

DASHAPUB06263
02/04/2019

DASHA
pp 06263-06276

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

PATRICIA McDONALD SC
COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION DASHA

Reference: Operation E15/0078

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON TUESDAY 2 APRIL, 2019

AT 2.00PM

Any person who publishes any part of this transcript in any way and to any person contrary to a Commission direction against publication commits an offence against section 112(2) of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988.

This transcript has been prepared in accordance with conventions used in the Supreme Court.

THE COMMISSIONER: Now, before we resume Mr Azzi's evidence, first an apology. After announcing the rest of our sitting times this week, something was reorganised within the Commission which means on Friday we will start at 10.00 but we go through to 4.30 on Friday. So happy news for you, Mr Pullinger.

10 MR PULLINGER: Well, it's a mixed blessing, thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry for, yes, the change but they're our times for Friday. Any objections? All right. Mr Buchanan.

MR BUCHANAN: Thank you. Mr Azzi, if I can continue to ask you questions about Exhibit 280, the telephone conversation with Mr Hawatt on 28 February, 2016, in which you conveyed messages from Bechara Khouri to Mr Hawatt. It would be fair to say, wouldn't it, that this telephone conversation shows that Mr Khouri thought that you and Mr Hawatt were so
20 closely allied together that you could be relied upon, you could be relied upon to convey Marwan Chanine's message to Mr Hawatt about Mr Hawatt's personal affairs?---I don't understand the question. Can you, I'm not sure - - -

Bechara Khouri obviously thought it was reasonable to convey a message to you from Mr Chanine that was intended for Mr Hawatt.---Mr Bechara, I understand, I see Mr Hawatt more than anybody else during my council business in council because I can see Mr Hawatt more than anybody else, I
30 contact him. So when I see him, deliver this message because I see Mr Hawatt more than anybody else.

And it also shows, doesn't it, that you were sufficiently close to Marwan Chanine for Mr Khouri to trust you with a message about a commercial deal being discussed between Chanine and Hawatt, doesn't it?---It's normal.

Can I ask that the witness be shown Exhibit 120, please? This is a transcript of a telephone conversation where you called Mr Hawatt on 28 April, 2016. And then you put Mr Chanine on the phone, you handed the phone over to Mr Chanine, and Mr Chanine spoke to Mr Hawatt. Do you see it starts,
40 "Marwan wants to talk with you, talk to you"?---Marwan was talking to me?

No, it says here, the transcript shows, you said, "Marwan wants to talk to you," and Hawatt said, "Okay," and then Chanine came on the line.---Yeah.

"How are you, mate?" And then they proceeded to have a conversation. ---Yeah.

Now, do you remember that occasion, that you were together with Marwan Chanine and you passed your phone over to Marwan Chanine so that he could talk to Mr Hawatt?---Well, I can't recall that date, sir. Well, I can't recall that date, but this conversation happened, that Marwan Chanine want to talk to Mr Hawatt. But I can't remember the occasion.

Mr Chanine, though, didn't ring Mr Hawatt himself. Instead, he used your telephone to speak to Mr Hawatt.---Yeah, looks like.

10 Do you know why that happened?---No, sir. Maybe - - -

What were the circumstances in which you did this - - -?---Yeah.

- - - you gave your phone to Mr Chanine so that he could speak to Mr Hawatt?---Maybe because Mr Hawatt was on the phone at the time, and Mr Chanine wants to talk to him. And - - -

Were you at your place?---I don't, I don't remember, sir, where it was.

20 Excuse me. Just to clarify – it wasn't clear before – the transcript shows that the call was made by Mr Hawatt to you. You were with Marwan Chanine at the time.---Yes.

And then you were told by Mr Chanine he wanted to speak to Mr Hawatt. ---It looks like.

And you passed the phone over to Mr Chanine.---It's could be, yeah.

30 So, were you at your place when that happened, or were you somewhere else?---I, I don't remember if at my place, no.

But how many times were you with Mr Chanine altogether during this period?---Yeah, I said, once or two, could be at my place. I don't remember.

40 You see, if it's only one or two times that you were with him, it would be easy to remember, wouldn't it? Because you couldn't get it confused with other occasions.---Yeah. Mostly, it has to be at my place, because I've seen Mr Chanine, I can remember, at my place once. But I can't recall it, sir. But I can't deny it, you know, it's happening.

Now, if you have a read of this transcript, you'll see that Mr Chanine said to Mr Hawatt, "The buyer of your property has been calling me. They've been chasing for an exchange since last week." And then they had a conversation about the exchange. And then a little later, Mr Hawatt said, "How much is he paying, again, for the exchange?" Chanine said, "\$30,000." Hawatt said, "He can't increase it to 50, you think?" And eventually Mr Chanine

said, "Once he gets his hands on it, I want to try to turn it over a lot quicker." Do you see that?---Yes.

What did you understand Marwan Chanine was talking about?---He was talking about business between Hawatt and, and him.

10 Yes. But you knew what was going on, didn't you? You knew that there had been negotiations between the two of them for Mr Chanine to purchase this property of Mr Hawatt's?---What I said before, sir, that only I know the title. I know Mr Hawatt has a business property in Penrith and try to sell it.

But this is two months later. This is sometime later than when Mr Chanine had previously been negotiating with Mr Hawatt, two months after you conveyed that message - - -?---Yeah.

- - - from Bechara Khouri to Michael Hawatt and Mr Chanine said in your presence, "The buyer of your property has been calling me. They've been chasing for an exchange since last week."---Yes.

20 Did you think to yourself hang on a sec, why is he talking about the buyer as if it's a different person?---I don't know. I never, I never get, interfere, you know, closely with his business.

And when Mr Chanine said in your presence, "Once he gets his hands on it I want to try and turn it over a lot quicker," what did you understand Mr Chanine was saying?---I don't know, sir, what this, I read here. I never
- - -

30 He was saying this in your presence. You had given him your phone.
---Yeah, he was talking to Hawatt.

Yes.---And I never get involved. I don't know what they were talking about. I know the investment property and I have no idea what they been talking about. Never get - - -

But you were close to Hawatt and you were close to Chanine.---I'm close to Hawatt, sir, about council business not about his own business.

40 We know that it's not right that you weren't close to him about his own business because we've seen how you were sufficiently close to be trusted by Mr Khouri and by Mr Chanine, by Mr Khouri with a message from Mr Chanine about Mr Hawatt's personal business.---Mr Buchanan, with this message it's nothing unofficial. Lawyer want to talk to other lawyer. That's why I didn't deliver. Other anything, I don't know anything about it at all. Not interested.

Did you have any contact with Mr Montague about the development applications for 212-222 Canterbury Road and 4 Close Street?---I don't

know there's been any talk specified about this one because I never been asked to, to interfere or discuss it at any stage except like just inquiry at one stage.

Did Mr Montague have any contact with you about those DAs?---I don't remember.

Did he give you any documents in relation to those two DAs?---No. I'm not aware of anything except what in council business paper.

10

If Marwan Chanine has told the Commission that you had contact with Mr Montague about these DAs would he be right or would he be wrong?---I don't remember I had any contact or discussion involving with Marwan like specifically on those DAs because they used to contact Montague and they direct by themself. Never interfered. Only I did interfere once.

And what was that interference on that one occasion?---When I said when I did ask where an inquiry with Spiro Stavis about what the situation and what (not transcribable) just to find out.

20

Did you have any contact with Mr Stavis apart from that contact you've just told us about about these two DAs?---I don't understand what you mean.

Sorry, I'll reframe the question. You've told us about a contact with Mr Stavis just a moment ago in relation to the DAs for 212-222 Canterbury Road.---Yes.

Did you have any other contact with Mr Stavis about those DAs?---I don't know if he replied later or he, if we discuss it later on or the same day but that's why I can't remember.

30

Could we show the witness please, in Exhibit 69, volume 26, page 251. If we could just look at the bottom, you can see that there is an email from Mr Stavis to Ziad Chanine cc'd to Marwan Chanine and it concerns, the subject is 212-222 Canterbury Road DA. See that?---Yeah.

And if we can go up the page to see the next part of the conversation. Ziad Chanine, this is 25 October, 2015, responded to Spiro, cc'd to Marwan, "Thank you for your email. I will ensure these two items are with you early in the week." Do you see that, where the cursor is on the left-hand side? ---Yeah.

40

And just by the way, can you see in the cc line, the second person cc'd in is a – oh, no. I'll withdraw that. And then can you see that Spiro forwarded to you on 25 October, 2015, that conversation between him and Ziad Chanine?---Yes.

Can you assist us to understand why Mr Stavis did that?---No idea.

Normally Mr Stavis sometime emails information we ask for. I don't, I don't recall his email.

10 Is that information, though, that you wanted? If we could just scroll back down, please. It's on 24 October that the original email, it's a Saturday, from Spiro Stavis to Ziad Chanine. "Two issues remain outstanding before our assessment can be finalised. First one is justification that the proposal's non-compliance with the rear setback control under the DCP. The site adjoins the Canterbury Bowling Club which is the subject of an imminent rezoning proposal. Secondly, the submission of an urban design report justifying the proposal's non-compliance with the front setback control under the DCP." Mr Stavis continued, "I have committed to reporting the DA to the November IHAP meeting. However, in order to meet this deadline, it's imperative that I receive the above information by the end of the week." When Ziad Chanine, on the Sunday responded, "Thank you. I'll ensure these items are with you early in the week," I'm sorry I think on the, yes, on the Sunday, it looks as if Spiro Stavis believed that you needed to know that these items were outstanding and that Ziad Chanine was going to attend to them.---I don't know, sir. I don't - - -

20

It suggests that, it suggests that you had been in contact with Spiro Stavis, indicating an interest or a concern about matters outstanding in relation to the DAs that needed to be completed before the deadline could be met for the report to the IHAP.---I don't know. Normally we enquiring a lot of things with Mr Stavis. We've got too many DAs. If the, somebody require any information or request and I have no idea, like, what I can remember, I enquire.

30 Well, that means, doesn't it, that your evidence to us that you can't remember any more contacts with Stavis than you've told us about in relation to these DAs is wrong or unreliable, doesn't it?---Mmm, no.

We can't place any weight on it, can we?---No, Mr Buchanan, the one I can remember when I made just the discussion with Mr Stavis about - - -

40 I'm not interested in you telling us what you have told us before. What I'm asking you to accept is this evidence shows, and I think you accept, that there were contacts that you had with Stavis, that you tell us you can't remember, that were in relation to these two DAs.---This, this email is related to the two DAs. But I have no idea if I did contact and ask him for this information or if he send it to, to me like he wants me to know.

Can you give us any explanation at all as to why it would be that Spiro Stavis would have sent you those two emails unless he thought, from what you had indicated to him previously, you wanted or needed that information, for whatever reason?---Could be, because I always ask Mr Stavis about information and what I need to know to understand what was going on.

Now, if we could have a look, please, at Exhibit 85, page 53. This is a record of a meeting that was scheduled to occur on 21 April, 2016, at a meeting room at council involving – sorry, and the record was created by Mr Stavis’s PA, and it indicated that the meeting was to be between her boss, Mr Stavis, and you. Are you able to assist us as to what that meeting was about?---Most of the time I meet with Mr Stavis, not, like, every time regularly when we had a council meeting, I regularly meet with Mr Stavis, or have, if I have any issue to discuss, any items in the news, in the business paper, we need information, I need like, advice from him or information, I
10 always meet or discuss it with him or contacted him.

If I tell you that the officer’s report – reports plural, because one report for each DA – in relation to 212-222 Canterbury Road, they were finalised and issued around the period ending 16 November, 2015. In, on 24 November, 2015, the IHAP recommended that the applications be refused. I wonder if we could perhaps just show you that, to assist you with your memory. This is volume 28, page 6 of 160. And it’s a record of the, a minute of the meeting of the CDC on 3 December, 2015. I’m sorry, let’s start again. It’s
20 a part of the business papers for the meeting of the CDC on 3 December, 2015, and it records the IHAP recommendation in respect of 212-218 Canterbury Road, Canterbury, that it be refused. And then it gives reasons, including exceedance of the planning control comprising the floor space ratio, and that the clause 4.6 requirements had not been satisfied. Now, I can tell you, Mr Azzi, that the IHAP made the same recommendation in respect of the other DA, that is to say for 220-222 Canterbury Road and 4 Close Street. You understand that?---Yes.

So that’s what happened on 24 November, 2015. In the same volume, page 18, please. Actually before we show that, can I just, if we take that off the
30 screen, I apologise. When you found out – I’m sorry, I withdraw that. You would have found out that the IHAP had recommended refusal of the two DAs.---I don’t know when, maybe when we receive IHAP report or - - -

What happened when you found that out?---I don’t, I, I can’t recall, I don’t remember what happened.

What was the decision of the CDC, do you remember?---No.

Did the CDC accept the IHAP recommendation to refuse the DAs, do you
40 remember?---No, I don’t remember that, no.

Do you remember – I withdraw that. Knowing that you had had as much contact as you had with Mr Chanine in around 2015, knowing that this was a recommendation for a refusal of the DAs for which he was the developer, what do you think you did?---I don’t remember, sir.

But what are you likely to have done?---Normally I speak with the, if I have, to find out something, I will contact the director of city planning.

Did you find out anything from the director of planning?---I don't remember what. I did enquiry with him a lot.

Did he have any contact with the general manager about this recommendation?---I can't remember, sir.

Excuse me a moment. If I could show you, please, Exhibit 244, page 46. If I tell you that the CDC meeting of 3 December, 2015 considered both Mr Demian's DA for the Harrison's site and Mr Chanine's DA for the 212-222 Canterbury Road site, both of them, and direct your attention to the records of your telephone calls, so far as they were to Spiro Stavis, Charbel Demian and Mr Montague or Mr Montague's office, you can see that in the period of November 2015 there were a number of lengthy calls that you made to Mr Montague's office and to Spiro Stavis's office, weren't there?---Yes.

For example, the IHAP report was dated 24 November. By 27 November, you are in contact with Mr Montague's office. This is item 2087 on the left hand side, 2087. You were in contact with Mr Montague's office for 3 minutes and 52 seconds on 27 November and again later that day for 54 seconds. Do you see that?---Yes.

And do you see that subsequently you were in contact with Spiro Stavis's office on 30 November, and on 1 December you sent him an email, sorry, a text message on 1 December as well. I'm looking at item 2094. 2 December, there's a quantity of contact between you on the one hand and Spiro Stavis and Mr Montague's office on the other hand in this period when the CDC was coming up to consider Mr Demian's DA for the two extra storeys on the Harrison's site and Mr Chanine's DA for – or DAs, plural – for the 212-222 Canterbury Road site.---Yes.

And why were you in contact with those two gentlemen or their offices at that time?---It's, it's usually I contact Mr Jim Montague office and Spiro Stavis on occasionally, daily, I need some information but I have no idea what was the cause of the contact. Always when I contact Mr Stavis, I need the information, advice from me, from him or Mr Jim Montague and have an issue.

If we could go back please to volume 28, page 18. This is part of the director of city planning's report about 212-218 Canterbury road to the City Development Committee meeting of 3 December, 2015. Do you see that? ---Yeah.

And can you have a look at the third dot point where the cursor is, on the left-hand side. The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions, including the following deferred commencement conditions. "One, submission of amended architectural and landscape plans increasing the building setback to three metres from the rear boundary adjoining 16

Close Street,” and then there’s reference to the matters outlined in the Sydney Trains correspondence. Do you see that?---Yes.

What that is, is this is part of a summary as at the front of Mr Stavis’s report in which he is summarising what is recommended and he indicates there on the third dot point that the application was recommended for conditional approval, for deferred commencement conditional approval. Do you see those words?---Yes.

10 And you can take it from me that the same recommendation was made by Mr Stavis in the officer’s report for the development application for 220-222 Canterbury Road and 4 Close Street. Does that ring any bell with you, that recommendation on Mr Stavis’s part that I’ve taken you to?---I can recall Mr Stavis once mentioned to me the issue with the roadway.

Yes. Do you remember, though, any issue being raised with you about a deferred commencement condition which would increase the building setback to three metres from a nil setback? In other words, make the building smaller.---I have no idea what he, I don’t remember that, what I, generally I discuss with him, said the issue was the roadway.

20 You see, if you could take it from me that the recommendation to increase the building setback, that is to say, from the boundary - - -?---Yeah.

- - - with the bowling club to move the back of the building away from the common boundary by three metres - - -?---Yeah, setback, yeah.

- - - meant that the development would be smaller. That would reduce the lot yield from the development for the developer. You understood that, didn’t you?---Yeah, I know the setback.

40 And do you remember a setback being raised with you?---I was, I don’t understand specified information about planning, what they mean they cannot do changes. I know generally, I heard there’s going to be a setback from the bowling club, and it’s a matter for the council and they, they can deal with it. But I, what I can understand, and I can believe or understood from Mr Stavis, is no problem with the council. The, the problem with the railway. That’s what (not transcribable) understand from what, when I discussed this matter with him.

From whom did you hear about this issue with the rear setback?---I can’t remember how it be raised, but normally from Mr Stavis, if he could, like, raise it, but the, the, the, the main thing I did understand from him, he said it’s a problem with the railway.

Did you hear anything from Bechara Khouri or Marwan Chanine about a concern about a recommendation that the building be made smaller by

setting it back three metres from the boundary with the bowling club?
---They didn't discuss with me, because I can't, I, I have no idea how (not transcribable)

Well, the Commission has evidence that you made a phone call about the setback issue in the presence of Marwan Chanine.---I can't recall this, mate, sir.

10 You see, did you, did Marwan Chanine ask you to intervene about this recommendation - - -?---I said - - -

- - - and get it changed?---No, he did ask me to see what was the problem, and I made my call to Spiro.

When you say what was the problem, you say that Marwan Chanine asked you to find out what was the problem. Is that what you tell us?---He, he, he did ask me, said, "We have an issue. Why the delay?"

20 So you've got nothing you can assist us with if I tell you that Marwan Chanine has told the Commission that you made a phone call in his presence to intervene with council about the setback issue?---I can't remember this. I remember I discuss it with Spiro Stavis, said the council has no issue. The problem with the council was the railway. That's why I can't remember.

30 The Commission's also got evidence, Mr Azzi, that you made a phone call to Mr Stavis one evening about the setback condition, deferred commencement condition that he had recommended, and that you were very angry, and that you were threatening him about it.---Threatening Mr Stavis? Never. Yeah, I made a call and advised him, yes.

What did you advise him on this subject?---Yeah, I said, when he, he called me and said, when he asked me at that conversation, "There's a problem with the railway," yeah, I told him, "Mate, you know your job, do your job. You know what you have to do."

40 So I just want to make it clear, you understand that Mr Stavis's deferred commencement recommendation would have meant a reduced lot yield for Mr Chanine. Had it gone through, it would have resulted in a reduced profit for his development. You understood that?---No, yeah (not transcribable)

And you tell us, do you, that Mr Chanine, even though he had spoken to you about this development previously, said nothing to you about that?---No. That's what he said to me. He said we have a delay and normally I do understand from Mr Stavis, like, they are in contact with him every day. I didn't get involved except what I know.

Did you say to Mr Stavis words to this effect, “You’d better your finger out, find a solution. I don’t want to see you end up like the other director”?

---No, sir.

Did you say anything to the effect that he would end up like Mr Occhiuzzi had done, losing his job?---No. I was in support of him, never said that to him.

10 Did you ever indicate that to him or hint at it to him that you didn’t want him to go the way Mr Occhiuzzi had gone?---I never have any.

In fact, isn’t it the case that more than once you implied to Mr Stavis – generally speaking, not just about 212-22 Canterbury Road – that Mr Occhiuzzi had had to go because he hadn’t been cooperative, he hadn’t been a satisfactory director of city planning and so he left?---No, I don’t know why he left. No.

20 You never tried to indicate to Mr Stavis that he’d better cooperate with you and Mr Hawatt because otherwise he’d end up like Mr Occhiuzzi had?
---No, sir.

Can I take you, please, to volume 28, page 179. This time it is the minutes of the meeting of the CDC of 3 December, 2015 and you can see the agenda item is 212-218 Canterbury Road and item 15, 220-222 Canterbury Road. Can you see that?---Yeah.

Can you see that you moved the motion in each case?---Yes.

30 Can you see what the motion is? It’s not a motion to adopt the recommendation of the officer in the officer’s report, it’s instead the general manager be authorised to wish you the consent for the DA subject to conditions as recommended in part B of the DCP’s report and any other conditions that arise as a result of Sydney Trains and RMS concurrence.
---Yes.

40 Why did you move that motion?---It’s a, it’s a recommendation coming by the general manager and the, what I can believe, the recommendation come by the GM and the director of city planning and been accepted and they explain why, who supposed to put that motion on the table to speak on the motion why we should be moving it. After this been circulated to the councillor, this happen and I move it for debate.

Well, you moved it with a view to it being passed.---I moved it, first, no, you have to be (not transcribable) after the vote. When you move an item, you have to move it for debate.

Yes. I want to put to you, though, that you moved it in order to ensure that the development applications were approved even though there was no

consent from, or no concurrence from Sydney Trains.---Mr Buchanan, when you move the motion, I moved a motion for a debate and I can't ensure anything before the councillor vote on it.

You moved this, didn't you, in order to ensure that Mr Chanine's development applications for these sites were approved?---I don't understand what - - -

10 The purpose of you moving these motions that you can see in front of you on this page was to get the DAs approved even though concurrence from Sydney Trains was outstanding?---Well, I moved it, I'm not, I'm not guarantee they going to be approved. I moved it for the councillor to vote on it.

You knew exactly that they were going to be approved, didn't you?---If all the councillor agreed on the director's motion, it's been circulated. It the director, it the general manager motion. It's been explained very well as being all the councillors agreed.

20 How many times did you move a motion on a planning issue at Canterbury Council where you didn't succeed?---I don't remember.

Well, you moved many motions on planning issues, didn't you, or you seconded them over the years?---Yeah.

Were you ever defeated? I'm just curious to know so that we can have a look at it.---I don't know.

30 Was there any item where you were ever defeated?---I mean if I move all the motion, I haven't been defeated, it being the right motion.

That's one way of looking at it. Another is that you control the numbers along with Mr Hawatt and you move that which you want the decision to be.---Not necessarily, Mr Buchanan, I can accept this. I don't control the councillors.

40 Now, there's no record that you declared an interest in respect of this decision or these decisions in respect of 212-222 Canterbury Road and 4 Close Street.---No.

Is that right, because you didn't declare an interest?---Why I have to declare an interest?

Because you had been in regular contact with Marwan Chanine with a view to progressing his applications and he was your friend.---No. I contacted Mr Chanine as a councillor and he is an applicant.

He was one of the boys, just like you and Mr Hawatt and Mr Khouri were.

You were part of a social set, a social circle.---Never had, we never had a social event. Didn't happen.

Did you ever declare an interest in a planning decision at Canterbury Council?---I can't, I can't remember.

Nothing that you can recall by way of a declaration of interest?---I don't remember because I don't have any interests.

10 And you didn't have any friends who were property developers with whom you worked to progress their developments?---I don't call them, like, relationship, friends. Like, I have too many, like, I know half of Canterbury.

In addition, you knew that Bechara Khouri was Mr Chanine's advocate for developments in the Canterbury local government area.---I wasn't aware of this.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: You were not?---I, I never, I wasn't aware it, like, he's advocate or, but - - -

MR BUCHANAN: You knew he worked for Chanine.---Mr Khouri, we work for everyone. I have no idea if he works for Chanine.

Well he worked specifically for Mr Demian and for Mr Chanine, didn't he? ---Maybe.

30 In relation to property development and the politics of getting DAs approved through council. You knew that, didn't you?---I know he works and he's a consultant.

And you were a good family friend of Mr Khouri and his family?---Yeah, later on, yeah.

You should have declared an interest in relation to Mr Chanine's development applications for these sites just on the basis of Mr Khouri's relationship with you alone, shouldn't you?---Why?

40 Now, can I ask you about the subject of an urban design review. Do you recall a process that was occurring over the years at Canterbury Council where the councillors, particularly Councillor Hawatt and yourself, were proposing that the process for reviewing the urban design of DAs be changed, in particular, to ensure that they weren't knocked on the head at the end by the IHAP, and instead were reviewed at the beginning of the process?---I can't remember what you are talking about, sir. There's been a discussion, a lot of discussion with the council. But I'm trying to, I, I don't recall.

Well, if I could just show you Exhibit 85, page 16, please. This is a record in council's schedule for meetings to be held, and it was organised by Mr Montague's staff for a meeting to be held at a conference room in council on 21 October, 2015, with the attendees being Mr Montague, Mr Stavis, yourself, and Mr Hawatt. Do you see that?---Yes.

And the subject matter at the top of the page is Urban Design Review Panel. Do you remember that meeting?---Mmm, oh, I can't remember about this meeting. I - - -

10

Does the fact that this record exists assist your recollection that you were involved in discussions about an Urban Design Review Panel?---Okay, we've been through discussion too many times about the design committee, but I'm not, I, I'm not (not transcribable) same one.

Commissioner, I think the next topic that I was going to pass to would take more than two minutes.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: We'll adjourn and resume 10.00pm, oh, sorry, 10.00am, on Friday, and Friday will go through to 4.30.

THE WITNESS STOOD DOWN

[2.58pm]

AT 2.58PM THE MATTER WAS ADJOURNED ACCORDINGLY

[2.58pm]