



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1076123

CITY OF PARRAMATTA COUNCIL

RECORD OF MEETING

MS M. TAYLOR, Presiding

**CITY OF PARRAMATTA, LOCAL PLANNING
PANEL – COUNCIL MEETING**

**RYDALMERE OPERATIONS CENTRE
316 VICTORIA RD, RYDALMERE NSW**

3.43 PM, TUESDAY, 8 OCTOBER 2019

MS M. TAYLOR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm sorry about the late start. This is a meeting of the Local Planning Panel at Parramatta. We are – there are no apologies. We are all here.

5 MS: Are we?

MS TAYLOR: One of us is missing but will come back shortly. In fact, two of us are missing. But when they turn up we'll be all here. We've all signed a declaration that we have no conflict of interest in this particular matter. And the matter is an
10 interesting one today in that all we are asked to do as the local panel is to pass a comment – a recommendation on to the council about what the council should do. So the council can ignore us or fall down and worship what we've said – whatever they like. But we only make a recommendation. We are not making a decision here today. And we're very pleased to see you all here. The general rules don't really
15 apply here today. We'll just start with – if – have we got a list of speakers?

MS: On your desk there should be a run sheet which will have the speakers' names on.

20 MS: This one. No, just there.

MR: Just there.

MS TAYLOR: Right. Okay. I've got Rachel Jefferson, George Elles, Warren Joel,
25 Kieran Joel, Elizabeth Ashard and Cath Lynch. So I'll – you've got a problem. You've got to get away. Will we start with you?

MR G. ELLES: Okay.

30 MS TAYLOR: Okay. Now, before you start I'll just say who we've got here today.

MR ELLES: Yes.

MS TAYLOR: On my left is Helen Deegan, who's an expert member of the panel
35 and she's a town planner. On my far right is Ric Thorpe, who's an expert member of the panel. He is a well-known architect. And on my immediate right is Darryn Capes - - -

MR D. CAPES-DAVIS: Capes-Davis, yes.

40

MS TAYLOR: Capes-Davis. I'm sorry.

MR CAPES-DAVIS: That's all right.

MS TAYLOR: Who is the local person representing the community on this panel. We are all here. We've all signed a declaration – no conflict of interest. Is that correct?

5 MS DEEGAN: Yes.

MS TAYLOR: Yes. No conflict of interest.

MR CAPES-DAVIS: No conflicts, no.

10

MS TAYLOR: All right. Thank you. And – so who would - - -

MR: can I just ask a quick question. Are you council members or are you individual people?

15

MS TAYLOR: No, we are an independent panel.

MR: Okay.

20

MS TAYLOR: We're a totally independent panel. I was appointed by the State Government. The two expert people were on a list of people the State Government said could be chosen out of about 250 people and the council chose this and a number of other people to sit on these local panels. And Mr Capes-Davis had to apply and show an interest and be chosen by the council. But none of us work for the council, except that we do get paid a small amount of money to turn up here and talk to you today. We don't take any instructions from the council staff or the councillors about our decision. But, of course, we're very grateful of the council staff who come and tell us what they're thinking about and organise the meeting here today. So we're totally independent. We don't live in the area, except for the local person. We live somewhere else and we just bring a fresh but professional ear to listen to what you have to say and to give our opinion to the council. In this case, it's only opinion.

25

30

35

We are not making a decision. All we are deciding about is what we think about the changes to the LEP. And as you know, this is – it's not a big change to the LEP. It's a small change to sort of bring in all those other areas that have been amalgamated into Parramatta and try and get a consistency between zoning and rules for all the areas with a little bit of shaping about some of the things with heights, densities and with the permissibilities for a particular kind of development. I'm asking questions, for example – do – if I'm a circus, do I have to now get an – still have to an approval from the council or do I come under their new rules about exempt development? If I own a property, can I redevelop it as a dual occupancy? And the answer will be in some areas, yes. In some areas, no. And that's been quite a controversial matter and a lot of you have written in and gone to meetings about that and a few other particular changes in different areas. So – now, sir, your name is?

40

45

MR ELLES: George Elles.

MS TAYLOR: Mr Elles has got an appointment picking up children. I'm going to ask you to speak first. Listen, we think - - -

MR ELLES: Is there a microphone to speak in or - - -

5

MS TAYLOR: - - - three minutes but we're not going to time you.

MR ELLES: This one here? Thank you very much.

10 MS TAYLOR: Yes. And we are being recorded so I ask you to be (a) polite. Remember that – don't say anything defamatory. Please don't tell anybody off. And otherwise, other people will be hearing about it and your – their lawyers may contact you. So, Mr Elles, thank you. Would you like to say where you live or not?

15 MR ELLES: I've just got some notes here and – I just made in the last couple of hours because I - - -

MS TAYLOR: Good. Okay. Thank you.

20 MR ELLES: - - - didn't have time to read these 613 pages you've sent me.

MS TAYLOR: It's a lot of - - -

25 MR ELLES: But I was – most of it, very quickly. I went very – through. So I've got a three minute little talk here.

MS TAYLOR: Yes.

30 MR ELLES: So I thank the land use panel for the communications as well as their facilitation to be included for the three minute talk.

MS TAYLOR: Yes.

35 MR ELLES: I support the prohibition of dual occupancy in Dundas, as directed by LEP I asked many in – from our constituents and they informed me they did not received a letter. No one informed them. And the only way I know and I continued on to communicate with you – and thanks to Julio that send me everything I asked. Only a few days ago I was able to make an application to be accepted. I thank you very much for that. And I say they were not informed, so that's a negative thing to
40 the very positive council and the beautiful work that you're doing. If necessary, we can inform our residents – inform them.

MS TAYLOR: Yes.

45 MR ELLES: And I'm pretty sure at least 500 – more than you have selected so far – will support us in what I'm saying today. I say to those who are against the prohibitions recommended by the LEP the land value will not decrease, but

increase in time. It will be a sought after area for the known reasons if you don't have a dual occupancy. Now, most striking about those who object to the land use planning prohibition is they're not interested in our neighbourhood. They want to cash up now and go. They are not interested in those who left behind in our
5 neighbourhood. The builders, they simply sell to the Australian Chinese community mainly because the demand exists. And they're barely designed dual occupancy virtually eight out of 10 and they disappear. You never to see them again. Maybe the first time builders now, both these groups are not interested in our area. They don't care what happens.

10 We are left to deal with the situation and it's getting worse. The lack of trees, the space for the children. They have to play in the streets. Excessive traffic, insufficient parking of many cars on both sides of the streets which may cause accidents and even lives eventually. Now, look at the prices obtained each dual
15 occupation. Double the amount of what they buy the first land. They subdivide it and they don't leave sufficient space in there for the elderly people who can't use the upstairs area to put a lift on. So senior citizens don't want to live upstairs. Look at my street – Bray Street, Dundas. Our 2011 LEP and the dual occupancy, it's getting worse and worse and worse. Not only the cars speed very quickly up two
20 cars and you're lucky if your child doesn't go outside – my grandchild, so to speak. Now, I support recommended in LEP for the prohibition of the dual occupancy in the Dundas area in particular and I thank you for the opportunity to speak for the three minutes, which I think I'm under. Thank you.

25 MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr Elles. Any questions from the panel?

MS DEEGAN: No, no questions.

30 MS TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr Elles. Rachel Jefferson.

MS R. JEFFERSON: Okay. So just start?

MS TAYLOR: We're ready when you are.

35 MS JEFFERSON: Okay. I'm an owner/occupier in Carlingford in the former Hills District.

MS TAYLOR: Carlingford?

40 MS JEFFERSON: Yes, Carlingford.

MS TAYLOR: Right.

45 MS JEFFERSON: Sorry – I – all right. My comments are regarding dual occupancies in the Carlingford/North Rocks area where council wants to ban them. I don't agree with council's proposal to prohibit dual occupancies in my area and this view was also supported by the majority of stakeholders, as you know. Mostly local

residents like me. Council has completely disregarded public opinion and went on with its own predetermined views on this matter. To be honest, I wasn't surprised by this as I spoke to a local councillor during the process and he said to me, "No, we won't be allowing dual occupancies in your area." But this was while the
5 consultation was still open and the decision was supposed to have not been made yet. For them, the whole consultation process was just a tick box exercise, which is very disappointing.

In fact, they openly admitted in the report that it was councillors' personal views that informed the proposal, not community views. Just for your reference, this was stated in section 29 of the report. It's also worth noting that none of the feedback from government agencies supported the council's position on dual occupancies. Okay. Council's approach on this was a captain's call. In the planning report, council didn't address any of the advantages of allowing dual occupancies, only the
15 negatives. For example, a lack of public transport was cited as a negative. However, more people in an area means more people to use the public transport and more frequent services. This should be viewed as a positive, not a negative. It also painted dual occupancies as the only evil in terms of housing types. For example, dual occupancy causing less trees as a major negative. But what about single
20 occupancy knockdown and rebuilds. They result in less trees as well, but council didn't even consider those in the report.

Granny flats are even worse because they're just built in the backyard of an existing property. Council's only agenda was vilifying dual occupancy so that they left out –
25 so they left out any details that would detract from this message. The report dismisses residents' arguments that dual occupancies increased housing stock by saying they won't significantly contribute to total dwellings, yet the entire analysis is based on the prospect that every house in every street might become a dual occupancy if they let them through. They can't have it both ways. If it doesn't
30 contribute to housing stock in a good way, they can't argue it contributes to congestion in a bad way.

Council should have been fair and balanced in their assessment, but they're not. They're prejudiced and one-sided. In conclusion, we live in a city bursting at the
35 seams and we need a multi-pronged housing strategy. Forcing everyone into units isn't the answer, nor is a simplistic approach of "Just send them out west", which I've heard a person say. While it won't change the world, every dual occupancy that's built will change the lives of that one family that can live in the second house that's built when they otherwise would have been forced out into the west. In the
40 bigger picture of Sydney housing, I think dual occupancies are an important element which council should embrace and not reject. Thank you.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Any questions?

45 MS DEEGAN: No.

MR CAPES-DAVIS: No.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

MS JEFFERSON: Yes.

5 MS TAYLOR: Mr Warren Joel.

MR W. JOEL: I'd like to thank the councillors and the residents who have attended the meeting today. I think it's very important. When I read the document last week, after the 600-odd pages, I probably got through a third of it and I was very concerned
10 to the point I couldn't sleep, that they were going to stop dual occupancies. But I'm from the Oatlands area. And from everybody I've talked in my neighbours, they need the – more than just one single home on a 900 or 1000 square metre block of land. My next-door neighbours who are 83 and 88 can no longer maintain their own home. They have already asked us if they know where they could live still in the
15 area in a villa or in a – they don't want a townhouse. They want a single level living area. They want to be able to drive into their garage and walk into their home without any stairs. And that's what I believe Oatlands will need as a multi-residential area to live in.

20 From the research I've done, Parramatta's population is going to double in the next 10 to 20 years. We need good residential areas to be able to live in. I've also then contacted to our two existing councillors today because I was so bothered about what was happening. And Benjamin Barrak and Pierre Esber both agree that Oatlands should have dual occupancies. We are also taking a – dual occupancies are a two-
25 storey home, but not necessarily, they can be a single storey home and attached. I believe that young people of today need to afford to live in an area close to their work and close to public transport. I've also thought of the idea that people can afford a new home, a three-bedroom home as a young family and grow, like we have in the past. But unfortunately, times are changing with population and density;
30 you're not longer going to get your 1000 square metre blocks of land. So we are now looking at the next generation, at what's going to happen in the next 30 years.

I also believe that I've offered and put in my opinion on the harmonisation that we put in in February 2019. And from what I've read in the proposal, it's been totally
35 disregarded. So I'm a little bit concerned about it. And from everything else that I've read, even Council themselves have identified Oatlands, which is where I'm from, is needing diverse residential accommodation. So I object strongly to the Council's proposal to ban development in the Oatlands area. Thank you.

40 MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr Joel, Kieran Joel.

MR K. JOEL: Did you want to separate us, speaker? Or did you want to put us back-to-back? Or - - -

45 MS TAYLOR: I don't mind. What would you like?

MR K. JOEL: It's up to you, Speaker.

MS TAYLOR: Okay. Well, come on up, seeing as you're here.

MR K. JOEL: Not a problem. Good afternoon speakers, Panel and residents. I have been born and bred in Oatlands and I am speaking completely separate from my
5 father. My name's Kieran Joel and I'm actually an owner of a home in Oatlands. After receiving the email last Monday from the Panel's recommendations to Council, I highly object to the proposal to prohibit dual occupancies across the governed area. I believe that the locals need a choice when it comes to accommodation in the Oatlands area, which involved mixed homes, not just single dual occupancies and
10 single homes but also the inclusion of townhouses and villas. I'm 25 and we have a problem where there is high costs for home and really difficult positions to live. Parramatta is supposed to be increasing in their density and trying to encourage us to do business in the Parramatta district. We can not be considered to either afford a single home or go and live in a unit.

15 There needs to be that variety and that choice. After contacting Pierre Esber, as well, he believes in the development in Oatlands. He also understands that there are narrow roads in Oatlands, however, on main roads, where there is transport, that they should be dual occupancies and mixed development usage. Also, this week, I
20 contacted Michelle Gerard, who is also our member in the Dundas Ward. She also supports the development of homes in the Oatlands area that sits on large blocks. As per your Panel, from the Panel's review you found that over 40 per cent of the homes in Oatlands sit on 900 square metres or more. And also 89 per cent over 600 square metres. This large mass of land that is no longer being used to have a single home on
25 it should be used for the best possible outcome and be able to build good quality homes and be able to allow for people to live close to their homes, close to schools and also close to their working space in Parramatta.

30 Finally, I wish to ask the Panel why the decision has been rushed so quickly? As by giving the residents one week to read 613 pages – also holding a meeting a day after a public holiday raises questions, in my opinion. On both the Parramatta Council and Hills Shire webpages, both Councils have recognised the lack of townhouses and villas options in the Oatlands area. And today we have the ability to allow that. Mixed developments in Oatlands is to allow for affordable housing, a variety of
35 housing options other than single homes and units but also the potential for community members to become part of the area and not be forced out west. As my father mentioned on a separate case, our elderly members are getting forced outside their local areas because they are either forced to maintain their properties or move into a unit or outside the local area. After 301 submissions, the Council is regarding
40 dual occupancies in Oatlands and prohibiting this.

45 It appears that the Council is not listening or the Panel is not listening to the community and hence why I'm proposing an action, if necessary, to fight the Council at the next election and allow mixed use in the Oatlands area. Thank you.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Before you go any questions from the Panel? Just let me assure you, ladies and gentlemen, we didn't write this document.

This has been written by the Council planning staff in the Strategic Planning area for the benefit of us to make a recommendation one way or the other or any which way to the Council and for the Councillors to understand, by the work that they have done, which way to go. As you can hear already, Councillors are divided in what
5 they're thinking about it. And so nobody's made a decision as yet. All that has been done is a Report has been written based on factual material and studies and reviews done.

10 So that matter will go to Parramatta Council and today we'll make a recommendation to say "Yes, no or maybe." Thank you.

MS DEEGAN: And Mary, sorry, may I just ask Kieran a quick question?

15 MS TAYLOR: Yes, by all means.

MS DEEGAN: I just wanted to understand, previously, have the properties that you occupy been permissible for dual occupancy?

20 MR K. JOEL: Currently not dual occupancies. However, there is precedents in our street and also in the area of townhouses and villas.

MS DEEGAN: Okay. So multi-unit housing. But - - -

25 MR K. JOEL: However, with this prohibition, it will change.

MS DEEGAN: Okay.

MS TAYLOR: Understood. Elizabeth Ashard.

30 MS E. ASHARD: Oh, that's me. I'm going to get – try and get through this very quickly. But I have quite a few things to say. First of all, my name's Liz Ashard, I live in the area of Adamson Avenue and Rope Street in the Dundas Valley area. We have been inundated with duplexes. And I feel, I would like to point out some of the issues around the standards and the problems that have occurred with the excess
35 amount of, I feel, of duplexes in the area. So I do, once again, thank you for allowing me to speak. I feel I shall shortly be able to bring up some point that other people will not have experienced, perhaps.

40 We have heaps of duplexes cropping up in various streets in the Valley. And each duplex brings pressures on infrastructure and disturbance to residents and neighbourhood coherence. The Valley is known for its friendliness and – and loyalty amongst residents. And we would like to see this sense of community continue if any change does occur. I did want to touch on areas of roads, which is a big issue with this overdevelopment, damage done by builders and what can be done to the
45 infrastructure and – and resources around. Depletion of green space and trees that comes as part and parcel of construction, these days.

Encouragement awards for architects and builders to be more sustainable in the way they draw up their plans and the way they do the landscaping around buildings. I am going to go past roads and see if I can catch up at the end, if there's a little bit of time. I'm also concerned about the damage and flaunting of regulations by

5 developers and builders. We need to stop the gung-ho approaches and exploitation by developers with – either with some legal restraints put in place or held up – at more force put in place. For example, we need to look at the aesthetics and look of buildings. This standard is dropping in our area.

10 We have got the most ugliest building at the end of our street at 12A and 12B Adamson Avenue, if you'd like to have a look at it. And it does not fit in with the rest of the street space. Now builders flaunting regulations. I amongst other residents have tried to register noise complaints, working out of hours, etcetera, on this one particular property in Adamson Avenue and have been told by Council staff

15 that I – that I have to contact the private certifier. Now, this is a joke, because once you contact him he's in cahoots with the builder and the developer. And he's going to immediately tell them who lodged that complaint.

We need to reinstate a – a Council – where we can contact Council and allow us, be

20 allowed to voice our complaints and have it treated anonymously and have these things completed. So otherwise, we're going to have these unscrupulous builders and developers and any – any like them to continue to flaunt the – the law and snub their noses at the inconvenience to residences. They have caused a lot of damage to drains in our area. We live with the damage and until that's repaired, they've

25 damaged nature strips and I observed our postie falling into one of the divots that they caused and damage to resident's vehicles.

We've had one of our cars written off by a cement truck. Depletion of green space is occurring at a rapid pace. I believe there should be a generous quota of green space

30 expected by and implemented by developers. A percentage of how much space they're going to use on a block they must allow a certain amount of green space, and trees. Where mature trees have been destroyed, I think it should be mandatory that they're replaced by well-developed trees and also trees that are placed in the nature strip being inspected some months after the development's been completed. I have

35 an example where trees were put in front of 9-11 Quarry Road. Within a week they were – they were pulled out and not replaced.

And I feel that these unscrupulous developers and builders should have been fined and made to replace these trees as an important consideration. So in future, can

40 inspections of tree planting be followed up months later and ensure that they are not pulled out. And if so, the developer receives a hefty fine and replacement of trees. Now, the last one here, encouragement and rewards for builders and developers in sustainability practices. Good architects and developers be encouraged to design for less cement and more green space with green architects and developers encouraged

45 or rewarded or awards given by Council for thinking and working sustainably with the community they are temporarily working with.

Money speaks so why can't we then, perhaps, look at the developers and the builders and reward them with, perhaps, less fees if they're going to do the right thing. And if a restriction of duplexes is envisaged for the Dundas Valley region that will be a welcome change. We have had to put up with many inconveniences placed upon us
5 by fly-by developers and builders who have no interest or concern for the area, infrastructures and changes and future effects on people who live there. Why not give preference for new builds to people who have resided in the area for a certain – a reasonable period of time?

10 Perhaps reduce fees for them in comparison to outside builders and developers should be made to pay an impost for their disturbance in an established residential area. This would ensure the community cohesion. And the other thing I wanted to talk about were roads. We've got narrow streets, lack of footpaths, saturation of roads that are now clogged with the – with the extra population that we've got.
15 We've got no exit out of the valley. And we need, we've only got King Street. We need lights at Quarry and Evans Road. These are the issues that are now being caused by the proliferation of duplexes in our area. We can talk about it. We're living it now.

20 Garbage is another thing that hasn't been very well handled, I think. Presently the duplex designs, there's little consideration given to the placement of garbage bins on properties. They are smelly and an eyesore when they're put up the front. Consideration needs to be given to new plans for convenient placements of bins on the sides of properties and consideration given to the ease of manoeuvring them to
25 the roadway. This brings me to the issue of garbage trucks trying to pick up garbage when a development is in full throe and it's surrounded by trucks and cement trucks and – and so forth. Even though they've got wonderful technology today, they're still thwarted by the fact that they can't get into streets with all these developers – with all the builder's cars and that around – the buildings.

30 And the builders really just don't care. And I'd like to – to commend our first speaker on a lot of things that you mentioned. I'm sorry I'm speaking so fast, falling over my words. But I'd like to commend you with a lot of the points that you brought up, as well. And I think that's just about it. I'm all over the place. But,
35 that's it, thank you.

MS TAYLOR: Just hang on there. Any questions?

MS DEEGAN: No, nothing further.
40

MS TAYLOR: Right. Thank you very much.

MS ASHARD: Thank you.

45 MS TAYLOR: And our final speaker was Cath Lynch. Thank you. We'll take that.

MS C. LYNCH: Thank you. My name is Cath Lynch and I live in Rope Street, Dundas Valley. For those of you who are not aware, Dundas Valley was first designed some 50 or 60 years ago, namely to accommodate Housing Commission housing. As part of the design, the streets are narrow. In our area, particularly,
5 they're about six point five metres wide. Cars are permitted to park on both sides of the street, which leaves only one traffic lane. Half of our street does not have a footpath either side and so parents with strollers or children going down to the park to play have to walk on the road. Duplexes which are built, have been built next door to my family's home use the garages for storage and park their cars on the street
10 or they remove the trees which Council ordered them to plan when the – when the building was designed and park on the grass. So we're not getting those extra green areas. Additionally, traffic on the corner of Evans Road and Yates Avenue right back to David Avenue has, once again, a very narrow street. It's a rat-run in the morning and there is also one lane, only, of traffic.

15 And we've got traffic coming up from Telopea, turning right into Yates Avenue. We've got traffic coming down Evans Avenue, Evans Road and turning into Yates Avenue. And so it goes on. It's just an absolute nightmare. I came here to speak on two issues today. The first is the prohibition of dual occupancy in Dundas Valley,
20 which I strongly endorse, as do many of the neighbours in our area. The second question that I would like to raise is the prohibition of childcare in industrial areas. I have been involved in childcare for 40 years. Not as a teacher or anything like that, but as a person who has supported the need for childcare, which Parramatta Council has endorsed. We are currently fighting in our street – as council would be aware –
25 DA5992018, which is going to the Land and Environment Court in May of next year. The banning of childcare in industrial areas is only going to increase the demand for childcare in residential areas, which was a set plan put forward by Anthony Roberts in 2018 – 2019 – '17 – sorry.

30 I don't recommend that we have childcare where there are obviously heavy industry or industries which we – which produce noxious chemicals or things which would be dangerous to a child. I would draw panel's attention to a development called Eden Park which was built on the House of David site on the corner of Lane Cove Road, North Ryde some 30 years ago. And it was a development of light industrial small
35 buildings so people who are carpenters or graphic drawers or – you know, light industry. The beauty of it was that they had a childcare centre where either parent – either mother or father – who worked there could go down to the childcare centre and have lunch with their child. They didn't have to do a cross-city drive to find childcare. They dropped their child to the childcare centre and they went to work.
40 And I just think that this is an area which needs to be looked at more closely. Parramatta needs more childcare and we don't need it in residential area. Thank you.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Just before we go, any questions of Ms Lynch?

45

MS LYNCH: Thank you.

MS DEEGAN: No, thank you very much.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you.

5 MR THORPE: No.

MR CAPES-DAVIS: No, thank you.

10 MS TAYLOR: And just okay. That's the number of speakers that I have
written down here. Is there anybody else who wanted to say something? Okay.
Well, what will happen from here on in, we will go back and consider all that you
have said and our own opinions on this. We too got this at the last minute and had to
15 spend our long weekend reading. And we will give our opinion on things that have
been said here today and that are in the report to the council and they will deal with it
when they make their decision in due course. I just remind all of you who are
speaking here today about problems in their area: you still have elected councillors
and I think that's what they're for so, please, I encourage you to speak to them and
20 not be fobbed off by perhaps somebody saying at the council it's not their job to do
X or Y. Perhaps your councillor would like to know you've got a problem and
would like to try and bring about a solution. I encourage you to talk to them often.
Yes?

MR L. BENNETT: Will you be making the decision today or will it be delivered
later?
25

MS TAYLOR: We'll take a little time to make this decision because we've had a
lot - - -

MR BENNETT:
30

MS TAYLOR: - - - of reading. It won't – we won't be coming back and saying,
“Yes, it's yes” or “no” or “maybe”.

MR BENNETT: Right
35

MS TAYLOR: Yes, but it'll be on our webpage.

MR BENNETT: That's fine.

40 MS TAYLOR: That is the Parramatta Local Panel - - -

MR BENNETT: Yes.

MS TAYLOR: - - - webpage and – in several days.
45

MR BENNETT: Very much complex problem you've got it's a very complex
- - -

MS TAYLOR: It's very complex.

MR BENNETT: - - - study you're doing

5 MS TAYLOR: Yes, it's a big deal.

MR BENNETT: I bet.

MS DEEGAN: Mmm.

10

MS TAYLOR: They say it's a small deal, but it's got a few - - -

MR BENNETT:

15 MS TAYLOR: - - - wrinkles that are very big deals.

MR BENNETT:

20 MS TAYLOR: Yes, so hopefully harmonisation will occur in a way that's of –
harmonious for everybody. Yes, sir.

MR K. JOEL: Would you like the findings from the Hills Shire Future Planning
Strategy that I have mentioned in my presentation?

25 MS TAYLOR: The Hills Shire?

MR JOEL: Yes, it is till 2016, before it got joined or harmonised.

MS TAYLOR: Before the amalgamation.

30

MR JOEL: Yes, before the amalgamation it was their future planning strategy,
which is what I mentioned in my speech. But if you'd like it, I'm very happy to - - -

MS TAYLOR: I sit on the Hills Shire panel as well.

35

MR JOEL: Okay.

MS TAYLOR: So I will have seen it at some stage, yes. Okay. But thank you very
much for the offer.

40

MR JOEL: Cool. Thank you.

MS TAYLOR: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I now - - -

45 MR BENNETT: Can I just make one comment?

MS TAYLOR: Yes.

MR BENNETT: This is supposed to be harmonisation, but, basically, I see it's for the former Baulkham Hills/Hills Shire Council area's integration into Parramatta. But it seems to be that there is a – not the same standard applied in this area as across the rest of the Parramatta Council area and that's – well, I was concerned about
5 harmonisation. It's not integrative with the whole of the council. That's something

MS TAYLOR: Yes, this has been written by town planners and we have put that particular question to them and they have said, well, what they're also seeking is
10 harmonisation in the area. So if you suddenly change the rules in an area that's well established, that might not be a harmonious way to go about things. So that is dealt with deliberately in this report somewhere so I recommend that you have a look through to see.

15 MR BENNETT: I'm not impressed with the arguments, quite frankly.

MS TAYLOR: Not impressed with the arguments. Okay. Well, thank you. I note what you say. Yes.

20 MR ELLES: Just one more question following the – thank you very much for the panel which Julio in particular for communicating with me. Although late, he send me all the information to be here today. But could I suggest to the panel here today to actually consider to write to everyone so everyone is aware because I think more than half – I'd say three quarter population – they don't even know what's
25 happening.

MS DEEGAN: Mmm.

30 MS TAYLOR: I – I've - - -

MR ELLES: And why didn't they before?

MS TAYLOR: - - - taken your comments on that - - -

35 MR ELLES: Yes.

MS TAYLOR: - - - on board and I will make a comment to the - - -

40 MR ELLES: Thank you very much. Yes.

MS TAYLOR: - - - council about that. Thank you. Okay.

MR BENNETT:

45 MS TAYLOR: Well, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for coming. We appreciate the time you've taken in both replying to this – because that's been very

valuable – and coming along and expressing your views here today. Stay tuned. Talk to your councillors. Thank you very much. I declare the meeting closed.

MR:

5

MS TAYLOR: Sorry – did you want to say anything?

MR BENNETT: Thanks very much.

10 MR: I don't – I've got no additional comments.

MS TAYLOR: Okay. Righto.

MR: That's fine.

15

MS TAYLOR: Thanks very much.

MS:

20 MS TAYLOR: That's – just in the state panel we always hear from the council and the local one we don't usually. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

MS: Thank you.

25 MR: Thank you.

MS TAYLOR: We've been assisted by your comments.

30 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[4.20 pm]