



## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

RE: THE TIMBERYARDS BY RTL CO. (SSD-76927247)

### **APPLICANT MEETING**

PANEL:

MICHAEL CHILCOTT (CHAIR)  
JULIET GRANT  
SUELLEN FITZGERALD

OFFICE OF THE IPC:

JANE ANDERSON  
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

APPLICANT  
REPRESENTATIVES:

JONATHON COMBLEY (The Living Company)  
JAMES HILEY (The Living Company)  
BEN CRAIG (Colliers Urban Planning)  
ELLA YALE (Colliers Urban Planning)  
DAN SZWAJ (Turner Studio)  
ANDREW BURNS (Architecture AND)  
HANNAH TRIBE (Tribe Studio)  
CHARLIE ROBINSON (Land + Form)  
AMELIA HOLLIDAY (Aileen Sage)  
RHYS HAZEL (Ason Group)  
DANIEL FETTELL (Mott MacDonald)  
REBECCA DAVIE (HSFK)

LOCATION:

ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE:

10:30AM – 11:30AM  
WEDNESDAY, 3<sup>rd</sup> DECEMBER 2025

## <THE MEETING COMMENCED

5       **MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT:** I have an opening statement that is part of the formalities of the IPC's meeting arrangements, which I'll just go through if you'd bear with me for a moment, and get that away. I'll need to go down and read it, so please excuse me for not looking you directly in the eyes while I make my opening comments.

10       So, good morning, everybody, and welcome to this meeting to discuss the Timberyards proposal by RTL Co., state significant development application number SSD-76927247, which is currently before the Commission for determination.

15       My name is Michael Chilcott. I'm the Chair of the Commission Panel for this matter. I am joined today by my fellow Commissioners, Juliet Grant and Suellen Fitzgerald.

I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you today from Gadigal country and I acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands from which we all virtually meet today and pay respects to Elders past and present.

20       The Applicant in this matter, The Trustee for Marrickville Property Trust, has proposed to construct and operate a 5 to 14-storey multi-use development comprising build-to-rent, affordable housing, co-living arrangements, retail development and a park. The site is located on multiple blocks, bound broadly by Victoria Road, Sydenham Road, Farr Street and Mitchell Street in Marrickville, with an adjoining  
25       suite of buildings near the corner of Sydenham Road and Victoria Road.

30       Today for our meeting we're also – my colleagues and I are joined by two of the Commission staff, Tahlia Hutchinson and Jane Anderson who's next to me here in the room.

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

35       The meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this application and will be one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination.

40       It's an important part of this meeting that Commissioners ask questions of attendees, we have the opportunity to do that, and to clarify issues and so forth whenever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

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

That's the conclusion of my opening statement, and we'll now commence. Thank you.

You have an agenda before you. Can I just ask to start, is that sufficient, are you satisfied or is there anything further you wish to add to it?

5

**MR JONATHAN COMBLEY:** Thank you, Michael. We're happy to follow that agenda. And thank you for the introduction and it's good to meet both Juliet and Suellen, Tahlia and Jane.

10

From our side, my name is Jonathon Combley. I am General Manager for Developments at The Living Company and RTL Co. I am joined today by our team leads who have each played a central role in preparing our state significant development application. And so, before we begin, it may be worthwhile quickly going around the room and doing a few introductions from our side.

15

**MR CHILCOTT:** Okay.

**MR COMBLEY:** So, I'll just ask Ben Craig first.

20

**MR BEN CRAIG:** Ben Craig. I'm the Director of the Planning Group at Colliers Urban Planning.

**MR JAMES HILEY:** James Hiley, Senior Development Manager from RTL Co.

25

**MR BEN VALENCIA-KLUG:** I'm Ben Valencia-Klug, I'm the Chief Operating Officer of The Living Company, which is the owner of RTL Co.

**MR CHARLIE ROBINSON:** Hi. Charlie Robinson, Landscape Architect at Land + Form.

30

**MR DANIEL FETTELL:** Hi. Dan Fettell, Civil and Planning Leader, Mott MacDonald.

35

**MS REBECCA DAVIE:** Rebecca Davie, Executive Counsel at Herbert Smith Freehills.

**MS AMELIA HOLLIDAY:** Amelia Holliday, Director of Aileen Sage Architects, Public Domain.

40

**MS HANNAH TRIBE:** Hannah Tribe, Principal of Tribe Studio Architects.

**MR ANDREW BURNS:** Andrew Burns, Director of Architecture AND.

**MR DAN SZWAJ:** Dan Szwaj, Director at Turner.

45

**MR CHILCOTT:** We've lost your screen briefly from the main screen.

**MR HILEY:** We missed Rhys.

**MR RHYS HAZEL:** And sorry, finally, Rhys Hazel, Ason Group, Principal Lead looking after transport matters.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. And I think there might be one other person at the back of the room that we didn't quite ...

**MS ELLA YALE:** Hi, I'm Ella Yale, I'm a Planner at Colliers Urban Planning.

10 **MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you very much.

**MS YALE:** Thank you.

**MR COMBLEY:** I'll share my screen now.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** No, that's fine, thank you very much. So, you'll take us through your presentation at this point?

20 **MR COMBLEY:** Yes, we'll take you through the presentation. Before we begin, we'd like to acknowledge the Gadigal people of the Eora nation, traditional custodians of the lands and waters where the Marrickville Timberyards sits. We pay our respects to Elders past and present and to all First Nations people joining us here today.

25 Marrickville, known traditionally as Bulanaming, was shaped by the wetland systems of the Gumbramorra Swamp. Through the connections with country process, we've sought to honour those stories, designing with care for non-human kin, providing custodianship for future generations, and fostering the growth of the creative community that has long defined Marrickville.

30 As we present this project today, we do so with gratitude for the knowledge held in this country and a commitment and design that's respected.

35 Today, we will cover three core areas. I'll provide you with an overview of the project. I'll then handover to Dan and the team to present the amendments made to the response to submissions stage, and we will then address our response to the Department's Assessment Report and the recommended conditions of consent.

40 The Living Company. So, The Living Company is Australia's largest operational real estate platform in the living sector, and the only dedicated platform of its kind in the Asia-Pacific. We're an integrated end-to-end living specialist supported by over 2,200 staff operating 116 assets and with \$17 billion under management. And under The Living Co., under the umbrella is Rent to Live Co., Built to Rent, which is the Applicant for this submission.

45 Our vision is ambitious; to be the Earth's best living company. We aim to shift the way people live, from ownership to access, from isolation to connection, from permanence to possibility, all while ensuring that what we deliver is good for the planet. Marrickville Timberyards is an example of that ambition at scale.

Marrickville Timberyards will transform long-term industrial land and deliver 475 build-to-rent apartments, 115 infill affordable rental homes, and 591 co-living dwellings. All with equal access to 2,670 square metres of communal amenity.

Importantly, the precinct will provide 10,200 square metres of publicly accessible open space, designed and curated by a diverse range of local architects and designers. This project has the potential to unlock much-needed rental housing in Marrickville.

We began engagement with government and community in January 2024. We thank the Department and Council for their active participation in progressing the assessment of the application to date. In line with the National Housing Accord, this project will provide well-located housing quickly. We are fully funded and we are ready to commence construction in January 2026, pending the determination of this application.

From September 2028, you can see that we can open 662 new dwellings, followed by 590 more in April 2029. When shaping our design strategy, we didn't want this to be just another development. Our intention has been to deliver a transformative precinct, turning an under-utilised industrial site into a place that future residents and the broader Marrickville community can be proud to call home. A precinct rooted in the creative, industrious and culturally rich identity of Marrickville.

Our goal is to broaden rental choice, align people to scale their lifestyle with opt-in services and access to amenity without the upfront cost of ownership. This has not been done on scale in Australia. Residents will be able to choose from entry studios through to four-bedroom family apartments and terraces. They can opt in to furniture packages, car share and bike share, and other services that make living in the Inner West more accessible.

We looked globally and locally at regenerative projects that deliver public benefits, strengthen local identity, and support diverse housing needs. In June 2024, we brought together a diverse range of local architects and designers – you can see everyone in that photograph below. Through country engagement, workshops with local artists and community, and engaging through a detailed design discovery process, we established four key design pillars, the foundation of the proposal, and a reflection of what matters most to the community.

The outcome is ambitious. We're opening up 2.2 hectares of previously inaccessible land and delivering a pedestrian-centric precinct that will include a new park and landscape zones, new gathering spaces and cross-site connections for the community. We have the benefit of being an owner-operator to curate and manage this precinct in perpetuity. Delivering a precinct that first provides a range of rental housing but also importantly offers a range of public amenity for shared enjoyment.

It should be noted that the site is well located, within walking distance of Sydenham Metro and train stations, a bus stop within a hundred metres on Victoria Road, across the road from the newly opened full-line Harris Farm, and down the road from both Marrickville Metro Shopping Centre and the Marrickville High Street.

I'll now handover to Dan to introduce the team and the scheme.

**MR SZWAJ:** Thank you. As the title of this page indicates, design diversity was a key underpinning design principle for the precinct. And from day one, it was established that it'll be diversity of architects working on the project. So, together with Turner, we have Architecture AND, and Tribe Studio working with us, so just next to us here.

Now, when we look at the diversity of the projects or the built form, the intention is that it's not just the aesthetics, we actually looked at getting the diversity for each streetscape, and also within the different domain spaces, which Amelia from Aileen Sage will talk about shortly.

This also extends to the topology of the built form as well, in terms of both the build-to-rent, co-living, and also the affordable housing. So, there's a true mix of different characters, uses, and each architectural firm bringing their own take on what the authenticity of the scheme is and being hyper-local.

Now, in terms of the different spaces through here. Victoria Road is identified as a key retail street, and in terms of the character is quite unique in terms of its offering at street level, and the street wall in terms of the building character.

Within the centre of the site, we have Warehouse Place, which is a true pedestrian link between Victoria Road and Farr Street. In terms of Farr Street, we have the Pocket Park, which is part of the original DCP, which we will have fully integrated into the site. And when we look at Timberyards Commons and Hardware Lane, the two spaces that are key in terms of the residential amenity but also offering public accessibility through the site.

**MS HOLLIDAY:** So, this has really been an amazing opportunity to create a really vibrant series of pedestrianised spaces through the site. The fact that it's all being developed as one site means that we're able to really amplify that pedestrian amenity because we don't have roads necessarily through the centre of the site.

And so, really drawing on some of those key design principles that flashed up on the screen previously, there's an opportunity to really improve that idea of urban biodiversity across the site with planting augmented by spaces such as this, which really speaks to that post-industrial heritage with this Gateway space being particularly identified as a space for a major piece of public art.

**MR SZWAJ:** So, in terms of the corner of Mitchell Street and Victoria Road, this is where the language changes from being the retail precinct to the residential. So, the character of these streets change. Mitchell Street becomes more residential in terms of its focus toward the corner, if we go to the next slide. We start to respond to the future Pocket Park and having active uses on the corner there in terms of communal spaces.

And changing the character of the built form as well as it becomes more residential in nature in Farr Street and changing the scale. So, along Farr Street, the character of the buildings change in scale. And as we go to Sydenham Road, this is one building which

we'll talk about in future parts of the presentation where we've dramatically changed that to respond to the scale of the site and the differing interfaces that we have.

Now, whilst we have a large ground plan that's publicly accessible and used for the residents as well, we have a rooftop area that we see as being highly valuable for the amenity to the residents. And that's accommodation of indoor and outdoor spaces on Building B.

**MR COMBLEY:** So, we recognise the NSW Government's priority to deliver well-located, diverse and affordable housing in highly accessible locations. Marrickville Timberyards provides this. The proposal will deliver high-quality built form by a diverse range of public spaces that will give the community and residents a high level of internal and external amenity.

Our aspiration is to deliver a global inspiration for imaginative urbanism. As an owner-operator, we have the advantage of being able to curate and manage this precinct in perpetuity. This precinct has been designed and forged by leading local architects and designers. The proposal will provide 760 construction jobs and 180 operational jobs. It will also provide a diverse range of access to well-located rental housing, right-sized to suit their needs, supported by our RTL Co. operational platform.

We believe this is the right project in the right place at the right time, and we're ready to deliver it.

I'll handover over to Ben Craig to run through the amendments made at RTS stage.

**MR HILEY:** Thanks, Jonathon. James Hiley, Senior Development Manager from RTL Co. We wanted to highlight this slide to provide an indication of the authenticity and integrity we've shown with how we've engaged with the community. So, Jonathon mentioned we've been talking to communities since January 2024. This then continued throughout the back end of 2024 pre-lodgement when we held two separate community open days at the site, to invite the local community in and try and allow them to better understand the ambitions for the site.

We also met with Marrickville Public School prior to lodgement and post lodgement. We've also done a presentation to their P&C Committee in April of this year, and they remain supportive of the development. We look forward to sort of extending that collaboration throughout construction and post completion into operation.

Flight Path Theatre, as we know, is a local theatre group who have a tired asset which we thought it was an opportunity to authentically engage with the [unintelligible 00:18:09] sector of Marrickville, and we've continued to pursue opportunities for how we could involve them in the development.

We've also had strong engagement through the Summer Hill electorate with community members. We've engaged with those community members throughout this year, both pre – sorry, I should say post lodgement and post RTS. So, we've taken them on the journey with us and presenting the changes that we were listening to, post

the RTS letter being provided. And we demonstrated with changes we've made to community, to make sure that they were on the same page with us.

We've also got a community website where we've constantly engaged and responded to RFIs from community. And most recently, we've engaged with Mud Australia who we know is a local manufacturing business, obviously focusing in pottery and homewares, and we look forward to extending that relationship through construction into operation.

**MR CRAIG:** Ben Craig from Colliers Urban Planning, formerly Ethos. So, we've been on this project since the very beginning. As James just mentioned, from that community engagement and through the RTS process, I think the important thing here is that we've genuinely listened to the concerns that were raised through that RTS process, and we've made genuine attempts to address those concerns.

And how that's been represented in amendments to the scheme is showcased nowhere better than in Building G, where we made substantial amendments to Building G. That has involved a reduction in the height of that building between 1 to 3 storeys, and the inclusion of now a tapered roof to try and vary up the building form and its presentation to Sydenham Road and the corner to Farr Street as well.

We've increased setbacks to Farr Street, included 11 metres setback there. And overall, those changes have resulted in about a reduction in 15 BTR apartments for that building, or about 1,100 square metres of floor space.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Can I briefly touch – sorry, can you briefly touch on the, if you can, the qualitative and quantitative improvements that it's made to its interface with the buildings in the area.

**MR CRAIG:** Sure.

**MR CHILCOTT:** You talk about the improved solar access to adjacent properties.

**MR CRAIG:** Yes.

**MR CHILCOTT:** What the improvements are.

**MR CRAIG:** Michael, we do have some further information at the back of this presentation where we can dive into that in a little bit more detail. Do you mind if we address that once ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** That's fine. We'll keep our questions then for that point. Thank you.

**MR CRAIG:** We'll take that on notice, because we do intend to step through that. So, the other key change is a redistribution of some of that floor space to Building B. There were opportunities there to capture some of that loss floor space from Building G and move that over to Building B, which is a slightly less sensitive location



within the site. So, that involved an increase by about the corresponding amount of floor area, and an additional level of Building B.

In addition to that, there were some other changes that we made to the scheme as well. We mentioned the Building G and the overshadowing, and we'll dive into the detail on that, Michael, following this presentation.

The other one was building separation. So, there was a concern raised around building separation between Buildings A, B, E, F and G. So, they're shown in those little dotted circles in the image there, blue-dotted circles. So, we addressed that through some redesign of the buildings, the inclusion of some privacy screening, redesigning some of the Building B re-entry corners, just to address some of those privacy issues.

Those privacy issues were isolated to levels 4 or 5 and above, and for small sections of façade where the two buildings were sort of directly opposite one another. And Dan will take you through that in a little more detail.

And then some of the other thing we did were, we included some additional external screens to assist with some of the wind mitigation. And in addition to these ones, there were a couple of other key changes, one of which was – we actually amended the unit mix. So, there was a concern raised around the unit mix and not having enough three-bedroom apartments. So, we increased the number of three-bedroom apartments by 11, and we also included a four-bedroom apartment, and that resulted also in a corresponding reduction in the number of ones and twos. So, we tried to make it more, I guess more opportunity for families to move into this precinct as well.

And the final other sort of material change was the change to the buildings along Farr Street where we included some design changes that made the present to Farr Street a little bit more like a terrace product. So, it's sort of reflective of the streetscape character in the area.

**MS TRIBE:** So, I'm Hannah Tribe from Tribe Studio Architects, the architects of Building G. So, Building G began life as a kind of place marker building, it's the first building that kind of heralds the new precinct. And we have designed it using a response to some industrial idioms within the landscape and sensitive design towards solar amenity.

During the SSDA process, it took a big haircut, stepping back from Farr Street to present a five-storey elevation only. And then striding back in terms of height, based on some nuanced solar access studies that treat those single-storey residential development, the houses across Sydenham Road. So, it's now designed to preserve their sunlight and present a soft landscaped roof to this interface piece.

So, we think it's a really great design resolution in terms of protecting neighbourhood amenity but still being a significant place marker for the site. The other thing that's quite encouraging, following on from Jono's introduction, is that the roof expression is something that's collecting water and talking to this place as a place that's about the

distribution of water and former wetlands really speaks to this continued understanding of country. So, we think it's a great result.

So, they're the changes that happened during the SSDA.

**MR HILEY:** So, with that, there was some minor redistribution of the GFA to Building B. It doesn't change the overall height of that building. There is some modification in Mitchell Street storeys, by an additional one, which is quite a lot less than the reductions to Building G. And we've maintained the communal open space and areas associated with that building.

**MR CRAIG:** So, now we just wanted to touch on the Department's Assessment Report and recommended conditions of consent. I think it's important to note in the first instance that we've had a really good working relationship with the Department of Planning throughout this entire assessment process. We've really sought to be very collaborative, and so have they, through this assessment process, noting the significance of the project.

And we believe that the Assessment Report provides an accurate and balanced representation of the project's progress and the key considerations identified. We're supportive of all their conclusions and recommendations, but there are just a couple of minor things I think that we considered in mind that we'd like to talk to the Panel about. And they're really with a couple of conditions of consent that exist in the draft conditions.

The first one is condition B1, and condition B1 is where the Department is seeking to impose a requirement for an increased building separation between Building D and the corner site, what we call the corner site and south of it, so the site on the corner of Sydenham and Victoria Road. It seeks to impose a separation requirement of 3 metres at ground and then 6 metres from level 1 and above. And we can see and appreciate what the Department is trying to achieve here and the reason for this.

But what we feel is there's probably a slightly more nuanced solution to how that can be achieved, and a solution that meets the Department's objectives in terms of getting solar to the site to the south, but still enables the corner site to maximise its development potential, and one that will continue to provide an outcome consistent, I think, importantly with the ADG. So, that there's separation distances the Department's trying to impose through the condition are in excess of the ADG requirements. And we believe that probably there's an alternate solution there that is shown in that right-hand image versus the middle image, that probably better achieves the outcome the Department is trying to seek there.

The other condition that we – I'll just go back to the condition – the other condition that we wanted just to talk to the Panel about was condition C1, which relates to the commencement ... It has a term in there, "prior to commencement of any works," and then asks for a whole heap of management plans to be prepared and submitted prior to commencement of "any works" (in inverted commas). Some of those management plans aren't necessarily needing to be prepared prior to we start demolition, for

instance, because some of them might relate to construction dewatering or an unexpected finds protocol.

There's a lot of demolition, obviously, on the site to clear the site in the first instance, and there's some management plans that may not be needed until later on, six months down the track. So, we were just after, I guess, that condition to be a little bit more nuanced. And the intention is that we'll touch on these, David will send through to the Panel a letter that will just articulate this a little bit more for your consideration.

**MR SZWAJ:** So, we touched on this setback here and the more nuanced approach. And this is coming after understanding the site for a good two years and working on it that we've created a number of different public domain spaces. And there is what we call Wicks Lane between the future corner site and Building D. And it's also important to note that for Building D, the side boundary elevation is secondary, so there's no primary outlook through there.

And with all our various studies that were undertaken for Wicks Park and also the corner site in terms of the future development potential, we see the benefit and understand the rationale behind the additional setback, and we see the benefit in considering the setback on the top level. And rather having it 6 metres, taking off 9 metres, which will provide a very similar, if not better, outcome in terms of solar access to Wicks Park and also to the corner site building. But at the same time retain the intention of the street wall that was within the original DCP or precinct 47 to Victoria Road.

The other one to note is the changes to Building G and we understand that to be from the top level, the 6 metres from the site boundary. So, we are happy to accommodate that within the scheme. And so, this is more for our reference to indicate the changes that are proposed.

**MR COMBLEY:** So, this is just a final image just reflecting the overall site plan and the range of public domain spaces that we will be delivering. You can see the Gateway that sits in the central portion of the site, what's retained. The Warehouse that will be adaptively reused and become an engaging connecting space for both residents and the local community. And then adjacent to that and spilling from it are a series of laneways.

The Commons, which is a central park zone and will form a connection between Marrickville Public School and the Metro. As well as the Pocket Park, which was envisaged under the DCP, and we have taken that and reinterpreted and tried to integrate it better into the overall public domain. One key characteristic that is different from the Victoria Road DCP is that this is a pedestrian-centric development, whereas previously it was anticipated to be more car-centric in that central boulevard being open to vehicular use.

So, we think a superior outcome has been proposed and could be realised here through the delivery of Marrickville Timberyards. We can – that's where we stop, Michael, and

we do have some further supporting information for those key matters for discussion, if you would like to go through those.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** No, I'm happy to go through those as well. So, if I'm understanding you, you're happy to move through matters in the order in which we've listed them. But as you go through them, you have further slides you'd like to present to us. Is that correct?

10 **MR COMBLEY:** We are able to address those discussion topics individually and have some content that we can share to help illustrate those discussion topics, if required. So, I guess we're in your hands in any of those particular topics that you would like to cover.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right, great. Just before we go, just a preliminary question, I guess bouncing off the last one on the conditions. You're suggesting some changes to conditions that are reflected in your presentation envelope level of responses to the design. Have you, in the background, got a suite of amended plans? Or are you proposing at this point, those design amendments remain at a condition?

20 And look, we've got them, that's great, there's obviously work to do in terms of discussions both with you and through the Department. But I'm just wondering, do you have amended plans to reflect those that you would seek to bring forward at some point?

25 **MR CRAIG:** Michael, I don't think at this stage, well, we could do it either way. We could either, we'll make representations to you in the form of a letter and some diagrams and show you the comparison between what the Department's suggestion in the condition is requiring, versus what the alternative is – which is those images you just saw before.

30 And it's really for the Department's consideration as to whether or not you think, you know, you could either amend it in the condition itself, because it says, it's quite specific in the condition, it says a 1 metre setback at ground and then I think it's a 3 metre – 6 metre setback from level 1 and above. And we're happy to show you what that amended condition might look like if it was to reflect the changes that we think are a better representation or a better solution. So, you could either just amend the condition and then we can comply with that condition in the future with updated plans. Or we could update plans, I guess ...

40 **MR CHILCOTT:** I mean, there's obviously a couple of stages to go through. You've got a set of Department conditions that are recommended and I guess there's an initial response to the conditions. And then depending on the outcome of those, the question will be whether one can put them into plans rather than conditions. I just express perhaps a view that generally speaking, I think it's better to, if you can, ensure that the application in the plans is representative of what the consent is being sought.

45 I'm always wary about imposing required design changes without really knowing whether or not it's going to work. But you're right, we can do it a number of ways.

5 **MR COMBLEY:** Michael, just to add to what Ben said, given the scale of the development, we've moved into two isolated issues. We have explored the impacts through detailed plans, which we are able to share with you. But we are comfortable with the conditions being imposed for the purposes of being able to progress the construction of the development. And then at the same time follow up with those detailed plans to address those specific concept conditions.

10 **MR CHILCOTT:** No, that's fine, it's good to know that. So, thank you. It's helpful. Well, shall we go through the various points of discussion as they're listed?

**MR COMBLEY:** Sounds good.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right, thanks. So, height and density. You obviously have, as you presented, a base plan there. You also have a clause 4.6 in there in relation to height, seeking to present the formal response to the requirements in clause 4.6 in relation to height variations. Can I ask in the first instance in relation to height and density, I think your FSR is consistent with limits on the site – is that correct?

20 **MR CRAIG:** Yes, that's right. FSR comes out at 3.4:1. With the 20% bonus associated with the infill affordable housing provision, we have a maximum FSR on site of 3.6:1 that we could achieve. So, we come out at 0.2 below the maximum.

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** I think that's useful to note on the way through. Just in addressing height, is there any further comments you want to make in relation to the height variations, and in particular the excesses or exceedances that you seek consent for, subject to the 4.6.

30 **MR CRAIG:** Yes. So, I think what's important to understand with this site, it's unique in some of its constraints and it's unique in the way that the infill affordable housing bonus has been applied. And it's been applied to respond to the constraints that are associated with the site.

35 So, what you can see here in the top-left corner is an LEP compliance scheme with no affordable housing. So, that's the built form that's pretty much envisaged from the rezoning that occurred in 2018. And then when you provide the 10% of affordable housing to get the 20% bonus to height and floor space, you end up, if you forget about the obstacle limitation service that applies to the site, you end up probably with an outcome in the top-right hand corner there. And what that's showing you there is that  
40 some of those elements, particularly those buildings in the middle of the site, are already designed to hit the OLS. They were designed that way when the rezoning happened in 2018. So, they're sort of, they're physically limited in their ability to take any of that bonus.

45 So, we need to be able to achieve some of that floor space, as per what the consented provisions are all about, to deliver the affordable housing. And that has really driven the need to find us another location for that floor space to sit on the site. And the only other locations for that floor space to then go around those perimeter buildings, so that

then shows you that sort of key move down in the bottom left-hand corner, tile 3. And that shows you where it's gone from Buildings B and E over to Buildings A, F and G. And that's driven that height exceedance a little bit further on those buildings.

5 And then in the bottom right-hand corner, what you see is the resulted outcome of that. So, we have some exceedances on Buildings A, F and G, and G is slightly more pronounced because the base height of that corner of the site is lower than the base height of the others. And the reason for that, I think at the rezoning time, was about providing that transition down to Sydenham Road and Farr Street.

10 So, then in the original application that we submitted, you saw those images previously of the built form being a more sort of rectangular sort of shape of buildings, so I'm not a designer so I don't know the right words to use. But then it then going through significant changes in response to the concerns that were raised about the height and the transition there, to then introduce one to three-storey reduction in the scale of that, and that tapered roof.

20 Now, the tapered roof is quite important because it really has helped us with the overshadowing impacts on Sydenham Road. And those overshadowing impacts are a material consideration when you're looking at the clause 4.6. And what we've got now is a built form that by 11:30, none of those properties on Sydenham Road are receiving any overshadowing impact from the development on the winter solstice, by 11:30. So, through from 11:30 to 3, there's no overshadowing on those properties at all.

25 There's a one singular property at 110 that has a little bit of overshadowing impacts on it, and it has a – I think it only gets about an hour-and-a-half. But what's important to note about that is that from 11:30, say about 1 o'clock, it's actually its own front awning that's overshadowing its front windows, which are bedroom windows. And that seems to be the only issue along Sydenham Road out of all of those properties on Sydenham Road.

30 But prior to that change occurring, we had some material overshadowing impacts on those properties that was causing them to be non-compliant. So, we really tried very hard to address that. And if you look at the overshadowing analysis, you'll see we've done 15-minute increments on winter, not hourly, not half-hourly, we've done every 35 15 minutes. We've mapped it in a table – we've also done that for the equinox. So, we've gone into a lot of detail to understand what those overshadowing impacts might be. And then we've also tried to terrace the building down as it goes to the corner there.

40 In a nutshell, Michael, that is the driver of the non-compliances. The non-compliances on the other buildings are a little bit less severe, and they're really just little pop-outs, particularly on C and D on Victoria Road, there's a couple of, I think one extra storey on Buildings A and F along Farr Street. But they're recessed back, so they've been set back further. And also, those properties on the other side of Farr Street don't receive any solar impacts from us from about 9:30/10 a.m. in the morning onwards.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right.

**MR CRAIG:** Is that the sort of information you were ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** That's helpful. That's helpful. We'll obviously have a look at the detail on the solar.

**MR CRAIG:** Michael, while I'm at it, the only thing I would say as well is that, is that the bonus floor space that this scheme is generating, the 20-odd per cent that we're entitled to, we get back to 14%, but of that, of all of that bonus floor space, 89% of that is being used for affordable housing. So, yes, of the bonus from the 3.8, 3:1, whatever it is, up to 3.4, 89% of that additional 0.4 is used solely for affordable housing.

So, there's a direct nexus there between some of the variations and actually the purpose of the Housing SEPP which is to deliver affordable housing. I think that's a key consideration as well.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right, thank you. I'll just open to my colleagues before we move on from there, to see if they have questions in relation to building form, height, and the presentation of the buildings in various aspects. Suellen?

**MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD:** Yes, sure, thank you. Just two things. One, to confirm – and thanks for taking us through graphically the changes you've made to Building G since the first lodgement, that was really helpful.

Your final scheme that you showed there, the one that we're considering from May 2025. That relates to 155% height exceedance. Is that correct – the final scheme is at that level of height exceedance?

**MR CRAIG:** That's a good question. I think –

**MR HILEY:** It'll be a very small portion of the building. The height plane actually does change. So, we can provide that information on notice, but that exceedance you're talking to is a very small proportion of Building G.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Okay. That's handy, that's helpful to know. Because there's a table in your final document and in the Department's assessment that puts the height exceedance on Building G at 155%. So, any nuance around that would be useful, I think.

**MR CRAIG:** Yes, Suellen, I think what you'll see is, because we have that base height of 11 metres and the bonus, the height exceedance occurs, and you'll see, what we'll show is a section view where the height plane from Farr Street extends into the Building G site, but then the 11 metre height limit wraps around. And there's a point at which that 155% occurs, and we'll demonstrate that to you, there is a diagram we can send through.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Is there a height plane diagram within the material that we have in terms of the plans that you can refer us to, to specifically that?

**MR COMBLEY:** Yes, we'll refer you to that specifically in the document.

**MR CHILCOTT:** If somebody in the background can have a look and perhaps give us a reference, that'll be helpful. You can take it on notice if you need to.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thanks, Michael. The only other point I wanted to make was overshadowing to the remaining residential lots along the, what would it be, the east side of Sydenham Road, so what's called in the documents, "the isolated corner site". I recall the overshadowing analysis for the other side of Sydenham Road, but yes, that existing properties north shadow analysis. Could you also refer to us, refer us to that part of the document as well too. Is there anything you wanted to comment on about the overshadowing to those residential properties?

**MR SZWAJ:** Suellen, this is Dan from Turner. In regards to that, there's a detailed study, independent study that was done by Ethos Urban for both sides of the street, and they go through and identify this parcel as well.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Mm-hm.

**MR SZWAJ:** So, that is covered in that report and it responds, I suppose, to outdoor space and primary windows as well.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Great, okay. Thank you for that.

**MR CHILCOTT:** We'll extract that and look at it, thank you.

**MR CRAIG:** And I think, sorry Suellen, just another thing to add is that that condition B2 that the Department sought to impose on Building G which asked for the additional setback of levels 5 and above, 5 to 7, I think what this is all about is opening up the solar channel so that it provides that further solar access into that corner site. And that's something that we're happy to accept.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Okay, great. Thank you for that. Thanks, Michael.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

**MS JULIET GRANT:** I just have one small question regarding the proposed changes to Building D, both the Department's version and your alternate scenario. What's the implication on the unit yield of either of those changes?

**MR SZWAJ:** That's a good question. In terms of the Department's response, it's a 3-metre setback at ground level, and we're currently 2 point – the site boundary varies its angle from Victoria Road, so it's not a perpendicular boundary. So, there's impact in terms of the ground floor retail, not significant. And when it goes to 6 metres, it's typically two co-living dwellings per level. But it's actually a little bit more because it does – I'm getting quite technical here -it does cut off some of the external wall in terms of the thickness.



5 So, for the lower levels it's two, and when we go up to the upper level, because we actually have some larger co-living dwellings in the top. There's three per level that relates to that area. So, it's six. So, from memory, I believe it's 14. So, when we look at that, when we change it, when we look at it differently to 9 metres at the top, when we take into consideration the outcomes beyond a numerical setback in terms of the benefits to the site, the park, and the urban design context, we remove one whole bay of the articulated sawtooth roof, and that removes, from memory, six, because there's three on each floor. So, they're entirely removing those.

10 So, it is a change in terms of the number of dwellings. But the outcomes in terms of amenity outcomes for adjacent sites is better, if not equal, if not better.

15 **MS GRANT:** So, sorry, it's six – a loss of six, with the 9-metre version, but how many for the 3-metre version?

**MR SZWAJ:** So, the three 14. So, the 3-metre version, which is the condition of consent requirement at the moment, is 14. Whilst the 9-metre is 6.

20 **MR BURNS:** If I could just – Andrew Burns from Architecture AND, as the architect for that particular building. I guess, also just to comment that I think the alternative on the right-hand side is much more consistent with the, I suppose, logic of the design, and retains the integrity, is that larger bay on the upper sawtooth square, where one is lost.

25 And I think the other thing to say is that the side wall, since these are co-living, there's no – there's not a cross-ventilation diagonal requirement to have windows on the side wall. So, we do have a blank façade on those dwellings facing the neighbour. There's glazing at the end of the corridor for amenity, which could be frosted or otherwise. So, really there's no privacy impact arising from this proposal.

30 **MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

**MS GRANT:** Thank you.

35 **MR CRAIG:** Michael, I might just jump back to the question that was asked before by Suellen. So, the 155% exceedance, Suellen, was for the original scheme pre-RTS. Through the RTS process, that's now been reduced to 117%.

40 **MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you.

45 **MR CRAIG:** You'll see that detail in table 4 of the clause 4.6. And if you go to the, if you do have a moment to go to clause 4.6 after this meeting, I would also direct you to – just bear with me, I'm just scrolling down – it paints a very clear picture as to with regards to Building G. Sorry, it's a long document. If you go down to, it is page 32 and 33, figure 23 and figure 24, they're quite useful figures to help you understand the nature of that variation.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you. That's helpful, thank you very much.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. Anything further on height and density on this one?

5 **MS GRANT:** Not from me, thanks.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thanks. Should we move onto the site isolation issues. Can I just invite you, the Applicant, if you have any comments you wish to add to what's already provided to us in relation to that?

10

**MR CRAIG:** Yes, we have a slide on that, I might just want to bring that up rather than ...

**MR CHILCOTT:** Is this in relation to the potential of that grouping down the track?

15

**MR CRAIG:** Yes, it's in relation to the potential, Michael, of that grouping. It's in relation to also, I guess, the discussions and dialogue that has led us to this point as well. So, as you'll note it's a large corner site, it has eight lots in total owned by eight different parties. So, it's quite a challenging portion of the site to bring everyone together. And in recognition of that, RTL Co. really did start early in negotiations with those landowners, quite a while before the SSD was lodged, so, you know, a good 12 months before the SSD was actually lodged.

20

There were multiple offers made to those owners. Four of them accepted at the time, four of them declined. But the four that accepted, they were all sporadic, you know, they weren't in a block, so they all over the shop and some people held out. So, it was very difficult to actually consolidate the land. And those negotiations ultimately broke down because those landowners were asking for prices that were well above market value to help them to move. And the offers that were made by RTL Co. were well above market value already, to try and motivate them to relocate, but they wanted even more than that.

25

30

Then it just got to a point where it was unrealistic to try and acquire them. So, RTL Co. had to make the decision, really, because they had acquired 2.3 hectares of land at significant cost, to move forward with the project. So, we did that. We had the RTS obviously come – oh sorry, the RFI came to us and asked us to explore that site isolation matter.

35

The team, Turner and the team then did a very detailed analysis on what could realistically be achieved on that site in the future, noting that it's eight properties, what could you do. We looked at obviously from a land use point of view, looked at it from a height and massing point of view, factored in the infill affordable housing bonuses that could be achieved on the site as well. And we pulled together a scheme that we think is a very realistic proposition for that site, and it shows that it can actually be delivered, and delivered in an orderly way in accordance with the requirements of the act and in accordance with the Land and Environment Court planning principles for site isolation.

40

45

5 So, we went through all of those tests and ultimately where we got to was that there is an opportunity to still redevelop these sites. They're not isolated, they can still get together if they want to. And I don't know if I'm speaking out of turn, but it's important to note that where we are at a point in time is that this development, it needs to be considered on its merits, and it doesn't preclude the possibility in the future if those owners are motivated to come back to the table and that site being wrapped up in the future. But that is something that is separate from this altogether.

10 But yes, so we've gone through a fairly long-winded process to get to that point. And I think RTL Co. have done everything in their power to try to make something happen, but it just hasn't happened for the purposes of this SSD.

15 **MR COMBLEY:** And I might just add that we have provided the State Government with the tracking record of those negotiations and offers made, as well as the two independent valuations undertaken for each.

20 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right, thank you. Just one question from me. I'll check with my colleagues in a moment. But given the discussion we were just having about conditions B1 and B2, and the implications of those for the design of the buildings adjacent to that corner block, G and D, and your response in relation to condition B1 concerning the toothed roof form, I think it's Building B that's there.

25 You'll see that your model there, your proposed model for that site for the corner block, contains the upper level, the long section along Sydenham Road, facing Sydenham Road and into the corner with Victoria. Is there anything you want or would like to comment on in relation to that?

30 **MR SZWAJ:** I can comment on this. In the response to the planning matters report, we've actually got a very detailed corner site study where we cover off a lot of technical matters, but also the ADG, and we provide an indicative layout per level from basement right to the rooftop. That level up there responds to the urban design about the setback to the upper levels. So, they are apartments in the top upper levels there. The language or the characterisation, although indicative, we've changed that to show the expression similar to the other Building D, which is sawtooth, that we understand that will be set back and of a similar nature.

40 Facing Building D are secondary windows or the lift core or fire stairs, because the primary outlook and aspect is obviously Victoria Road and Sydenham Road. The challenging part of this site which we've addressed and indicated in the planning, is solar access. And we've indicated through the mixed use nature of the site, it's MU1 and R4, that with the varied uses in there, similar to what we're doing for Timberyards and very similar to other sites within the Marrickville Inner West area. Having apartments, retail on the ground floor, co-living dwellings, the distribution through there and solar access and cross-ventilation, that being achieved to meet ADG requirements.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. I'll just open up to questions from my colleagues.

**MS GRANT:** Sorry, just to follow on from that. I was thinking Michael's question was going more along the lines of what does that top two storeys there do to the overshadowing of Wicks Park.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** Yes.

**MS GRANT:** So, it was –

10 **MR CHILCOTT:** And across the road.

**MR SZWAJ:** We actually, in that part of that lot's study, the corner site, we've included overshadowing and indicated the extent of that overshadowing to Wicks Park and to the adjacent sites there. So, that's included. I'd have to take it on notice what the difference is and whether our reductions at a top level would change that, with that in mind. So, we're happy to provide that information, if required.

15 **MR CHILCOTT:** If you could give some consideration to it and no doubt there'll be a response coming back to us in some form. But that would be helpful, the work that's been done and the discussions around those two conditions and their implications for the other buildings adjacent would indicate that some thought ought to be potentially given to that top element as well, that it would seem to be not consistent with the treatments that have now come forward for those – or are proposed in terms of your amendments to the conditions for those other buildings.

20 **MR CRAIG:** The only comment I'd make in that, the onus on us for this corner site is to demonstrate that there is a feasible proposition here for it to be developed from a site isolation point of view.

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** I don't seek to press it unduly. I just invite any consideration you've got in relation to that.

30 **MR CRAIG:** Sure, yes, understood.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. Shall we move on from that point. Suellen, are you okay?

35 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, good. Thanks.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Shall we move onto construction impact. It's obviously a key matter that you would have turned your mind to a lot because the site is in a busy and constrained part of Sydney. Again, I'll invite you to start to see whether there any particular comments and illustrations you wish to bring forward, or information you want to refine in relation to these matters.

40 **MR HILEY:** James Hiley from RTL Co. I think regarding the conditions of consent, as Ben mentioned, condition C1 does have some conditions imposed which would be difficult to implement to commence the project as soon as possible. So, there's some opportunity there to re-assess and we could put forward that in writing, what our

recommendation would be. Obviously, we would continue to comply with the requirements, it's just the timing they've provided.

5 With regards to site access, one of the great benefits of the development is that there's fantastic access internally of the site boundary. So, whilst we do have – so, this perspective here is probably looking southeast, so we can get our bearings right. That's Wicks Place across the road to the top left of the screen is park, so it's looking top of Farr Street.

10 We're looking to have a lot of our vehicular circulation within the site. There will be construction work zones established on Victoria Road, Farr Street and Sydenham for parts of the time in the project where it will become sort of the access through the centre of the site will no longer be available. There will be construction work zones around the perimeter but for the majority of the project, we'll be able to circulate  
15 through the centre part of the site.

20 The existing warehouse steel structure that's referred to there, that will be removed during demolition, which will open up our ability to service the site internally, and then be reinstated as part of the completion of public domain. So, Jonathon was just referring to those internal circulation routes for construction vehicles. And the positive is, the location of those access gates on Farr Street is already industrial in terms of the use of commercial. So, they aren't residential properties in those locations immediately affected by vehicle access and similarly, on Mitchell Street towards Victoria Road.

25 So, this is a couple of 3D animation slides which we refer to. Obviously, this is starting excavation of the basements on some of the perimeter buildings. And that's coming towards completion. And as I mentioned, that work zone, so we obviously understand there's state-owned roads and local government roads, and all those applications will be complied with and submitted in accordance with the CC's. But I think that's all I've  
30 got to provide on ...

**MR CRAIG:** Just to clarify, James, so what that actually means though is that all the holding areas for vehicles and that are not going to be parked on the street, they're going to be parked in the site.

35 **MR HILEY:** Yes. So, I think it's important to note regarding construction worker access, we will have that stipulated in our contracts. This will be viewed as like it's a CBD project where no construction workers will be expected to, or allowed to or encouraged to, drive to site to park. Obviously, one of the great benefits of the  
40 development is its location and connectivity to public transport. We'll be providing those instructions to our early works and main works contractors, that there's certainly no ability for construction workers to drive to site and it will not be encouraged and will be strongly advised to not do.

45 But there'll be, obviously to deliver material to site, yes, we'll be using the arterial roads and local roads. And we've already got those entrance and egress routes identified in our traffic plans by Ason.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. We will no doubt talk more about this when we're on site as well, in the site view. Suellen?

5 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, thanks, Michael. I was just going to ask, I didn't see anywhere in the docs where it talked about whether there was a school drop-off at the end of Farr Street for the primary school. Is there?

**MR HILEY:** Suellen – oh, you go.

10 **MR COMBLEY:** You go.

15 **MR HILEY:** As I mentioned and it was raised in our community consultation, and it was raised in the P&C, we'll be working closely with the school to make sure that there is negative aspect to that impacts during construction. Particularly with our larger quantities of vehicles accessing and egressing the site, we'll be making sure that we sort of align that to be opposite those key school drop-off times and pick-up times as well. But the adjacent street is where most of the drop-offs and pick-ups are done, to the north of the school.

20 **MS FITZGERALD:** Right, not Farr Street.

**MR CRAIG:** No, Suellen, the Farr Street access, I believe, is staff. The access is a gate which goes to staff car parking.

25 **MS FITZGERALD:** Yes, thanks for that. Yes, yes. It looked like a little car park from the aerial photographs. Okay, thank you for that.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

30 **MR CRAIG:** The main drop-off is off Chapel Street.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Mm-hm.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Juliet, you okay for questions?

35 **MS GRANT:** Yes, no questions, yes.

40 **MR CHILCOTT:** Can I just point out, we're sort of at the limit of where we did – gone back over a little bit where we envisaged being – we have a further meeting at midday. But there's more we need to get through on this agenda. Are you comfortable just progressing for another 10 minutes or so?

**MR COMBLEY:** Certainly.

45 **MR CHILCOTT:** Was that a yes, sorry?

[Multiple people say yes]

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. We then move onto traffic and parking. Again, there may be points you want to particularly raise. I think we were keen to hear about your Green Travel Plan. You've talked already a little bit about construction and operational parking, we'll have some discussions with the Department as well. And site access considerations. Any particular points you want to bring forward or you've prepared already?

**MR HAZEL:** Hi, Michael. Rhys here from Ason Group. Yes, look, obviously we ran through a detail preliminary Green Travel Plan as part of the submission. The site itself lends itself to reliance on that sort of scheme, and one will be further developed, obviously there's a condition of consent. They are important for these sites.

The travel made share for the demographic of people that will be occupying the buildings will be important. The parking rates we've applied are obviously the set compliant rates and they're quite low rates inherently, so that for a start encourages active and public transport use.

The way the Green Travel Plan is implemented for the various buildings will be important. And that's about prioritising active travel, the car pooling we have on the site that will be privately managed, 22 spaces on site. There's EV provision on 90% of those spaces to encourage the use of those spaces for sustainable means.

The public transport connections along Sydenham Road are important. But the Metro as it's operating today has meaningfully changed the area and how people travel to and from that area. But it will change in the second half of next year when that next stage to Bankstown is completed. And that cuts travel times, encourages that use.

What we did look at as well is the demographics of the area and where people work, the existing residents, and it's that economic corridor, basically, from Mascot through the CBD up to Macquarie Park. And that's where the Metro inherently travels. But in combination with buses, it's well linked in terms of public and active travel.

Other things like welcome packs, travel demand initiatives, and how they're implemented through a Travel Plan Coordinator, maintenance of that to update it when it's needed over time, and to engage with stakeholders will be similarly important.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. I'll just check with my colleagues if they have any particular further questions on traffic and parking at this point.

**MS FITZGERALD:** No, I don't. Thanks, Michael.

**MS GRANT:** No, I don't, thanks.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Note as well that Victoria Road's obviously an important corridor for bus traffic past the site.

**MR HAZEL:** Yes, and there's bus stops quite close to the site on both sides of Victoria.

5 **MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you. Moving into the back part of the agenda and looking at building separation and overshadowing. We've dealt a fair bit with that along the way, and your specific proposed amendments to those conditions of consent to address for some of these. Is there anything further you wanted to add on building separation that was helpful information?

10 **MR SZWAJ:** We're happy to talk about building separation, and there's a slide which is coming up now. During the assessment process, the Department identified some minor locations where the numerical requirements for separation varied. There's four locations between G and F, that is now being removed given that we've changed Building G and provided a terrace on the upper level there and set back the form.

15 Between E and F and then A and B, there's four levels. Level 5 to level 9, where we have some minor variations to the separation requirements. We are talking about apartments that have a dual aspect to Building B and E, so they can either look to the east or to the west in addition to the north. To mitigation those, we've provided external screens to the north to address any of those issues with potential privacy loss.

20 In terms of solar access, there's no change to those apartments, or cross-ventilation. So, the diagram there just demonstrates the levels that it relates to, and the mitigation measures that are being employed.

25 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right, no, it's helpful. Thank you. I'll ask Juliet and Suellen whether they have any particular further questions on building separation at this point. No? Thank you. And overshadowing we've talked a bit about. Is there anything further you wanted to add on overshadowing? I think we've probably dealt with most of the major considerations, from our side.

30 **MR COMBLEY:** Yes, nothing further to add, Michael. Thank you.

35 **MR CHILCOTT:** All right. Thank you. You've also made some comment in relation – if we move onto the next point, which is the Department's conditions of consent. You've made some commentary and you'll be providing some correspondence to us in relation to certain of the conditions of consent B1 and B2 and C1, I think it was. Anything further you wish to bring to our attention for discussion?

40 **MR CRAIG:** No, I mean, the only thing I would say to the Panel in sort of closing is that this is a project that is an amazing project that we're all super excited about. We've been on a journey here – I've been on a journey with this precinct since 2012 when we started the rezoning for this precinct. When it first happened in 2018 when we rezoned it, it was envisaged to be build-to-sell and envisaged to have streets that would be car-dominated and just be standard residential.

45 And then with RTL coming on board, what they – the proposition that they bring is something that's entirely different, and it's something that responds to the needs of Marrickville, to the needs of local community. To have 1,100 dwellings there that are entirely to build-to-rent and a mix of co-living of one's, two's, three's and four beds,



for BTR, for affordable, you just don't get this sort of project happening, really anywhere. This is the first of its kind in Australia and we're super proud to all be a part of that. And I think RTL Co. brought together an amazing team of designers and experts, many of which live locally in the area, so it's a passion project for everyone involved.

And we're really proud to be involved, and we've done – I think we've consulted with the community, we've listened to the community, we've listened to the Department, we really genuinely try to work within and with as many people as possible to deliver the best outcome. And you can see that in the changes that we're seeking to make. And you can see that in the fact the bonus that we're trying to achieve on the site, 89% of that bonus is being delivered as affordable.

So, just overall, I think this is a wonderful project for the area, it'll be transformative for the area. And yes, we just want to close on that. I don't know, Jono, if there's anything else you wanted to add but ...

**MR COMBLEY:** You said it well, Ben. Thank you.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right. Thank you. I'll just check with my colleagues whether they've got any final questions. Juliet or Suellen?

**MS GRANT:** No. Thank you very much for your time and for your presentation, everybody, that's very helpful.

**MR COMBLEY:** We appreciate your time today. Thank you, all.

**MR CHILCOTT:** And I'll just check with Jane and Tahlia. Anything that you need clarification on in relation to following up on the discussions we've had?

**MS JANE ANDERSON:** Nothing from me other than, Ben, we'll be in touch regarding your comments on the conditions.

**MR CHILCOTT:** Thank you.

**MS HUTCHINSON:** Nothing from me, thanks Michael.

**MR CHILCOTT:** All right. Thank you. Thanks, everybody.

[Multiple people say thank you]

**MR CHILCOTT:** We'll see some of you on site on Monday.

**MR CRAIG:** Monday, yes, will do.

**MR CHILCOTT:** And we're staying on this link, I think.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**