In continuation from my question regarding 248-250 Sturt Street at the last FMC on the 7th June and with respect Cr Ong, but the advice we have received from VCAT and a resident of Southbank who until very recently was a lawyer with VCAT, is contrary to what you have advised.Without specific reference to this hearing, but the Compulsory Conference process in general and in light of the Minister being the party that was referred to VCAT, not the CoM, the CoM would not have been forced to come to an agreement with the developer. Also, the Compulsory Conference fact sheet on the VCAT website indicates that a successful outcome is not mandatory.In light of the developer amending the plan presented to VCAT for consideration from 44 to 16 storey’s, we understand the CoM could have argued that the city has a process for planning applications to be considered, being FMC and that it was not appropriate for a Council Officer to negotiate and approve a planning outcome outside this process, albeit conditional.In theory, this question could be jointly presented to both Cr Ong and Cr Mayne, being Chair of Governance, in light of our research and advice received we ask again, how did this happen thereby depriving the residents of their voice? We believe residents deserve an apology from this Council, but even more importantly, what assurances do we have that it won’t happen again?