



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1406218

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

APPLICANT MEETING

RE: PITT STREET SOUTH OVER STATION DEVELOPMENT

PANEL: **MR CHRIS WILSON (Chair)**
PROF HELEN LOCHHEAD

OFFICE OF IPC: **CASEY JOSHUA**
KATE MOORE

APPLICANT: **TIM BLYTHE**
CHRIS CAROLAN
FIL CERONE
JASON HAMMOND
MATHIEU LE SUEUR
LUCINDA MANDER-JONES
NELLIE O'KEEFE
JACQUELINE PARKER
PHILIP VIVIAN
SCOTT WALSH

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICES**
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **2.18 PM, TUESDAY, 9 MARCH 2021**

MR C. WILSON: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge traditional owners of the lands on which we meet, the Gadigal People of the Eora Nation. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging.

5 Welcome to the meeting for the Pitt Street South Over Station Development. Pitt
Street Developer South Proprietary Limited is seeking planning approval to construct
a 39-storey residential tower above the Pitt Street South metro box, including retail
and communal residential spaces within the approved metro box. They are
concurrently seeking approval for a modification to the concept approval. The site is
10 located in the Sydney CBD on the corner of Bathurst and Pitt Street. Sydney Metro
City and Southwest Metro line is currently being constructed at the site. At the
completion of the metro line works, the Pitt Street Metro station will occupy the site.
The proposal is located above the southern entrance of the Pitt Street Metro station.

15 My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by
my fellow Commissioner, Professor Helen Lochhead. We also are joined by Casey
Joshua and Kate Moore from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.
In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of
information, today's meeting is being recorded and the full transcripts will be
20 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 determination.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify
25 issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and 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. I request
that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time
and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to
30 ensure accuracy of the transcript. Now, I did say at the beginning, I think we should
go round the table now to ensure that we all get a chance to introduce ourselves and
because not everyone may speak. And I will note that the presentation you've
provided us today will be put on our website. So let's starting with you, Chris.

35 MR C. CAROLAN: Chris Carolan from Pitt Street Developer South.

MS N. O'KEEFE: Nellie O'Keefe from Pitt Street Developer South.

MR P. VIVIAN: Philip Vivian from Bates Smart Architects.

40

MS J. PARKER: Jackie Parker from Urbis Planning.

MR T. BLYTHE: Yes. Tim Blythe from Urbis Planning.

MR F. CERONE: Fil Cerone, Sydney Metro.

MR M. LE SUEUR: Mathieu Le Sueur, also from Bates Smart Architects.

5 MS L. MANDER-JONES: Lucinda Mander-Jones, appearing for the developer.

MS K. MOORE: Kate Moore, Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

10 MS C. JOSHUA: Casey Joshua, Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

MR WILSON: And those on Zoom, do you want to introduce yourselves?

MR S. WALSH: And Scott Walsh - - -

15 MR WILSON: Scott Walsh.

MR WALSH: - - -

20 MR J. HAMMOND: And Jason Hammond from Sydney Metro, from corporate design.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay, that's everybody. So the first agenda item is basically just for you to respond to the department's assessment report and the recommended conditions.

25 MR CAROLAN: Thanks, Chris. Thanks, Helen. We've just got the agenda up there. what we've done is just grouped a couple of things in a different order - - -

30 MR WILSON: Sure.

MR CAROLAN: - - - just so they're a bit more logical in terms of flow. Forgive us, we also thought we were doing an opening statement, so if I could just - - -

35 MR WILSON: That's okay.

MR CAROLAN: - - - start in that context.

PROF LOCHHEAD: All right.

40 MR CAROLAN: And just wanted to give some background to the project, which will make probably more sense of some of the other things that we're going to discuss today. So the first one, just briefly, I'm just going to go through about half a dozen slides which are contextual. In terms of where the developer sits in the overall timeframe, we lodged our tender at the end of December '18 and we were preferred
45 between December '18 and September '19 when the contract was signed. And for the clarity of these proceedings, Sydney Metro were the applicant for the stage 1 DA approval, which was achieved in June '19. Subsequent to the contract signing, the

SEARs were issued by the department to us in October. We lodged our stage 2 development application for the south building in May '20. It went on exhibition on June '20 and our RTS lodgement was in September of 2020.

5 During the tender period we went through what Sydney Metro called the Design Excellence Evaluation Panel, the acronym being DEEP, and for the south building, unsurprisingly, the south façade and the interfaces with the adjoining buildings were the focus. Those meetings were held between November 2018 and June 2019. And you can see there were four, in fact. Three – the first three with a panel whose
10 membership is indicated there: Olivia being the acting government architect at the time; Graham from the City of Sydney and other DEEP members. The final meeting was just with Olivia following clarifications of items affecting the south interface.

15 Post the tender, so once we'd signed the contract, we worked with the Sydney Metro Design Review Panel. We presented on 14 occasions to the panel. And what you see on the slide there is the occasions where the south OSD. The Sydney Metro Design Review Panel considered the station, the north OSD and the south OSD, and the membership, again, you can see there, when Abbie took the role of New South
20 Wales Government Architect.

What we want to emphasise there is the rigour that the south building has had from some distinguished members of both the DEEP and the DRP and, as part of that process, Design Excellence was certified by the DRP prior to the DA lodgement and
25 then we are required, under our contract, to go back to them for any modifications as part of the RTS process, and the design excellence was further certified consistent with our RTS submission.

I just wanted to talk briefly about why we needed to modify the stage 1 approval. As
30 I said, that application and approval was managed by Sydney Metro and what we thought was beneficial to the project was the addition of retail use, which wasn't considered in the approval or the conditions, and then the notion of architectural embellishments. The proposed food and beverage offer enhances the building both for the surrounding neighbours and the onsite residents and it also provides activity
35 above the station entrance, which is where it's located. The DEEP reveals in the façade, which became part of the architectural character through the DEEP process, provides for substantial articulation and visual privacy, which Philip will take you through. I would like to emphasise that the glass line is within the stage 1 approved envelope. And there is no floors pace that will project beyond the stage 1 approved
40 envelope.

Very important to us, both in the project and our ethos, is stakeholder engagement. We commissioned who we believe are the best at this and Cathy Jones and I personally designed the engagement project program for Pitt Street South.
45 Personally, I engaged with 32 separate stakeholders, including the City of Sydney, because as part of my responsibility with stakeholder engagement for Pitt Street South, we letterbox dropped in surrounding area over 10,000 letterboxes and we ran

two community sessions during the exhibition and we had a number of specific meetings, including, but definitely not limited to the Princeton Apartments at both the pre-DA stage and during the exhibition period, the same with Edinburgh Castle, Fire and Rescue, Primus Hotel, and the Euro Tower and Century Tower did not take up our invitations to meet.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry. Say that again.

MR CAROLAN: Euro Tower and Century Tower - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Which ones are they?

MR CAROLAN: Euro is on Bathurst Street.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

MR CAROLAN: And Century Tower is further down Pitt Street, but it was included in the stage 1, because of views to St Mary's Cathedral.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right. And Primus didn't take it up - - -

MR CAROLAN: Only on one occasion.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right.

MR CAROLAN: Primus has been on the market, and my suspicion, although I can't confirm, is their level of interest wasn't significant after the first meeting.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right.

MR CAROLAN: Approximately 15 people turned up to the first Primus meeting, and they were representatives of the hotel management, and from Greenland, who are managing the development next door.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right.

MR CAROLAN: Also by way of background and – I'd like to emphasise that this is our assessment of the information available on the DPI portal in relation to the objections that are published there on the portal; that is 83 objections in total. We've identified 65 from Princeton Apartments or related to Princeton Apartments, and the relationship is based on the language used in those objections, 16 can't be identified, and two we can identify as not coming from Princeton. And then the last slide in the background is, I suppose, a macro context, because for us this is an overall project. You can see the timeline and some key stats on the south and the north, and just the difference in terms of the size and scale, the objections, and where we are in terms of timing.

So, Chris, going to the specific agenda: item 2. And we've just got two slides here, and I'd, again, like to emphasise something here. We are not nit-picking here out of a voluminous report, but there are some language issues here and some information issues that we'd really like to emphasise. As we've mentioned to you on the site
5 inspection, given the nature of documentation that's submitted in the stage 2 development application – potentially there may be a lack of clarity, given the technical nature of the drawings between the CSSI and the OSD, and we've got some slides today that should hopefully assist in that. Within the report, the facade establishments, the GRC, are referred to as columns. Now, from a technical point of
10 view we associate columns with structure as solid items – they are not columns and they are not structural.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Do you think they might be referring to the GRC elements, which are directly related to the columns, so they're very specific in their reference?
15

MR CAROLAN: No.

PROF LOCHHEAD: No.

20 MR CAROLAN: Because they're relating to them generically.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Right. Okay.

MR CAROLAN: Again, a mention about the sorts of technical information we've
25 provided in our application, in terms of setbacks, specifically to the south facade. So today we've got some, I suppose, cleaner diagrams to assist in communicating those. The report suggests that the Princeton windows are not permitted to be operable. Our understanding is that they are. The emphasis here being they're not permitted to be operable under the BCA when on the boundary.

30 Further, in 6.3.39 there is discussion around overshadowing, and a comment here that site constraints have not materially changed since the concept approval. Our understanding, and Scott will describe this, is that since then the castle residence approval was subsequent to the stage 1.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: So where is the castle residence?

MR CAROLAN: That's on the corner of Pitt and Bathurst.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Right. Okay.

MR CAROLAN: It's the Hutcheson building site that we walked past.

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

MR CAROLAN: In other words, that provides a – a level of shadowing that wasn't considered in stage 1, and Scott will take you through that. A really important one:

there's a very big difference between six-star NABERS and six-star NatHERS, and we're complying with the six-star NatHERS. I'll hand you over to Jackie.

5 MS PARKER: We have reviewed the conditions – recommended conditions of consent from DPIE, and for the most part the project team's very happy with those conditions. There are five conditions, which are shown on this slide here, which we seek to have some minor amendments made. We will put these in writing subsequent to the panel – to you all, so that you have that before you when you're considering this request. Condition B9 seeks – the department seeks that there be 10 external privacy screens or obscure glazing included on the south facing east and west living room and kitchen windows. We seek that this condition be removed, given the distance of these windows from the boundary – 12 metres or further from the boundary or from any adjacent window on this Princeton site, and that the screening and privacy impacts of the southern facade have been reviewed and 15 endorsed, as proposed by the DRP.

B11 refers to the maximum building height at RL 165.15. We wish that this reflect the 165.35, which is shown on one of the elevation plans within the plan pack, and is 20 reflective of the uppermost point in the plant room, but we do ask also that this condition remove reference to including plant and lift overruns, so that we wish to exclude plant and lift overruns from that maximum height.

MR WILSON: That – that doesn't compromise the concept plan?

25 MS PARKER: No. It doesn't.

MR WILSON: No.

30 MS PARKER: It's well within the envelope.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35 MS PARKER: Yes. B21 talks to site stability and construction work. In general, this asks for confirmation of site stability and construction impacts for the OSD, such that they don't affect neighbouring buildings – in summary. Given that the OSD building sits above the station construction and the Metro box, all of – all of those site stability works is being undertaken under that CSSI approval. We're requesting that there's specifically a sentence included in that clause, which says that "evidence of the above may be provided in a form produced to inform the works undertaken 40 under CSSI 7400".

45 Condition B38 – bicycle parking and facilities contains an error in the number of bicycle parking spaces that are allocated to the residential component. We seek to – to clarify that so that it reflects the right number that are shown on the plans. B38 includes all bicycle parking space – the numbers refer to all the bicycle parking spaces, including retail and residential, and we wish to just refer to the residential, which totals the 203.

And E31 – archival recording and heritage interpretation: this condition reads that archival recording is to show the relationship between the building site and the Sydney Water building across the road on Pitt Street, and it requires evidence of archival recording from prior – from the site prior to – prior to demolition and excavation. That demolition and excavation has occurred on the site under the CSSI approval, so we wish to reflect that any archival recording undertaken by this condition reflect the current status of the site as a construction site, and not require any of the – the previous building works shown to be part of that – part of that archival recording condition. So we’ll pop some further correspondence to you on the specific wordings and rationale for that, but we just wanted to step that out - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS PARKER: - - - in case you had any specific questions.

MR VIVIAN: Okay. So I’m responding to some of the key themes. I’ll be talking about built form, design excellence, and our response to heritage, which is integral to the overall response. I’ll also be talking to visual and aural privacy because it’s a little hard to separate that out. So we’ll try to cover all of those items from your agenda. Just starting with the context, there’s two primary north-south streets in Sydney, as we know: George Street built on the ridge running the length of the city, and Macquarie Street, which aligns with Hyde Park, and those two streets gather all the, kind of, grander civic buildings. If you like, it’s “Sandstone Sydney”. So they’re – they’re grand sandstone buildings, often with copper domes. However, our site is on an east-west street, and that has a very different character. It tends to have a kind of – more commercial buildings, often warehouses. They tend to be of brick construction.

And there’s some examples of buildings literally surrounding this intersection of Pitt and Bathurst Street, and so they tend to be quite rich in brickwork. They have some sandstone or sandstone-like detailing. So it’s a completely different context in this area to, say, what is the context of Sydney, and it’s something we’ve tried to respond to, and particularly the – the rich polychromatic brickwork that is part of the buildings adjoining this site. So I’ll take you through how we’ve done that, but we started with the – the reference envelope. We found this sort of stepping forms here unsympathetic, in terms of the relationship with the Edinburgh Castle Hotel, so our first move was to really try to step that podium form down and step down and create a much more sympathetic relationship with the Edinburgh Castle building. You can see a – a sketch there of more sympathetic materials and colours relating to the Edinburgh Castle, and here you see those steps as you – the form comes down and starts to relate to the Edinburgh Castle on the corner.

The Metro entry then, you can see it’s – it’s a kind of raised up form to highlight its civicness. It also aligns with the parapet of the Edinburgh Castle Hotel, so the idea there is to reference that scale. Sorry, the slides are a little slow sometimes in loading, but you can see where the alignment of the Edinburgh Castle Hotel comes through, the scale of the Metro entry which has been lifted up to give it that civic

quality on Bathurst Street, and, indeed, the scale of windows and openings adjoining the Edinburgh Castle have a much more sympathetic relationship with the small windows of the Edinburgh Castle before you rise up in the podium where you have a – a grander scale beneath the tower.

5

The building form has been articulated, particularly to let light and natural ventilation into the heart of the residential plan. You can see this slot here that lets light and air into those corridors, so it's a well-lit residential communal space connecting all of those apartments. I'll just quickly then go through how that performs under the ADG and SEPP 65. We're just highlighting here some of the ADG compliance guidelines here to maximise north aspect, so we have three apartments that are getting pure north aspect. The next element is to minimise southern aspect, so we have zero apartments with a solely south facing aspect. These face west and east. And then the third aspect of that guideline is to, again, try to maximise easterly aspects, so we have these two apartments facing east. West is not specifically mentioned, but the last apartment on this floor plate faces west and does achieve the two hours of west-facing solar access. So there are eight apartments in all on the floor plate, which, again, complies with the ADG.

10

15

20

25

This diagram by Scott Walsh, and he might talk later in more detail, but it does show the overshadowing from the adjoining building, particularly the castle residences. So one of the challenges at this site is to – it's a – it's a dense urban context. And if I take you back to the plan, the plan does provide great orientation in terms of north, east and west, and zero south, but our compliance with actually achieving two hours of sun – so each apartment that has a yellow dot here is achieving two hours of sun, so every apartment that possibly can is achieving the sun. The – what is stopping apartments achieving sun is overshadowing from surrounding developments and, indeed, we believe Edinburgh residence was – the planning approval was after we took over this site.

30

In terms of dual aspect apartments, you can see five of those apartments have dual aspect and natural ventilation. And in terms of the requirement to maximise shallow apartments, all apartments bar this one apartment have a shallow aspect with – in terms of the apartment planning. So – and – and, finally, cross ventilation: you can see that we have – five of those apartments are achieving natural cross ventilation, so we have in excess of the 60 per cent requirement for natural cross ventilation due to this quite highly articulated form.

35

40

45

I'll go back, then, to the design strategy and just draw your attention to some of these models that worked from a – a concept model through to a detailed model where we are in front you, but we – we have developed a stepped form that takes these four volumes. The idea of the volumes – just have a look here. We're identifying in some of the warm timber colours the heritage buildings surrounding our site and drawing a relationship with the – both the scale and the colouration of these four forms that make up the tower. And the idea really is to reference the scale, as you can see, of surrounding heritage buildings in the scale of the tower, and, indeed, there's a three-storey modulation that is repeated up the tower.

So conceptually we started with a – a human-scaled three-storey element. We stacked a series of similar elements to create, in a sense, four vertical rods, which are brought together creating a nestled cluster of towers, not unlike, in a sense, a stack of Cuisenaire rods that probably some of us are familiar with from kindergarten. So the
5 idea is to create a stack of these – these vertical rods that come together to form the tower, and, in a sense, make up this vertical tower out of a relationship to the elements – the red brick buildings that surround it. And there you see a perspective that you see that cluster of four elements, and I will talk more about the colouration and the materiality in a minute. And a skyline view, again, just showing you those
10 four different vertical portions and, indeed, how they're expressed on the skyline as stepped forms.

I'll just go into more detail on the facade, and particularly the vertical GRC elements. So the – we do have a typology of different facade elements. We've tried to
15 emphasise the verticality in between these masonry verticals. We have fine steel horizontals. We have a living room window type that gives us a – a wide living room window, and a narrower slot which is a ventilating slot. We have a typical bedroom type which allows half of that to slide open, creating a balcony condition for the bedroom for natural ventilation. And then we do have a – a full balcony
20 condition. The last condition then is on the south facade where we are required louvres.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Is it okay to interrupt you - - -

25 MR VIVIAN: Sure.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - as you're going along? Can you just tell us how wide each of those three conditions are? So we've got the living room, the bedroom – yes – that - - -

30 MR VIVIAN: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: So how wide is that

35 MR VIVIAN: So, broadly, and this is going from memory, I think we're 2.2 wide here and we are – is it 600, Matt?

MR LE SUEUR: I think it's 650.

40 MR VIVIAN: 650 for the smaller windows, Helen. And then when we come to the bedroom – and the idea here is that it's – it's a smaller more intimate space for the bedrooms, so the width there, Matt, was - - -

45 MR LE SUEUR: It's about 1600.

MR VIVIAN: - - - 1600. So you've got an 800 sliding door, and, again, referencing that sort of human scale of a – 800 is a typical opening door into a room. And, again,

1600 for the balcony. And then – so those dimensions become fairly standard as they work their way around, but it – Helen, the idea was to break up – so there isn't a rigorous sort of grid, like an office building, running around the building, but to use human scaled dimensions and dimensions that work with the scale of rooms. So in a
5 650 window, for instance, you can stand there and feel very much you're framed in a window, and 800 just gives you that little bit more, like a door, and two metres is like a picture window.

The south facade has windows that address Princeton Apartments, and we've
10 provided full louvre screening, and these are angled in – in a way from the Princeton Apartments, and I'll show you those. So the – the louvres you see here cover the full width of Princeton Apartments, and for the apartment to the west the louvres orient southwest, away from those apartments, and from the louvres in the eastern
15 apartment they orient to the southeast. The end bay windows to the living rooms – so there's a corner bay there and it doesn't look directly at Princeton Apartments. It does not have to be louvres.

MR WILSON: So just to confirm - - -

20 MR VIVIAN: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - they're fixed?

MR VIVIAN: The louvres are fixed.
25

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR VIVIAN: Oriented at 45 degrees, and you can see a – a detail there, Chris. I'm
30 being given the hurry up, but you can add on to question time. So there are – then for ventilation there are three bedrooms in the south facade. There are three slots. This was discussed in great detail with the DEEP and then the DRP panels as to their dimensions. You can see a detail here. So they are 600 wide and they are 400 deep, and the opening portion of the windows is at 90 degrees, which is one of the
35 conditions we agreed with the DEEP and the DRP – at 90 degrees to the adjoining apartments to minimise any – well, to create aural privacy.

PROF LOCHHEAD: So they're 600 wide and 600 deep; is that correct?

MR VIVIAN:
40

MR LE SUEUR: The operable panel is only 450 deep, but the opening that they sit within is 650.

MR VIVIAN: So 650 wide. That – that's 450 there, plus the depth of our facade.
45

MR LE SUEUR: That's it.

MR VIVIAN: Really they're a vent slot. That's – the intention is not actually a window, but it's a – it's a – a vent flap at 90 degrees to Princeton.

5 MR LE SUEUR: It opens inboard and it's on restrictors to maximise the opening to a maximum of 150 mil.

MR VIVIAN: Okay. In terms of, then, the facades in more detail, the strategy was to look at the surrounding context. As I mentioned earlier, we – we, in a sense, abstracted and pixelated the colours, and we were looking for colours that would
10 work sympathetically with that polychromatic brickwork, creating, kind of, tonal variation. Here's some examples of buildings that use tonal variation in their composition. That was a fairly exhaustive search through both precast and GRC to get the colour right, and we reviewed that many times with the DRP, but you can see here where the – the colour palette is drawn from these specific buildings that are
15 highlighted below. And the – the final colours that are chosen – and this is one of the arched openings of the Edinburgh Castle, but you can see the – the brick quality and how it draws directly from the polychromatic brick in the Edinburgh Castle Hotel itself, so there's a clear attempt to work sympathetically with that heritage building on the corner. And those colours are then applied to each of the Cuisenaire rods, if
20 you like, with a sympathetic red steel oxide in between.

I'll just skip over that for time. And then the last issue is how do we relate to the heritage building on the corner and, indeed – particularly when we build up against it, you're seeing the entry into the apartments here and the use of this steel express
25 structure and a new brick wall, so the – we were very interested in creating something that was very sympathetic to the existing Edinburgh Castle building. That is the side wall, that you might have seen on site the other day, exposed. At one point we were interested to see if we could leave that wall exposed, but there is structure required. And so we started to explore actually doing a new wall in a –
30 using brick that would be sympathetic to, not mimicking – it would be sympathetic to the existing brickwork, but clearly contemporary.

And we studied in detail the Edinburgh Castle brickwork and handpicked a pallet of bricks that could be drawn out from the existing Edinburgh Castle and put that mix
35 together. It's a – it's a mix of Daniel Robertson bricks, and use also then a red oxide steel for the steel elements. And you can see here how the new brick is expressed. It's sympathetic to, but is – is not a mimic of the Edinburgh Castle. It creates a side wall with a glazed entry, and the intention there is it's like entering a laneway between the historic building and a new building on the right-hand side.

40 I mentioned before the relationship of Metro entry and drawing in the scale of the Edinburgh Castle Hotel, and the scale of these smaller windows in the podium, and to Pitt Street, again, the – the smaller windows and the relationship with scale, which steps up, actually, to relate to the height – not on this image, but the height of the
45 Princeton Apartments. So that is our material palette. The – the top three are GRC, the materials become precast concrete as they drop down into the podiums, so where

you can see it and touch it it has a greater solidity and materiality – that you can see the brickwork, the two colours of red oxide and our paving materials.

5 And then to finish off, a reminder of the overview perspective from the corner. And you can see here its relationship to the surrounding heritage buildings. The way the podium has been brought to step down, and most of that podium is services for the Metro, so there's a lot of working with engineers to make the podium work and accommodate the architecture. The alignment of Metro entry with the Edinburgh Castle and the entry between the two. And last, but not least, the building on the skyline adding a little bit of colour to Sydney, and the building at night. Okay.
10 Thank you.

MS O'KEEFFE: Thanks, Philip. We just – I'll just take a few minutes. Following the site visit last week, we thought it might be worthwhile just to have a couple of 3D
15 diagrams to explain the delineation between the station box works, which fall – which is part of the CSSI approval, and then our – our OSD form, which is the over station development building form, which is – which is this SSD DA application.

20 So looking at the corner of – we're on the corner of Pitt on the right-hand side, Bathurst in the front of the screen, the Edinburgh Castle Hotel on the corner. The blue line is the uppermost section – so the blue line at the top of the screen is the uppermost section of the station box work within the podium, and that work is covered under the CSSI approval. So that blue line sits at the top of the level 5 station plant room, which is our level 6 slab.

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: So where does the – where does the Edinburgh Castle fit; in which development?

MS O'KEEFFE: It's outside of our development. The Edinburgh Castle Hotel - - -
30

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Separate site.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Separate ownership.

35 MS O'KEEFFE: Separate ownership, so not part of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No integration.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Separate lot.

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: Oh, it's completely separate?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 100 per cent

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: Oh, okay. Yes.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes. Completely separate lot. So the blue line is sort of indicating – excluding - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. Yes, yes, yes.

5

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - the Edinburgh Castle Hotel. You can just see on the right-hand side of the screen there what Philip was just pointing to, in terms of the setback of the podium form, which aligns with the height of that Princeton Apartment – sorry, the mouse has a bit of a delay – the alignment of that station box podium setback to the Princeton Apartment terrace that we were looking down on to at the site visit. So this is now looking down on to the station box, which is looking on to the level 6 slab. And, again, all of the works within this – excluding the Edinburgh Castle Hotel, but all of the works within our – within that podium volume forms part of the CSSI approval and is outside our SSD DA application.

15

Just zooming in a little bit, this is what we were looking at last week on the site visit, which is the relationship of that – of that level 6 slab to the first Princeton Apartment windows on their northern boundary. And then this diagram starts to bring in – or brings in the tower form – the over station development building, which is part of the SSD DA application. So the landscaping works you're seeing on the right-hand side of that image, that is the land – our landscaped terrace on level 6. Level 6 is our resident amenity floor, but that terrace is not accessible. It's only accessible for maintenance, and that's really there to provide that buffer of both amenity for those Princeton Apartment windows, as well as amenity for our residents on the – on the pool and wellness floor.

20

25

That also shows the 12 – the next so this section's cutting north on the right-hand side, south on the left-hand side, so you're seeing Bathurst Street on the right-hand side and the Princeton Apartments in grey on the left-hand side. Everything within the blue line and that grey box is all station works covered under the CSSI approval. The pink and – the restaurant and the bike and apartment storage that we've highlighted there, we're just highlighting that because the use of those floors is what forms parts of the SSD DA application, and most specifically, the modification around the retail use.

30

35

MR WILSON: That's your podium; yes?

MS O'KEEFFE: It's not our - - -

40

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - podium. The podium is delivered by the station, under - - -

45

MR WILSON: Oh, yes.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - the CSSI approval, but the – the actual use of those two areas - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - within the podium - - -

5 MR WILSON: They're just changing use. Yes. Okay.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - are covered under the SSD DA. Yes. And then you're seeing there the resident amenity floor on level 6. That's our first floor that forms part of the SSD DA. I just also – was there any questions on that before I move on?

10

PROF LOCHHEAD: No.

MS O'KEEFFE: Okay. Just so – we step through the progression of the built form which, obviously, Philip has done a – already talked you through, but how it specifically relates to the setbacks for the tower form which is part of the SSD application. So what we're looking at here is – sorry, I think I've gone – no, that's okay – yes. What we're looking at here is the envelope of the tower form, so the tower envelope that's part of the stage 1 SSDA application and approval. So Pitt Street is at the top of the frame. That has a slightly varied setback in dimension to align with the outermost space of the Princeton Apartments on the left-hand side of the screen because the site boundary is – is at angle.

20

We're then on the boundary with the Edinburgh Castle Hotel which is what's up here in the top right-hand corner of the screen. There's a four metre setback on Bathurst Street. There has been a three metre setback following the, you know, slightly angled sightline and that three metre setback is to the Euro – the Euro Tower and the Fire and Rescue NSW building. There was in – there wasn't a – as part of the original application the southern portion of that eastern façade actually went right to the boundary and then as – in the application, however – or the approval – the stage 1 approval amended that setback to give that three metre threshold on that southern portion of the eastern boundary and that was to improve solar access to the Princeton Apartments. Then the envelope obviously contemplates that 12 metre setback to the Princeton Apartments. So that's the diagram of the actual approvals setback.

25

30

35 MR CAROLAN: So there's an error – error on slide 87.

MS O'KEEFFE: What's up on the screen here is our original typical tower floor plate of the SS – of the stage 2 DA application. The building followed the setback along Pitt Street that the envelope had already contemplated, as well as on Bathurst Street and the 12 metres to the glazing line for the Princeton Apartments. The key change – the key decision we made as at the start of the project was to actually increase the setback on the eastern side of the boundary to the – to the primary building line and to increase that from what was a three metre setback for the building envelope to a four and a half metre setback at the southern – the southern face and 4.8 metre setback at that more northern face of the eastern boundary. So we weren't building – we weren't consuming that whole building envelope opportunity.

40

45

Following the submission – the submission period and as part of our Response to Submission, there was a couple of key moves we made in response to that. The first one was reducing the depth of the architectural embellishments, the GRC elements on the southern façade, and we also looked at opportunities to how we could shrink
5 our floor plate and shift it to the north a bit in order to get as much increase to that 12 metre distance from the Princeton Apartment boundary to our glazing line. In addition to that, we reconfigured the balcony to this south-east corner apartment. We pushed part of that balcony inboard and relieved that south-east corner of the built form of that balcony in order to improve solar access through to the Princeton
10 Apartments.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Can you just flick back to the previous slide for a moment, just so we can see the difference? Right. So it's just the thickness of the GRC.

15 MS O'KEEFFE: Yes.

MR CAROLAN: Yes, you probably can't see it in this scale, but we moved the building north as well. Yes.

20 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So you get 300 millimetres, basically.

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes.
25

MR VIVIAN: Yes. And more than 12 metres separation to the glass line.

MS O'KEEFFE: And then - - -

30 MR CAROLAN: And it – and it's a device to help the louvres seat within the façade line.

MS O'KEEFFE: And lastly, here with – again, following discussions at the site visit last week, we thought a diagram like this might be useful in order to try and illustrate
35 our tower setback to the Princeton Apartments and how that relationship sits with that change in the Fire and Rescue NSW buildings to the east of our boundary. And what we would have seen on site, which was that change from the lower form building up into the taller red form of the fire building is very close to the point in which that 12 metre setback occurs.
40

MR LE SUEUR: Nellie, just point out where the station outline on that drawing is, as well, I think.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes, good point. And just a reminder, as – I think – thank you,
45 Mathieu – is that line there, so that's the – our level 6 terrace which is the top of the level 5 station plant room and if you draw that line across the page and around to – sorry – the mouse is very delayed – and around to that point there, that is effectively

the – the point in which the station box under the CSSI Approval is below that line and then our application is above that line.

5 MR CAROLAN: And those façade panels, they're blind openings towards the fire brigade.

MS O'KEEFFE: These ones here, yes.

10 MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes. Okay. Any questions on that before I move on? Thank you.

MR CAROLAN: Are you there, Scott?

15 MR WALSH: Yes. Yes - - -

MR WILSON: Just on solar, I guess what we want to try and understand is the analysis undertaken to determine that the – the planning outcome that you've achieved on site, what analysis went in to determine that that was the appropriate outcome?

MR CAROLAN: Sure.

25 MR WILSON: And that – so how the analysis dictated that additional setbacks weren't warranted or - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

30 MR WILSON: - - - you know, weren't supported by analysis.

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MR WILSON: That's – that's something we – we understand the impacts to some degree, or mostly.

35 MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MR WILSON: But I guess we're trying to understand that analysis as well.

40 MR CAROLAN: Scott is going to talk for five minutes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

45 MR CAROLAN: He could talk for an hour – an hour just on that given the amount of work that he has done and we've done, and the giggle suggests that. Okay, Scott, I will turn the slides. There's a delay, so just excuse us.

MR WALSH: Yes, I will wait for it here. So the first part of our analysis was to actually look back at the stage 1 approval and see what the actual solar numbers were as the – has been – Bathurst Street Bathurst Street or past resident. It wasn't included in stage 1 application. I've done some further research and just to clarify
5 those was approved in 2015, so it was just an error in the stage 1 reporting, so it was done by a consultant at the time. We have – that now is approved and apparently being built, so that has been included in our updated analysis.

10 So the first part of what we had to do was go backwards and work out what the actual solar access would have been with the approved concept envelope with classes of residences in there and that had a significant impact on not only solar access of our OSD building, but also onto the overshadowing Princeton Apartments. As you can see between the two images, the amount of Princeton Apartments that lose sun has from that one development. Grab the next – I know there's probably a delay.
15 So overall there's effectively no net increase in solar access between the stage 1 approval and stage 2 instead of the complying solar access for two hours.

They were mainly – I will show you shortly, that was mainly due to an orientation and position. So what we've been looking at is, what is the net
20 benefit of pushing and pulling versus time in different areas, so whether it be on the east or the west, and how any increased setbacks would improve that solar access. So as the SSDA application was lodged, there was a net benefit overall of 156 minutes additional solar access – the apartments from Princeton. As part of the Response to Submissions we – with the – or decrease in that GRCs depth, that was
25 not approved by the design panel although it ended up still within the projection beyond.

As a result, in the end our later scheme, the updated SSDA, has now 168 minutes of additional solar access to those apartments as well as an increased amenity, which we
30 will talk about soon, on top of the themselves. So we looked – this is what we were talking about earlier with the eastern setback versus the western setback. We could have had a three metre setback to the east but we looked at it and it did have a 4.5 metre setback to the east instead of that three metre and we looked at what the impact would be of a western setback. It would be 6.2 metres instead of the 4.7.
35 Overall, there's no net change – sorry – there's an overall balance that shows that there's more benefit in putting the eastern setback in. That's got to do with a lot of the upper level apartments of Princeton facing towards the east and overshadowing conditions of those.

40 The western setback would have increased solar access, but We can probably open the next from there and we'll come back and ask questions on these later if there are some. Princeton Apartments themselves aren't actually really designed to maximise solar access, is my first statement. On the lower levels – there's levels, most of the apartments face to the west which has a short frontage to, basically,
45 Century Tower and and Greenland Tower, but the apartments do not face north. They're all bedrooms, even on these northern blue units. The apartments face east to

west in the living room and it's the bedrooms to the north side rather than putting the living rooms and that's why there's that solar access.

5 So the net – well, the solar building unlike this building where every apartment has been – would achieve a hundred per cent solar access even if site is – would be the same as Princeton. If we can go to the next one sorry. This is where we start to talk about this three metre setback and try to give you graphics to understand that. So the blue is the concept envelope and then I've put it in a red-dash circle – that's actually through to the Princeton Apartments to the north-east apartment of
10 that. What that shows is that those – all those apartments there now receive sun at 10 am which previously concept envelope. That – that, again, shows gain of these apartments which then overall accounts for the 168 – or contributes to 168 minutes of gain next slide.

15 The reason and that has nothing All that we've done to actually increase the solar access is that we had lying under the original SSDA windows which therefore apartments, so those windows used to be half overshadow and now they get full sun at that time. And then the next one is – that's actually it – yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Any questions for Scott?

MR WALSH: Any questions or comments, I'm happy to hear them.

25 MR WILSON: Yes. There's a statement in the department's report which refers to the fact that additional – there would be very little benefit from additional setbacks on the western side. I guess I'm trying to prosecute that a bit more in terms of what those lack of additional benefits might be. So, I guess it's a question to you, Scott. I understand we – we can acknowledge and understand the improvements on the eastern side, but I guess it's the western side that I – I'm actually looking to
30 understand if you would increase that at the western setback, why wouldn't you get those benefits? That – that's raised in the department's assessment and I guess I just need to understand why that's the case.

35 MR LE SUEUR: I can possibly answer that. This is Mathieu from Bates Smart. We took that very scenario through to the DRP and I think as part of our RTS submission response we were asked to explore increasing the setback on the western side - - -

40 MR WILSON: Sure.

45 MR LE SUEUR: - - - and to understand what benefit it would give as far as solar impacts à la benefits to Princeton would be. And the – the real impact – Scott will be able to tell what the solar amenity impact was to Princeton. From memory, it was very minor, but what it did do was, and the DRP agreed, create a situation where a one bedroom apartment effectively lost 10 or 12 square metres of floor space and ended up being significantly below what the ADG minimum apartment sizes would need to be for that to be an apartment that met ADG requirements as far as size was

concerned. So the on balance recommendation by the DRP was that the amenity impact in terms of loss of apartment size to the proposed development was way more significant than the amenity gain which Princeton Apartments might gain through the fractional increased solar access such as that - - -

5

MR WILSON: Okay. So a fractional increase, has it been quantified?

MR LE SUEUR: It has. Scott - - -

10 MR CAROLAN: Scott, it was - - -

MR WALSH: Yes, it has been. If I can cut in – sorry.

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

15

MR WALSH: any benefit to our building or loss to our building regardless of that change, so regardless of what Mathieu just said there. Either way, there are clear on the eastern side and the western side. So on this slide here, it talks about a five minute additional gain for – on the eastern side for – for a 12 more
20 apartments. If we do the same setback additional five minutes, but would only benefit nine units. The reason that we give is that on Princeton Apartments on the western side on levels 9 to 25 from level 26 up to 31 to the east and it has bedrooms facing to the north. So the main benefit to get solar access is to have more apartments where they can get additional solar access into on the eastern side.

25

If we were to do that – increase the setback from the west, yes, we would end up with more time to nine apartments instead of four, but any additional apartments would actually be amount of time to the bedrooms which aren't what we're trying to increase in We're trying to get as much solar access as we can into the living rooms, so that - - -

30

MR CAROLAN: So - - -

MR WALSH: But when you asked me that point in time, that's the two dot
35 points there down the right and that's a difference – so effectively, a difference of three minutes that shows that the east is better than the west.

MR CAROLAN: We're happy to provide some documentation to support that.

40 MR WILSON: Yes, I – can I - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: So can I just – just to clarify, you'd – you said that the apartment size would be under the ADG requirements, but it – I mean, another option is to make an enlarged apartment. You know, like, to increase the size that an
45 adjacent apartment as opposed to - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes. Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Did you look at that option as well?

MR CAROLAN: We – yes, we did. But, look, if – when you set it back, you lose solar access to our apartment - - -

5

MR LE SUEUR: Correct.

MR CAROLAN: - - - and to the adjoining Princeton Apartment you gain minutes of solar access to a bedroom window. That was the trade-off.

10

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For nine – nine apartments, five minutes.

MR CAROLAN: So you – five minutes to nine apartments is the net gain and you lose solar access to all the apartments and – and, look - - -

15

MR LE SUEUR: It was about 27 that we lost. We lost 27 - - -

MR CAROLAN: 27 on - - -

20

MR LE SUEUR: - - - to gain about nine difference to - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

25

MS O'KEEFFE: But the nine that Princeton gained didn't – doesn't tip their compliance – the two hour compliance – doesn't tick their two hour window above two hours. They're still – they're still below the two hours, so their compliance level doesn't change. It's just an incremental increase of five minutes within an already existing - - -

30

MR CAROLAN: To bedroom windows.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - non-compliant solar apartment whereas that redesign of our south-western apartment, we – we would lose compliance on 27 of those apartments.

35

MR WILSON: Okay. What – what dictates a – where did the 6.2 metres come from?

MR CAROLAN: A line of - - -

40

MS O'KEEFFE: We looked at a 1.5 metre shift east - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS O'KEEFFE: - - - and a 1.5 metre shift west.

45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS O'KEEFFE: So that's an equitable distance on both sides.

MR CAROLAN: So would you like us to put a pack together for that?

5 MR WILSON: Look, I think it would be helpful. I mean, that's – that is a fundamental issue for – it's one of the key issues, obviously, and we're just trying to understand the analysis that went into determine - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

10

MR WILSON: - - - and the quantification that was used to determine it. I mean, that's an important issue in relation to the – that doesn't change their compliance even where the eastern side – the gains on the eastern side does affect compliance. I mean, we need to understand that a little bit better.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, yes, because when – yes – because the objections as well.

MR CAROLAN: Can I point out the challenge is the issue – so that's at the corner apartment. This is Princeton and if can – we've just – there's a building now that's the water board.

20

MR WILSON: Yes. Yes.

25 MR CAROLAN: So the issue is that there's a very narrow - - -

MR WILSON: We understand.

MR CAROLAN: - - - window before the sun is affected by a water board.

30

MR WILSON: Yes, we've a – we - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

35 MR WILSON: We went into a number of units on our site inspection - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - and – and you can see that that's the case that - - -

40

MR CAROLAN: Okay.

MR WILSON: - - - the west is more compromised than the east based on existing context.

45

MR CAROLAN: Correct, so there's a very – yes – tiny window. We will be very brief about - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Because we probably – we still want some questions as well.

MR CAROLAN: Yes, okay.

5 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

MR CAROLAN: We will be very brief about noise.

10 MS O'KEEFFE: Sure. One of the issues raised by, primarily, Princeton's submissions was the mediation of noise generated from plant on the site, specifically that on the level 6 – or open space – terrace or podium. There are two conditions proposed by the department, draft condition F13 and F14 which requires compliance with noise standards. 5 dBA – no more than 5 dBA above background and no exceedance of the project amenity noise levels as in the Renzo Tonin report
15 accompanying our application and also requirement for operational noise fabrication within three months of operation which we intend to comply with.

MR WILSON: So you – firstly, your confident you can meet that - - -

20 MS O'KEEFFE: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - criteria and secondly, if you can't there's mitigation measures that will enable you to meet those criteria.

25 MS O'KEEFFE: Yes. Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay, so you're not objecting to them.

30 MR CAROLAN: No.

MS O'KEEFFE: No.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

35 MR CAROLAN: That's just to say there's a CCSI component which is dealt with separately.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

40 MR CAROLAN: Okay.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, okay.

45 MS O'KEEFFE: This was one of the items on the agenda that we received, so build-to-rent or BTR and globally more commonly referred to as multi-family is a fairly new and emerging concept for Australia which I'm sure you've both heard

about. It's well established in the US and Canada and more recently in the UK, probably in the last decade. Oxford owns and manages across the globe around - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Isn't that just like a – like, a company title?

5

MS O'KEEFFE: Build-to-rent? No.

MR CAROLAN: No. Definitely - - -

10 MS O'KEEFFE: It's a – it's a model.

PROF LOCHHEAD: No. It's not - - -

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes.

15

MR CAROLAN: A typology.

MR WILSON: Yes.

20 MS O'KEEFFE: At Oxford we own and manage over 10,000 apartments globally. We have buildings in cities such as Toronto, Montreal, New York, Washington, Boston and we have a growing portfolio in the UK through our platform we've invested in there called Get Living. So Get Living is the brand. Build-to-rent is the concept. So the way we've defined build-to-rent is – the concept of it is a purpose-built development. It's designed for single ownership and single management and
25 it's specifically built with the intention of market rentals and most importantly, it's – it's not designed – well, it's not there for individual strata apartments or to sell strata apartments. So think of it as an asset class - - -

30 MR WILSON: It's not a commodity.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes. Think of it as an asset class as a very – just like a commercial office in that we have a single institutional owner across the whole building and then they are responsible for the leasing, management and ongoing
35 operations of all apartments. For renters, there's, sort of, three key themes to the benefits for renters and for our future residents. There's customer service, there's community and there's flexibility. So one of the key aspects of a build-to-rent model is actually the customer service model. Obviously, you know, we're there as a long-term owner and investor of this product. We build quality products to – that we
40 maintain to a really high level of standard. We want to attract residents and we want to retain residents.

From a community point of view, there's extensive resident amenities which is – which is designed to not only foster community for the people within the building,
45 but also to provide connection with the broader community. Quite often we look at things where we set up relationships with operators within the community. We can offer art work rentals, book rentals, dog walking, you know, cleaning and the list

5 goes on. From a flexibility point of view, that comes in a few different ways. Obviously, there's flexibility around your lease term, offer both short and long-term lease terms, offer flexibility with even being able to move within the building if your personal needs actually change and you need to go from a one bedroom to a two bedroom, or the other way.

10 The other way we offer flexibility is through being able to tailor your space to a degree and the three key themes there are paints, pets and pictures. So pets are allowed, you can paint your walls, you can hang your pictures, so it's very much designed for the resident. From an investor's perspective – so from Oxford's perspective, you know, the – the big attraction is that it is a single ownership structure and the focus for us is on those long-term stable returns which you get from a residential product. It's important for Oxford that we do have those long-term returns because we have – we have to support what's called our pension promise, 15 which is back to the pension fund in Canada for the municipal workers of Ontario which is, effectively, a superannuation fund.

20 As opposed to build-to-sell developers which are looking for short-term high project returns, we are more interested in creating buildings of quality in growth – in growth locations, attract and retaining those residents and thereby fulfilling those long-term return requirements. Any questions?

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: I'm just wanting – wondering why it's Canadian as opposed to Australian.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a new Australian - - -

30 MR CAROLAN: Canadian and are the best property investors in the world. There's a group of them - - -

MR WILSON: So you also, obviously, have onsite management, so there would be - - -

35 MS O'KEEFFE: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

40 MS O'KEEFFE: So we have dedicated concierge, security and onsite managements and maintenance.

MR CAROLAN: So just like JLL or Colliers who manage an office building, they will do the same thing.

45 MR WILSON: Yes, okay.

MR CAROLAN: Other issues – one slide – we just – it gets lost, but it's very important to us and we just wanted to emphasise that we're achieving outstanding

environmental performance for a CBD office – sorry – residential building in Australia. The headline is, we understand we’re the first residential building in the city to achieve BASIX 30. You can see some comparisons there. It’s really tough. Lucinda has had a really challenging period to achieve that within all the constraints,
5 so we’re very proud of that achievement, also in terms of BASIX water and we’re going to be one of the few 5 Star Green Star residential high-rise buildings in Australia. So we just wanted to mention that as something we’re very proud of and it’s a significant rate thing for our development. That’s the end. Your agenda was follow-up actions - - -

10

MR WILSON: Do you want me - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

15

MR CAROLAN: - - - and obviously, any questions.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Can we have – Chris?

MR WILSON: No, after you.

20

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay. So you’ve, sort of, answered a lot queries – sort of, very specific queries. I – I still have a query about the amenity of the southern apartments in your building and part of it is related to the structure which is, obviously, quite pre-selective, I would imagine, because of the station development.

25

MR CAROLAN: That’s right, yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean, they’re – they’re humungous columns and – but they’re also – you know, with the GRC which is actually quite deep and quite – you’ve gone for an expression which is particularly – you know, modulated for particular reasons, but in these apartments it does seem to really – you know, if you’re thinking about the sun coming from here, these actually create quite – quite – these façade elements create quite distinct penetration into what might be actually a fairly unencumbered eastern elevation and similarly, we’ve got a very compromised
30 condition here and it’s also quite solid and you’ve – then you’ve got internal elements such as this in here - - -

35

MR CAROLAN: Yes.

40

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - which also, kind of – yes.

MR CAROLAN: So is it – is it mainly those two apartments, Helen?

45

PROF LOCHHEAD: Well, yes. But, I – I mean, even – I mean – yes, look – even if you factored all the – all the balconies are fairly internal and then you’ve got a solid wall there, so it just seems that there’s all these – these, sort of, conditions where you might be able to tweak it, or mitigate it, or improve the amenity, and I

understand it's a juggling act or a trade-off between amenity and articulation, but because these – this is an existing development. It never complied with the ADG
- - -

5 MR CAROLAN: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - or SEPP 65 and it, you know, as far as I'm - - -

10 MR CAROLAN: Or ever the city of Sydney – they're built illegally those windows, just out of interest.

PROF LOCHHEAD: But – yes, exactly right, so notwithstanding that, you know, there isn't - - -

15 MR CAROLAN: They are there.

PROF LOCHHEAD: They're there. But with this one, this is a brand new development and obviously it's a high quality development and you want to ensure that – especially in this post-COVID world where people are actually 24/7 in their
20 apartments and living in them, but these apartments become – have the amenity that they deserve compared to the situation in which they are which is a very dense urban environment and I – I just was wondering whether some of the façade articulation and the depth which had been so much a focus of – of modelling a façade was in some way undermining the amenity and the light and in some even just sun. It's
25 actually light and, you know, external connection and I – I also – I was wondering also about this and the louvres and whether in fact it becomes quite enclosed for - - -

MR CAROLAN: Okay.

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - this proposed development.

MR CAROLAN: Okay.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: And also, while you're there - - -

MR CAROLAN: You happy for me to tackle that.

PROF LOCHHEAD: - - - I also think this becomes – you know, like, by the time you, sort of – like, you recess and then it's only open at 150 millimetres you're going
40 – like, well how much ventilation are you going to get? I mean, have you modelled it? Like, I'm just wondering.

MR CAROLAN: Okay, let me deal with solidity - - -

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: Because I'm – so I'm interested – and – yes.

MR CAROLAN: - - - then louvres, then ventilation to the south. Is that - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. And so it's basically amenity versus architectural - - -

MR CAROLAN: Yes, sure. So if we start with the solidity, there's a tension
between an all-glass building versus a solid building. Our intention was always to
5 create a building of solidity, and particularly to fit in with the existing brick buildings
that are around, and to create something that actually had a bit of solid to it, and also
that didn't feel like it was paper thin and stuck on. And I refer to perhaps the
building behind it's a government building that has solid – and just feels like it's
a – it feels like a sketch just plastered on. So we wanted not just solidity but some
10 depth and feeling that these were real elements. As the glass comes out to the
façade, if we talk about solar access, obviously in winter, having sun in apartments is
a positive.

But in Australia, particularly in summer, having sun in apartments is a negative. And
15 with the east and west, we ended up erring on the side of – you know, I think the
summers are far, sort of, hotter and stronger in Australia than the winters. If we
could provide good solid protection in all of these apartments and incorporate
horizontal and vertical shading, so we're not overheating those apartments. So some
of the solar protections are positive. And, look, you mentioned is it stopping light
20 getting in. If you recall those little façade metrics, we were very conscious of
trying to create a framed window. And a couple of times I talked about standing at
the slot window, the door, the picture window, it was very much about creating a
framed view as opposed to all glass building which is just a complete view.

And I think – look, I think in Australia, we're trying to move away from all glass
25 buildings, particularly the privacy aspects, solar aspects in the city, and I think it's,
sort of, coming to terms with what does solidity mean, what does framing views
mean. But we were – to be honest, we were quite comfortable with the sense that
there are picture – large picture windows letting quite good light in, but also having
30 some solar control. We did, just out of interest, in the presentation, we told you we
reduce the depth of the panels on the south. We did explore that right around the
building with the DRP, and the end result of that was they said we really think
you've lost the solidity and the depth and the articulation, and we went back to 450
deep. It was outright rejected.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: I mean I – I can understand that. It's more of – it's probably
very nuanced in terms of, like, those apartments which are most impacted as opposed
to – I mean, like - - -

40 MR VIVIAN: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: You have actually got the, you know, the Cuisenaire rod
approach. So it's not like you've got one unique platonic form.

45 MR VIVIAN: No.

PROF LOCHHEAD: That should have, you know, a singular expression. You've actually got these clusters.

MR VIVIAN: Yes.

5

PROF LOCHHEAD: And perhaps the clusters might suggest that there might be a different expression on the southern side which may actually which you wouldn't apply so look, I - - -

10 MR VIVIAN: Which – you understand that we have – so that's 250 deep there.

PROF LOCHHEAD: On the – yes, on the south side.

MR VIVIAN: Whereas the others are 450.

15

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes.

MR VIVIAN: Just – so then you mentioned whether it's dark in there. So they are all oriented at 45 degrees, and you will notice, say, for instance, standing at the kitchen, that the view from these apartments is generally at 45 degrees. It's interesting, I have in my own house I live with louvres on the north side at 45 degrees which lets me view out to our view, but protects my neighbour's privacy. And I also have them on the west, which gives me solar privacy. They're vertical and in exactly that scale. And it doesn't feel dark at all. It gives you a, kind of – it's like a horizontal blind, like a venetian blind, but it's vertical and a bigger scale.

20

25

MS O'KEEFFE: Can I add something. So this – if we just set aside the depth of the element, it was – we've already raised it, we looked at trying to reduce that depth, but it was – the DRP didn't support it. If we look at the width of the element, one of the things we have to balance and to achieve with quite high sustainability requirements, both at a stage 1DA level, but also you know high performing building. We do have a solar to glass ratio that we have to work within in order to achieve our NatHERS rating and, you know, green star. I think Mathieu and Lucinda probably know that solar to glass ratio off the top of their heads, but that has been very much part of where – how many of those GRC elements we actually need in order to provide those insulated panels to achieve those sustainability requirements.

30

35

MR VIVIAN: And just on that, there was a rationalisation where we looked at taking some of those verticals off.

40

MS O'KEEFFE: We did actually.

MR VIVIAN: So we've explored the limits of that, can we take any more off, and we've arrived at the balance of environmental and various other factors.

45

MS O'KEEFFE: Between the original application and the RTS response, we should know the number, but - - -

MR VIVIAN: Matt might remember it. I think we went - - -

5

MR LE SUEUR: Between 34 and 49 I think is right in terms of the number of verticals we looked at, and where we're now at.

MS O'KEEFFE: Yes,

10

MR LE SUEUR: 42 from memory?

MR VIVIAN: I think so, 44.234.

15

MR LE SUEUR: And then we more, and then we were asked to put some back in by the DRP.

MR VIVIAN: Put them back in.

20

MR LE SUEUR: It was a trade-off constantly between giving enough privacy to live in a dense built up urban environment and feel that you weren't on show when you were in your apartment, so where you could retreat into your apartment, and also achieving the environmental criteria and a sense of solidity to make this a building of its context.

25

MR VIVIAN: And then the third part of your question, how long was the operability of these slots, so they are a – it's a bent slot, it's full height. We've tested that we certainly get the BCA, in fact, I think we slightly exceed the BCA minimum requirements, and remembering the windows can only open that 125 as well, so whether it's a – so this is a full height pivot that opens and I think – well, it exceeds BCA and does give us ample ventilation.

30

MR LE SUEUR: We've also had it tested against the City of Sydney draft BCPU with regards to traffic noise and natural ventilation openings within built up urban areas, and the air flow analysis has been – that has been done exceeds the requirements outlined in the draft DCP, through those ventilation slots on the south, and that's an actual physical CFD analysis of the air flow movements through the apartments.

35

40

MR WILSON: Okay. I think we've got counsel waiting, so I will get - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, we've got

45

MR WILSON: I'm mindful of the time. So – but if we have additional questions, we will put them in writing.

PROF LOCHHEAD: And maybe you could share the studies that you did for the
DRP.

5 MR CAROLAN: Sure. Which particular depth, or number?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, yes.

MR CAROLAN: Yes, then number?

10 MR WILSON: Yes.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. I mean, we don't want to be revisiting the same thing
..... good time

15 MR CAROLAN: And we may even go right back when the city was very strong on
the privacy from a visual point of view, which is where it first came and then
department asking to go for the full extent. So it is a very much a balancing act

20 MR WILSON: Okay. So, look, thank you very much for coming. As I said, if
we've got any other questions, we will put them in writing. We will also put your
presentation on our website.

MR CAROLAN: So you've received that okay?

25 PROF LOCHHEAD: We did. Thank you.

MR WILSON: The one thing today is that we get some additional quantification
in relation to the western side, the solar access and their setbacks on the western side
in particular.

30 MR CAROLAN: Yes.

MR WILSON: That would be really useful.

35 MR CAROLAN: Yes, and a pack on the façade.

MR VIVIAN: That and the studies.

40 MR WILSON: Yes. Thank you very much.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.36 pm]