

From: Caleb Ball  
 To: Caleb Ball  
 Cc: Zaha Sohier  
 Subject: PW: 39-43 Hassall Street - Draft IPC Responses  
 Date: Tuesday, 20 February 2024 10:07:19 AM  
 Attachments: [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

Hi Callum

I'm just providing a response to the questions you sent through (I have responded in red). I have also attached the excel from the Applicant that was sent as **Attachment B** in the formal response to the IPC for your reference.

- In 6.7.16 DPHI supports TfNSW's recommended conditions for a Travel Access Guide and Parking Management Plan. Have these been included under other conditions with different names? **Carparking including Bicycle and End of Trip Facilities are covered by B27 B28 and E28. TfNSW's parking management plan was to prioritise car sharing which is discussed in B27(e) although Novus have not confirmed the total number of Car share spaces. Condition E28 is to the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary and therefore the Department would be required to review the parking strategy including car share spaces EV and EOT facilities.**
- In 6.7.38 DPHI recommends a condition requiring compliance with the NCC for the provision of base infrastructure for EV charging for 100% of the residential car parking spaces – where is this set out? **BCA and NCC are sometimes used interchangeably and so A13 covers this requirement off.**
- In Table 12 DPHI recommends a condition requiring the implementation of the recommendations of the Wind Report. Is this sufficiently covered by condition A40(d)? **Yes**

Let me know if you have any other queries.

Kind Regards

**Caleb Ball**  
 Senior Planning Officer  
 State Significance  
 Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure  
 02 927 6186 | [ca.ball@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ca.ball@planning.nsw.gov.au)  
 Parramatta Square | 12 Darcy Street | Parramatta NSW 2150  
[www.dpie.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dpie.nsw.gov.au)



I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land and pay respects to Elders past and present.  
 I also acknowledge all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff working with the NSW Government.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Lionel Puang  
 Sent: Friday 9 February 2024 9:35 AM  
 To: Gabriel Wardenburg <[gabriel.wardenburg@dpie.nsw.gov.au](mailto:gabriel.wardenburg@dpie.nsw.gov.au)>; Caleb Ball <[Caleb.Ball@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Caleb.Ball@planning.nsw.gov.au)>  
 Cc: Jason Goldsworthy  
 Subject: RE: 39-43 Hassall Street - Draft IPC Responses

Hi Gabriel and Caleb

I'm re-forwarding this email as Jason's Outlook is playing up.

Happy to chat it through today – I am also refining a response re: the final question to Council (item 3 on the register) that has specific reference to the *SEPP Amendment (Parramatta CBD) 2022* so will send through an updated schedule shortly.

Regards

Lionel Puang  
 Senior Development Manager

**NOVUS**



From: Jason Goldsworthy  
 Sent: Friday February 9 2024 7:57 AM  
 To: Gabriel Wardenburg  
 Cc: Lionel Puang  
 Subject: 39-43 Hassall Street - Draft IPC Responses

Morning Gabriel/Caleb

We have reviewed the questions posted by the IPC and have prepared draft responses to assist.

We have also noticed that the time to respond is the end of next week – hoping/fingers crossed that a response can be issued sooner as we are closing out the Builder engagement piece.

Happy to discuss further if you have any questions or clarifications.

Thanks  
 Jason

#	Stakeholder	IPC Request	Response
1	Council	A response to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure's independent flood review completed by GRC Hydro.	N/A - Council to provide.
2	Council	A clearer version of the Probable Maximum Flood Hazard map of the Site.	N/A - Council to provide.
3	Council	Details of any Planning Proposal and LEP amendments applicable to the site's zoning and/or FSR controls including if any flooding assessment was undertaken as part of any amendment. The Commission would particularly appreciate advice on whether Council considers a development of the size permitted by the site's FSR (as increased in 2022) is supportable.	N/A - Council to provide <b>noting the below is what Novus have sourced.</b>  Mo Ino Stewart prepared the "Update of Parramatta Floodplain Risk Management Plans (FRMP)" which accompanied the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal which led to the rezoning of the subject site for high-density residential and mixed-use development.  This FRMP concludes that the intensification of development in the Parramatta CBD represents a tolerable risk to life and property providing that amendments are made to the Parramatta LEP 2011 and Parramatta Development Control Plan (DCP) 2011 to better manage some of the risks of flooding to life. In addition, Shelter In Place would be a particularly appropriate strategy to be adopted by Parramatta CBD due to the type of the development and to the flashing nature of the flooding which would not allow enough time to evacuate safely.  Council's CBD Planning Proposal introduces a new clause that will apply to sites within the CBD Planning Proposal boundary that are affected by flood events up to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) being the largest flood that could conceivably occur.  The purpose of this new clause is to ensure that although the planning proposal will permit a significant increase in development potential and thus people, the overall risk to life will not be increased. To achieve this, it is proposed that a new planning control is included that requires a shelter to be available within a building that is above the PMF level, or that people can evacuate safely to land that is located above the PMF. The building must also have an emergency access point to land that is above the 1% annual exceedance probability event, and that buildings be able to withstand flooding up to the PMF.  This new clause is supported by an updated Flood Risk Study and Plan which considers the unique flooding characteristics affecting the Parramatta CBD, expected population increase and NSW State Government's recognition of Parramatta as a Metropolitan Centre and "Central City". The clause will apply to land within the CBD Planning Proposal boundary identified as being affected by the PMF of the Floodplain Risk Management Plan.  <b>The above information can be found at: <a href="https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/cbd_planning">https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/cbd_planning</a></b>
4	DPHI	With reference to condition A2 of Schedule 2 of the recommended conditions of consent, please confirm that these are the correct revisions for architectural drawings DA-00-01 and DA06.13 as the Commission notes that later revisions are available on the Department's website.	Refer to Tab 2. Drawing Schedule.
5	DPHI	Detail on the background of clause 73 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 requiring that build-to-rent developments be maintained as such (as set out in clause 73) for only 15 years.	N/A - DPHI to provide.
6	DPHI	Advise how many undersized apartments pursuant to the ADG will have balconies.	<b>Refer to Tab 3. Apartment Breakdown.</b>  There are only 24 apartments that are undersized (by ~1.7sqm) pursuant to the ADG - these are the Studios facing north over Levels 8-31. These Studios are fully furnished (i.e., they include wardrobes, a bed, couch, table, TV etc.) and they do not have a balcony.  The remaining 186 apartments all meet the minimum internal sizes pursuant to the ADG and all have balconies.  The internal of the Studio ranges from 33-55m <sup>2</sup> @ an average size of 44m <sup>2</sup> The internal of the 1 Bed ranges from 52-70 @ an average size of 61m <sup>2</sup> The internal of the 2 bed ranges from 76-97 @ an average of 89m <sup>2</sup> The internal of the 3 bed ranges from 107-122 @ an average of 122m <sup>2</sup>  The balcony of the Studio ranges from 0-9m <sup>2</sup> @ an average of 3m <sup>2</sup> The balcony of the 1 bed ranges from 4-9m <sup>2</sup> @ an average of 6m <sup>2</sup> The balcony of the 2 bed ranges from 7-16 @ an average of 8m <sup>2</sup> The balcony of the 3 bed ranges from 9-28 @ an average of 19m <sup>2</sup>  <b>Novus / Build to Rent Context:</b> <i>When designing a unit mix for our Build to Rent assets the critical focus is on creating a sustainable income stream for the long term. To optimise this process we focus on achieving the right balance between four key drivers of demand: affordability &amp; choice, community and viability. We believe the intersection of these drivers is the optimal unit mix for a given Build to Rent asset and the questions we are constantly asking ourselves are:</i> <b>Demand</b> - Who are the existing rental residents in the catchment? What unit type is their demand for? What is the depth of market for each unit type? <b>Affordability &amp; Choice</b> - Is there a diverse range of price points for residents? Is there enough diversity in the proposed unit mix to create choice and scarcity? <b>Community</b> - Based on a unit mix what will the makeup of the resident base be? Will it be diverse or focused on a key demographic? How will it compare to the existing catchment?

			<b>Viability - Does the project meet the required return hurdles? Is the unit mix achievable within the existing planning framework?</b>
7	DPHI	Advise whether the Department is satisfied that accessibility and adequate access can be maintained when the Tea Room is being utilised as a rental sales premise	Only a small portion of the Tea Room will be utilised as rental leasing premises, with the balance being a lounge lobby serviced by the adjacent retail tenancy (of which will be retained in single ownership by Novus). McKenzie Group prepared an Access Design Consultant Statement on 20th June 2023 confirming that the project documentation provides appropriate accessibility to meet previous reporting and minimum provisions of the BCA & Disability (Access to Premises - Buildings) Standards 2010. This was included as part of the Response to Submissions response.
8	DPHI	Advise whether the Department considered the potential event of the proposed Hassall Street accessible lift being non-operational. Does the Department consider that the development makes appropriate provision for equitable access and meets the relevant requirements	McKenzie Group prepared an Access Design Consultant Statement on 20th June 2023 confirming that the project documentation provides appropriate accessibility to meet previous reporting and minimum provisions of the BCA & Disability (Access to Premises - Buildings) Standards 2010. This was included as part of the Response to Submissions response.
9	DPHI	In a quantified and tabulated format, confirm all the elements of the application that have not met the minimum requirements of relevant planning instruments and guidelines, as well as the Department's reasoning as to why these non-complying elements have been recommended for approval.	<b>Novus / Build to Rent Context:</b> <i>Build to Rent is a different housing typology whereby the apartment development is designed to attract a renter market, the building is well-maintained with great facilities and renters are afforded greater security in their housing. In recognition of Build to Rent being a different housing typology the Housing SEPP was put into place in 2021.</i> <b>In addition, reference can be made to Rothelowman's SEPP 65 Report dated 19/06/2023 which was lodged as part of the RTS Submission.</b> <b>Refer to Tab 4. Compliance with the Housing SEPP.</b>
10	DPHI	Please advise why three electric vehicle charging points were incorporated into the development and if there are any relevant criteria or development standards requiring a certain number or percentage of EV-ready spaces be provided; and	In accordance with Green Star's requirements for a Sustainable Transport Plan - the proposal will include EV charging points to 5% of all car parking spaces (4 spaces) and 25% of car parking spaces (18 spaces) to be EV-ready. <b>On top of this the electrical substation has been sized so that 100% of car parking spaces can be EV.</b>
11	DPHI	If available to the Department, please advise what, if anything, has historically been located on the site.	A Statement of Heritage Impact (November 2022) has been prepared by Comber Consultants, a brief history of the site is noted below <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1793 1876:</b> A part of Harris Farm.</li> <li>- <b>1876 1868:</b> Subdivided as part of George Wigram Allen's Harris Park Subdivision.</li> <li>- <b>1878 1941:</b> Eliza Howe's cottage and dairy.</li> <li>- <b>1941 2002:</b> 3 individual homes which had various ownership throughout the period.</li> <li>- <b>2002 2005:</b> The homes were demolished by the previous landowner (prior to Novus).</li> <li>- <b>2005 2022:</b> Vacant land.</li> <li>- <b>2022:</b> The site accommodated a vacant display suite which was removed by the tenant in September 2022.</li> </ul>

Jason Goldsworthy  
Chief Development Officer

**NOVUS**

