



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: NOVUS ON ALBERT – 763-769 PACIFIC HIGHWAY, CHATSWOOD –
BUILD-TO-RENT (SSD-59805958)**

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	BRONWYN EVANS (CHAIR) MICHAEL WRIGHT
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	KENDALL CLYDSDALE TAHLIA HUTCHINSON
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	JASON GOLDSWORTHY (Novus) CHARLES MAXWELL (Novus) SCHANDEL FORTU (Ethos Urban) MATTHEW DI MAGGIO (Ethos Urban) FRANCES HALL (Rothelowman) JONOTHAN COWLE (Rothelowman) MONICA DIRADJI (Rothelowman) ANITA YOUSIF (Artefact Heritage)
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	10:45AM – 11:30AM THURSDAY, 12 JUNE 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **DR BRONWYN EVANS:** Good morning and welcome. I can see we have a couple of meeting rooms and as well as individuals. So, thank you very much for joining us. We're expecting seven people on the call, and I can see six, and maybe there's one ... We might get started because we have 45 minutes for the call this morning.

10 I will be reading a short statement to begin, and also to let you know that for transparency reasons, our meeting today is being recorded.

15 I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from the land of the Gadigal people, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all of the lands on which we virtually meet today, and pay my respects to Elders present and past.

20 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Novus on Albert – 763-769 Pacific Highway, Chatswood – Build-to-Rent Project (SSD-69805958) currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, the Trustee for Albert Avenue Sub Trust, proposes the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a shop-top housing development comprising 198 build-to-rent units, retail premises, car parking across three basement levels, residential amenities, and communal spaces.

25 My name is Dr Bronwyn Evans. I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel. I am joined today by my fellow commissioner, Michael Wright. We are also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Tahlia Hutchinson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.

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

35 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 issues whenever it is 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.

40 I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure the accuracy of the transcript.

45 We'll now begin our meeting. So, thank you very much and welcome. We do have an agenda for today and thank you for sending through your presentation ahead of the meeting. I propose that as the Commission we ask questions as we go through, noting that I think you have around 49 slides in the slide pack. We want to make

sure we certainly get through the main part of the meeting with about 10 minutes to spare so we have time to go over any specific items.

5 So, with that, I'll ask for whoever is leading on the Applicant's side to give a brief overview and also introduce your colleagues on the call this morning. Thank you.

10 **MR CHARLES MAXWELL:** Thank you. My name is Charles Maxwell. I'm a Development Manager here at Novus, responsible for the Novus on Albert Project. With us in the room we have Jason Goldsworthy also from Novus, who is one of our co-founders and Chief Development Officer.

15 We have Anita Yousif from Artefact Heritage who will be available to provide any commentary on the heritage response. We have our town planners from Ethos Urban, Schandel Fortu and Matt Di Maggio. And then we have the Rothelowman team, Jonothan, Frances and Monica, who have led the design for the project.

I'll start with a bit of an introduction. Is it easiest if I share my screen to go through the presentation?

20 **DR EVANS:** Yes.

MR MAXWELL: Sure.

25 **DR EVANS:** And given that we are limited in time, maybe you could make sure you really get the key points about this project discussed.

30 **MR MAXWELL:** I think we can do that. And as you mentioned, please feel free to jump in with any questions or if there's any other items that we need to talk about along the way. That would be the best way to approach it. Okay. Can everybody see the presentation?

DR EVANS: Yes, thank you.

35 **MR MAXWELL:** Okay, great. So, we'll start with a quick background, Novus, the Proponent, and who we are. Novus is a dedicated developer, owner and operator of built-to-rent housing in Australia. We have as strong focus on providing high-quality, well-designed housing options which offer security of lease term and bridge the gap between owning and renting.

40 We have a demonstrated track record of progressing projects through to delivery and completion, with multiple projects representing just under 2,000 apartments in total across Sydney and Melbourne in the planning delivery phases. This particular project, Novus on Albert, does have funding in place and is ready to move into the delivery phase once the development consent is granted.

45 In terms of context, Novus on Albert is located on the corner of Pacific Highway and Albert Avenue towards the southern end of the Chatswood CBD. The proposal has been specifically designed to respond to the Build-to-Rent Housing

SEPP which was first gazetted in February 2021 and permits residential build-to-rent uses on E2 zoned land, as well as the Willoughby LEP Amendment 34 which was gazetted around two-and-a-half years later in June 2023, to enable greater height and density on land throughout the Chatswood CBD.

As part of these updates, the planning controls on our subject site were amended to permit a building height of 90 metres with no maximum FSR control. And our proposal is consistent with the planning controls under the Housing SEPP and the LEP and is located less than 200 metres walking distance from the Chatswood Transport Interchange which provides direct access to metro train and bus services throughout Sydney.

I'll pass on now to our town planners from Ethos Urban, who will talk through some of the key aspects of the proposal and the process that we have gone through to date.

MS SCHANDEL FORTU: Thanks, Charlie. That's really just a good segway into the strategic context for the site, and there's just a couple of points I'd like to make about this. We're obviously aware that the National Housing Accord has objectives to deliver the 377,000 homes within the coming five years. We also undertook some analysis of the rental vacancies in Chatswood and there's an exceptionally low rental vacancy at 1.3%.

So, those two key drivers in the need to deliver well-located homes as well as the extremely low rental vacancy rates, mean that the delivery of 198 well-located homes is very much aligned with government policy. And as discussed, Novus really have the resources and ability to get this project up and running and the homes delivered.

I'll just jump onto the next slide. This slide's really just talking to – I won't go through it in detail because we don't have enough time today. But just the detailed level of engagement that we've had throughout this project has been very important from a Novus perspective. But also working with the Department of Planning and key stakeholders within Willoughby Council, and that commenced in July 2023. Also resulted in at least five key touch points with the Government Architect's Office and the Design Integrity Panel.

At least five key touch points with the Department of Planning as well as countless meetings and interactions with Willoughby Council in working through some of the key issues. All the way from heritage down to stormwater management. But also ensuring that we were able to take the comments that had been raised and ensure that those comments and any changes to the design resulted in the scheme that's before the Commission today.

Next slide, thanks.

MR MATTHEW DI MAGGIO: So, just briefly, we just want to touch on, we support the Department's findings and recommendations for all the key issues just

on the screen there. Now, we'll just run through some of the key issues as flagged in the agenda items briefly.

5 Next slide, Charlie. Next slide. In terms of the building height, as Charlie touched on before, the maximum height limit of 90 metres under the LEP, which we comply with. Also, there's additional overshadowing protection controls for public open spaces at mid-winter between 12 and 2, and we meet those requirements.

10 Next slide, Charlie. Just in terms of density, as Charlie touched on, there's no maximum FSR, notwithstanding all the way back from design comp phase, the scheme has been deliberately designed to respond to the surrounding and evolving character of the CBD, including podium height, setbacks, tower setbacks, articulation, modulation etc., to come up with a form and massing that's acceptable. And this slide here kind of reiterates some of those points I just
15 mentioned. And as well, the scheme has had regard to the planning framework and the vision for Council, particularly at that public domain level.

Next slide, Charlie.

20 **DR EVANS:** Actually, I think it's Matthew who's speaking, isn't it?

MR DI MAGGIO: That's correct.

25 **MS FORTU:** It is.

DR EVANS: One of the things, and I think Michael wanted to discuss this, was around the zero-setback proposal. Michael, was that something you wanted to take up here or ...

30 **MR MICHAEL WRIGHT:** Yes, I know that there's some slides in this pack towards the end which go into some detail around Willoughby City Council's view that there should be, I think, a 4.5-metre setback to the north.

35 **MR DI MAGGIO:** Yes. Yes, there is.

MR WRIGHT: Could we talk about that briefly now, actually, because ...

40 **MR DI MAGGIO:** Yes, that's fine. If we can jump to the slides at the back, Charlie. So, just for context, the project team provided a pretty in-depth response back to the Department in January on the issue, obviously responding to Council's sort of request for a 4.5-metre setback. I think it's towards the end, Charlie, but this slide should be fine.

45 But basically, yes, that's right, in terms of that detailed response, if you want to have a look. But in summary, basically Council were after 4.5-metre setback to the north for our proposal, and then presumably a 4.5-metre setback for the adjoining office strata title building when it was redeveloped.

From our perspective, firstly, we'd feel like that approach would be borrowing amenity from that northern neighbour. Even with that 4.5-metre setback up the tower, you still wouldn't achieve alignment with the ADG as the building rose higher, as well as preserving the potential.

5

So, Novus had a look at the redevelopment potential of the adjoining site. Firstly, from permissible uses in the LEP, and also the Housing SEPP in terms of BTR, from a commercial floorplate for an office, for example, it wouldn't be achieved on that site. And also noting the low demand for commercial office development within Chatswood, which is – Charlie can correct me here in terms of the rate, it's quite high in terms of vacancy rate for office at the moment, it's like in the 30's, 30%, I think, roughly.

10

MR MAXWELL: That's right. Vacancy is very high and there's very little pipeline for new commercial office delivery because there's a significant lack of demand from office tenants in the Chatswood CBD.

15

MR DI MAGGIO: So, to preserve their potential as well with the nil setback, with a highly articulated façade which we worked with the design jury and Department to realise, enables that potential for that adjoining site to be redeveloped. Whether that's a hotel or BTR tower as well.

20

As well, the Chatswood LEP has a 35-metre trigger for a design competition as we went through. So, on that site, if it went above 35 metres, it would have to go through its own comp process and you would get an outcome similar to ours where you have a highly resolved and articulated façade as well as a contextual response.

25

So, we feel on balance, and the Department supported our position that a nil setback was appropriate. And also, for the adjoining property owner's potential in the future. So, it's sort of a summary of that response ... [cross-talk 00:14:12]

30

MR WRIGHT: I think it's fair to say that I think Council had aspiration that those two, this lot and the one next, would be consolidated potentially for a future single office block which would be a contiguous wall in any event.

35

MR DI MAGGIO: That's right, that's right. And in that outcome, Michael, you probably wouldn't get the level of articulation that you're getting now. Because typically office buildings, glass facades generally are much more flat designs. Whereas this is a really highly resolved and modulated and broken down through the balconies and elements. So yes, we feel you're still going to get a better outcome and a contiguous outcome which Council sought anyway, but with a commercial outcome.

40

MR WRIGHT: Yes, and just while you've got this slide up, I can see that minor encroachment as described there on the western façade.

45

MR DI MAGGIO: Yes.

MR WRIGHT: Is that for balconies?

5 **MR DI MAGGIO:** Yes, solar access. Rothelowman might be better placed, but it's just to maximise solar access to those middle units there in the core. I don't know, Jonathon, if you wanted to jump in and just touch on that point?

MR JONOTHAN COWLE: Sure. Maybe – do you want to jump in?

10 **MS FRANCES HALL:** Yes. I suppose, the western façade in that central portion has been pushed further west purposefully to capture the northern sun, where you can see with the little number 1 on the plan. So, that stack of apartments then is able to achieve the 2-hour compliant solar access. So, that's a strategic move to step and push the building to capture that solar.

15 **MR COWLE:** And I guess on mass ...

DR EVANS: Could you please identify who's speaking. I think that was Frances ...?

20 **MS HALL:** I'm Frances from Rothelowman. Thank you.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

25 **MR COWLE:** I'm sorry, and Jonothan Cowle. We also saw that as an on-balance, I guess, articulation around the tower on all sides, to try and, yes, optimise solar but also ...

MS HALL: Maintaining a generous setback.

30 **MR COWLE:** That's right, maintaining setbacks and so on as well. We thought it was –

35 **MR WRIGHT:** Bronwyn, if I can, just one other question there with the balconies facing Pacific Highway. Noise attenuation from – traffic noise from Pacific Highway, and I'm not sure how busy Albert Avenue is, but certainly I'm interested in whether there's any proposed treatments to mitigate traffic noise.

40 **MS HALL:** Oh, I think Charlie's talking.

45 **MR MAXWELL:** I'm happy to talk to that. From an acoustic perspective, I suppose that the noise and vibration impact assessment that we lodged alongside the EIS assessed those Pacific Highway fronting apartments and made a couple of recommendations to ensure that the acoustic levels that we need to achieve are being achieved.

So, there's a couple of recommendations in there, particularly around glazing thickness to ensure acoustic levels are appropriate. The other thing to note there is

that darker sort of maroon colour that you can see on that plan view, that outer dashed line is the existing site boundary, and the Pacific Highway sits beyond that. So, in addition to the acoustic treatments that are recommended by our acoustic engineer, there's also a setback from the existing site boundary of between sort of 11 to 13 metres, depending on the location of the building, which further assists with that acoustic consideration.

MR WRIGHT: Thank you.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR DI MAGGIO: I guess we'll just continue on, Charlie, maybe next slide, we touched on the setbacks there. And I'll pass over to Anita from Artefact to talk about the heritage response.

MS ANITA YOUSIF: So, the project area includes a heritage item, the Old Fire Station that was constructed in 1899 and is listed in the Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012 as an item of local significance.

This heritage aspect has been addressed from the very beginning of the project. It provided advice and recommendations during the design excellence competition. And also provided statement of heritage impact and mitigation measures as part of the SSDA lodgement with DPHI.

The main significance of this item actually is in the building's façade. Unfortunately, the building's façade falls within the road reserve that is designated for road widening to the Pacific Highway, and in the future. So, for that reason, this is the main constraint, and for that reason, the building or the actual façade cannot be retained in situ.

In addition to this major constraint, there are other constraints that would be significant and would basically require some higher level of management that in its entirety is not feasible. And this is the current building, and the fabric has already been compromised by intrusive elements over the years, particularly the 1970s tiling and support that the removal of which would cause even further damage to the existing fabric.

In that respect, dismantle and reconstruction is not possible because the fabric would be further damaged and compromised. So, the solution for mitigation or the most desirable mitigation measure would be interpretation, heritage interpretation of the item to be incorporated into the new development. And that has been regarded as the most desirable heritage outcome that's been supported by the Fire and Heritage New South Wales.

The interpretative element would consider elements of the original fabric. It is proposed that some material could be incorporated into the new design. And I believe that Rothelowman can provide information on the interpretation strategy and interpretation plan.

MS HALL: Thanks, Anita. Yes, so with all that in mind, our design response with that re-interpretation is basically a reconstruction with a new material being like a stainless-steel mesh or something similar, where we can reference the building that was there. The scale is not one-to-one – you can see the dashed line, that would be the actual scale. We’ve scaled it down to suit the scale of our podium and to work within that context in that landscape and the built form that we have.

As Anita mentioned, there will be reuse of salvaged materials that we can – such as the brickwork, where we can rebuild piers, rebuild the capitals, and make use of the elements that we can, such as the plaque that’s on the existing façade, and the signage can be re-made. So, we’re really referencing that element.

If we go to the next slide, Charles, and keep moving through. There’s an opportunity here to really amplify the response with the – for pedestrians and for passersby to go into a little outdoor room. There’s plaques which talk about the history of the site, there might be elements of the building that we can place there as sort of like a mini-museum, if you like, and reference that.

We’ve also looked to bring back the clock tower which was demolished some time ago in the 19th century, and re-interpret that as on the side of this element to make it more 3D. and as you’re driving down Pacific Highway, you would see the reference to the clock tower on the side there.

Moving through the slides. You can see here, this is the placement of the object in plan. It’s really the red hatched area shows where the building is now, where the façade is now, and we’d be keeping the new element as close as possible, but obviously moving back to suit the future road widening, and scaling down. And it’s really been considered with the landscape design as to how that space would work.

And if we move onto the next one. There’s opportunity obviously in the detail, when the time comes, we’ll work with a local artist to refine and work out how all these elements are going to come together. Obviously, with the heritage constraints in mind.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MS HALL: Charlie, did you want to talk about this one, or did you want me to ... Effectively, in a ...

MR MAXWELL: You go, Frances.

MS HALL: So, I suppose in a nutshell, with looking at the solar access to the apartments, we’re obviously in a dense CBD context. Looking at 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., we would get 48% of the apartments would achieve the 2-hour solar access.

What we've done is extended that an hour to 4 p.m., which means we get 71% of the apartments achieving compliance. And obviously, with a heavy western frontage, we believe that's a valid strategy. And obviously, with the push-and-pull of the building that we talked about before where we've slightly pushed things out a metre here or there, we'd get those northern windows, you can get the maximised aspect to as many apartments as possible. There's no single aspect south-facing apartment, so apartments that are on the south still have west or east aspect. So, we believe that's a positive response, given the constraints of the site.

And we've also obviously done a lot of study and additional work on the additional overshadowing impacts to the adjoining surrounding buildings, and that's all informed part of the submission. So, it was found that there was minimal impact to those apartments, still maintaining an hour to 1.7 hours a day at that worst-case scenario in mid-winter, which we believe is appropriate for the context.

Looking at the, I suppose the visual privacy being the interface to the serviced apartments to the east. We've obviously, as part of the submission, set out all the dimensions. I believe that 3-metre setback being the worst-case scenario, is supported by the Council at the time.

If we zoom in on –

MR WRIGHT: Can I just ask, with that privacy issue, is that the primary reason why the studios to the east haven't got balconies, because it would push the building out further or ... Can you just explain that for me?

MS HALL: The reason that, well, if they did have balconies, which maybe during the competition they might have had in the original scheme, it probably wouldn't have been east, it might have been north and south. But what we've found is you actually get much better layout and use of amenity and space with providing a 500-mil wide, say, duet balcony, is actually compromising on the layout and experience within the living room and the bedroom.

So, what we've done is tried to maximise that internal space by providing additional cross-ventilation with the use of casement windows and carefully placing the windows and carefully laying out the space to, I suppose, optimise the amenity within that footprint,

MR DI MAGGIO: I just want to touch on, Michael, in terms of BTR and the type of housing it is, and the Department's guide on apartment design in terms of balconies. There is sort of an understanding that BTR developments are quite communal in their offering. So, on this scheme in particular, probably seen on the plans in terms of rooftop areas for communal interaction as well in the podium as well.

So, there is a real strong encouragement of community, and we assume most residents will take advantage of that. And that's sort of another supporting reason

the Department's guidelines as well as the fact that BTR is quite a communal offering in terms of its interactions. So, that's just sort of another point as well.

MR WRIGHT: Good. Thank you.

MS HALL: So, if we go to the next slide. The diagram in the middle shows that in terms of the privacy, the only area that I suppose is fronting onto that window would be the living area. Obviously, the bedroom and all the other areas are behind the solid portions of the wall.

So, it's really about how we treat that window, and we've obviously proposed the use of internal blinds, and happy to look at other measures that maybe are required to further improve that privacy. But the layout's been carefully designed to, I suppose, maximise the amenity for the occupant whilst having that in mind.

MR MAXWELL: I might just add to that. The Department has proposed a condition of consent in the draft conditions uploaded on the IPC's website. I think it's C4, from memory, which proposes the implementation of appropriate screening measures up to a height of 1.4 metres from finished floor level. Particularly for those living rooms in those studios.

We're happy to accept that condition. We think there's a good architectural outcome that we can develop there which will further improve the privacy for these units while still maintaining the solar access and the cross-ventilation.

MR WRIGHT: Should there be something other than blinds – would that be like opaque glass, treated glass – is that what the Department's looking for?

MR MAXWELL: It could be a number of things. One option could be some sort of applied finish to a portion of that glazing, to obscure views up to the 1.4-metre height, so that when you are using the living room, for example, sitting on the couch, there's no direct cross-viewing into that room.

MR WRIGHT: Yes.

MR MAXWELL: Yes, something like that.

MS FORTU: I think the condition doesn't specify but it allows us the opportunity to work to find an acceptable solution, is the key point. Thank you.

DR EVANS: Yes, thank you.

MS HALL: So, I suppose just in terms of the surrounding buildings, there's no real loss of views. The only, if we go to the next page, we did look closely at the Meriton because obviously we're building in front of them. But what we found was that when we looked at the floor plan, we're maintaining their views to the north and the south from living rooms and from terraces.

So, the only impact was maybe some bedrooms where they don't have the direct view that they currently would have. So, we believe we're maximising those views from those key habitable spaces.

5 **MR MAXWELL:** Just to add to that. There's one single aspect west-facing apartment on the typical floorplate for that serviced apartment building, which you can see in the centre of that maroon-coloured floorplate there. There are 11 apartments total, and the rest of those are all oriented to the north and the south for their primary aspects.

10 So, 1 out of 11 of those apartments is likely to have the view impact by our proposal. But the Department found in their Assessment Report that on balance, given the short-term visitor accommodation use of the serviced apartment building, and the fact that the majority of the view lines are being preserved, that it
15 was an acceptable outcome in the circumstances of this proposal.

DR EVANS: Yes, thank you. Just noting that we have 13 minutes left, I do want to make sure that get through the waste management, traffic and parking, and the comments with the Department's recommended conditions.

20 **MR MAXWELL:** Okay, we'll move onto waste management, loading and servicing now, and then work through those other items.

25 **DR EVANS:** Because that was one area where the Council in particular raised concerns about the waste management and had objections to the private waste collection. So, perhaps you can talk us through that.

MR MAXWELL: Yes.

30 **MS HALL:** So, an HRV, which was the Council's standard collection vehicle, was found with sort of detailed analysis of swept paths, can't actually turn left into the laneway from Albert Avenue without encroaching onto oncoming traffic. Because that laneway is actually two-way, which is quite narrow for two-way, but that's the condition that we have to work with.

35 And so what we found was the solution that we're proposing was a pull-in bay with the use of a smaller private contractor vehicle, such that the waste truck can pull in off the laneway without disrupting oncoming traffic from the other direction. And we've set back our building to allow that to happen and to have
40 easy waste collection directly from our bin room on ground.

And we've also got SRV access into our basement for loading. So, people moving in and out obviously is contained within the basement within the site, so it's only the waste collection that would be out on the street.

45 But if we go to the next slide, you can see we've got a blue colour there on the plan, we've set back the building to provide a pedestrian footpath the whole way through. So, during the day when the waste truck's not there, it's quite an active

space with one of our main entries off the laneway and safe pedestrian passage up and down the site.

MR WRIGHT: Can I just ask – is that drop off by fully on the lot, or is it on public domain?

MR MAXWELL: So, it's partly, it's inset as much as possible. But there will be a partial encroachment by waste collection vehicles and trucks using that loading bay, which the Department has accepted in this instance. We've designed it, and Stantec, our traffic engineer, have provided swept-path analysis to confirm that when that loading bay is in use, other traffic using the laneway will still be able to pass the trucks using the pull-in bay.

And that's an outcome that's also been accepted by Council in other areas of the Chatswood CBD, including just to the south of our site at 15 Ellis Street on Crispe Lane where on-street loading was accepted there.

MR WRIGHT: So, your SRV will be partially in the carriageway when it was in that loading bay?

MR MAXWELL: Yes, there'll be a partial encroachment into the carriageway.

MR WRIGHT: Okay.

MR MAXWELL: While that bay is in use. I think in terms of the private collection issue as well, one of the reasons why the Department was comfortable accepting that in this case, is the nature of the build-to-rent use and the fact that it will be owned and managed by a single entity with on-site management staff.

It lends itself operationally speaking to be more in the realms of, say, a commercial building typically would be managed where waste collection is undertaken by a private contractor, versus a typical strata subdivided build-to-sell residential scenario.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR DI MAGGIO: And just quickly on traffic and parking, so noting the site's excellent public transport access, metro train, buses, as well as the CBD location struck between the Housing SEPP and Council's controls in terms of public parking provision. So, a total of 53 spaces, which is sort of in the middle range of Council's requirement.

In terms of active and sustainable travel, we've really sort of gone above and beyond. So, providing 121 bicycle spaces, where the DCP recommends 40. So, we're really trying to encourage active travel as well as a Green Travel Plan which will be refined and implemented post determination. So, I just sort of want to touch on those key points in terms of sustainable travel.

And then noting as well, in terms of the traffic analysis that has been undertaken in terms of minimal additional trips, noting a lot of residents probably will choose to access public transport and other measures to get to and from the site. So, I just wanted to point that out on that matter.

DR EVANS: Thank you.

MR MAXWELL: And then the final item that we had was just a quick slide on the Department's recommended conditions of consent. The main message here is that we have engaged with the Department regarding the consent conditions prior to the referral to the IPC. And on the whole, we're comfortable with the conditions that are proposed and we're happy to accept them as drafted.

There are some very minor administrative adjustments, those three items with the yellow text on this slide, that we think are required just to ensure that they operate as intended. They're very minor, they don't alter the intent of what the condition is imposing. I won't go into them in detail, but we have listed them there and can provide further information if that's required.

And the only other item that we wanted to note, which we mentioned earlier, was that condition C4 regarding those design amendments to those studios on the eastern façade. We just wanted to put forward that we are happy with that condition, we're happy to accept it as drafted, so there's no issues on that one either.

DR EVANS: Okay, thank you. Can we talk through the zero setback? One of the things that we wanted to ensure is that we have before us the actual design that you're going to build. You say in your Response to Submission Report that, "Refinements have been made but they don't change what the application is seeking consent for and therefore an amendment to the proposed development is not required."

Do you also have an acknowledgement from the Department to that extent, that what was proposed is not required to be amended, so just to ensure that we're approving what you actually intend to develop?

MR DI MAGGIO: Is that in terms of the description, Bronwyn, in terms of how it's sort of set out?

DR EVANS: Yes, that's right.

MR DI MAGGIO: Yes, yes.

DR EVANS: Just making sure that the application is – it covers all of the amendments you've made in response to the submissions.

MR DI MAGGIO: For clarity, we can double check that come back to you with some additional information if needed. But I think, yes, it'd be prudent that we

have a look at the wording as drafted and make sure it aligns with what we're seeking. So, if we can come back on that, that'll be appreciated.

DR EVANS: No, that would be very helpful.

MR DI MAGGIO: Yes.

DR EVANS: Thank you. Are there any further comments or points you want to raise, Charles and your team, in terms of today's meeting?

MR MAXWELL: I don't have anything in particular, but I'll throw that back to the team as well and just make sure that there's nothing from anyone else that we want to raise at this stage.

MS HALL: Nothing from our side, thank you.

MS FORTU: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Nothing from me.

DR EVANS: Okay. Thank you.

MR WRIGHT: I think we've covered off everything. I mean, the only thing I was going to raise was the lift servicing proposal, I think you're proposing three lifts, which is obviously, puts you, I think, at one lift per 66 units, which is obviously below the threshold ideally required in the Apartment Design Guidelines, which I think is 1-in-40. You've done a vertical – I think it's got vertical transport report – I haven't actually stepped through it. Could you just explain to us why you think three lifts is sufficient for this particular development?

MR MAXWELL: Yes, happy to talk to that. So, we do have a vertical transport consultant on board. They, right at the initial phases of the concept design for the proposal, prepared an analysis for us to have a look at estimated wait times based on the lift core having three lifts. They were comfortable that the three lifts proposed provide adequate servicing to the building and are consistent with the relevant guidelines for wait times and level of service for residents using those lifts. So, on that basis, we proceeded with the three-lift proposal for this building.

MS FORTU: The provisions that are in the ADG relate to a standard lift. But I guess the key takeaway is that we're up-spec-ing the lift, so that it provides a greater level of service that meets the requirements. I think it's an Australian Standard or an ISO provision that's identified in our Vertical Transport Report.

MR WRIGHT: Okay. So, what they're ... larger and faster?

MS FORTU: They're faster, yes, so the wait time is reduced. Yes.

MR WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you. Nothing else from me, Bronwyn. Thank you.

DR EVANS: Thanks, Michael. And Kendall, was there anything else you would like to cover?

5 **MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** Thanks, Commissioner Evans. The only query I have is, I think we've got an extra person in the room, and just for our record keeping, is it Monica in the room?

10 **MS MONICA DIRADJI:** Correct. Monica Diradji.

MR CLYDSDALE: Lovely. And we might just clarify your title and position details etc. for our transcript later. But that's the only thing I had to mention. Thanks, Commissioner Evans.

15 **DR EVANS:** Thank you, Kendall. Tahlia, anything that you need?

MS TAHLIA HUTCHINSON: Nothing from me, thanks Bronwyn.

20 **DR EVANS:** Thank you. Well, thank you to the team for meeting with us this morning, and we have neatly come to the end of our time. So, I really appreciate you giving us the presentation and answering our questions. Thank you very much.

25 [All say thank you]

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED