



NSW RURAL FIRE SERVICE

The Council of the Municipality of Kiama
PO Box 75
KIAMA NSW 2533

Your reference: PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00
Our reference: SPI20210309000030

ATTENTION: Ed Paterson

Date: Thursday 1 April 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

Strategic Planning Instrument

Rezoning – Planning Proposal

Referral 3

Planning Proposal to amend planing controls to enable residential development and environmental protection on rural land situated west of the Princes Highway between Saddleback Mountain Road and Weir Street, South Kiama (Lot 1 DP 707300, Lot 5 DP 740252, Part Lot 101 DP 1077617, Part Lot 102 DP 1077617, Lot 8 DP 258605 and part of unnamed road reserve)

I refer to your correspondence dated 09/03/2021 inviting the NSW Rural Fire Service (NSW RFS) to comment on the above Strategic Planning document.

The NSW RFS has considered the information submitted and provides the following comments.

A review of the additional information with regard to Section 4.4 of the directions issued in accordance with Section 9.1 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* has been carried out.

The following information is based on an assessment of the amended Strategic Bush Fire Study (SBFS) by Ecological dated 9 February 2021 and the concept masterplan depicted in figure 2 of the SBFS by siteplus dated 25 January 2021 and is in response to NSW RFS letter dated 24 November 2020.

Future subdivision of the land shall comply with *Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019*. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Provision of Asset Protection Zones (APZs) within the proposed lots and road reserves in accordance with Table 5.3a;
- Access to be provided in accordance with the specifications and requirements set out in Table 5.3b; and,
- Services to be provided in accordance with Table 5.3c.

Additionally, with regard to these requirements, the following comments are made in relation to the referenced concept plan:

Site Ingress Paths

1

Postal address

NSW Rural Fire Service
Locked Bag 17
GRANVILLE NSW 2142

Street address

NSW Rural Fire Service
4 Murray Rose Ave
SYDNEY OLYMPIC PARK NSW 2127

T (02) 8741 5555
F (02) 8741 5550
www.rfs.nsw.gov.au

To ensure adequate access and timely response times to all incidents, at a minimum, the central underpass of the motorway must be made available for a Category 1 appliance to enter the proposal site. The existing road network may be require upgrade to facilitate this traffic movement.

To ensure that future subdivision development can be supported by NSW RFS, at the strategic planning stage prior to approval of the PP, the consent authority shall be satisfied that the above access provision can occur at future development stages.

Consultation with emergency service providers

NSW RFS recommend that comments are received from all emergency service providers during the consultation period regarding the adequacy on ingress paths proposed.

For any queries regarding this correspondence, please contact Anna Jones on 1300 NSW RFS.

Yours sincerely,

Bradley Bourke
**Team Leader, Dev. Assessment & Planning
Planning and Environment Services**

Item 4.4

Enclosure 6





Planning,
Industry &
Environment

Our ref: DOC20/908212
Senders ref: PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00

Ed Patterson
Manager Strategic Planning
Kiama Municipal Council
E-mail: ed.patterson@kiama.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Patterson

Subject: Revised Planning Proposal – Weir Street & Saddleback Mountain Road, South Kiama – PP_2019_004_00

Thank you for your email dated 9 October 2020 requesting comments on the revised masterplan (Version 4, August 2020) and amended information submitted in support of the planning proposal. In response, our comments are detailed below.

Floodplain Risk Management

We note that the revised planning proposal has been subject to some minor amendments, including the removal of a previously proposed flood detention basin and minor reduction in floodplain filling, and the flood assessment has been revised accordingly. However, as with the previous version of the proposal, the flood assessment continues to demonstrate there will be downstream flood impacts.

This includes increased flood levels, frequency and duration over the full range of possible flood events. As there is no proposed measure to offset the reduction in storage downstream of the fill, flood impacts caused by the floodplain filling are unmitigated. We also note that the opportunity to provide an overall reduction in existing flood risk to the community is lost and flood risk will instead be increased due to this planning proposal. In addition, the revised flood assessment has not addressed matters raised and discussed in our previous advice.

As such, it is considered the planning proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of Section 9.1 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land, in particular Clauses 5 & 6, as well as the NSW Floodplain Development Manual (FDM) 2005. The above issues are not minor and should be of concern to Council to satisfactorily address.

As previously advised (DOC20/515380 letter dated 29/06/2020 & email dated 14/08/2020) we consider the environmental, public safety and flood impacts associated with the proposed filling of the floodplain to the top of the creek bank can be resolved by applying setback provisions within the Kiama LEP 2011 flood planning and riparian land framework. We consider that Council now has adequate information to resolve this matter by aligning the planning proposal with the objectives of KLEP 2011, Section 9.1 Direction 4.3 & the FDM. We remain available to further detail these concerns or provide technical flooding advice as required.

Biodiversity

We note no change to the flora & fauna report prepared by Eco Logical Australia (ELA, 2020) in support of the original planning proposal. However, we support the updated zoning and riparian layers of the PP, reflecting the expanded area of E2 at Munna Munnora Creek and the east-west riparian corridors traversing the site. We reiterate our previous suggestion that a conservation



Planning,
Industry &
Environment

agreement be implemented for the management of the E2 zoned remnant Illawarra Subtropical Rainforest and Freshwater Wetlands on Coastal Floodplains threatened ecological communities and areas containing the threatened flora species *Zieria granulata*.

If you have any questions about this advice, please do not hesitate to contact Mr Calvin Houlison, Senior Conservation Planning Officer, via calvin.houlison@environment.nsw.gov.au on 4224 4179.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Chris Page'.

Chris Page

4 November 2020

Senior Team Leader, Planning (Illawarra)
Biodiversity & Conservation Division
Environment, Energy and Science

Item 4.4

Enclosure 7



3rd August 2020

Mr Ed Paterson
Manager Strategic Planning
Kiama Municipal Council
PO Box 75
Kiama NSW 2533

Via email: council@kiama.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Paterson,

SUBMISSION TO SOUTH KIAMA PLANNING PROPOSAL PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00

School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW), as part of the Department of Education (DoE), welcomes Councils invitation to provide comments on South Kiama Planning Proposal PP_2019_Kiama_004_00 (PP) affecting rural land situated west of the Princes Highway between Saddleback Mountain Road and south of Weir Street, South Kiama.

SINSW has reviewed the documentation submitted and notes that it seeks to amend existing planning controls to enable residential development and environmental protection land on land currently zoned for rural purposes. The proposed rezoning would facilitate up to 455 residential lots.

It is understood that the Kiama community have raised concerns that existing government schools will not be able to accommodate the increase in school aged children associated with this proposal.

SINSW advises that the subject site is in the catchment of Kiama Public School and Kiama High School. It is also part of the Kiama Primary School Community Group (SCG) and Kiama Secondary SCG. There are 1,118 primary school students currently enrolled in the Kiama Primary SCG (comprising Gerringong Public School, Jamberoo Public School and Kiama Public School) and 1,066 students enrolled in the Kiama Secondary SCG (comprising Kiama High School).

The latest DoE Student by Area (SbA) projections show that there will be 1,063 primary aged students and 1,082 secondary aged students living in the Kiama SCGs by 2036. SINSW assumes that these DoE SbA projections have already included the future students associated with this proposal. This is because the proposal affects land already identified for urban expansion within the draft Kiama Local Strategic Planning Statement (DoE SbA projections take into account future urban expansion areas).



Considering the latest DoE SbA projections for Kiama, SINSW has determined that the Kiama Primary SCG and Kiama Secondary SCG will both be able to accommodate the future students associated with the proposal.

Should you require further information about this submission, please contact Jarred Statham at Jarred.Statham@det.nsw.edu.au.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Carpenter".

Alix Carpenter
Director Statutory Planning

Item 4.4

Enclosure 8



8 June 2020

Edward Paterson
Manager Strategic Planning
Kiama Municipal Council
P: 02 4232 0444
PO Box 75, Kiama NSW 2533
www.kiama.nsw.gov.au
edwardp@kiama.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Patterson,

I am writing to you in relation to the planning proposal identified below and would like to register the Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land council's opposition to the development, at this point in time, based on but not limited to the following concerns:

- Residential development in the area based on current anticipated demand would not warrant a development of this size;
- The cultural landscape from an Aboriginal and European heritage perspective, associated with the land concerned has not been factored into any assessment to this proposal
- There is potential for significant Aboriginal heritage items to be present on the sites concerned and while mitigation measures may be able to be implemented avoidance of impact is always the preferred course of action

Title	Residential development Saddleback Mountain Road Weir Street South Kiama
Summary	To rezone rural land west of the Princes Highway between Saddleback Mountain Road to south of Weir Street, South Kiama for residential and environmental conservation purposes.
Number	PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00
Location	
Lot/Section/DP:	101 /1077617
Lot/Section/DP:	5 /740252
Lot/Section/DP:	1 /707300
Lot/Section/DP:	102 /1077617
Lot/Section/DP:	8 /258605

Regards


Paul Knight
Chief Executive Officer

LAND COUNCIL, 3 ELLEN STREET, WOLLONGONG, NSW, 2500
02 4226 3338 • ILALC.ORG.AU



RESPONSE TO REQUEST RE: PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00

Title Residential development Saddleback Mountain Road Weir Street South Kiama

Summary To rezone rural land west of the Princes Highway between Saddleback Mountain Road to south of Weir Street, South Kiama for residential and environmental conservation purposes.

Location

Lot/Section/DP:101 /1077617

Lot/Section/DP:5 /740252

Lot/Section/DP:1 /707300

Lot/Section/DP:102 /1077617

Lot/Section/DP:8 /258605

Dear Mr Patterson,

In formally responding to the request by DPIE, as part of the Gateway Determination and the condition that Council consult with the public authorities/organisations under section 3.34(2)(d) of the Act and/or to comply with the requirements of relevant section 9.1 Directions which includes the Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council we provide the following response.

The Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council recognises the importance of the provision of residential housing to the community and the economic benefits, activities such as the construction of housing and population growth provides to areas such as Kiama Municipal Council. We do however have concerns in relation to this development based on the size and location of the land that will be impacted by this proposal.

The Land Council would firstly like to highlight that from all the population projections for the Kiama Municipal Council area that we have been able to find there would not appear to be a demand for this development for the foreseeable future. This position has been most recently highlighted in the Council's Draft Local Strategic Planning Statement, which indicates a population growth of 4,000 people over the next 20 years. This would therefore indicate an estimated housing demand of some 1600 homes over this timeframe or an average of 80 new dwellings every year. It is our view that this demand can be met by current infill development and some greenfield developments that have already been earmarked in the LGA, furthermore we understand that over this time period there is potential for other land holdings to be made available for housing development that have more appropriate access to infrastructure.

The question may therefore arise as to why the Land Council is concerned by this development on the grounds of demand. This understanding underlines the following concerns which we believe strongly challenge the development proceeding, at this point in time.

Firstly and most importantly, we believe that this development will have a significant impact on the cultural landscape associated with the area. Cultural landscape in this instance includes both a



significant Aboriginal perspective with obvious European Heritage. It is our view that there has been an inadequate evaluation of the cultural landscape across the development site and surrounding areas. As there development is not required to address a current demand regardless of whether a new report is developed to investigate the cultural landscape perspective and the impacts to this, it is our view as per Burra Charter which seeks to appropriately manage heritage that avoidance of impact is the preferred course of action. Therefore the preferred course of action should be to not proceed with this development

As an Aboriginal community we find that the process of assessment of our sites and their value being reflected in relation to their scientific classification as being completely inappropriate and offensive. This position fails the human test. Aboriginal people are not scientific experiments. Our heritage belongs to us. Our dislocation from our land, our country, our stories belongs to everyone and we need to take responsibility as a community for this. To place the tangible connection to Our Lands and Our Country in the realm of scientific understanding is another slap in the face and a devaluing of our human rights and our identity. It is time for Governments and Industry to understand and accept this, and not give it lip service and skirt the legislation that has been enacted to return the dignity and identity to Aboriginal communities. We find it offensive that these reports on Aboriginal cultural heritage are undertaken in this white paradigm of science and interpreted through the lens of white privilege that provides a token understanding of what real connection and belonging to Country is about.

The Illawarra Local Aboriginal Land Council would also like to emphasise that, our culture is a living culture and our heritage surrounds us every day. Science is not what we live for or aim to contribute too. We strongly believe that the wider community as well as archaeologists and anthropologists need to appreciate and resolve to support the recognition of Aboriginal cultural heritage as part of a living and continually evolving society and place an emphasis on highlighting and celebrating this heritage rather than recording whether it has scientific value.

All heritage has high importance to our community and we point out that this importance relates to the tangible and the intangible aspects, values, identity and connection between places, "The Cultural Landscape", which is not scientific but a value belonging to Aboriginal people as humans. To deny this, is to again place Aboriginal people back in the category of flora and fauna that can be exploited by white colonial privilege.

ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance - Burra Charter, 2013¹

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members. We would specifically like to highlight and reference the following Articles without limiting or negating the relevance of the entire 34 articles included in the Burra Charter:

- Article 3. Cautious approach
- Article 7. Use
- Article 8. Setting
- Article 15. Change

¹ <https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>



Conflicts with Burra charter

The Aboriginal cultural heritage report fails to reflect many aspects of guiding documents such as the Burra Charter to which the NSW government is a signatory. We would contest that the potential impact which will be attributed to this project does not align with the cost that will be borne by the Aboriginal community through the potential loss of such a significant landscape. It also doesn't identify the loss which will also impact the wider community, and therefore assert that it is not in keeping with what would be expected under the Burra Charter.

In support of our assertion we can highlighted at least 4 articles in this Charter that can be applied to this project. Specifically, we reference the following types of places of cultural significance including natural, Indigenous and historic places. We also highlight the charter makes reference to cultural values and is a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians. We therefore encourage further consideration of the following Articles in relation to this project and ask the proponent to address these matters as a matter of urgency before proceeding further.

Article 3. Cautious approach

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

5.1 Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

It is our view that this development and the objectives of this project do not align to this Article and the stated objective of taking a cautious approach.

If this were in fact the case greater consultation and further investigation would be seen as an appropriate step. Additionally, the project would potentially need to be fully reconsidered, due to the potential destruction of such a large area and the relationship with surrounding Aboriginal and European cultural heritage sites within and beyond the project area.



Article 7. Use

7.1 Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained.

A place should have a compatible use. The policy **should identify a use or combination of uses or constraints on uses that retain the cultural significance of the place.** **New use** of a place **should involve minimal change** to significant fabric and use; should respect associations and meanings; and where appropriate should provide for continuation of activities and practices which contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

As this project will result in permanent and unrepairable damage to the landscape there are several considerations that should be made, however the most significant is whether this project should proceed given the destruction that will occur due to the activities that actually are not essential to the environment in which they will occur. The development is not needed to meet the expected demand for housing in the area and therefore avoidance of impact would meet the minimal change and support the continuation of current use.

The proponent should not proceed without further investigation to record, detail and enhance the ongoing connection of the local Aboriginal community back to Country. Additionally, The proponent should be seeking to further engage with the Aboriginal community to determine the most appropriate mechanisms for ensuring the cultural values and connections to the landscape are recognised and that any destruction of cultural sites and objects is absolutely limited.

Article 8. Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate setting. This includes retention of the visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Again, this development is not in keeping with this aspect of the Burra charter and can be seen to completely disregard this Article within the Charter. The known mass profiling of the landscape alone do not align with the principles of this Article. Additionally, the Project has not thoroughly investigated the impacts relating to cultural relationships relating to landscapes and their cultural significance.



Article 15. Change

- 15.1 Change may be necessary to retain *cultural significance*, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. **The amount of change to a place and its use should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.**
- 15.2 **Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.**
- 15.3 **Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable.** However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of *conservation*. **Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.**
- 15.4 **The contributions of all aspects of cultural significance of a place should be respected.** If a place includes *fabric, uses, associations or meanings* of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance.

The whole proposal completely disregards this aspect of the Burra Charter. It seeks to put a return to investors ahead of the interests of the community and in particular the Aboriginal community that will see, yet another significant landform change impact our cultural landscape. We therefore assert that this project has provided little consideration for cultural significance of the area, from an Aboriginal or European perspective and the activities associated with the development proceeding will result in irreversible demolition of a unique cultural landscape.

Finally, I would request that Council and DPIE consider these points in light of the overall project impacts of creating a significant changed amenity and loss of character to the area. We would also suggest that due to the location of this development our concerns will be exacerbated by infrastructure works beyond the project area. The later point, is often overlooked, when development proposals seek to identify the impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage on a specific location rather than seeking to understand the impacts from a cultural landscape and supporting infrastructure perspective at the same time.

Regards



Paul Knight
Chief Executive Officer



Our ref: STH07/01931/03
Contact: Hayley Sarvanandan
Your ref: Planning Proposal_2019_KIAMA_004_00

10 September 2020

Ed Paterson
Kiama Municipal Council
BY EMAIL: edwardp@kiama.nsw.gov.au
CC: council@kiama.nsw.gov.au

**PLANNING PROPOSAL – AMENDMENT TO KIAMA LOCAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN (2011) TO ENABLE
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, LOT 1 DP707300, LOT 5 DP740252, PART OF LOT 101 DP1077617,
PART OF LOT 102 DP1077617 & LOT 8 DP258605**

Dear Ed

Transport for NSW (TfNSW, formerly Roads and Maritime Services) refers to your correspondence dated 4th August 2020 regarding the above planning proposal.

TfNSW has reviewed the additional information provided.

TfNSW does not support the planning proposal in its current form. TfNSW believes further consideration needs to be given to the likely impacts of future development facilitated by the planning proposal, identification of appropriate upgrades to mitigate these impacts and identification of a suitable legally binding mechanism to secure contributions and/or upgrades prior to rezoning the land. Detailed comments are provided in Attachment 1.

If you have any questions please contact Hayley Sarvanandan on 4221 2423. Please ensure all future correspondence is sent to development.southern@rms.nsw.gov.au.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Chris Millet'.

Chris Millet
Land Use Manager
Community and Place | South Region

Attachment 1

Impact on State road network

The information provided to date does not address how the proponent will address the broader impacts of the rezoning on the State road network, nor does it identify a legally binding planning mechanism to secure any upgrades or contributions. TfNSW requests clarification on whether this land will be identified as an Urban Release Area under the Kiama LEP and thereby be subject to reaching 'satisfactory arrangements' for State public infrastructure prior to the subdivision of land or if a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) is proposed. Where possible, TfNSW's preferred option would be for any upgrade works to be delivered as works in kind (WIK). TfNSW requests clarification on the proposed arrangements. This should also address the infrastructure items listed below.

Walking, cycling and public transport

TfNSW notes the proposed pedestrian facility upgrades detailed in Section 4.1 of the Revised Traffic Impact Assessment dated 28th July 2020. Strategic designs for the proposed footpaths and pedestrian crossing treatments identified need to be prepared to clarify the scope of works, demonstrate a compliant design can be constructed within the road reserve.

Notes:

- a) The footpath designs need to clearly identify which side of the road footpaths will be located, property boundaries, footpath width and the location of where new footpaths will connect to existing pedestrian facilities.
- b) TfNSW is not convinced the underpass which connects to South Kiama Drive is wide enough to accommodate a travel lane and a footpath. A cross section and plan view are required demonstrating the proposed layout of the underpass clarifying the lane width, vertical clearances and footpath width. Swept path analysis in accordance with Austroads turning templates must be provided demonstrating that the largest vehicle to utilise the access can successfully turn left out onto South Kiama Drive.
- c) Pedestrian refuges must be in accordance with TfNSW Technical Direction TDT 2011/01a.
- d) At a minimum, the strategic designs must be to scale and include property boundaries, be appropriately dimensioned (i.e. existing and proposed lane widths, lengths etc).

Noise

TfNSW remains concerned with the level of detail shown in the noise assessment provided. TfNSW believes noise mounding or barriers are likely to be required at this location to adequately mitigate noise levels for future residential development. This is supported by Section O:5.1.53 of the Kiama Council DCP which states 'Acoustic rear boundary fencing will be required in most circumstances for residential lots abutting an arterial or sub-arterial road.' Based on the noise assessment information provided, the topography of the land at this location and also noting the existing noise barrier north of the subject site adjacent to Coryule Place, TfNSW recommends Council gives strong consideration to provision of a noise barrier.

Noise mounding or barriers provide acoustic benefit externally to the residences as well as internal. Alternatively, larger setbacks from the road could be considered.

TfNSW's expectation is that any noise barriers would be located within private land and not within the road reserve. Detailed plans should be provided demonstrating that an effective noise wall can be constructed prior to any subdivision occurring. Consideration must also be given to maintenance arrangements, noting TfNSW will not be willing to accept any maintenance responsibility.



3 June 2020

Our Ref: 185250

Ed Paterson
Manager Strategic Planning
Kiama Municipal Council
council@kiama.nsw.gov.au

RE: Planning Proposal – Saddleback Mountain Road, Kiama (PP_2019_KIAMA_004_00)

Thank you for notifying Sydney Water of the planning proposal listed above. The proposal relates to the rezoning of the above site from rural to residential and environmental protection, which would ultimately allow for 465 residential lots.

We have reviewed the application based on the information supplied and provide the following comments for your information to assist in planning the servicing needs of the proposal.

Water and Wastewater Servicing

- Sydney Water has completed a servicing assessment for the Kiama South area which has taken into consideration residential growth on this site.
- Following the assessment, Sydney Water is delivering a project to address wastewater wet weather system performance issues identified in the Kiama South assessment. These works are planned to be delivered by September 2021.
- Sydney Water has no objection to the planning proposal; however, we request that future developers within the site submit a feasibility application to Sydney Water to ensure that their development is consistent with the allowances made in the upgrade works.
- Additional infrastructure such as lead in mains or amplifications may be required. These will be assessed when developments are referred to Sydney Water for a Section 73 application.

As Sydney Water is currently undertaking upgrade works in the area, we encourage Council to liaise with their Sydney Water Account Manager, Sean Pracey via email at sean.pracey@sydneywater.com.au about future growth in the area so that it can be considered as part of these works.

The development servicing advice provided by Sydney Water is based on the best available information at the time of referral (e.g. planning proposal) but will vary over time with development and changes in the local systems. This is particularly important in systems with limited capacity (such as Priority Sewerage Program scheme areas) and it is best to approach Sydney Water for an updated capacity assessment (especially where an approval letter is more than 12 months old). If you require any further information, please email the Growth Planning and Development Team at urbangrowth@sydneywater.com.au.



Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kristine Leitch", written over a horizontal line.

Kristine Leitch
Growth Intelligence Manager
City Growth and Development, Business Development Group
Sydney Water, 1 Smith Street, Parramatta NSW 2150

Item 4.4

Enclosure 11