

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: SSD-59805958 Novus On Albert  
**Date:** Monday, 30 June 2025 2:58:47 PM

---

---

**From:** Aziz Ishak [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 29 June 2025 3:17 PM  
**To:** IPCN Submissions Mailbox [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** SSD-59805958 Novus On Albert

Dear IPC,

I write in follow-up to the redacted version of my submission on *Novus on Albert – SSD-59805958*, which was published on the NSW Planning Portal on 27 June 2025.

Firstly, I would like to thank the Commission for acknowledging and publishing my submission, and for its time in reviewing the materials under tight deadlines.

However, I wish to respectfully express concern and request clarification regarding the nature and impact of the redactions applied — particularly to **Objection 1** and its supporting documentation.

### **Clarification Regarding Redactions to Objection 1**

The redacted material includes a documented chronology and factual correspondence outlining procedural issues of direct relevance to planning integrity. These elements were submitted in good faith to assist the Commission in evaluating staging and access conditions, including **D16**, **D27**, **F35** and **Clause 72(3)(b)** of the Housing SEPP 2021.

### **Why These Redactions Matter**

I understand the IPC may redact material or avoid publication of defamatory or privileged content. However, I note that:

- The correspondence does not defame, accuse, or speculate about individuals, nor does it contain privileged legal advice not intended for public distribution.

Rather, the material is factual and directly relevant to the **procedural handling of planning documents** and exhibition process.

Importantly, **Objection 1 provides the evidentiary basis and procedural context for the remainder of my submission**. Its redaction significantly weakens the interpretive clarity and public visibility of my concerns.

### **Consequences of the Redactions**

I do not allege deliberate bias. However, I respectfully submit that the redactions may have the **unintended effect** of:

- Relieving the proponent from having to address claims that — had they been published — may have required a **formal right of reply or panel scrutiny**.
- May inadvertently obscure evidence of planning system vulnerability and risks allowing the same mischaracterisation previously advanced by the Department: that this is merely a private lease dispute — **which it is not**. On the contrary, as the unredacted submission makes clear, the conduct documented is central to the consent process itself - all of which directly affect the enforceability and legitimacy of proposed conditions

### **Request for Confirmation and Public Upload**

In light of the above, I respectfully request the Commission:

1. **Please Confirm** that the full, unredacted version of my submission — including all Appendices submitted to the IPC — has been made available to the assessment panel and treated as **material** to the consent determination?
2. **Confirm** whether the redactions were made on grounds of legal or administrative risk, and whether the proponent was consulted or notified as part of this process.
3. **Accept this letter** for publication as a clarification notice on the public planning portal, or as a supplementary note, to ensure the public record reflects the original intent and evidentiary grounding of my submission.
4. If publication is not possible, provide assurance that the redacted content — particularly the procedural chronology in Objection 1 — remains under consideration in assessing **Condition D16, D27, F35, and Clause 72(3)(b)**.

Thank you again for your time and your role in maintaining the integrity of NSW's planning system.

Yours sincerely,

Aziz Ishak