



MR WILSON: Okay, so just some quick introductions. My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this Commission panel. Over to you, Helen?

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: I'm Helen Lochhead. I'm a member of the panel and a member of the Commission.

MR JAMES: Hi. I'm Brad James, town planner, from the Office of the Commission.

10 MR WILSON: David?

MR ZABELL: Okay. I'm David Zabell. I'm the senior planner from the City of Sydney.

15 MS MISRA: And I'm Priyanka Misra. I'm the heritage specialist for City of Sydney.

MR WILSON: Thank you for all coming. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting.

20 Sydney Church of England Girls Grammar School Darlinghurst Limited ("the applicant") is seeking approval for the staged redevelopment of the SCEGGS Darlinghurst campus which is located at 215 Forbes Street, Darlinghurst, which is in the Sydney local government area. My name is Chris Wilson, and I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Professor Helen Lochhead. Brad James from the Office of the Commission is also in attendance.

30 In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

35 This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at a preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website.

40 I request that all members here today state their names each time before speaking and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. I would also ask that we speak – pause between each person speaking to give time for our computers to calibrate and make sure we're in sync. Thank you.

We now begin. So I presume, David, you'll be giving a bit of an overview of the City's position on the proposal?

5 MR ZABELL: Yes, I'll be giving a brief introduction and just highlighting some of our key points. So good afternoon, everyone. My name is David Zabell. I'm a senior planner with the City of Sydney Council, and I prepared the City's reply to the applicant's response to submissions in a letter dated the 29<sup>th</sup> of November last year. This followed – and reinforced – the City's original objection dated the 28<sup>th</sup> of March 2019, objections which the City retains notwithstanding the Department's  
10 recommendation for approval.

Thank you for providing City staff with the opportunity to address the panel today. My colleague, the City's heritage specialist, Priyanka Misra, and I will be briefly touching on some of the key points raised in the City's submissions in objecting to  
15 the proposal, in particular matters regarding design excellence, heritage and landscaping. I also draw the panel's attention to the City's annotated draft conditions of consent which were provided to the panel yesterday should the panel be minded to approve the development in its current form. Priyanka and I will be happy to assist the panel if there are any questions regarding the City's objection following our  
20 submissions today.

It is the City's opinion, as outlined in our written submissions, that a competitive design process should be undertaken, not just as the development can reasonably be considered to exceed the threshold for which a competitive design process is required  
25 but because of the site's visual and cultural significance. The subject site is important ..... both visually and culturally ..... the City. As Priyanka will detail further, the site exhibits heritage significance in and of itself and as a landmark within the broader conservation area. While the City supports the use of a concept application to establish a long term approach to the site's future operation and  
30 ongoing regeneration, the consent as recommended falls short in ensuring a superior heritage and urban design outcome to the detriment of the school community and the City.

It is noted that the amended QS report at attachment A of the response to  
35 submissions provides two CIV estimates: one at just below \$50 million and one significantly over \$50 million. As the panel may be aware, this \$50 million figure is the threshold at which a competitive design process is required to be undertaken. It is noted in the Department's report that the lesser figure has been chosen to justify not requiring a competitive design process.  
40

The replacement of Wilkinson House and the new multipurpose building on Bourke Street in particular represents significant interventions in the heritage character of the site and the surrounding area, and it is in the interests of the school and the City that any significant demolition, new building envelopes and forms are rigorously  
45 scrutinised. The City has developed a robust framework in which to undertake a competitive design process which has been lauded for producing superior design

outcomes. This process should apply at concept stage and in each subsequent significant stage to the site's development.

5 The panel will note the City's recommended landscape conditions at B7 and B8 of Schedule 2. Landscaping is an integral environment of the school campus and its relationship to the surrounding area. With rising temperatures an increasing concern for the City, it is disappointing that a commitment to providing tree canopy coverage to 15 per cent of the site has not been made, contrary to the City's policies. As such, we ask that, should development consent be granted, a commitment to increasing tree canopy cover in line with the City's minimum requirements be achieved.

15 It is also noted that green walls are proposed for the building replacing Wilkinson House. While the City supports green walls, they require a complex infrastructure and maintenance schedule to truly flourish and contribute to the architecture of the building. Additional consideration is therefore required on this matter as well.

20 I will pass over to Priyanka now to discuss what represents the City's key concerns regarding the demolition of Wilkinson House and the impact on the heritage significance of the site. As I stated at the beginning, the City's objections cover an array of issues as outlined in our previous submissions. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have regarding these matters. It is our opinion that these are significant issues that outweigh the benefits to the school and should provide sufficient justification for refusing the application as it stands. Thank you.

25 MR WILSON: David, just before we switch over to Priyanka, just in terms of tree canopy, they have proposed 15 per cent. What would normally be the – Sorry, what is the desired outcome from Council – from Council's perspective?

30 MR ZABELL: So we – so the City is requesting a minimum 15 per cent tree canopy cover.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MR ZABELL: Yeah.

MR WILSON: Do you know what they're proposing?

MR ZABELL: No. I don't believe it's been stated.

40 MR WILSON: Okay. We'll check that. That's all right. Oh, I see what you say. Yeah, okay. There's no commitment to it is what you're saying.

MR ZABELL: That's right.

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: And just a question about – it's Helen Lochhead – the triggering of the design competition notwithstanding there is some differences in the

capital value of the project. We had some advice yesterday that in fact the requirement was turned off by the Education SEPP.

5 MR ZABELL: Yes. So the requirement under the Sydney Local Environmental  
Plan is for a concept application or site-specific DCP to be prepared. That particular  
provision, clause 7.2 – 7.20 – is turned off by the Education SEPP, but our argument,  
as outlined in our submission, is that they would otherwise be required to do a design  
competition because they are a site greater than 5,000 square metres and that they  
10 have chosen to undertake this stage 1, this concept application process, which is the  
basis of clause 7.20 of the Sydney LEP. So it's sort of like a circular argument that's  
been inadvertently written into the Education SEPP which says ordinarily you'd  
require a design excellence competition notwithstanding the fact, you know, that  
7.20 has been turned off, but because it's been turned off you don't require one. So  
15 we're basically saying that because of the site area, because of its significance, this  
condition should be imposed, or a condition should be imposed, requiring - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: So you're – Yeah, so you're acknowledging that it is  
switched off, but you're saying notwithstanding it has the characteristics of a site that  
would normally require a design competition in your - - -

20

MR ZABELL: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - local government area and therefore that should be a  
consideration of the panel.

25

MR ZABELL: Yes, that's right. I do note in the Department's report that their  
justification is that the cost of works does not exceed \$50 million. That's the  
justification put forward in the Department's report. So we challenge that argument  
based on these competing CIVs. But yes, you are correct, the SEPP does turn off the  
30 key provision of 7.20.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. And there was one more question. So you said a  
design competition should apply at concept stage, which is where we are right now.

35 MR ZABELL: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: As well as at each subsequent stage. Yes? Is that what you  
said?

40 MR ZABELL: Yes, so ideally a design competition could look at the conceptual  
long term approach to redeveloping the school – that would be the City's ideal –  
because as Priyanka will go into, about demolition of Wilkinson House in particular,  
we would like to see alternative schemes explored, and a design competition is the  
best way to do that. However, if the panel is minded to grant consent to the concept  
45 stage without a design competition we would still like to see design competitions  
imposed for each subsequent stage.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, which is more building works as - - -

MR ZABELL: That's right.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Yeah. Okay, great. Thank you for that clarification.

MR WILSON: Thank you. Over to you, Priyanka. I think that's - - -

10 MS MISRA: Thank you. I'm Priyanka Misra. I'm heritage specialist for the City of Sydney. I assessed the subject proposal from a heritage perspective for the City. Thank you for providing this opportunity to present today.

I'll start with a brief introduction of the heritage status of this site. The subject site is listed as a local heritage item in Sydney LEP 2012, Schedule 5, and is known as  
15 "Sydney Church of England Girls Grammar School Group including Barham, Church Building and Wilkinson House and their interiors and grounds". Barham House itself is individually listed on the National Trust register. The subject site is also located within East Sydney Heritage Conservation Area and is identified as a contributory building in the Sydney DCP except for the portions of the site with later  
20 development – that is the south end of the site adjoining to 30 Bourke Street and the portion of the site west of Wilkinson House fronting St Peter's Street – which are identified as neutral. The subject site is specifically identified in the Heritage Inventory report for the Heritage Conservation Area as having high significance and the buildings associated with the subject school site as being prominent buildings in  
25 the area. Wilkinson House, in particular, is an interwar residential flat building which was designed by a key architect of the interwar period of Sydney named Emil Sodersten. This building is one of his earliest works and may be the last remaining works from the early period of his career.

30 I will now summarise Council's heritage objections to the proposal. Council's heritage objections are primarily centred on the extent of proposed demolition resulting in irreversible loss of heritage fabric and the proposed bulk of the new buildings within the existing heritage context of Barham House. Council strongly objects to the demolition of Wilkinson House as it would result in irretrievable loss  
35 of heritage fabric. Demolition of heritage significance and demolition of a contributory building within the conservation area will also impact upon the physical and historical integrity of the conservation area.

40 The Old Gym building, which is identified as moderate significance in the heritage impact statement by TKD Architects, actually contributes to the overall significance of the site and its demolition has potential for cumulative adverse effects on the heritage significance of this site. Its demolition will also remove additional heritage fabric, yet another contributory building from the conservation area, and further dilute the significance of the area.

45 The bulk and scale of the proposed administration building fronting Forbes Street will potentially affect the settings of the chapel and Barham House as it will be

visually dominant within the context of the two buildings. The size and location of the new building will potentially affect significant views and sightlines towards Barham House.

5 I will now briefly discuss what a conservation management plan is and highlight the  
significance of Wilkinson House. A conservation management plan, which I will  
refer to as a CMP, is a document that makes a thorough study of the history and  
fabric of the heritage site and assesses its significance and sets out the management  
10 mid to long term guidance for the conservation and development of the heritage site.

In 2001 Godden Mackay Logan prepared a CMP for Wilkinson House. This CMP  
concluded that Wilkinson House is of local heritage significance for its aesthetic,  
historic and social values. The CMP also identified the original external fabric of  
15 Wilkinson House as being of high significance. In the State Heritage Inventory  
listing for this item, Wilkinson House is specifically identified as having historical,  
aesthetic, social and representative significance at a local level. It could potentially  
be a heritage item in its own right. Council understands that National Trust of New  
South Wales is currently considering the listing of Wilkinson House on their  
20 National Trust register.

In our first submission we pointed out that the heritage impact statement prepared by  
TKD Architects downplayed the significance of Wilkinson House as moderate,  
possibly to justify the proposed demolition, and this is contrary to both the CMP for  
25 Wilkinson House and the State Heritage Inventory listing for the site.

The CMP should be updated before any major works are proposed and be used as a  
basis for contemplation of any future redevelopment. As a general practice, a CMP  
should be prepared or updated independently from the development proposal. The  
30 CMP should be reviewed and endorsed by City Council and Heritage New South  
Wales before the concept plan is approved. An approval of the concept plan without  
endorsement of the CMP will pre-empt the CMP policies and jeopardise further  
discussions on the feasibility and the form of the development. Thank you.

35 MR WILSON: Helen, do you have any questions on that?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, I do have a couple of questions. One: you talked about  
the bulk and scale of the proposed replacement building for Wilkinson House, and in  
fact it's actually within the envelope of Wilkinson House.  
40

MS MISRA: I was talking about the bulk and scale of the building that is proposed  
between the chapel and Barham House.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.  
45

MS MISRA: For the extension.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Yes, okay. All right, just to clarify that. And then you also spoke about the bulk and scale of the admin building, so you're talking about  
- - -

5 MS MISRA: So that's the admin building.

PROF LOCHHEAD: That's the admin building? Okay. So you just used different terminology; that's all. Okay. All right. And so you're questioning the classification in the CMP that has been used? Is that what you're stating?

10

MS MISRA: That's correct. So the CMP was specifically made for one particular building, not the entire site – so just Wilkinson House – and it concluded that Wilkinson House is significant at a local level, and the heritage impact statement that was submitted as part of this proposal downplayed that significance as moderate.  
15 There are examples given of the analysis of potential options for retention of Wilkinson House. One of the options, Option A, was to retain and adaptively reuse Wilkinson House, which is possible, and that was one of the possibilities put forward by the applicants, and that is one of our preferred options - - -

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: There was a second – Sorry. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. But there's a second option which actually keeps the streetscape of Wilkinson House and - - -

MS MISRA: It keeps the principal facades of - - -

25

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

MS MISRA: - - - Wilkinson House, but what it does is it actually still contributes to a loss of fabric greater than what would be anticipated for a building of this  
30 significance.

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: So in terms of the City's position, just to clarify, the only option from the City's position is retaining the building in its entirety?

35 MS MISRA: With some minor alterations to expand some of the rooms, like amalgamate some of the rooms for slightly larger rooms, there is potential to add a lift, which was one of the issues about disability access. A lift could be added to the building without the whole building being demolished.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: There are some sort of other considerations, such as the levels of the building between the two lines so that there is accessibility with – you know, issues between the adjoining teaching block and this one if this one is turned into a teaching space. So there's a few other complications with just maintaining the existing fabric and knocking out walls, so to speak, so in terms of – And I'm just  
45 trying to get a handle on the value of the building. Obviously, a perfect situation: its entirety. But we have to speak from a position of ignorance at this point, because we haven't actually been inside the building – and we have yet to go there – but it seems

that the cellular nature of the building is counter to the pedagogy that they're trying to introduce in the school and it really prohibits a lot of activities happening in its various forms. So that was one of the strongest reasons for demolishing it. But if there was some way of accommodating the streetscape, retaining the streetscape and its contributory role in the conservation area while still meeting the contemporary demands of an educational establishment – is there any kind of leeway in there from the City's point of view?

MS MISRA: I suppose there could be an option that hasn't been presented to us which is a balance between Option A and Option B. So Option A is complete retention of the building. Option B is just the front facade and the two facades which are highly visible. But there might be potential for retention of a lot more than just the two facades; maybe a bit more of the internal features that contribute to the significance, maybe the entry lobby or original elements like fireplaces and things. Perhaps there could be an option to interpret the internal room layout while still being able to amalgamate the spaces inside. But I believe that the amount of demolition proposed in Option B, it just isn't the line of façade – it's not a route that we'd like to take ..... heritage conservation.

MR WILSON: Priyanka, when was the nomination made for Wilkinson House for listing on the State Register?

MS MISRA: It is not listed on the State Register. It's just the local LEP.

MR WILSON: I thought you said that the nomination had been put forward to list it on the State Register.

MS MISRA: National Trust has put in an objection, and they are considering listing it on their National Trust register.

MR WILSON: Ah, National Trust register. Okay. Thank you.

MS MISRA: No worries.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Another question. Can I ask another question, Chris?

MR WILSON: Of course.

PROF LOCHHEAD: So one thing about this – the concept plan – is that it puts in place floor space and heights and distribution of height and bulk. Do you have any comments on the disposition of the multipurpose building as it impacts on the bulk and scale?

MS MISRA: From my own perspective, I was looking at what the existing building there at the moment is, which is quite ugly to begin with from when you look at it from Bourke Street. I think the proposed building design was revised after our first submission went in and they have now acknowledged the presence of the Heritage-

listed terraces on Bourke Street and they have managed to design a good transition, having a two-storey front wall to be in line with the two-storey terraces. As much as I understand the building is quite bulky, I think they are still within the LEP height controls, and I am not very concerned about the bulk of that particular building front  
5 in Bourke Street from a heritage point of view. It's the extension of Barham House on Forbes Street – that would be my concern from a bulk and scale point of view.

PROF LOCHHEAD: What about David? Do you have a view about that from a –? I mean, it does exceed the envelope, the LEP – or maybe it's the – sorry – DCP  
10 envelope; I don't know. It steps back, but it does actually - - -

MR ZABELL: Yes, we had an original objection to the scale of the – I think it's the multipurpose building on Bourke Street. The modification that they made to set back that upper level is considered acceptable. We did have some other recommendations  
15 around the relationship with the terraces and having insets and whatnot. I see in the Department of Planning's report that there have been further changes made that the City has not seen, but from what is written in the Department's report it sounds like they have incorporated changes that we requested.

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: Is that correct, Brad? Do you know?

MR JAMES: I would need to confirm that.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. Okay.  
25

MR WILSON: Okay. I'm just trying to get my head around the design competition process. Would that be – So what you're saying is there's two options: there's an option to do it as a whole for the three envelopes or it could be done individually. Is that correct? Is that what I heard?  
30

MR ZABELL: Yes. So ideally a design competition could be held to determine where floor space could be distributed throughout the site to establish a concept, and then you could have individual design competitions for the three – you know, whatever eventuates. If it's three additional new buildings, you could have  
35 individual competitions for those as well. If the panel is minded to approve the concept as it currently is proposed, we could still request that design competitions are held for the building to replace Wilkinson House, the multipurpose building and for the extensions as well.

40 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR ZABELL: Or potentially one competition for two buildings, you know, if they are held - - -

45 MR WILSON: Yeah, I understand.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. I mean, just based on the Wilkinson House envelope, it's pretty much the same envelope, so whether you – I mean, you could still have a competition and say "See if you can retain the building as much as possible" in the brief. With the multipurpose, it's pretty much the LEP/DCP kind of constraints  
5 which they have modelled. The only thing is how does the extension to – well, the admin building – conform from a DCP – you know, from the Council's own controls. I'm just thinking if basically the envelopes that are proposed in this concept plan are pretty much labelled with the current controls for that site, there's not much – there's not a strong reason for having a design competition for this first  
10 stage, is there, because it's pretty much they're all within their envelope. Do you know what I'm saying?

MR ZABELL: Yes. What we would anticipate if a design competition were held to establish building envelopes and distribution of floor space is to ideally try and retain  
15 Wilkinson House in particular.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right.

MR ZABELL: And ask competitors, with a brief of the objectives of the school, to  
20 provide the necessary floor space elsewhere. If there could be - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

MR ZABELL: - - - some internal changes to Wilkinson House, it could be that  
25 Wilkinson House is left as it is and there's additional floor space put elsewhere to meet the needs of the school. So ideally a design competition at concept stage would allow for greater innovation and imagination as to how the objectives of the school going forward could be achieved without such significant impacts to heritage-significant buildings.  
30

MR WILSON: Based on that, though, it would be difficult to determine the application as before us.

MR ZABELL: That's why we would recommend that this application is not  
35 supported and that they go back, undertake that particular process and re-lodge a concept application once they have undertaken that process and hopefully established a better outcome.

PROF LOCHHEAD: So the constraints of that brief would include retaining  
40 Wilkinson House in its entirety, restoring Barham House and ensuring any building in the vicinity of Barham House and Wilkinson House respected the bulk and scale of those heritage items. Is that the sort of thing that you would imagine in a brief on a competition like this? I'm just trying to – Because I mean it's got to balance their requirements of what they need to do on the site, which is their core focus, and we're  
45 trying to balance the public interest with that as well. We need to make – Is that what you're thinking, that sort of thing?

MR ZABELL: It might not be as strict as saying “retain Wilkinson House as is”. It could be a more broad statement around respecting existing heritage fabric on the site to allow some flexibility. And there may be an opportunity – or potentially, if they want to go through that process, they could come back to the City and obviously put  
5 in a planning proposal to allow for additional height and bulk in certain areas to offset retaining heritage fabric. So I believe that the concept application is a good half way between having to go through a planning proposal to reassess planning controls for the site but also giving the school the opportunity to explore alternatives than to just demolish Wilkinson House to accommodate their needs. I feel like that  
10 is the easier solution. A design competition for building envelopes could maybe bring out an alternative and better scheme.

PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean, I think that the floor area, it’s not like you can’t fit – I don’t know how many square metres it is but, say it’s a thousand square metres in  
15 that building, you can probably accommodate 600 square metres. So it’s not that it’s – I think it’s the nature of the space and the compromising structure that is the limiting factor. So yeah, you have got to put the – If you take out that floor space, you have got to put it somewhere else to enable them to accommodate flexible learning areas.

20

MR ZABELL: No, I appreciate that.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

25 MR ZABELL: I imagine that what could happen, similar to how they have structured this current application, in that a redevelopment of Wilkinson House forms part of the concept application as well, those works form part of the initial stage, as part of a design competition for the concept they could look at – in detail –  
30 how you could reconfigure or repurpose Wilkinson House to meet their needs rather than just going to the point of full demolition as is proposed.

PROF LOCHHEAD: There’s one more question. Sorry, Priyanka, just one more question – it’s a heritage question – is that we were trying to clarify how we ensure that the conservation works to the heritage buildings that are on this site or that are  
35 retained on the site get conserved in this sort of proposal as well and how it can – I mean, they’re talking about the status of Barham House being 2030 or something like that. My experience on these sorts of sites is you need to bring the conservation works forward to ensure that they get done because it’s often a bit like landscaping; the last thing done is the first thing to be cut from the budget. So do you have any  
40 suggested conditions about that?

MS MISRA: I think one of my suggestions – the primary suggestion – would be that the site needs a conservation management plan, which it doesn’t have at the moment, and that conservation management plan will then entail policies, and it will  
45 have set priorities for what conservation works need to be undertaken as soon as possible and in priority, and it will also guide as to how any potential development should happen on the site. So first and foremost a conservation management plan,

and that is one of the conditions that we have proposed; and, after that, certainly conservation of existing heritage buildings is the second priority; and then possibly potential development that is sympathetic to the context.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you.

MR WILSON: Is there - - -

MS MISRA: If I may – Sorry.

10

MR WILSON: Sorry. Yes, you go.

MS MISRA: Can I make a quick comment about the floor space – the discussion that we were having about Wilkinson House? So the three options that the applicants have proposed – Option 1 – retention of the building in its entirety – gives them about 500-ish or so approximate square metres, and Options 2 and 3 are close to each other at around 800 square metres. So between Option 2, which is retention of principal facades, and then complete demolition they are not really gaining that much floor space, so there is no reason why at least Option 2 shouldn't be further explored.

20

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. So it's – What did you say? It's three – So what was the floor areas?

MS MISRA: I was just – I think from my memory – this morning I was looking at it – it was about 500-ish for retention of the building in its entirety and just accommodating spaces within it.

25

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah?

MS MISRA: And for the other two options it was close to 800. And they were very similar to each other.

30

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Yeah, okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR WILSON: David, is there - - -

35

MS MISRA: If - - -

MR WILSON: Sorry. No, sorry, Priyanka, you go.

40

MS MISRA: Oh, I was just going to say that it is in the documentation provided by TKD. It's the Wilkinson House option analysis document.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. Yeah, I just don't have it handy on my desktop. Thank you.

45

MR WILSON: Just quickly on your recommended draft conditions should the Commission be minded to approve this application, is there anything you want to point out specifically? You have spoken about the conservation management plan. Is there anything other that you would like to point out to us which you think is critical?

MS MISRA: I suppose if the demolition of Wilkinson House is definitely going forward, or if it's getting approved, a really thorough archival recording of the – measured drawings of the building and just detailed photographs so that there is always evidence of that building digitally if not physically.

MR WILSON: Yeah. I think those conditions are in the Department's.

MS MISRA: I think so.

MR WILSON: And I have noted you have also requested them as well.

MS MISRA: Yeah. I think, yeah, just on that. And just around excavation, because there's an extensive excavation on site, very close to heritage fabric, and just protection of heritage fabric from vibration and structural instability issues.

MR ZABELL: On the – Sorry, it's just David speaking. We have put in just City standard conditions around waste management, construction and whatnot, so there's nothing else in particular to draw your attention to.

MR WILSON: Okay. So the most critical one is obviously the CMP?

MR ZABELL: That's right.

MR WILSON: Yeah, okay.

PROF LOCHHEAD: On that – Sorry. Sorry, I'm just – Am I –? Can you hear me?

MR WILSON: You go. Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah? Okay. So the – You know the tree canopy – I mean, this is an incredibly dense site. Do you think the 15 per cent tree canopy is achievable in this dense, built-up environment?

MR ZABELL: Our landscape officer reviewed the plans and believed that it was possible, but it might be something that could be discussed further with each stage as to how that could be achieved and particularly with regard to whether or not – Generally speaking, the City doesn't count street tree planting within the tree canopy coverage for the site, but it might be that to offset any deficiency on-site there may be additional street planting, for example. So that could be a conversation that is

discussed with the City. However, our landscape officer has ..... that an arborist has recommended the 15 per cent target is achievable.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, okay.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you. Yeah.

10 MR WILSON: Okay.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

15 MR WILSON: Unless you have got anything else to add, I think we have – I don't have any more questions. Helen, do you have any more?

PROF LOCHHEAD: No. No, thank you. That was helpful.

20 MR WILSON: So David and Priyanka, unless there is anything else you want to add, I think that probably brings an end to our proceedings today.

MR ZABELL: Thank you very much.

25 MS MISRA: Nothing from me. Thank you.

MR WILSON: We appreciate your time. Thank you.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[4.09 pm]**