New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: NOVUS BUILD-TO-RENT 39-43 HASSALL STREET, PARRAMATTA (SSD-34919690)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	MS WENDY LEWIN (PANEL CHAIR) MICHAEL WRIGHT RICHARD PEARSON
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	TAHLIA SEXTON CALLUM FIRTH
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	JASON GOLDSWORTHY ADAM HIRST LIONEL PUANG ADAM BYRNES BEN POMROY STEVEN MOLINO SCOTT BUTTON ANIKA MISFUD ADRIAN DUNNETT CHARLES MAXWELL BAYZID KHAN FRANCIS HALL
LOCATION:	INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION 135 KING STREET, SYDNEY NSW 2000
DATE:	10:30AM – 11:30AM WEDNESDAY, 31ST JANUARY 2024

<THE HEARING HAS COMMENCED

MS WENDY LEWIN: Good morning. Thank you all for being here with us. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet people and pay respects to their elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD case number 34919690. The Novus build to rent at 39 to 43 Hassall Street, Parramatta, which is currently before the Commission for determination. The application has been lodged by Perpetual Trust Limited as custodian for oh - excuse me, Trust One Proprietary Limited as trustee for Harris Street Sub Trust Novus the Applicant. The Application seeks consent for the construction and operation of a 34 storey mixed use building at 39 to 43 Hassall Street, Parramatta, comprising 210 rent units, three levels of basement car parking for 73 car spaces and three storey a three storey podium providing retail and commercial floor space, residential amenities, a rooftop terrace and communal open spaces. My name is Wendy Lewin and I'm the chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioners, Michael Wright and Richard Pearson. We are also joined by Callum Firth and Tahlia Sexton from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. 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 place its determination. It is important for Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. In the interest 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. People speaking for the first time, I request each speaker introduces themselves and that throughout this meeting you do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So, we shall now begin and over to you. How would you like to begin the Presentation?

MR JASON GOLDSWORTHY: Great. So, I will, I will sort of start proceedings and then we'll sort of pass over to Adam Burns over there, planner and then to Ben Pomeroy, our architect. And then, Steve over there from a flooding point of view. So my name is Jason Goldsworthy, co-founder and chief development officer of Novus. Novus is a dedicated developer, owner and operator of build to rent assets throughout Australia. We have over 1200. Maybe flick to the slides.

Alright next one. Yeah. So, we have over 1200 apartments, in our pipeline across Sydney and Melbourne. And our mission is to create homes for 10,000 people within the short to medium term. At the core of what we do is ensuring that we're designing and delivering buildings that are suitable for Long Term, for the Long Term. We don't compromise on quality, and we certainly don't compromise on safety. We work collaboratively with the Department, Council and the relevant authorities throughout the entire DA process to address any issues whilst ensuring design excellence is maintained. Today we have our key project members in the room as well as online.

We've got the Novus project team with Lionel and Adam, to my right, Adam Byrnes from Think Planners, Ben Pomroy from Rothelowman Architects and Francis Hall from Rothelowman, as well as Steve Molino, from Water Tech and Scott Button from Lyall and Associates. We've also got Bayzid Khan from Stantec in terms of traffic. Today, we'll cover a brief context of the project. Adam will provide a brief planning summary as it relates to the key assessment items, as well as provide a summary of the design excellence process. And Ben will then talk in more detail with regards to the key assessment items, ensuring that there's plenty of time for Q&A. Next slide. Okay, so located in the heart of Greater Sydney, 39 to 43 Hassell Street, was up zoned by Council and the Department from 6 to 1 to 11.5 to 1 in early 2022, enabling mixed use and high-density residential accommodation. The project is positioned to take advantage and really utilise the key infrastructure, that has been taking place within the broader context of Parramatta, including the Sydney West Metro Light Rail, Western Sydney University and the Westmead Health Precinct. The project provides several benefits including diversity and housing choice, significant economic contributions to Western Sydney and the wider state, as well as part of the cohort a sustainable future facing homes. I'll now pass over to, Adam.

MR ADAM BYRNES: Yeah thanks. Adam Byrnes from Think Planners. I just want to take you through this slide to the assessment items. It provides a headline summary of these key six key assessment items that we will then the team will then take you through in a little bit more detail. So firstly, in terms of design excellence, I'll take a little deeper dive in a moment about this. But this application before you was a unanimous win of a design excellence competition. That competition was determined by a panel that included representatives from government architect's offices. And. Obviously, it doesn't stop at declaration with a firm that the jury becomes a design integrity panel. And they have, reviewed this proposal throughout its assessment process prior to appointment. And they confirmed on multiple occasions that, that we've retained design integrity will form the proposal does comply with the provisions of the Parramatta LEP that was lodged under the 2011, document and of course, the housing step and provide the bulk and scale which is compatible with the future character of the area. Also, some more about this shortly. There's residential amenity - the proposal achieves a high level of residential amenity for future residents. Per the ADG, when applied flexibly, as you've read in the report before, you, when considering both the housing separate apartments, flexible design provisions in relation to the BTR housing typology. Public domain and landscape, we do provide dedication of land for local road widening consistent with the Parramatta LEP.

And we'll talk a little bit more about this later. Flooding. This has been a key issue. The proposal provides habitable floor levels above Council's flood planning level. So, the ground floor is above that flood planning level that provides protection for property via the request. Also, at the flood planning level, there's only one single access into the basement at that level and automated flood gates for the PMF, the probable maximum flood level. And then the fourth, I guess tenant to spoke to this wheel is a flood emergency response plan that has a shelter in place strategy for this site. It's been found that our approach is to comply with both Council's LEP and DCP

requirements, and the flood protection utilised on the project is endorsed by inclusion in Parramatta DCP. And finally, in this headline slide, traffic, Transport and accessibility. The proposal has no unacceptable traffic implications in terms of road network capacity. Broadly, and locally, with projected peak hour traffic volumes within acceptable limits without parking ratio is 0.3 to 1, and we promote sustainable modes of transport.

Provide a quick summary of the design excellence process. I think that's critical to the pathway that we've taken to date. And then we'll move to some of those other items. As you're aware, the Parramatta LEP triggers a design excellence competition for most proposals within Parramatta CBD. And as this is an SSDA, the process occurs not through the Council but through the Government Architect's Office. And notwithstanding that and think planners having had experience on a number of competitions in the CBD, including another competition on Harris Street itself, we sought to engage very early on with Council as, as early as late 2021, and those discussions were around things like built form responding to the adjacent development that has been approved and constructed, and under a different planning regime. So, and relationships to the boundary of our site to that, to that development adjoining and the site generally. So, this was discussed very early with Council, following that, liaising with Council, we then turned our attention, of course, to liaising with the Government Architect's Office to set out two things a design excellence strategy and a Design Excellence competition brief, which was supported by a reference design, and that informed the competition that was run in mid-2022. Important to note that the City of Parramatta Council were involved in that design competition. The City Architect of the Council set up jury, along with the Government Architect's Office representative of course, and the proponents representative.

As we said earlier. The jury determined that the Rothelowman scheme was the winning scheme and counsel were advised and acknowledged the outcome of that competition. It's important to note that it's typical that the design excellence strategy embedded within it, the ongoing engagement of the design jury. Out with the new name it gets at Design Integrity Panel name a dip into the process, moving beyond the appointment of the winning architects. And so consistent with that strategy, prior to the lodgement of the SSD application, the Dip reviewed the proposal, it sought amendments of us. We undertook those amendments, and then we lodged the SSDA once those amendments were endorsed.

Subsequent to that, as part of the RTS process following lodgement of the SSDA, we've made further changes to address issues that have arisen during that, and they also needed to be presented to the dip and endorsed by the dip on more than one occasion, both June and October last year, that they endorsed those changes. So, during the assessment by the Department. The Government Architect's Office made a number of requests to for changes that were that are embedded in the proposal. So, in summary from beginning to end, the design excellence has been embedded in the proposal and has been subject to multiple reviews by both the jury and the Design Integrity Panel. Thank you.

MR BEN POMROY: Yes. Thank you. So, thank you. Commissioners. My name's Ben Pomroy. I'm the principal at Rothelowman Architects. What we're going to run you through briefly as I can. And lots of room for questions at the end is really, I guess, around Adam's commentary there around our initial design vision and the process we went through in the design Excellence competition. And then run through some more specifics. The first slide on the screen here is really around how we first landed and arrived at upon the site and the vision around the site. And that's really, was we're privileged enough to work with a local First Nations artist and also ecologist. And I guess those two parts are really critical to what we came up with in terms of our approach to the ground plane. Parramatta is in a flood prone area, this site in particular, and was there a way to work with the flood constraints of the site rather than throw up barriers to it? And I guess that foundational principle led us towards, I guess, the idea of the raft, which you see before you and the way that we've dealt with the edge and the way water moves into and around the building, rather than it being a defensive posture, it's more around allowing the natural climate and impacts to roll around the site and through it. And as the Molino Stewart team will talk about, is that idea of the vision of working with the place has then led to a better flood mitigation outcome. Next slide. The site itself is really in quite a unique position. It's part of the Parramatta CBD and the DCP controls that we work through with Council in the initial design process transitions then to parkland.

So we're in a high density urban area. The transition to parklands and that unique aspect of the site is something that we've thought to draw on, to carry through in our podium design. The second part is then the position on Clay Cliff Creek. That's, a man. It's been a heavily modified original creek. This is a creek that's been there since the first visitors to Parramatta, first western visitors to Parramatta, and has been and I guess as part of the Dharug, people have used that space in place for a long time. So in our conversations with Jeff and his team that has drawn through into our concept of the site, the nature of flood and drought and how we could draw that into our design. Next slide. And what that led us to is this concept of the raft. The idea of the ground plane being as permeable as possible below the flood planning level, really to allow landscape to push in and around the edge of the building to create that appropriate transition to the parklands to our east and then allow that to transform then into urban area to the west. And when you visit the site later on, you'll see a lot of the different outcomes that have been dealing with those flood solutions over time and really why we work so closely with our flood team here to develop a more bespoke, a more responsive, outcome to allow the activation to draw right to the edges of the site. Next slide. What that's meant. And this slide here is the full Harris Street elevation.

None of these buildings are completed as yet, but as you can see from Adams conversation earlier, we sought to illustrate the projects which have already gone through a design excellence process and those that are yet to come. And how they have all in very different ways, dealt with this edge condition of the parklands. There's a variety of built form heights, those racking height plans that are do with a solar, solar protected zone for farmland to our south, and how each of those

buildings, if you go to the next slide, has then managed the idea of what is a podium and what that street wall height would be. And so heavily diversity that's already been enshrined in approved schemes, in the area and continues as you roll up Hassall Street in particular. Next slide. So, the podium design and as it's as it's framed here, I'll probably just point to the items that have been developed during that back and forth process with the Dip and with the RTS. And one of those key aspects was obviously maintaining the motion of the heavily socialised internal and outdoor space to the right, to the east of the scheme, and then a more visually direct connection from our northern Hassall Street frontage through the south to Clay Cliff Creek, to maintain not only a physical but a visual link between those two. To the left of screen is then our servicing access way that also provides an overland flow path. So wherever possible, working with these engineering outcomes to create a design outcome. Next slide.

The transition, the edge to our neighbours. So, the building to our west was constructed and developed under previous planning controls in Parramatta. These had a much taller street wall, a 7 to 8 storey street wall with a recessed upper level. And so, our site has to provide that mediation between the parkland edge to a building which no longer forms where the built form controls are heading in Parramatta. So, it is a bespoke solution to create our platform and our podium. That's more of a public and externalised space to then transition into the high density urbanism of that 8 to 9 storey building to our west, and there's been a lot of back and forth of that process. Next slide. I'm just getting a bit more of a closer view. The whole of the building, its northern elevation on the left. And then as we draw through the detail, we've been obviously working with our, indigenous artists around working through services. The site's quite, constrained in terms of location of services. So how our substation and how the overland flow paths would all interact with the streetscape that's been developed as part of this design. Next slide.

Okay, just a couple of views. That's again, just the more northern view. One point I will draw you to is the break in our podium is something that was developed post competition. That also aligns with a subsequent DA application to the north of our site, whereby I believe Deicorp, have a 600-apartment development with a retail ground plane and a through site link that runs through to the right light rail stop. So, our scheme has been developed in concert with that project. Let's go to the next slide. So, street wall and setback height. You can see on the screen here the SSDA and the current scheme for the site. The DCP has a variety of podium height controls. And I guess we'll talk a little bit more about the definition of what that podium language means. The way we've tackled this is really about maximising the activation and people on the edge of the site and engagement with the street. And so the notion of the raft being the light blue zone there, having internal external spaces pushing out to the north to our street to maximise the activation of the hassle. And then for the full length of Harris Street, our external spaces for our communal and our retail areas, allowing people to be on that edge and visible from the street. The controls in the area talk to that outcome of bringing activation to the edge. However, once those spaces are enclosed, staircases go internally. I think the best example for that is right next to our site. So, we'll talk about that when we get to site later.

Again, our Harris Street frontage. We'll talk a bit more about some of the controls around the setbacks along here. But by virtue of this concept, here we have our raft activating that full edge along Harris Street, engaging with the beautiful fig trees that line that edge. And then the bottom of the page there. That's our flood free access pathway. So, one of the requirements of the site, given the local streets are below that flood free access plane. We developed the concept around this elevated walkway, which connects to the bridge over Clay Cliff Creek. So that provides not only a visual link across the landscape where you meander through it to get to the building, but also that flood free access. Next slide. And finally, as I've talked about previously, that north south link from Hassell Street that connects through to decor Turner scheme to our north and links back through to Clayton on the south next slide. And these are just some, imagery of the podium design as it stands before you. Sometimes I will point out during that RTS process with Council around how we could bring, people still to the edge, but slightly lower down the notion of these bleacher seats, which spill out from our internal social spaces out onto Harris Street, that's been something that we think has been a positive improvement to the scheme. So, we have a variety of heights now of how people engage with the streetscape, but still maintaining the key aspects of what the design jury saw were key parts of our design. Next slide.

This is a view then, from the bridge over Clay Creek, looking to the north. Harris Street at this point, then terminates the light rail, comes across the parklands and turns on the street to our north. So, this axis will be an important one for pedestrians connecting back up to the rail stop. And there's that flood free access bridge that kind of accesses the roof from the bridge way. And you can see our podium treatment there with the lower levels. And then our rain harvesting canopy that projects above on the upper level. That's our main rainwater retention element, landscaped and bio filtration systems. Next slide. An elevated view of that edge I was talking to you before with what we call the bleacher seating, the seating, pushing people out to the edge of the street. So, you still get that? I guess what the way we describe it is working on the intent that's enshrined within the DCP controls and Parramatta, but creating a more vibrant and more active edge scape than a glass facade would do. Next slide. And finally, our northern edge here. slide.

There's some more specifics here which we might just go through this, but we've got our demonstration of, controls within the podium, ground floor and first floor heights. You can see here all those three levels on the lower level of our building being built to rent. That's a much higher amount of non-residential spaces in the lower levels from our recreation space, commercial spaces and retail and communal spaces on the ground floor. So heavily activating that edge, not only overlooking the park through the tree canopy, but also to the north as we transition to the more higher density urbanism and the retail that's proposed to our north. Next slide. The tower design itself, this tower designs, the primary evolution through the process, with design access more being the incorporation of more detailed ESD analysis. But the concept of deep shade to our north, our east, and then shielding walls to our south and west, of as the character changes and optimises through the way residents will

live within those dwellings. But the lighter of the coloured petals, which is drawn through the colours of the clay, actually within the creek bed itself, it's a really deep oxide colours that are found in this part of Parramatta, being drawn through into part of our concept vision for the building itself. Next slide. This is the more high level. So maybe I might briefly talk to the high level elements around the set.

MR BYRNES: We're Mindful of the report. Before you. And I think it absolutely deals with the issues around what the housing set, sets out for the requirements for BPR. We're particularly mindful of that clause that sets out the must maintain a high level of amenity to residents, consistent with the ADG. Because of the asking, there's the opportunity to be, tested and otherwise comply with all components within the ADG. And so perhaps we could, return to some of these slides, this slide at a, at a later point in time if you wanted to drill down into that. But suffice to say, I'm comfortable that we've retained the intent of the ADG, design entity, requirements, notwithstanding some variations that we propose consistent with the legislation.

MR POMROY: Yeah. And I guess what we've got here is just a couple of examples of those areas where the flexibility under the ADG has been worked through between ourselves and the Government Architect. This was one of the first projects running through the build to rent, provisions. And so, one of the, one of the first aspects of that is around the provision of areas for private open space. The rather than being a reduction in open space, that open space is transferred to a communal area. So, the private balconies are reduced across each of the individual urban typologies, circa two square metres. However, that space is redeployed into the additional provision of communal areas through the three levels of the podium and then also on the rooftop itself. Next slide. So those are those are some of the current design imagery of our communal references. The second part is then about apartment mix size and layout. This has been heavily developed with our client the needs of the local community. So you've still got the heavy diversity across those houses and apartments. However, they deviate from the very prescriptive mix within the Parramatta. DCP and as you can see from the typical layout plan here, there's a lot of diversity then within the usability of those apartments. And the one, two and three bedrooms all still meet the internal areas under the ADG. You see the note there. The studio does fall under the minimum square metres nominated under the ADG. However, these are very bespoke to build to rent. They're provided fully furnished as part of that. And that's been worked through under the flexibility in the BTR provisions.

MR MICHAEL WRIGHT: What what's the range in those for the studio?

MR POMROY: 33 square metres in total space.

MR WRIGHT: 33, -

MR POMROY: 2.7 to 33.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: You'll see the technicality of the ADG. You know, effectively anything that kind of falls below 50m² is classified as a studio. But if on

here you can effectively see, you know, from, from our point of view. And it's been the operator of this building. This is classified as a studio under the ADG, but for all intents and purposes, it functions as a small one bedroom apartment. It's under 50m², so it has to be listed as a studio. So, you'll see in the actual planning report that it looks like there's actually a higher percentage of studios, but that's just a virtue of the technicality of the ADG.

MR POMROY: So -

MR GOLDSWORTHY: It makes sense.

MR POMROY: So, studios range 32 mid 40s and then high 40s. So, the studios themselves, some have those flexible rooms as you can see in the Typical plan.

MS LEWIN: How many do you have at 32?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I think it's about 15. Yeah 15.

MR POMROY: Next slide. Please. And then the final 4G storage, again, the storage areas here, given the rent, the overall rental management of the building, the storage areas are managed under the overall provisions for, the operator in Novus, and they manage that space. We have a vast majority of apartments achieve the required minimum internal storage within the apartment, and that's offset then with these, shared communal, and leasable storage areas within the development of the basement slide, common circulation spaces. The primary item here to flag is the quantum of lifts versus the dwellings in the building. There's 210 apartments. We have three lifts. Within our submission, we have a detailed lift, demand analysis, proofing up, the workability of that. Indeed. That's part of one of the key aspects of build to rent is the is the move in, move out time is very critical to the operation and operation of the building. So, there's usually a lot more invested in the speed and the serviceability of the lifts. Given you've got, transit, the faster we can get the renters in the better. And also, we're doing that move in, move out sequence more professionally. You also notice in the ground floor we have additional loading spaces to do with that as well. It's part of the overall operator experience. And so those three lifts were determined to be more than sufficient for the 210 dwellings within the building. Next slide.

MR BYRNES: So, the Parramatta LEP identifies all the eastern boundary of the site. The reservation for acquisition for future road widening. It's 3.5m were originally advised 3.0m. So, the architects and designers amongst us can imagine the flurry of, work that was taken when we realised that 3.5 and not 3, but that were taken. We do set back the entire building and all below ground structures, a full 3.5m, obviously, because it's the only provision, it stipulates that the City of Parramatta is responsible for its acquisition. Notwithstanding that, notice proposes the dedication of that land to the Council free of charge on the basis of, realising its full FSR over the parent parcel on the child parcel. That's the scheme that you have before you, there was the whole triggering of the Just Terms Compensation Act and all that sort of thing. So, there Novus is committed to that. That's, in writing before the Council, the APS itself

evident in that image there you can see that we've made provision setting back the building in the short term, landscaping it. As far as I'm aware, there's no program or funds available for Council to yet enact the widening of Harris Street, but we're certainly make provision will assist in that through the dedication of land and the short to medium turn landscaping of that area.

MR POMROY: The next slide is the landscaping, concept design that suits that. So, the proposal being in that, in that short term, the dense landscape treatment to Clay Cliff Creek carries around to our eastern edge, that when the road widening does happen, there is still landscaping against that edge. So, the design condition can be maintained. It's circa 50% of the space there on that plan.

MR STEVEN MOLINO: I'm Steven Molino from Water Technology. I've been working hand-in-hand with Scott Button from Harlan Associates. So, Scott Long and Associates has done the flood modelling. And then we've taken those model results. And how to manage risk of (indistinct) with the design and operation of the building. And so, in terms of the flood modelling, it was necessary to develop a site specific flood model for this site. Because the Flood Model Council had dated from 2005, used outdated techniques, etc. Didn't include the overland flows. And so Lyall and Associates undertook that modelling and that was independently reviewed by DRC and found to followed best practice methodology and that modelling shows that the 1% event, doesn't really affect the site. It's in larger floods at the site gets affected. And the construction of this building is going to increase flood levels or hazards on neighbouring properties. It will be some minor increases in more extreme events in Hassel Street and the Harris Street and the park across the road across Harris Street. But it doesn't, significantly change the flood hazard. So, there are some minor increases in flood levels, in the more extreme events. As was pointed out earlier. The development control plan, Parramatta LEP and DCP, make provision for sheltering in place in Parramatta CBD. And this development moves forward those requirements for sheltering in place. There is flood free pedestrian access to the building via the bridge from the outdoor platform to the bridge over Clay Cliff Creek. Which would allow emergency services to access the building in events up to the 1% flood event without having to pass through flood waters.

MR RICHARD PEARSON: Ask a question about that bridge. Is it the case that a pedestrian could traverse a bridge in a 1% or is this. -

MR MOLINO: Yes. -

MR PEARSON: It's actually not inundated at 1%.

MR MOLINO: It shouldn't be inundated in the 1%. And Scott can speak to this better than I can, but the flood models, assume perfectly smooth, surface. Flood surface. That's not the case in reality. And so, if there is any, I guess, disturbance of the surface as it's going around the bend there or any minor blockage of that bridge, there could be some surging, but you're only looking at, 100mm or so. That might be across that bridge and no handrail. So, it's not like someone's going to be swept off

the bridge. But the, the idea of having that and this is a provision in the DCP is that if for some reason you happen to have a building fire at the same time that you had a flood, that people can evacuate from the building, without being trapped in the building, in events up to the 1% event, or if someone has a medical emergency and, emergency services need to access the building, then they're able to do so without passing through flood waters, up to the 1% event. In rare events, the combined probability of getting a very rare flood, and one of those other secondary emergencies occurring simultaneously. Bearing in mind that we're talking about the peak of the 1% flood, which is only going to last for a few minutes there. Even the probable maximum flood, and there's three ways in which this site can be affected by flooding. We've got the local flooding, overland flooding, running down Hassell Street and into the creek. You've got Clay Cliff Creek running and overtopping, and then you have the Parramatta River overtopping and backing up. Now, the worst flooding that could possibly affect the site is a probable maximum flood in the Parramatta River backing up. And even in that event, the site is only going to be isolated by flood waters for about six hours or so, according to our modelling and estimates. The provision for sheltering in place, the provisions there for people to shelter in place with backup power and water, etc. For 24 hours. And so any. Let's.

Sorry if there are any more frequent flooding event. That's somewhere between the 1% and the probable maximum flood. That isolation is going to be for a shorter duration. And so, all the ground floor level, is above the flood planning level. In fact, it's more than one planning level. And the first floor and above are above the probable maximum flood level. So, all the apartments are well above any reach of any flood waters. It's only those that foyer area and the tea room downstairs. It could possibly be flooded in a more extreme event, and there's plenty of space for people to retreat upstairs, and enough time for people to retreat to the next level up. If the if those areas are occupied at the time at which it floods, the basement itself, is passively protected, as was pointed out earlier, by a driveway crest that is at the planning level. And then there's automated gates at the elsewhere.

In the basement (indistinct). And again, that (indistinct). DCP requirements. And the other thing that, stood here too, is that this is a managed building. This is not, sprouted apartments where people can do their own thing. It's a managed building. There will be a flood emergency response plan. There's a building manager. There's an app that, the residents can be signed up to, and so communication around flooding and, emergency response during floods.

MR PEARSON: A quick one on fighting the. I mean, the Council seem to have a diametrically different view about flooding on this site. And the peer review was undertaken by the Department. There seems to be this fundamental, disconnect, I guess, between modelling undertaken by the Applicant and reviewed by the Department's. Who you are and what the Council's for. I mean, do you have any comment on that -

MR MOLINO: Scott Button is probably the best person to ask in my mind, because Scott is the flood expert -

MR WRIGHT: Sure, he's there? Yeah.

MR MOLINO: In the absence of Scott, what I can say is, and I've been working for Parramatta Council and for developers in Parramatta CBD on flood issues for the last 20 years and the old modelling that the Council has. Was always a bit suspect. And in fact, Lyall and Associates were engaged through us to do work for counsel to independently review another development further upstream on Clay Creek, where there were questions about the fundamentals. And it was the model that Lyall and Associates developed for counsel for that review that has been expanded, further downstream for this modelling. Now, counsel has over the last several years been developing a flood model for the whole of the Parramatta LGA, but that's still in a draft form and we've not been able to get access to that. So -.

MR WRIGHT: They said it was available on their website. Isn't that the thing that.

MR MOLINO: There's a difference between saying, low resolution maps, with contours that are a meter interval, and actually having the information about what the assumptions are, the inputs and being able to use that model in the two-flow flood modelling software to assess the impacts of this development. Counsel is not willing to provide any of that detail at this point in time, until that has been (indistinct) announced. So, at the moment we have access to a very old model, which is giving us sensible results. We and we have access, which is Council's whole old model, and we have access to a site specific model, which is, the further, development of a model that we, that Lyall and Associates developed for Council, a few years ago to assess a neighbouring development.

MR WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

MR MOLINO: That's about all I have to say about,

MR PEARSON: Can I just ask a question about, some information we receive from Council suggests that under their modelling, the structure could be subject to a six level flood velocity waters in a (indistinct) any commentary around engineering design to ensure the building could stand the.

MR MOLINO: The A building of this type is basically a solid concrete block. And it's unlikely to be affected by erosion because you've got a concrete lined channel next to it, etc. So, the requirement within the Council's BCP is that it has to be certified by structural engineer, that it can withstand the velocities, the debris forces of the hydrostatic and the hydrodynamic and the debris forces of a probable maximum flood. And so, this building will be, designed and certified in that way. And. The winds throughout Parramatta CBD (indistinct) Including ones that are right next to the Parramatta River, where the velocities are going to be much more significant than they are here (indistinct). The powerhouse, for example, is under construction at the moment, right on the banks of the Parramatta River. There's a

number of other high rise buildings right on the banks of Parramatta. It's been possible to achieve those design objectives.

MR POMROY: And just to expand on that, that design criteria for our landscape architect and for ourselves, because with the setback to the south and to the east, these form part of the flood pathways. So while the heavy movements are through Clay Creek, there is the ability for the water to move laterally along Harris Street. So, while we have our setback zone, the way the nature of the raft itself with the additional under croft created additional volume, it's hard to see on this screen, but on the prints you can see the shaded under cross that provided for additional volume, and then the friction coefficients for our landscape architects designed for that ground plane and the suspended walkways was part of that analysis process.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And then just, just finally on the traffic, transport and accessibility. You know, the proposal has no unacceptable traffic implications. Features a car parking ratio of 0.3:1. And we'll encourage our residents to utilise, you know, the world class transportation options on the doorstep. And as part of everything that we do, we're very future focused in terms of green travel plans and very much adopting, you know, live tracking information as part of the building app, that we have for all of our residents.

MR WRIGHT: Sort of gets to the question of I'm fine with I've heard on traffic, but just the maybe I don't know if it's the right time to raise it, but the whole idea of the thing is here is build to rent, and then you can figure. Subdivision of the (indistinct). What? -

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I mean, we are 100% dedicated to the build to rent sector. We have no intention of subdividing. The building, for us, all of our buildings sit within, you know, dedicated investment vehicles. Very much the same as how a, you know, a large scale office building, you know, is owned by institutional owners. So, at a point in time, you know, that may trade from one institutional owner to the next. And very much sort of stay in that single ownership with that management overlay. So that's why it's really important for us from the outset to make sure that we're designing and delivering these buildings so that they're suitable for the long term. Because, you know, the development period is a very finite period in what we do as a business. You know, it's all about the Long Terme operational side of things for us. Because if we're making decisions now that affect that ongoing operation. You know, we're going to have an issue in terms of customer retention, you know, over the top capital expenditure. And it's stuff that, you know, quite frankly, will hurt the bottom line in terms of the value of the asset.

MR ADAM HIRST: Yeah, I might just add. So, Adam Hirst. Co-founder and CEO of Novus. It kind of talks back to even the Sep 65 stuff when we're designing these buildings. There's two things that we're looking at customer satisfaction and then operational efficiency. Long term customer satisfaction. Return your mind to. This is not a build to sell project where we're selling off the plan, and then people are turning up and going, oh, this is what I bought. We're building this building and we

lease it when it's complete. So, we are so aligned in creating product that people want that's attractive and that has demand. Otherwise, we haven't been building. It's obviously not a great outcome. And then the operational efficiency piece is kind of through the whole building and talks to the longevity and mindset of us when we're designing this. If we were planning on flipping this in 15 years, there's a lot of things that you wouldn't do that we're doing around services, MEC, ground floor, you know, basement strategy, the whole thing. It's long term in the way that we approach it, the whole across our entire (indistinct).

MR POMROY: Yeah-

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I think like just to paint a little bit of colour on that, like the substation resistance, like we've designed that to be 100% capable of doing charging throughout. So, it's stuff like that that we're factoring in from the very outset so that you do have that flexibility in the long term.

MR PEARSON: Are you providing any affordable rentals or (indistinct). And that there's no requirement. I'm just wondering what you thought about that.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Some of the projects we are.

MR WRIGHT: Yeah.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And that's becoming increasingly more common. Yeah, particularly some of our Melbourne projects and in Sydney as well.

MR WRIGHT: Why not this one?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: There was no requirement to it. So, wherever we're doing it, it's it needs to be factored in. Right. There's a there's a cost to doing it. So, if we're buying land that already requires it, then we factor it into the purchase price and we can afford to do it. But here there was. It's not (indistinct).

MS LEWIN: Basement parking. Electric vehicles. Ventilation fire. How does that figure in the way that you've developed the. Systems to support. Electric vehicles and batteries.

MR POMROY: In terms of the details on the basis. The design basis, but I think so where we've developed design since and during this DA process, I guess the current position around the quantum. So, the engineering analysis is based on, I think the position from the brigades and fire engineers is, is being developed, I think is probably the honest truth around electric vehicles in basement car parks. So, I guess what we've done at the moment is, is kind of factor in as much as we can. The buildings are fully electric building, the quantity and the, the scale.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And the space provision. Right.

MR POMROY: Well, exactly. It's the spatial provisions. It's the fire suppression systems in the basement. So, there's a slight additional factor in the tank storage facilities because the they will operate for longer because the cars I guess the current feedback on electric vehicles is they the batteries burn for longer. My understanding there's going to be a lot more development on this in next 18 to 24 months as more and more buildings go electric. But I think the I guess really all we've been able to do at the moment is kind of amplify the things that we know, which is probably fire suppression, a little bit more additional capacity within the mechanical ventilation systems. And I think one of the things that helps us the most here is the quantity of cars. It's Parramatta, it's a maximum rather than minimum. So, with the lower provisions of typically required from a build to rent tenant that's being, that's being targeted and given where 300m from the, the light rail stop, which I think in a couple of weeks starts. That's assisted with the quantity of cars. The basement footprint is quite compact as well. So, I guess we're testing some other on other schemes. The bigger footprint car parks are struggling, to deal with EV because of the smoke spread through a really large basement is really hard to manage. When it's a compact footprint, it's a little bit easier. But, yes, I think it's going to be an ongoing challenge, as people develop these. So, we're kind of building it the best we can, the additional provider, just making extra provisions, so that, as again, our client in 15 years' time doesn't have a problem with upgrading the whole thing to comply with the control that might be developed then.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And it's the same thing down in Victoria, dealing with the authorities down there, the fire brigade, you know, there's no sort of consistent approach to it just yet. So, it's very much something that we're following and continuing to maintain that sort of engagement to make sure there is no risk to life. And we do have the appropriate provisions in place to be able to have that future flexibility. So, it's further work to go on it. There's no question about that. But yeah, it's important that the design factors in that future provision.

MS LEWIN: And can you talk us through this, shared foyer, entrance address, design position?

MR POMROY: Yes, So, I guess in a planning sense, we have that north south axis. So, we have our central for the golden space. You can see in the middle. We then have two airlock provisions. So, the site really I guess the strategy around the raft was this site has no real back door other than its western hard edge against the existing building. And so, what we were trying to do there was we essentially have a hassle street address, and we have a Harris Street slash Clay Cliff Creek address with those two airlocks. So those spaces are both secure access for residents and for the commercial space above. To the right of that is then our food, food and amenity spaces. It's a build to rent building. So, the retail tenancy is another space managed by the building owner. So essentially the curation of the tenant that goes into there, while it's not calculated within our communal spaces, all of it, it's part of the communal offering. And so that will be heavily managed. So, the South is more food and beverage, the tea house which is the north-eastern corner is more designed around social spaces. Because that space, it's hard to point without standing up.

We've got our mailroom, we've got our main parcel storage, and then we've got our again, it's a managed building, our staff asset management. So actually, I'll go stand I can't do it.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And the. Future.

MR POMROY: Yeah. So primary. So residential address for the purpose of fire Brigades on the north, our tea house does form part of our communal space as it's got our building management mailroom parcel store. And so really what we're trying to do with residents there is the more social interaction we can create within the building, the better. That's about long time tenure for our client, other than just the things that we should be doing as architects in any case. So, this provides that social aspect. Our retail tenancy then is designed to stitch in with that. So, the more blurred lines we can create while there's a physical sliding barrier, the more blurred we get. The nature of the management of this food and beverage tenant with its spaces, the better. And then really, the raft provides that link around the edge. So, you have outdoor communal space on the corner, the bleacher seating, which spills out from both the tea house and the retail and then running around to the south, where we then have our additional walkway that's really we imagined to be the primary walkway to for residents to get to the park. You come out this side, you walk across, and you cross the street into the kids playgrounds that are just directly adjacent the sign.

And the other thing we do from the tea house is obviously run our leasing operation. So, the idea is, that there's foot traffic and people actually are looking up and seeing and want to come in and then tour apartments, and you're driving rental demand through that as well as we run that through that area as well.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: And to be clear, the non-residential spaces. So, the retail and the commercial that retain that is retained in ownership by Novus. And we proactively manage and operate that. With strategic partners.

MR PEARSON: Can I just ask a question again about. The floodway along the creek and that raft structure. In the under croft. So, what sort of what sort of resistance does that structure put in place for that floodway? Is it the intention that the waters flow under and over it as well?

MR MOLINO: Well. In larger events. But you'd have to have something like seven foot (indistinct).

MR POMROY: Yeah. I think it's. Under I think the only space that maybe is where the very strategically placed. But there is a connection point here to the walkway where it contacts the ground. That's probably the only place where it will spill under all the rest it's under, because by this point, for about a metre above the landscape space here. So that landscape treatment washes in underneath and then we step back down to operate. So, this is all part of the lower level. This is an additional overland flow path that comes through the site. So, Hassall Street has a bit of a dip that provides (indistinct)

MR PEARSON: this way.

MR POMROY: They're moving up and down the page through here and obviously. To run.

MR LIONEL PUANG: So, as I said, there's three ways in which this can be affected by (indistinct). Principle wise, over running down Hassall Street, which then to ensure that this development doesn't make flooding worse on neighbouring properties. That driveway has been designed so that the run down the pipeline and (indistinct). But if.

MR PEARSON: There's number one.

MR PUANG: So, water running down Hassel Street will run. Continue to run down Hassel Street but will also run through here because currently it runs through the site. So, this is, a controlled, flow path for overland flows coming down here. So that ensures that the flooding isn't, worse in on these properties due to this development and then flooding that comes along Clay Cliff Creek, it currently flows out that way. And so, it can also flow in that direction. But there are, flood barriers here that control the rate at which it can flow in that direction, so that not too much of it goes that way. And then the rest of it goes into this landscaped area and under the floating raft and through here and as was mentioned, the only point where that sort of comes down to the underside of the bridge will be below the 1% flow level. It's just in that corner there where it has to marry in with the footpath. But. all of the resistance of that, landscaping and the supports for this, have all been taken into account in the roughness factors in the modelling. So that's all been accounted for in the model?

MR POMROY: Just to interrupt. Sorry, Lionel. From Nova speaking. Scott Button is on his way.

MR WRIGHT: So, I think.

MR POMROY: Okay.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I mean, we didn't have any other material to formally present. Unless there was other questions.

MS LEWIN: We might be able to. Put your questions forward when we're outside.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Sure. That's good.

MR PEARSON: One last question about deep soil zone and that actually for creek frontage. Does the does the carpark basement protrude into that space or. -

MR POMROY: It does. But it's at the second at that next level down. So, there's a crate. So, it's not a heaven to hell deep soil. It's a structural deep soil zone. So, it's a story. Which I think is in the architectural park.

MS LEWIN: Any questions for me?

MR POMROY: No.

MS LEWIN: So, any questions on that?

MR POMROY: Thank you for that. So, if there's any. I know there was a time limit.

MS LEWIN: And.

MR WRIGHT: We're meeting with on site.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: One, two, three four.

MR POMROY: Yeah. Okay.

MR WRIGHT: I'll see you there.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: See you out there.

MR WRIGHT: Thank you.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Awesome. Thanks a lot. Thanks, guys.

MR POMROY: Thank you.

MR WRIGHT: Your way out. Just hang a left and keep going.

MR POMROY: Thanks a lot, guys. Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Thanks very much.

<THE MEETING HAS CONCLUDED