



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**RE: GEORGES COVE MARINA SITE – 146 NEWBRIDGE RD,  
MOOREBANK (PP-2024-658) – GATEWAY DETERMINATION REVIEW**

### **DEPARTMENT MEETING**

**PANEL:** ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR)  
JULIET GRANT

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** BRAD JAMES  
PHOEBE JARVIS

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING, HOUSING  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE:** TINA CHAPPELL  
SUZANNE WREN  
OYSHEE IQBAL

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

**DATE:** 1:30PM – 2:30PM  
TUESDAY, 4<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2025

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

**MR ANDREW MILLS:** Welcome, everyone. We're just waiting for Suzanne's picture to appear. But welcome very much and just – my name is Andrew Mills.  
5 Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and acknowledge the traditional custodians of all the lands on which we virtually meet today. I pay my respects to their Elders, past and present.

10 So, welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Gateway Determination Review Request for the planning proposal applying to the Georges Cove Marina Site at 146 Newbridge Road, Moorebank (PP-2024-658) currently before the Commission for advice.

15 The proposal seeks to facilitate mixed use and residential development by introducing a new additional permitted use to permit residential flat buildings, multi-dwelling housing and restaurants and café, with a maximum total gross floor area of 1,500 square metres, as well as increasing the maximum height of building and floor space ratio controls.

20 My name is Andrew Mills. I'm the Chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this Commission Panel, and I am joined by my fellow Commissioner, Juliet Grant. We're also joined by Brad James and Phoebe Jarvis from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 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 website.

30 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's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. However, if you are asked a question and you're not in a position to answer it, please do feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which can  
35 then be put up on our website.

40 I request that all attendees 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 the accuracy of the transcript.

We will now begin. Thank you very much.

45 And thank you to the members of the Department – Tina, Suzanne – is it Oyshee, is that the correct pronunciation?

**MS OYSHEE IQBAL:** Yes.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you. The agenda that we've offered today is to discuss those

various items there. But I wonder, did you want to start with the presentation that you had prepared? Is that how you'd like to ...?

5 **MS TINA CHAPPELL:** Yes, we can start after instruction.

**MR MILLS:** So, we have that available. Did you want to share it, Brad, is that the best way to ...?

10 **MS CHAPPELL:** No, no, I'll share mine, if that's okay?

**MR MILLS:** Yes, that's fine.

**MS CHAPPELL:** Yes. Just bear with me.

15 **MS SUZANNE WREN:** Should we introduce ourselves or ...?

**MS CHAPPELL:** Yes.

20 **MR MILLS:** Please go ahead.

**MS WREN:** Yes, sorry. I've just figured out how to turn on video. My bad. Suzanne Wren, I'm Manager of Metro Central, South, West.

25 **MS CHAPPELL:** Thank you, Suzanne. And I'm Tina Chappell, I'm the Director of Central, West and South, so Suzanne's director, and we've got Oyshee as well. Oyshee, would you like to introduce yourself?

30 **MS IQBAL:** Hi. Oyshee Iqbal, I'm a Planning Officer working with Suzanne and Tina.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you, and welcome again.

35 **MS IQBAL:** Okay. So, thank you for meeting us today. We'll be looking at the Georges Cove Marina Gateway Determination Review by the IPC today.

I'd like to first start with acknowledgement of country. I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land we are meeting here today. I pay my respects to the Elders past, present and emerging, and celebrate the diversity of Aboriginal peoples and their ongoing cultures and connection to the land and the waters of New South Wales. I also acknowledge and pay my respects to our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and colleagues joining us today.

45 So, without – at the start, I'll go through the background of the planning proposal and the matters that relate with the planning proposal, mainly flooding. So, we'll go into a bit of depth, but generally speaking, the flooding information in previous planning proposal, they span back from 2004 and 2018. The planning proposal itself has been going on since 2020 and up until 2025, which is now. So, to go into details, 2004 is when Council's current adopted ...

**MS WREN:** Oyshee, did you just want to show the presentation? We've got the slides but it's not in presentation mode.

5 **MS IQBAL:** Oh, okay.

**MS WREN:** Is that for everyone else, the same?

[All say yes]

10

**MS IQBAL:** Maybe ... Maybe I'll share again. Is that showing?

**MS WREN:** Great. Yes, that's better. Thank you.

15

**MS IQBAL:** Okay. So, I'll go back another slide. So, the flooding information – the current – the flooding information in the previous planning proposal, that was dated back to 2004 and 2018. The current planning proposal itself has been going on since 2020 until now in 2025. And I'll go into a bit of detail of the major milestones for Department, Council and to do with flooding.

20

Obviously, blue is the Department, key dates or milestones in white is Council, and green is anything to do with flooding. To start with, the Council's current adopted Floodplain Risk and Management Study dates back to 2004. It's adopted, however, Council has more current recent flood data and regional evacuation studies.

25

In December 2017, there was a planning proposal issued by the Department for 125 dwellings, which was deemed invalid by the New South Wales Supreme Court. And the next step is where the planning proposal in its current form starts. So, in June 2020, a DA for recreational use and facilities was approved by Council. The Department is unaware whether the DA has been activated or if it's still in Department deferred commencement mode, we're just not quite sure what the current status of the DA is.

30

August 2020 is when the Liverpool Local Planning Panel considered the current planning proposal in its current stage. And Liverpool City Council, they often have a practice of pre-exhibiting pre-gateway stage, so they did conduct a pre-gateway exhibition. I believe they only received some submission; however, it's not extensive, comprehensive and required exhibition. So, we are not fully – Council has not been able to fully investigate what the community view is on this.

35

In August 2020, the Liverpool Local Planning ... Sorry, my bad.

40

In November 2020, SES and BCS, they provided preliminary advice indicating to the Department for the broader Moorebank East precinct. Because at the time there was a lot of flooding happening, so they just provided blanket comments to us.

The Department then went back to Council in December 2020 and provided some

5 additional information. At the time, we had three planning proposals with the Department, one of them which we had already issued gateway, and others were under consideration. So, our comment back to the Department was, we amended the gateway determination for the planning proposal that we'd already determined, to consider the upcoming of the imminent flood study, as well as the other two planning proposals that we were assessing, we returned it back to the Council, indicating that we would like the current data to be considered, the flooding data to be considered.

10 In 2020, the Georges River Flood Study (the BMT 2020 which it's referred to as) was finalised. And it's to be noted that this data is being used by Council for the development application and current planning proposals in the area.

15 In March to July 2022, New South Wales Flood Inquiry was finalised. And in following this, March 2022, the Georges River Evacuation Study (which Molino Stewart 2022 would be referred to as) was finalised. So, there are current data available as well as we have the New South Wales Flood Inquiry principles.

20 In April 2023, the Department met with the Council on the Moorebank East precinct again and in ... And advised that we would now like to, having those new data available, we would like Council to consider those new data and ensure that the planning proposals are being considering the flooding information adequately.

25 In June 2023, Council issued additional information to Mirvac, requiring Mirvac to demonstrate consistency with the current flooding data. And in December 2023, Council forwarded the planning proposal to the Department, noting that there the environmental constraints, the flooding and the evacuation were not resolved.

30 Between January to February 2024, the Department conducted pre-gateway consultation with SES and BCS. BCS is DCCEEW this year, BCS, so the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water-Biodiversity Conservation Science Team who are the experts in flooding. And SES is obviously the New South Wales SES, they provided extensive comments for the planning proposals and where they would like – where the proposal has not demonstrated any adequacy in relation to flooding and evacuation.

40 In July 2024, based on the pre-gateway comments and our assessment, the Department determined that the planning proposal to not proceed. And in October 2024, Mirvac initiated the Gateway Determination Review. And in 2024, the Department forwarded the package to IPC onto the last one which is our briefing today.

45 I just would like to note that since then, between us forwarding the package to you and our briefing today, Mirvac has provided some additional flooding information to the Department to consider. I will go into details a bit later into the presentation on what the current position is on the additional information, where we're at.

To start with, the planning proposal – does anyone have any questions so far? No?

5 The planning proposal will facilitate 340 dwellings, so 21 of them will be in terraced dwellings and 319 will be in the form of residential flat building units. Under the residential flat building on the ground level, it will also enable 1,500 square metres of restaurants and cafes on the ground floor.

10 Just looking at the context of this site, so as you can see, the site is outlined in red. Immediately to the north you have the Georges Cove Village, which is currently under construction. Further – just immediately north of that, you will see a blank plan and that is employment plan, which also enabled residential development, and it has not been developed yet, so it's undeveloped.

15 To the west, we have Liverpool CBD 4 kilometres to the west. And the Moorebank residential area and the town centre is immediately to the west. And the town centre itself is 1.8 kilometres away. The town centre is where you would have your local facilities and the public transport services.

20 To the south, you have the Wurrungwuri Reserve and further south you have the golf course. The site itself has frontage to Georges River to the east. But on the other side of the river, you have a lot of public reserves and recreational land, and this will be a bit more apparent in the next slide as we look at the zoning map.

25 Again, so the E3 land in blue to the north, that is not developed. And as you can see, there's a substantial amount of RE1, so public and private recreational land surrounding the site.

30 The planning proposal, it proposes LLEP amendments in the form of its not actually seeking to rezone the land, so it is retaining that RE2 private recreation zone. However, the planning mechanism that the proposal is utilising is that they're identifying the development site as a key site, which will be mapped, and it will include some additional local provisions. In this case, the additional local provisions will allow additional permitted use for the residential uses and commercial uses.

35 So, to summarise, the planning proposal will retain the zoning, however, have an APU for residential and commercial use.

40 **MR MILLS:** Oyshee, is there not in the E3 zone, a proposal for another village centre of some sort?

**MS IQBAL:** I don't believe so. The E3 is just an employment at this stage. It's not forming part of the village. However, I'll have to check.

45 **MR BRAD JAMES:** Yes, Andrew, I might just jump in there. Oyshee, I had a look at the – what available information there was through, I think, the planning viewer, and it looks like there's a planning proposal seeking to facilitate the provision of some retail premises on that site.

**MS IQBAL:** Oh, for the village, sorry, I thought you meant the employment. So, in the – it's currently on exhibition. I believe it's already finished exhibition. That is just to introduce some retail for the village, yes. It hasn't been finalised yet.

5 **MS JULIET GRANT:** Which village?

**MS IQBAL:** So, the R3 land to the north of the site, that's referred to as the 'Georges Cove Village'. Currently, there is a planning proposal to introduce or expand the retail. Suzanne, I'm not sure – yes, and yes, it hasn't been finalised at this stage. And it's just finished exhibition last year, I believe.

**MR MILLS:** I'm just conscious of the reference to the 1.8 kilometres ...

15 **MS IQBAL:** At this stage, I believe until that has been finalised, you would have to take what's present on the site than relying on planning proposals that haven't been finalised yet.

**MR MILLS:** Fair enough.

20 **MS IQBAL:** But the reference was really in relation to the public transport, which was going to the next point. So, the closest train station to the site is 3.8 kilometres away, which is the Liverpool Train Station. And there is also an M80 bus stop on Newbridge Road which is 800 metres away. And the 1.8 kilometre away in the Moorebank town centre you have the other bus stop. So, it's just to demonstrate how far the public transport nodes were.

25 **MS GRANT:** Oyshee, do you think that there's a reason why the applicant has chosen to just add APUs by key site mapping rather than change the zone? Have they articulated that as a, you know, do they think that's an easier path or ...?

30 **MS IQBAL:** I believe so. Because in their assessment I did find that under the 9.1 direction their argument relied on that, you know, this is not really a rezoning as such. But the 9.1 direction is consistent, or this planning proposal is consistent with 9.1 direction.

35 So that, I would – that's the only material thing. But I would agree with you, and I think I speak for the team as well, that it's probably easier and less onerous having to demonstrate consistency with the local and the Regional Plan and the current flood policy and everything, theoretically.

40 **MS GRANT:** Thank you.

45 **MS IQBAL:** On July 10, 2024, we issued – sorry, bear with me. The Department issued the gateway determination to not proceed based on the fact that the planning proposal was inconsistent with the relevant Regional Plan, the District Plan and the Ministerial Directions that apply to the proposal, which is the implementation of the Regional Plan and the flooding. It also demonstrated very limited consistency with Council's local strategic planning statement and local

housing strategy.

5 So overall, it did not adequately demonstrate any site-specific merit in relation to flooding risk. And additionally, it may absorb the evacuation capacity for the future development in Moorebank East and Chipping Norton resident.

10 We'll go into the reasons a little bit because as a part of the review we had looked at our gateway determination and reviewed the additional information provided by the proponent.

15 So, first off, the Regional and the District Plan. So, it is located in a high risk flood area. The proposal seeks to provide diverse housing, being units and terraces, however, the subject site is located in a high flood risk area. And the Regional Plan requires the housing to be located in areas which are not exposed to existing and potential natural hazards.

20 The Regional Plan seeks to avoid locating new urban development in areas exposed to natural and urban hazards and considers options to limit the intensification of development existing urban areas exposed to hazards. Additionally, in terms of housing supply choice and affordability with access to jobs, services and public transport, the Regional Plan requires to consider that.

25 Development of the Moorebank precinct is considered to be an urban renewal development. When considered against the criteria for the urban renewal, it didn't demonstrate a lot of consistency.

30 **MS GRANT:** Can I just ask you, on that, the Department is saying it's a high flood risk area, and in your report I think there's a mention that the proponent has said it's a low flood risk area.

**MS IQBAL:** Yes.

35 **MS GRANT:** The site's a low – yes, page 12, the site is a low flood hazard category. How do you end up with – it either is or it isn't. Are they using different references or ...?

40 **MS IQBAL:** Yes. So, we do have a slide just looking at the two different perspectives. But essentially, Mirvac is using the current adopted data, which is back from 2004, and, however, the current practice is to use the current data, which is from 2020. So, Mirvac's looking at outdated data whereas, yes, we're looking at the current available information.

**MS GRANT:** Thanks.

45 **MS IQBAL:** That's okay. We're looking at – so the next one is the 9.1 direction. Our assessment shows that the planning proposal was inconsistent with the 9.1 direction. It wasn't consistent with the Floodplain Development Manual because it is reducing the evacuation capacity of the immediate area and broadly of Chipping



Norton and Moorebank residential area. Additionally, it locates permanent population in a high flood hazard event site. So that's the – the Floodplain Manual seeks that those evacuation is not to constrain and that you do not locate permanent population in a high hazard flood event site.

5

Additionally, when looking at the Council's current adopted 2004 study, it locates – when we look at the principle that it must not locate residential and commercial development within high flood risk area, the planning proposal does that. However, the difference will be that under the 2004, it's not identified as a high flood risk areas.

10

Using the BMT 2020, which is the current flood study, the planning proposal has not considered those available data. So, as such, we weren't able to assess the flood impact adequately.

15

To summarise, the planning proposal will intensify development in a floodway area, and it will be located between flood planning area and PMF. It will introduce high-density residential accommodation in a high flood hazard area. And it is, most importantly, is likely to result in increased New South Wales Government spending for emergency management services, flood mitigation, and emergency response measures such as provision of road infrastructure, flood mitigation infrastructure, utilities, etc.

20

The proposal also demonstrated limited consistency with Council's LSPS and local housing strategy. I won't go into too much detail because I believe Council will speak to that. But generally speaking, the proposal was not close to any existing centre, so it was not located close to the Liverpool CBD or any highly dense area, and it does not have good public transport accessibility, which are the LSPS priorities. As well as the Liverpool local housing strategy, it does not increase housing stock where it's in demand, so which is a densely population area such as the CBD or a TOD.

25

30

It does not include any affordable housing component. So, even though the proponent indicates that the additional housing will increase affordability, the proposal itself does not have an affordable housing component in the proposal. So, I don't believe the affordable housing has been assessed or interpreted correctly.

35

**MS GRANT:** And is Liverpool on track to be meeting its housing targets?

40

**MS IQBAL:** At this stage, Council has indicated that they are well above or beyond what their minimum – what they're required to achieve, so they're well on track. And this particular planning proposal would not result in any substantial increase when they're already meeting the targets.

45

Moving onto the site-specific assessment, which is, first, the flooding and evacuation, which are the biggest contention for this planning proposal. So, first off, Mirvac's assessment. The FIA, the Flood Impact Assessment is based on the 2004 study. It identifies the area as a low flood hazard category. All the habitable

floors are flood-free, so essentially all the residential component is proposed to be above the PMF level.

5 It also notes that the Georges River flooding is a slower rising flood and finally, in the Stage Evacuation Report that they have submitted, the final stage is to shelter in place.

10 Now, DCCEEW-BCS, they have also provided comments for the Gateway Determination Review package, and they require that the Flood Impact Assessment consider the current flooding data. Which, again, it's commissioned by Council, is used by other proponents and Council, but it's not adopted at this stage.

15 The BMT 2020 data identifies the site as a flood hazard risk, and in the flood hazard area, so you've got the hazard categorisation, and the majority of the site will be the H4/H5/H6. So, H4 being the least hazard category land, it is unsafe for vehicles and people. H5 is unsafe for vehicles and people, and buildings require special engineering design and construction. And H6 is unsafe for vehicles and people, and all building types considered vulnerable to failure.

20 When looking at the site, so 5% AEP, which is 1-in-20 event, the first image here, you'll see that the flood depths could reach between 2 to 5 metres, and the hazard category is H4 to H5. In an event of 1-in-100-year flooding, which are more re-occurring, or which are re-occurring in the last 20 years, the flood depths can get between 2 to 5 metres with part of the site actually exceeding the 5-metre, and is H5 to H6. So, it's getting to that high – the buildings require special engineering to buildings that are considered vulnerable and might fail.

30 In the event of an PMF flood, the flood depths could exceed the 10 metre, is entirely H6, so that's the highest hazard category. And parts of the flood become – parts of the site become a floodway.

35 In the Evacuation Study which was completed in 2022, again, commissioned, used, but not adopted, it identifies that the Moorebank East precinct at this stage has 340 theoretical evacuation capacity. Theoretical meaning that even though it identifies the evacuation capacity, it doesn't – you cannot – the capacity depends on road upgrades which are not completed yet. So, it's not currently there.

40 The next – we'll quickly run through the site-specific, which is the biodiversity, social and economic. So, biodiversity is still pending. The original gateway determination, BCS identified that the report that was submitted was not – it needed to be updated because six years had passed. So, as part of this gateway determination, we have not received an updated biodiversity assessment.

45 Then social, which is still unchanged. No affordable housing has been proposed. There is a potential public access to the marina, so public may have access to recreation, however, that kind of details is more suitable to be determined at the – or it could change, be determined at the development application stage.

5 The economic impacts. So, there might be some employment increase in the area because the proposal will – it proposes to introduce commercial uses for the land. However, it is also likely to increase government spending significantly, as discussed previously.

10 To summarise our assessment, the planning proposal still remains inconsistent with the Regional and District Plan, Council’s LSPS and local housing strategy, and the relevant Section 9.1 direction. The planning proposal is located in a high flood risk area, which is floodway and flood storage, so it will not only impact the immediate but also downstream.

15 It will reduce evacuation capacity for Moorebank East precinct and Chipping Norton residents and surrounding. It does not demonstrate strategic and site-specific merit for flooding.

20 And finally, it is incompatible. So, the proposed APUs are incompatible with the current objective of the RE2 private recreation zone, which is proposed to be retained. Residential development is prohibited in this zone.

25 As indicated before, we’ve received some additional information from Mirvac on 17th of December. It’s still using the old 2004 information, the FIA modelling, but so the modelling has not been updated, and we’ve only received an [extract 00:31:04] of the existing flood information.

30 This information was referred to the DCCEEW-BCS as they’re the flooding expert. And also, Department’s internal Risk and Resilience Team, because they’re our Department’s flooding expert.

35 This has provided some preliminary comments. We are still waiting for the comprehensive flooding assessment comments from BCS, we haven’t received that. But the preliminary comments indicated that the positions are unchanged, so they have not seen any difference to what’s been provided and what’s there. They have been able to look at the building stability assessment and concluded that the building stability assessment is inadequate, considering the flood hazard that is present on the land.

40 And our internal Risk and Resilience Team has provided comments to identify that the Risk and Resilience Team’s position aligns with the agency comments. They, at this stage, until the agency comments are unchanged, we will support the agency position.

45 The next steps for this would be the planning proposal will need to seek rezoning of the development site. So, in the future it needs to use the correct or appropriate planning mechanism for the intended development. The Flood Impact Assessment needs to consider the current flood data, which is the BMT 2020 and Molino Stewart. It needs to address the BCS and SES comments, the comprehensive comments provided back for the gateway determination and the gateway review.

And it needs to consider DFI's current shelter-in-place guideline which is now finalised and available for flash flooding, adequately.

Thank you. Any questions?

5

**MS GRANT:** Yes, just on that last point. The current guidelines as finalised, allow for 6 hours, I think, maximum shelter-in-place.

**MS IQBAL:** Yes.

10

**MS GRANT:** And this, I think somewhere I read, was likely to be 12 hours. Is that ...?

**MS IQBAL:** Yes. I believe that 12 hours is the proponent's position. But SES identify it could be up to 36 hours. This year's indicated it would be more than 24 hours, yes.

15

**MS GRANT:** Right.

**MR MILLS:** That's quite comprehensive. I think you addressed all of the things that we had raised on our agenda.

20

**MS GRANT:** This might be something that you're not aware of, but it seems very bizarre that Mirvac would submit that additional information in December and still not refer to the updated modelling or updated standards. Did they – in the information they submitted, did they explain why?

25

**MS IQBAL:** I think their position is that they don't believe they have to use that data because it's not adopted by Council. Because it was commissioned but not adopted, so they are more comfortable using the adopted data. But flooding data or flooding doesn't work like that, it's not a legal matter, it's more dynamic. Yes.

30

**MS GRANT:** Right. Okay. I mean, presumably, they're aware of the Flood Inquiry. For them to not submit updated biodiversity information also seems strange. They would know that planning proposals, you know, two years is more normally the rule-of-thumb, but data was more than six years old doesn't meet the LEP guidelines.

35

**MS IQBAL:** No, but in past I have dealt with planning proposals where we have done pre-exhibition conditions for planning proposals to address the biodiversity conservation – or biodiversity impact assessment issues. So, perhaps they haven't provided that, thinking they don't want to commit to that kind of financial – yes, financial undertaking, if the planning proposal is not to go through.

40

**MR MILLS:** Has Mirvac suggested that your work to date shouldn't be considering the more recent flood assessments?

45

**MS IQBAL:** I'll hand it to you, Suzanne and Tina.

**MS WREN:** Yes, they've repeatedly said they'd like to rely on the old data.

5 **MR MILLS:** Have they actually said that you shouldn't be, or that no one should be using the more recent one? So, have they directly challenged ...?

10 **MS WREN:** Yes, I suppose when they say comments like, "It's not adopted by Council, so it's not the standard," I think that's their view. But yes, we would always want to use the most up-to-date data as best practice.

**MS GRANT:** And that was a recommendation, I think, of the 2022 Flood Inquiry, wasn't it, in terms of adopted government policy that you would use the most up-to-date data?

15 **MS WREN:** I think ... Yes.

**MS IQBAL:** I'd also like to add – sorry, you go, Suzanne.

20 **MS WREN:** No, I was just going to say I agree about the inquiry, Juliet, and for whatever reason, that a new flood study doesn't get adopted by Council, we don't know the ins and outs – that might be a political decision, but yes, I think it's best practice to take the more up-to-date data if it's available. Yes. Oyshee?

25 **MS IQBAL:** No, that's it.

**MR MILLS:** Brad, did you have any questions or want to add ...?

**MR JAMES:** No questions from me, Andrew.

30 **MS GRANT:** Just one query. When the original rezoning for the Georges Cove, the Mirvac development, went through and this became RE2, does the Department have any records of that sort of thought process?

35 I think Brad sort of followed that rabbit hole down to the point where it was part of the comprehensive LEP's rezoning, so it probably wasn't specifically mentioned. But I'm not sure whether there was, you know, any considerations specifically at the time that that area was rezoned to allow that residential development. Because it looks like there might have been some fairly strategic thought in where the RE2 was placed versus where the residential land was placed.

40 **MS WREN:** I don't know off the top of my head, the history. They do have consent for the marina development, so that can go ahead. And Mirvac's also got some other sites within that Moorebank East area. So, they've got the Georges Cove, Village, they've got residential pockets, and the three are all part of that, that have been planned strategically in a DCP for some time.

45 **MS GRANT:** Okay. Thank you. I don't have any other questions, Andrew.

**MR MILLS:** Thanks, Juliet. I think the couple of questions, I was just cross-checking something else then, the other question I had in my mind has already been dealt with through the SES report. So, I don't need to pursue anything on that myself.

5

That being the case, thank you very much for the comprehensive presentation and run-through of addressing a number of the things that we were interested in. If there is anything that comes up, we'll obviously put it in writing through the usual way. But thank you for your time today and I think we can bring the meeting to a close. Thank you.

10

[All say thank you or goodbye]

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**

15