

MR A. PILTON: Good afternoon and welcome. I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the MLC North Sydney, former, request for advice on proposed listing on State Heritage Register currently before the commission. This matter has been referred to the Independent Planning Commission for review under section 34(1)(b) of the Heritage Act 1977.

My name is Adrian Pilton. I am the chair of the commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Dr Peter Williams. We're also joined by Stephen Barry, planning director for the Office of the Independent Planning Commission, and Andrew Sneddon, heritage advisor assisting the IPC. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is one part of the commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its advice.

It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take up the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that everybody here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and that all members ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. To start, it might be helpful if you could introduce everyone on your team, Frank, and perhaps we can start with you.

MR F. HOWARTH: My name is Frank Howarth. I'm chair of the Heritage Council of New South Wales. With me is Pauline McKenzie, executive director of Heritage New South Wales, and Mary Ann Hamilton, who is a staff member at Heritage New South Wales and is our specialist on the MLC Building.

MR PILTON: I notice that Steve Meredith has now joined the broadcast. Are you there, Steve?

MR S. MEREDITH: Yes, I am, Adrian. Steve Meredith, acting regional manager, northern, Heritage New South Wales.

MR PILTON: Welcome.

MR MEREDITH: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Okay. Frank, perhaps you would like to start.

MR HOWARTH: Thank you, Adrian and Peter, for the opportunity to talk to the panel today. There's a couple of ways we can do this, and I will seek your guidance. We've provided some detailed notes to the IPC that probably went in yesterday that I'm guessing you may or may not have had a chance to read. I will come back to that.

MR PILTON: We've received them, thanks, Frank.

MR HOWARTH: Sorry, you have or you haven't?

MR PILTON: We have received them.

MR HOWARTH: You've received them. Okay. What I was going to ask is whether, Adrian, you and Peter would like me to – I can go through and summarise the key points in that submission, but I've got some sort of more overall remarks. Or we could leave it to you to ask us any questions first, and then I would like to summarise one way or the other. So we're in your hands about your preferred way.

MR PILTON: I think it's best if you start and give us an overview of the notes you sent yesterday and emphasise the important parts.

MR HOWARTH: Sure. And the notes we sent really address the questions that the IPC raised, and I am going to be very brief about this, because all of what we're going to say is in those notes. And your first question really was is the statement of significance endorsed by the council thorough and appropriate. And certainly the council believes it is. We went through in a great deal of detail assessing the absolute and comparative significance of the MLC Building. It's of state significance for its importance to architectural and cultural history of New South Wales.

It was a seminal building in terms of its type of construction, but also its location, the first major office building, the first building of its type in North Sydney, and it really marked the establishment of North Sydney as Sydney's second CBD. So it has a great deal of significance there. It's significant because of its association with Sir Walter Osborn of Bates Smart. It's an iconic building for North Sydney. It's held within high regard by the architecture and engineering communities, and a number of submissions in favour of listing to Heritage New South Wales, which I think all may have been made available – and it's certainly on our website – very strong support within the architectural community for the listing of the building.

It's a significant piece of modern architecture of rare quality, and – this is a key point from the council's point of view – particularly the iconic Miller Street wing is of state significance. I note, actually, in the range of reference works that we looked at, one of the references that particularly notes the significance of the building is indeed by Bates Smart. The publication is 165 Years of Enduring Architecture, and we believe that the MLC Building is indeed a piece of enduring architecture. Probably the two most helpful submissions that were made were from the organisation

Docomomo and from the Australian Institute of Architects drawing attention to the significance of the building.

5 In terms of comparative analysis, it's worth spending just a moment about how the Heritage Council got to pick out the MLC Building. In 2013, the then-Heritage Council endorsed a priority list to be progressed to the State Heritage Register listing under a theme of modern movement. And I want – I might mention here that the current approach of the Heritage Council is to see the State Heritage Register as a curated collection of heritage excellence of New South Wales. So we will go
10 through and we look at various themes, we look at gaps, we look at things that, indeed, might be overrepresented as well. And in 2013, the council looked at what was called and is still called the modern movement theme.

15 Because the work in the background to list something is pretty extensive and takes quite a lot of time from the staff here in particular, we will tend to focus on – once we've got a target list, and the MLC Building was very clearly on our target list and we had said it is of state significance in 2013. And this is contrary to what Investa actually asserted. It was clearly identified in 2013 as of state significance. We will focus on buildings and places that are more likely to be under threat or aren't
20 otherwise protected. At that time the MLC Building was – was – listed on North Sydney's LEP as under local significance and was not then under threat. And indeed it was the threat of the DA coming in for demolition which triggered the council to consider the particular building.

25 In terms of comparative significance, one of Australia's most noted architects, Louise Cox, who was a member of the State Heritage Register Committee before, noted that the MLC Building in North Sydney is at least as significant as the ICI Building in Melbourne, also designed by Bates Smart & McCutcheon, which is nationally listed for its heritage values. And I mentioned before, the MLC Building
30 is the only example dating from the first years of construction of these historically innovative buildings that is located in North Sydney. The council takes very seriously the question of significance, if I can put that, within a site. They key significance for the MLC Building is its overall architectural form and its reading from the Miller Street side in particular, and that – the council is certainly of the view
35 that sympathetic modification of the building that doesn't impact on those heritage values is entirely possible.

And in that sense the council had an extensive discussion about the level of intervention that could be achieved on the Denison Street side, and certainly – and
40 also discussed at length the curtilage that we were proposing. There was – whether the curtilage should only cover the Miller Street building or the full site. We decided in the end to cover the full site, not so much to say that the building on the Denison side was of equal significance, because it isn't, but more to ensure that the Heritage Council or the Approvals Committee has a role in working with the building's
45 owners in any proposals for modification to that side of the site. I'm just looking at the key points of our submission, so forgive me for a moment.

We looked in detail at the relative repairs and maintenance necessary for the building and whether that would create a grandfather's axe problem, to use the jargon or the vernacular. And the council really determined that the architectural design is key to its heritage significance, and therefore relatively extensive replacement of the fabric
5 would be quite reasonable without impacting on the significance, and one of the two peer-reviewed reports that we commissioned, the Peddle Thorp & Walker peer review maintains that the building is capable of being fitted out for a contemporary workplace, as minimum building and workplace parameters are compatible with the Property Council definition of an A-grade building. So we certainly believe that the
10 building could be brought up to a current A-grade standard and retain its heritage significance at the same time.

The single – I think the council's and certainly my view is the most significant issue that I suspect the planning commission will be looking at is whether the listing would
15 result in undue financial hardship. And it was a result of really the same thinking by the council that we commissioned two peer review reports, which you have. And I'm not going to go into any discussion about those except to note that both reports fairly clearly, in our view, show that the building is capable of a reasonable or economic use. Interestingly, in terms of the cost of refurbishing the building, when
20 Investa lodged its DA for demolition it estimated the cost to bring it up to standard as \$120 million, but in the owner's submission to the Heritage Council that figure had gone up to, I think, \$230 million. We were aware of both figures and tested both figures, or the peer review tested both figures.

So I'm not going to say any more, Adrian, about – and Peter – about our submission. That summarises it. I think the – I just want to pull those together to give perhaps a
25 higher level view from the Heritage Council's point of view. The council certainly takes the view that in protecting the – well, the Heritage Council takes the view that we need to conserve, protect and celebrate heritage, but at the same time we need to facilitate change and enable change. We are as much, oddly, about protecting the
30 heritage of the past as we are about facilitating the heritage of the future, because without change we won't get that heritage of the future. If we go back to the construction of the MLC Building at the time, it was construction of heritage of the future, and that's why we're talking about it now.

35 The question of – well, the council and, I think, my view is that the key issue with this building is the question of reasonable or economic use, as it is with many commercial buildings that are considered for heritage listing. And I stress that our view is that it's not, "Is it the best economic use of the site," because in many, many
40 cases, the highest economic return will indeed be got by bulldozing the building, and that applies as much to a Qantas building or an AMP building or a Sydney Opera House. It's often easier and cheaper to get an economic return by bulldozing, but that's not what heritage is about, and that's not what we believe the questions or the test of reasonable or economic use are about. We believe that the peer reviews
45 clearly demonstrate that the building can achieve a reasonable or economic use.

The other comment I wanted to make, having been part of the walk-around yesterday, was that the walk-around was interesting by virtue of the fact that most of the talking was done by an architect for Bates Smart. That architect or firm of architects has proposed a design and is presumably in a position to design a new
5 building if this one was developed, so that architect has a particular view that would not be unreasonable to suggest that he's going to point out the biggest problems and make quite a lot of those problems. It would have been interesting to have done the same walk-about with an architect who was looking to retain the building and solve the problems and have her or his perspective on achieving that.

10 Now, our peer review, particularly the PTW work, did that as far as we possibly could using the construction drawings of the building – without being inside the building, but using the construction drawings – and it certainly looked at questions of floorplate, of ceiling heights, of fire protection, and I think pretty directly addresses
15 the issues that were raised yesterday in the walk-around. And I think that the way those issues were raised I liken to being slightly within a court case and only hearing the prosecution but not the defence. And as far as we possibly can, we're arguing very much for the defence in this case. I just stress again that the council has made it very clear that the primary significance of the building rests with the Miller Street
20 building and its form, and we would be very interested to consider interventions on the Denison Street side that would arguably improve the economic return for the building and get a greater reasonable and economic use in that way.

The council is also very flexible of how building interiors are treated. I think our
25 view in general terms for a building like this is that it's the public areas of the building that are of the greatest significance. And what happens within the particular privately used office floors, there is a great deal of flexibility, as has already happened in there. Most of those floors have been significantly altered. And just in closing from me before I sort of hand it over to you guys for the questions, the
30 council acknowledges that retention of a commercial building of heritage significance is always going to be a challenge. As I said, in almost every case bulldozing will achieve the highest return, but that's not what society values about heritage. And very much the council's role, I think, and the IPC in this case as well, is about achieving a balance of our past, present and future, and achieving that
35 balance does present some challenges.

The council believes very strongly that in the case of the MLC Building, those challenges are not insurmountable. We also note that when Investa became owners of the building, they had their eyes open. It was very – well, they should have. It
40 was very clear that the building was – has been on the council's LEP as of local heritage significance for a long time, and that since 2013 it has been listed or considered by the Heritage Council to be of state heritage significance. So I think the building owners were quite aware of that, or should have been quite aware of that.

45 And the council firmly believes that Investa can achieve a reasonable economic return from the building through innovative contemporary architecture and adaptive

reuse, and we believe that that has been done in many cases around the world, because there are many buildings of this vintage and construction type in key cities around the world. And the Heritage Council looks forward to being able to work with the building owners to achieve that ideal compromise. Adrian and Peter, that's
5 all I wanted to say. I was going to ask Pauline if she had any extra remarks. No. Well, over to you for anything else you would like us to address or any questions to pose to us or anything else you would like us to focus on.

10 MR PILTON: One of the things we were discussing after the site – amongst the panel, rather – after the site visit yesterday was what if they had to replace all of the cladding? What's the Heritage Council's view of taking off the cladding and putting on the same thing again but new? It's sort of like a Disneyland approach to architecture.

15 MR HOWARTH: Adrian, I think that our view is because this building is significant because of its form and appearance, particularly from Miller Street, the literal fabric is not crucial to it. And in the criteria of significance rating, I mean, sometimes the build fabric will be very high – or the building's fabric will be very high in our – in significance. That isn't the case. So we believe that the building
20 will retain its significance because of its bulk and presence. If the cladding is replaced to look the same or very close to it as the current cladding, it's not crucial for the significance to use precisely the same materials, in our view, for instance.

25 MR PILTON: Thank you. Peter, do you want to ask anything, or - - -

DR P. WILLIAMS: Yes, thanks. Yes, thanks, Adrian. Thanks, Frank. That was a great overview, and also thank you very much for sending the notes through earlier on. They've been very helpful. So I – just reiterating that last point from Adrian, so
30 what you are saying is that the heritage significance is more its architectural design - - -

MR HOWARTH: Yes.

35 DR WILLIAMS: - - - rather than the fabric Okay. Okay. What other issues - - -

MR HOWARTH: Its landscape design, its place in North Sydney, and the – you know, its physical location, it's part of the history of North Sydney.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Right, right. Just in relation to the curtilage, there was – remember when we did the walk-around yesterday and there was that – we were walking along Miller Street, and there's that little addition at the end, right next to Victoria Station. And there was some concern – or, sorry, some uncertainty about that particular bit that stuck out. I mean, that arguably is not part of the original
45 building. It's a more recent addition. So, I mean, some of those sorts of elements that might have to be resolved as well. But it gets down to this point about the curtilage. I can understand why you're arguing or, you know, making the point that

you want to be able to have the whole curtilage included in the heritage listing, but at the same time you're also saying that the key element is the Miller Street wing and what happens at the Denison Street wing is not so significant.

5 Almost – do you perceive there might be any problems with the fact that, in one sense, you're saying, “Well, there's the curtilage we want protected, but in fact within the curtilage there's only one bit we're really concerned about”? Because if the entire curtilage did get heritage listing, it could be used as an argument against redevelopment of the Denison Street side. You know, people might make
10 submissions to say, “Look, it's the entire curtilage that has been listed, and therefore you really can't touch the entire curtilage, or at least in terms of demolition.” I'm just trying to foresee if there might be any problems in terms of trying to separate or distinguish between the elements within the entire site that are of most significance and those that are of less significance - - -

15 MR HOWARTH: I think this is an issue - - -

DR WILLIAMS: - - - and trying to - - -

20 MR HOWARTH: This is an issue that is not uncommon, Peter. For comparative reasons, we recently listed – or we recently recommended for listing and the Minister did list a 1930s Sorensen building in Newcastle, a 1930s apartment building. Now, on the curtilage of that there was a number of garage buildings and other odds and ends that were within the curtilage but not of significance. The reason we expand the
25 curtilage over that is not to say that they can't remove those garages or change them, and very clearly, I think, the significance statement indicates that they can. It's rather to ensure that whatever is done is sympathetic to the original building.

And we would say exactly the same with the MLC Building. That little
30 contemporary building facing Miller Street, I would say, certainly could go. There's no problem with that. And just to stress again that the council certainly considered the curtilage issue, and I would say we looked at the two cases of where the curtilage should be, and we really wanted that larger curtilage not to discourage change but to encourage working with us, that the change is sympathetic to the main building. And
35 we're certainly happy to talk about, you know, quite significantly different things as long as they are sympathetic to the main building.

Now, in reality, if we made the curtilage smaller and a DA was lodged for the Denison Street buildings, the council would be consulted, but it wouldn't have
40 perhaps the level of ability to work with the architects to achieve a sympathetic addition on that side. But certainly the council's approvals committee under Dillon Kombumeri is very keen to facilitate adaptive reuse and facilitate change that is sympathetic to and doesn't diminish the significance of, in this case, the main building. And I think in our submission we've been fairly clear about that. Pauline.

45 MS P. MCKENZIE: I think the other point to make about the curtilage and the fact that while there may be a difference in the significance, the whole building is

significant for its role in that pivotal point in the development of high-rise in not just New South Wales but Australia. And it is a single physical entity, so being able to, as a standard sort of practice within Heritage New South Wales and from the point of practicality, you would not generally be putting a curtilage through the middle of a physical entity.

And we also do generally try to make – it doesn't always work, because it depends – but a curtilage be around a lot or something, because then you've got very clear boundaries of where the Act operates and where the Act doesn't operate. To have put it through, or even to contemplate doing that, would have been – it would make for a very difficult legal set of circumstances in the future, because it's hard to see how anyone could make, you know, massive changes to the Denison Street element of that building without having to have an impact on the Miller Street wing. So it would have also created practically a very difficult circumstance.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. No, thanks for that. Sorry, Adrian, just one more question, if I may. On the site inspection yesterday, we noticed particularly from the Denison Street side you could see two open space areas of the – looked like on the first floor, at either end of the building. What's the view of – Heritage Council's view on those? Nothing was mentioned about them, but a lot was mentioned about the grass area on Miller Street and protecting that from overshadowing. Has there been any consideration about the open space on either corners of the Denison Street side of the building? It's up on about level 1 or 2 of the building.

MR HOWARTH: It's a podium, I think. It's the top of the podium, it would be.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Yes.

MR HOWARTH: Mary Ann.

MS M. HAMILTON: Yes. And there is an auditorium on the northern end inside the building, just adjacent to that open space. And that auditorium – and I think there's a gym there, too – they were sort of very unusual things to put in an office building, so once again, part of its innovation at the time.

MR PILTON: They were original?

MS A. HAMILTON: Sorry?

MR HOWARTH: Were they original?

MS HAMILTON: Yes. Yes.

MR PILTON: Yes, they were there in

MS HAMILTON: Yes.

MR PILTON: Okay.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thanks for that. Thanks for that.

5 MS McKENZIE: Also, I think that Peddle Thorp & Walker had options which
might have included taking up some of that space to make for a – for reasonable –
you know, for the economic use or the financial viability, and all of that would be
something that, if there was a proposal, if it was listed and there was a proposal to
10 actually redevelop that, it would all be part of the consideration of the council. And,
you know, the council has demonstrated very clearly across multitudes of state listed
sites a flexibility and ability to work with owners to get an outcome which works for
both the owner and for the celebration and protection of the heritage of the site.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thanks, Adrian.

15

MR PILTON: Andrew, do you want to ask anything?

MR A. SNEDDON: I was wondering, well, the – Investa says that it's a B-grade
building, and they would spend a lot of money to make it a B-grade building.
20 Obviously, the peer reviewers took a different view, but do you have anything to add
to their report that you've thought on since? Is it possible to be an A-grade building?

MR HOWARTH: Andrew, that's something we've agonised over. And the council
relies heavily on the PTW report for that, and they're of the view that it can be. I
25 don't think that many of the individual councillors were wanting to express a view.
The only thing I would say is that certainly the comments from the Institute of
Architects and the government architect, I guess, sitting behind those, is the view that
they certainly – that it certainly could be made a contemporary office building. And
in other cities around the world and with buildings like Qantas and the AMP, I think
30 it can be achieved. I just go back to my point yesterday that we heard very clearly,
and at some length, and it was most interesting and informative, one side of that
view. And I would think it would be very interesting to do a walk-around with an
architect whose challenge was to make the building work rather than an architect
who may have more interest in pointing out the building's problems, if I can put it
35 that way.

MR SNEDDON: I've got one other – sorry, Adrian.

MR PILTON: Sorry. Go ahead, Andrew.
40

MR SNEDDON: I will be going in another direction, so if you had a follow-up
question - - -

MR PILTON: I was just going to ask about – one of the issues that we were talking
45 about yesterday was sort of upgrading it to modern fire protection standards and so
on, which meant that they had to put new concrete floors in, new concrete slabs in on
top of the existing lightweight slabs, which then increases the load on the columns

and so on. Does the Heritage Council have a view on upgrading buildings to modern standards, as it were, of fire protection and so on?

5 MR HOWARTH: Yes, we do. And in fact, one of the key roles of – the council has two expert panels that advise it. And the technical advisory panel, a lot of its time is taken up advising heritage property owners how to meet fire protection standards in a heritage building. And I would very much like, for instance, the technical advisory panel members who do that to look at this building and really say, “Look at the MLC Building. Does that 140 mil slab have to be put there to achieve adequate fire protection or not?” I think we heard one view yesterday, and I think perhaps I’m going to – it’s clearly up to the panel, but that may be an area where further thought, perhaps more independent thought, is given, because, yes, that’s a significant issue. The building did have a new fit-out in 2012, I think.

15 MS MCKENZIE: Eight years ago.

MR HOWARTH: Eight years ago, and brought up to standard then. I certainly don’t know – I don’t know the technicalities of fire standards, whether anything has significantly changed. And it was certainly a bit unclear to me yesterday about why or whether that assertion of having to put the supplementary slab in was really necessary or not. It seemed to be something to link to the ceiling heights, but then it was pointed out if you put that 140 mil in, then it makes greater problems for the ceiling heights. So I think, to be quite honest, I would defer to a more independent specialist’s view on that one.

25 MR PILTON: Is it possible at all that you could get some quick feedback from your technical committee on that?

MR HOWARTH: Yes. We would probably ask that – yes, the short answer is yes. We would maybe ask for the ability to inspect the building. We have the construction diagrams, but given that the building has been refitted, providing, I think, we have the support of the owner to enable a site inspection, we would very quickly organise that with a couple of our – one or more of our specialists.

35 MR PILTON: Steve, would that be possible, do you think?

MR MEREDITH: I think certainly – I mean, subject to the building owners’ permission, I think that would be eminently possible from our view.

40 MR PILTON: And time-wise, we have a new deadline, do we, for submissions?

MR MEREDITH: It may create timing issues in terms of giving parties time to respond to that. So I think it would be useful – I think it’s definitely something we need to pursue. Whether it’s practical within our timeframe is another factor. So maybe I could liaise with Mary Ann on that point.

MR PILTON: That would be – if you could follow up later on, that would be good. Thank you. Okay.

5 MR SNEDDON: I had another question about this word “undue”, as in “undue financial hardship”, which is something being expressed by Investa. Does the Heritage Council have a position on how that should be defined?

10 MR HOWARTH: Well, the council has a strong position on reasonable or economic use, which is the other side of that, I guess, and that it’s clear that in many cases – well, in many cases, the greatest economic benefit would be by bulldozing, but that’s not what the Act on that meaning is about. It uses “reasonable or economic” very deliberately, I think. And I think the PTW report shows that Investa would not be subject to any financial hardship. It may have a lesser economic return than bulldozing and rebuilding, but it would not lose financially, and therefore, on
15 our view, it would not be subject to economic hardship.

MS McKENZIE: But also, just on technical the meaning of “financial hardship” under the Act, there were – in the Sirius case, that was discussed quite extensively in relation to the Sirius building, and it is a relative financial hardship provision, and
20 that relativity is between the significance of the item and the financial capacity of the owner and then the relative hardship of whatever that listing might create. That’s just more the legal technical finding of the court in the Sirius case.

MR HOWARTH: And the other thing, Andrew, I would add to that is that, as we
25 said before, Investa went into this with its eyes open. The building ownership history for the last 20-odd years, or 10 or 15 years, seems to be a series of related party transactions rather than an open market sale. But I don’t think Investa could say that it did not know or its due diligence should have given it to know that the building was definitely of local significance, and, by 2013, was of state significance
30 as well. So I think economic hardship has to be read in that context as well.

MR PILTON: Okay. This might be a little detailed question, but there was a point about the flooding of the lobby and so on from Miller Street, that the PTW report said that those problems would likely be addressed by the major public infrastructure
35 upgrade required for Victoria Cross Metro Station. Do you know anything more about that, or is that just a sort of throwaway comment from PTW?

MR HOWARTH: No, we discussed it quite extensively, Adrian, and I think we even briefly discuss it with North Sydney Council. But it certainly is linked to, and
40 the infrastructure upgrades that will go with Victoria Cross, we firmly believe, will solve that problem. We don’t – we don’t deny, obviously, that it has happened in the past, but we do think that Victoria Cross will solve it. But also, as one of our council members said, that problem is not one of Investa’s causing. It’s an infrastructure in council or Roads and Maritime territory, not Investa’s territory.
45

MR PILTON: Okay, thank you. Look, I don’t have any other questions. Peter?

DR WILLIAMS: No, I think – just thinking, too, also, the whole argument about why work might need to be done with, you know, additional slabs and putting extra services and fire rating and all that, we also need to go back and have a closer look at the arguments put forward by Investa on why that’s necessary as well. And that’s
5 something for us also to look at. Perhaps also we might need to get back to them, as well, ourselves.

MR PILTON: Yes. I mean, I think - - -

10 DR WILLIAMS:

MR PILTON: It was very easy to see that that is a key issue, and I think it would be very interesting to get another view that was less vested interest, if I can put it that way.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, that’s – yes, that’s – I think there’s that element, and then also there’s one of also getting another view – another viewing of – or if you could get some of your people in to also provide some advice, if that was possible to get access, would be very helpful as well. But just to explain what’s possible in terms of
20 upgrading and in terms of servicing, fire safety and all these sorts of issues, and still have a building that’s going to be, you know, commercially viable or a reasonable return. Yes. Thanks, Adrian. That’s all.

MR SNEDDON: And a very – it could be a one-word answer, and that is, do we
25 know if our original architect ever expressed a view about upgrading the exterior and maintaining the curtain wall and the like, and the tiles?

MR HOWARTH: It was McCutcheon.

30 MS McKENZIE: Yes, McCutcheon.

MR HOWARTH: I think McCutcheon has been dead for some time, I think. So, no, we don’t know, Andrew.

35 MR SNEDDON: No, I figured that would be the answer.

MR PILTON: I’m pretty sure he has been dead for at least 30 years, but I’m not sure of the exact dates.

40 MR SNEDDON: I was hoping for a plan lying around somewhere with a little annotation.

MR HOWARTH: What, from McCutcheon, you mean?

45 MR SNEDDON: A little arrow pointing to the curtain wall with some views on appropriate replacement of cladding. These things are pretty rare.

MR PILTON: Yes. Steve, do you want to add anything?

MR MEREDITH: No questions from me, thank you.

5 MR PILTON: Look, I think we've adequately covered it today, so thank you, Frank and Pauline and Mary Ann and Stephen. Unless there's anything else you would like to say, we might wrap up now.

10 MS McKENZIE: I would just like to ask some practical questions, really just so we know what's going to happen next. You said the transcript would go up on the website. When is that likely to occur?

15 MR PILTON: Typically within 72 hours. We would hope to get it up sooner than that. The transcript from Monday, maybe, for instance, went up today. So we - - -

MS McKENZIE: So it's the recording that goes up – it's the recording that goes up, not the typed transcript?

20 MR PILTON: No, the typed transcript.

MS McKENZIE: Yes.

25 MR PILTON: The recording isn't published. And all of the submissions that we get will also be up.

MR HOWARTH: Adrian, we're very grateful for you interrupting your holiday at the Sagrada Família in Barcelona to speak with us today.

30 MR PILTON: I have a – I have a series of different backgrounds. You don't want to look at my living room.

MS HAMILTON: I was there in February last year.

35 MS McKENZIE: Before the pandemic.

MS HAMILTON: Just before the pandemic.

40 MR PILTON: Yes. Okay. Well, thank you very much for your time this afternoon, and if you do have anything else you want to send to us, we've got a few days, I believe, before submissions close. So thank you again. We will call it quits now. Thank you.

MR HOWARTH: Thank you, everyone. Thank you for your time.

45 MS HAMILTON: Thank you.

MR SNEDDON: Thank you. Thanks for your time.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.13 pm]