions, recommended conditions of consent.

15       **MR GARLAND:** Bonnie, I'll hand to you. Is there anything that you'd like to raise or make comment on?

**MS YUE:** Thank you, Shaun. No, I think Joanna and Joseph already covered those concerns in regard to those conditions. Yes.

20       **MS SYKES:** Thank you.

**MS SOROURIAN:** Just one thing I would mention. Maybe there is a stormwater quality positive covenant and retention area positive covenant for engineering was in the conditions that, in the revised conditions they're not. Usually Council have these two conditions as part of the positive covenant under, and restriction, those two, I think on the list of the new conditions.

25       **MS SYKES:** Could you repeat that, those two conditions specifically that are normally ...

30       **MS SOROURIAN:** Yes, it's stormwater quality control positive covenant and restriction. And OST positive covenant and restriction.

35       **MS SYKES:** Okay. Thank you very much, Sayana. We'll investigate that. So, with that in mind, I did not have any further specific questions of Council. Juliet, did you have any other items you wished to raise?

**MS GRANT:** No, I don't, thank you.

40       **MS SYKES:** Okay. So, I'd just like to invite whether there was any other matters wished to be raised by Council and if not, we will draw our meeting to a close. But were there any other matters?

45       **MR GARLAND:** No, I don't believe there's anything further, so I'd like to thank the Panel for their time and considering our concerns.

**MS SYKES:** Thank you, thank you very much, Shaun, and to everyone at the meeting today, you know, we really appreciate your input and it certainly helps to guide us as we work through the material and consider all of the various aspects and to deliberate

this determination. So, with that in mind, thank you very much for your time and we'll draw our meeting to a close. Thank you.

**MR GARLAND:** Thank you.

5

**MS YUE:** Thank you.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED**