



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: NOVUS ON VICTORIA, CHATSWOOD – BUILD-TO-RENT
(SSD-63324208)**

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL: ANDREW MILLS (Chair)
SIMON SMITH

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON
GEOFF KWOK

**APPLICANT
REPRESENTATIVES:** JASON GOLDSWORTHY (Novus)
CHARLES MAXWELL (Novus)
ANIKA MIFSUD (Novus)
SCHANDEL FORTU (Colliers Urban Planning)
CRAIG BAUDIN (Fender Katsalidis)
DINAL SAVINDA (Fender Katsalidis)
RO IYER (Land + Form)
DUNCAN CORRIGALL (AJC)
DAMON JONES (Navigate)
DAVE SALANGSANG (Stantec)
ADRIAN DUNNETT (Solis Projects)

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 11:30AM – 12:30PM
WEDNESDAY, 21st JANUARY 2026

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

[Audio gap until 00:00:15]

5 **MR ANDREW MILLS:** I'll start with an opening statement and then we'll get underway. So, good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss Novus on Victoria, Chatswood – Build-to-Rent state significant development application (SSD-63324208) currently before the Commission for determination. Novus Management Pty Ltd proposes to demolish existing buildings and construct 260 build-to-rent units with a 46-storey top-shop
15 housing development – sorry, shop-top housing development – with retail on the ground and first level, two basement levels, and communal open space on the podium at 410 to 416 Victoria Avenue, Chatswood.

20 My name is Andrew Mills. I am Chair of the Commission and of this Panel, and I am joined by my fellow commissioner, Simon Smith. We are also joined by Jane Anderson and Geoff Kwok from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure 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.

30 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.

35 It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice, but following the meeting the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response. Any subsequent response or information
40 provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

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

Thank you. We can now begin. And perhaps from your side if I can ask for introductions for everyone involved. Thank you.

45 **MR CHARLES MAXWELL:** Thank you. And thanks everyone for joining today. My name is Charles Maxwell. I'm a Development Manager with Novus, looking after the project today. We have also, from the Novus side, got Jason Goldsworthy who is a

Co-Founder and the Chief Development Officer at Novus, and Anika Mifsud as well, who is the Assistant Development Manager working with me on the project.

We've also got a few members from the consultant team who were involved in preparing the SSDA with us. Those include Colliers Urban Planning, who are the town planners on the job. FK Architects, who prepared the architectural scheme. As well as a few other disciplines who will be available to take questions if more technical items come up from the likes of urban design, traffic, construction management and those sorts of things. But the presentation will be led today by myself, by Colliers Urban Planning and by Fender Katsalidis.

So, we might jump into it, unless there's anything further before we do that?

MR MILLS: That's great, thank you. If you don't mind, as you go through the presentation, if we jump in and ask questions as you go.

MR MAXWELL: Of course. Happy to do that. I'll just share my screen. We've got the presentation that we've prepared today. Can everybody see that?

MR CRAIG BAUDIN: Yes.

MR MAXWELL: We'll start by just providing a bit of an overview on Novus. So, for those who aren't aware, Novus is a specialist developer, owner and operator of purpose-built residential rental accommodation in Australia. We've got multiple projects across Sydney and Melbourne which are all focused on providing high quality, professionally managed rental housing options with high levels of service and amenity for our residents.

Novus on Victoria is one of our latest proposals in Sydney and represents a unique opportunity to unlock diverse, well-located housing in the heart of the Chatswood CBD. It's just 50 metres from the entrance to the Chatswood Transport Interchange which offers metro train and bus services at very high frequencies throughout Greater Sydney.

We wanted to start off by providing just a small amount of context on the history of the proposal. Novus on Victoria has been the subject of a significant and extensive consultation process with key stakeholders and authorities, including Willoughby Council, Government Architect, and the Department of Planning from inception.

That process started in late 2023, with the start of the competitive design excellence process. As part of that, we were requested by the authorities – being the Government Architect, the Council and the Department of Planning – to prepare a site-specific urban design study, which was to set the parameters for what would ultimately become the baseline for the design excellence process.

The design excellence – sorry, the urban design study was completed by AJC Architects and that was in consultation with those key authorities, and developed and agreed upon set of parameters which informs the preparation and endorsement of the

design excellence strategy, the architectural reference scheme which informs the design competition brief, the endorsed competition outcome which was selected by a panel of three jurors, and ultimately the development application that was lodged with the Department of Planning.

Throughout that process, there was continual and iterative engagement and refinement with Council, Government Architect and the Department, as well as the Design Integrity Panel, to make sure that the proposal represented an appropriate contextual response to the site, which achieves design excellence and responded to the strategic imperatives of each stakeholder.

That all culminated in the lodgement of the development application last year, which has now been subject to assessment by the Department of Planning. I'll pass over to Schandel Fortu now from Colliers Urban Planning, who will talk through the context of the proposal and the key items that were assessed in the Department's Assessment Report.

MS SCHANDEL FORTU: Great. Thanks, Charlie. Schandel Fortu from Colliers Urban Planning, so the planning consultant. In terms of the project context, obviously looking at the project by Novus on Victoria, and there are two key planning sort of reform instruments that guide the development of the site.

So, first of all, in February 2021 we had the introduction of the Build-to-Rent Housing Provisions that allowed build-to-rent housing within the three business zones, which have now been reclassified to E2 zones. So, this site is zoned E2. And then we had the Willoughby LEP amendment which came in, in June 2023, which formulated the planning controls that allow greater building height and density on sites within the Chatswood CBD.

So, the subject site that we're looking at today, it was rezoned to the E2 zone and it's subject to a maximum building height of RL 246.8, with no maximum floor space ratio control. And as Charlie mentioned, the site is extremely well located in terms of its accessibility to public transport being 50 metres walking distance from the Chatswood Transport Interchange.

Just moving through to strategic context. I think you're well aware that there's a very strong drive to deliver housing. So, 377,000 well-located homes are needed over the next five years, and our project very much aligns with those objectives of the National Housing Accord. And the site being located within Chatswood, Chatswood has an exceptionally low rental vacancy rate of 1.8%. There's very much a need for more rental accommodation within this centre.

So, this project ideally delivers 260 well-located homes, which aligns with all the key policies of government down from the – starting at the top from the National Housing Accord down to the Greater Sydney Region Plan, the new draft Sydney Plan, Northern District Plans, Willoughby Local Strategic Planning Statement, and very much better placed.

In terms of the key planning controls, I won't labour on this too much because I've already mentioned them. But we do have a land use zone of E2 Commercial Centre, build-to-rent accommodation being permissible by virtue of the Housing SEPP, the 246.8 AHD maximum building height. There is no maximum floor space ratio provisions. We don't have any heritage restrictions on the site. There is no affordable housing minimum delivery on this site.

It is impacted by two sun access provisions, there are two protected areas and we cannot create any additional overshadowing of those open spaces, and we'll get into that in a bit more detail. There's a no minimum lot size control. Design excellence is required for the development proposed on this site, and that process has been completed.

The only other relevant LEP provision is a maximum street wall height of 7 metres. Now, we do actually breach that 7-metre wall height and we will get into that in a bit more detail. Just in a minor way, and we have submitted with the application what's called the clause 4.6 variation request and provided the necessary justification based on a contextual response to the design on the site.

And in terms of our agenda, we would like to just provide some comments about the DPHI Assessment Report. Very much we are aligned with the outcomes that are put forward in the DPHI Assessment Report. The development is very much permissible with consent, it is within the maximum building height limit that's set for the site, we have gone through the design excellence process, the design competitive process and satisfied those requirements and sought endorsement for design excellence.

The development provides a built form which is very much compatible with the character of the future of Chatswood CBD. We don't result in any unreasonable overshadowing, privacy impacts on the adjoining development nor the public domain.

The proposal achieves the necessary active street frontages and has sought to minimise the impact of vehicular movements and minimised the number of vehicles provided on the site to minimise vehicle movement impacts. The proposal provides the commercially managed build-to-rent floor space as well as retail activation, which will generate additional economic activity.

So, there are at the end of our presentation, some proposed amendments to some of the conditions of consent within the DPHI report. We have provided a letter in advance of this meeting to get to the sort of nitty-gritty of those proposed changes, and we will talk through those at the end of this presentation as well.

Now, moving through to the key issues. So, we do have up on the screen an executive summary of the key issues and we will deep dive into each of these issues, presenting the full package of information about our proposal.

Some of the key issues that have been raised include the setbacks and built form. The proposal is compliant with the statutory planning controls that apply, and it doesn't

result in any additional overshadowing of those two protected public open spaces that the site could impact within the Chatswood CBD.

5 The proposal complies with the maximum building height. The massing and setbacks have been the subject of extensive consultation process that began with the design excellence brief and an additional urban design study that we've completed. And the proposed outcome delivers a high level of residential amenity that takes into consideration the future occupants of our building but also surrounding buildings.

10 The proposed setbacks really have taken on board a contextual approach to ensuring that the right outcome is achieved for the site. The extent of commercial floor space proposed within the site, so there's actually no minimum non-residential floor space requirement within the statutory planning instruments for this site. But our development does provide over 1,100 square metres of both ground floor and first
15 level (level 1, first floor) non-residential uses. And it does provide the mandatory activation of street frontages, provides great outcomes in terms of public domain activation and streetscaping improvements, all generating great employment and economic opportunities at the site.

20 **MR MILLS:** So, can I just stop there and just dwell on that point for a moment. Do I understand from what you're saying that the 1,101 square metres of ground floor and level 1 non-residential uses, that's just simply, we're talking mainly that retail space. Is that what we're effectively referring to here?

25 **MS FORTU:** Yes, that's right. Yes.

MR MILLS: Sorry, I was just thrown a little bit, because it's a similar number in terms of the open space, common open space as well.

30 **MS FORTU:** Oh, right.

MR MILLS: And it just troubled me – hang on, I was conflating things, so apologies. Do continue.

35 **MS FORTU:** Sure, yes. So, it's within the ground floor and level 1 uses, that's right.

40 In terms of the overshadowing, view loss and visual impact, the proposal is generally aligned with the built form that's been envisaged by the planning controls for the site, and it does not result in any unacceptable overshadowing, visual privacy or view loss impacts.

45 Traffic, car parking and servicing. So, the ground floor has been refined since the original submission of the state significant application, to provide really efficient loading and servicing vehicle access strategy, and that aligns with the requirements of a build-to-rent management. There's minimal car dependency and traffic generation coming out of the site. And there's uninterrupted emergency access and operation of the Chatswood Mall Markets.

5 In terms of Post Office Lane, we will get into this in a bit more detail, but there have been some refinements to really improve the interface with Post Office Lane. The ground floor has been refined to make sure that there's efficient loading and to enhance prioritising pedestrian access along Post Office Lane. And the proposal provides a concept design to upgrade Victor Street public domain, which is to be further developed in consultation with Council.

10 In terms of waste management, the proposal before you is for private waste collection, and that very much aligns with the build-to-rent management and operational model, which is actually the most effective way to manage waste within the site. Because of the site constraints and being located right within that CBD, we believe that is the right proposal for this development.

15 I'll just hand over now to the FK team to talk in a bit more detail about the setbacks and built form. Thank you.

20 **MR BAUDIN:** Thank you. It's Craig Baudin here from FK. We're just going to cover some of the setbacks and built form aspects. As mentioned earlier in this presentation, there was an independent study commissioned to inform the design competition around how the built form might allow for equitable development of this part of Chatswood. There's a numbers of sites that are potentially inter-related in terms of how their built form might interact, and also the related, you know, urban design and ADG implications for various typologies, and that's illustrated on this diagram on the right-hand side.

25 I think as noted on the slide here, the key focus areas was a zero lot setback to the west of the subject site, which would allow an abuttal for a future adjoining development to our west, which would preserve the developability of both sites in terms of development of this part of the Chatswood CBD in a consolidated built form which will be consistent with the planning framework.

30 The podium was envisaged as being a built-to-boundary condition which was seen as being in accordance with the planning framework and consistent with the surrounding built form in context of this part of the Chatswood CBD. There were minor tower setback variances which we reviewed in this urban design study to deliver more viable floor plates. And I think if we go to the next slide, there's a bit more detail here on what that outcome is in terms of detailed outcomes.

35 So, we have to Victoria Avenue and to Victor Street, so the northern tower setback and the eastern tower setback at 6 metres, this tower setback was seen as being consistent with the minimum 6-metre setback control set out in the Willoughby DCP and aligned with the urban design study and the design excellence competition that was held based on these criteria to maintain those outcomes. As mentioned before, a nil podium setback to respect not only the DCP but also to the predominant built form with this part of Chatswood.

40 To Post Office Lane again, a nil podium setback, and no minimum tower setback was mapped within the DCP either. But a 5-metre tower setback was proposed to facilitate

adequate tower separation between the proposal and any adjacent future development to the south.

This approach was afforded by the urban design study and was reflected in the design excellence competition outcome which our team submitted.

To the west, a nil setback was anticipated, so effectively an abuttal condition which would then allow a variety of built forms to be developed on the western site. If we head to the next slide, the urban design study, I think it might be the slide after this, contemplated a number of different outcomes which we will get to.

But before we get to that, in terms of the outcomes of these typical setbacks were also studied in terms of their visual reading within the streetscape. So, there's a series of white card models on the screen here. On the left-hand side, we have the DCP tower setbacks with an 80-degree field of view on the top, and a 40-degree field of view on the bottom. This is on Victoria Avenue looking towards the Metro and the Transport Interchange.

You can see here between the left and the right, the comparison of the DCP tower setbacks, which was anticipated with a 1:20 ratio versus the 6-metre minimum setback requirement in the Willoughby DCP. The view from these studies was that the 1:20 ratio adherence would have a negligible impact on the pedestrian experience of that tower form above the podium. And that a 6-metre setback would be an appropriate outcome. And you can see from the two views on the bottom are slightly closer views that the reading of the 1:20 setback versus the 6-metre setback is negligible. And the 6-metre setback would allow for a developable and more viable floor plate.

If we go to the next slide, which I alluded to before, this is really looking at development scenarios where a western setback of zero metres or a zero setback would be applied in an abuttal condition between the two tower forms. Looking at either a commercial scenario to the west, a hotel scenario to the west or a build-to-rent or residential living sector type development to the west.

In each case, it was determined that a viable development scenario could be developed with the setbacks and urban design outcomes being anticipated in the urban design study that was commissioned. And these envelopes would then form part of the design excellence competition which our firm submitted for and were subsequently successful in.

And I think the next slide is just a – I think this was touched on briefly as well. The Victoria Avenue street wall height has a 7-metre LEP maximum height, which is at odds with the predominant built form context of a two-storey street wall with allowance for reasonable floor-to-floor heights for a non-residential use like retail or commercial. We believe that 7 metres really is non-viable for any kind of two-storey retail or even non-residential use. Hence, the design competition winning scheme and the scheme that was lodged for the SSDA adopted a higher street wall height, which was subject to the clause 4.6 submission.

I think that is it for that section. I'll hand over to the next speaker.

MS FORTU: Yes, that's back to me. Thank you, appreciate that. I won't labour on this too much because I really just have a couple of points to make, and this is about the extent of commercial floor space.

So, we've got some extracts there which show you from a high level the extent of non-residential floor space, the commercial floor space within the development. So, we are located within the E2 Commercial Core Zone, build-to-rent housing being permissible within that zone by virtue of the provisions of the Housing SEPP. There is no minimum requirement for non-residential floor space. Notwithstanding that, we are providing 1,101 square metres within the ground level and level 1.

And just confirming that build-to-rent development is very much aligned with both state and federal levels of government, including the National Housing Accord, as well as the provisions within the Housing SEPP, Sydney Region Plan and Northern District Plan.

Thank you.

MR DINAL SAVINDA: Yes, I'm Dinal Savinda from FK. I'll talk a little bit about the overshadowing and the shadow analysis we have done in detail on the neighbouring residential buildings.

So, we identified the living rooms, and we mapped out and modelled all these residential buildings in the neighbourhood. And from our analysis, we discovered only two residential buildings are impacted by our proposal, and they're quite minimal impacts. And these two buildings, they will maintain 1.6 to 1.8 hours of solar access in mid-winter between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m.

And these outcomes are still similar to what would be from a compliant DCP envelope as well. So, if you just go to the next slide please, you can see our tower form is a slender, tall tower form, which is in line with Chatswood CBD strategy and also our height is under the Willoughby LEP height limit as well.

Yes, so on that basis, I think the proposal has very minor impacts on overshadowing and any impacts on residential buildings.

MS FORTU: Thanks for that. I'll just turn to the issue of view loss and visual impact. In terms of the View Impact Assessment, we undertook quite a rigorous exercise of identifying the buildings, which you can see on this extract map provided, of identifying the buildings where views were subject to impact and analysing within the buildings where those views are obtained and the impact to those views.

We then undertook our assessment on the View Impact Assessment in accordance with the Tenacity outlined process which is the four-step process assessing the views that are impacted, what part of the property are those views gained from, assessing the

extent of the impacts, and then understanding and assessing the reasonableness of the impacts that it's causing by the proposal.

5 The view impacts are, for a majority, a moderate impact. There is complete acceptance there is a view change, but whether the view loss is acceptable, it has been found to be acceptable. And most of the views that are obtained from most buildings are actually views that don't contain prominent elements or iconic features, aside from one of the views where there is a slight impact, but that is detailed in the DPHI Assessment Report which we are aligned with the outcomes of that.

10 So, the view impact overall has been determined and considered to be acceptable. The view sharing outcome is a reasonable outcome, very much anticipated by development that is going to occur within the Chatswood CBD, there will be impacts and view changes that will occur as a result of that.

15 But part of the reasonableness test is understanding whether there is compliance with the planning controls that apply to the site. And as I mentioned previously, we are fully in compliance with the maximum building height control, and so the anticipated built form outcomes that are anticipated in the Chatswood CBD, we are aligned with those.

20 So, the proposal has been determined that it can be supported on view impact grounds without further amendment. And just reinforcing some of the DPHI Assessment Report, the findings were just summarised here, the proposal complies with the maximum building height control and has been assessed against the envelope provisions within the Willoughby DCP. And any development of the site would result in similar impacts. Existing views from the affected properties are already partially obstructed, and with district views remaining unaffected in some instances. The view impacts are reasonable, as I mentioned, in the context of a growing Chatswood CBD and very much anticipated by those planning controls that are in place.

30 And our proposal is very much a slender tower form, so therefore some of the visual impacts, the view impacts are minimised by that slender form. And it's very much been informed by the design excellence process, so resulting in a high-quality urban outcome, representing a skilful design.

35 In terms of the visual presentation to the public domain, we've just got some extracts of the eastern elevation, western elevation, northern elevation, how the building is to be viewed. But the proposal is compliant with the key statutory planning outcomes. And it's consistent with the contextual analysis and the built form outcomes that are anticipated within the Chatswood CBD context.

40 In terms of the parking provision and traffic. So, we do have a one accessible car-share space which is to be provided, and that's to be made available for the residents. We have to complement that, provided really extensive bicycle parking, which is in excess of the Willoughby DCP parking requirements.

45 So, the parking provision on the site is aligned with Council's Integrated Transport Strategy and that's all driving at reducing private care reliance. So, as noted, some of

the key takeaways within the DPHI Assessment Report, the site is extremely well connected in terms of those, you know, there are multiple transport options. The site is very much focused on a pedestrian active environment, which reduces vehicular demand.

5

The proposal aligns with Council's objectives to reduce car dependency, and the strong bicycle parking provision will create those opportunities for people to rely on active transport options. The proposal is consistent with strategic transport directions and very much unlikely to have any impact on the CBD in terms of on-street parking. I mean, it's anticipated that if you are coming to rent an apartment here, that you will be heavily reliant on public transport options and active transport options that are available to you.

10

And just in summary, our Traffic Impact Assessment has been able to confirm that the proposal will have negligible to no additional car movements during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods.

15

MR SIMON SMITH: Schandel, just before you pass over the bike parking. Can I ask, is it intended that electricity will be provided for recharging of electric bikes in that area?

20

MS FORTU: I might ask Charlie if he can jump in there.

MR MAXWELL: Yes, sure, I can answer that. We typically do provide areas where bike charging can take place in our buildings. We usually consolidate it into one sort of common shared space, typically within the basement, just to manage the overall charging process and potential risks associated with that. But yes, that is a typical provision in our projects across our portfolio.

25

MR SMITH: Yes, it's just a minor point, it just seems like there's a lot more e-bikes than ordinary bikes these days.

30

MR MAXWELL: Yes.

MR SMITH: And so there would be a demand and if there was no power supplied, then a lot of bikes would be going up in the lifts.

35

MR MAXWELL: Yes, that's right. No, across our portfolio, our approach is to generally restrict the charging of e-bikes within the apartments and require residents to do it within a shared bicycle charging area within the basement or in a basement room.

40

MR SMITH: Thank you.

MR MILLS: Just on a follow up in relation to that. There has been some controversy about certain e-bikes and other rechargeable lithium-based batteries setting fire. Is there adequate, I guess, sectioning off of that charging area, fire control, things that are designed into that having regard to the risks?

45

5 **MR MAXWELL:** Yes, so the details of, I suppose, the specific design elements would typically come as part of our detailed design process post consent. But it's certainly something that we consider upfront and intend to implement to make sure that any bicycle charging that happens within the site is done safely. And that if something does go wrong, then the appropriate measures are in place to manage it.

MR MILLS: Okay, thank you.

10 **MR SMITH:** Do you have any other projects that have one or zero parking spaces?

MR MAXWELL: Not in the Novus portfolio. There is a project in the Sydney CBD, the Indi Sydney Project, which is an over-station development above the Gadigal Metro Station which similarly provides zero car parking for residents of the residential component there.

15 **MR SMITH:** And what's your research on your future residents who might be wanting to live in a two or three-bedroom apartment? I mean, are there plenty of customers who want to live there who are happy to not have a car?

20 **MR MAXWELL:** Yes, so I view is that, particularly given the location of this site, 50 metres from the Metro and similarly for that project I mentioned in the Sydney CBD, residents in this area are generally happy to be heavily reliant on the use of public transport. Particularly when something like the Sydney Metro is available which provides very fast and high-frequency transport throughout Sydney.

25 There likely will be residents who this building won't be suitable for, if they do require use of a car. But notwithstanding that, there's still going to be significant demand from people who are happy to forego the use of private vehicles. Noting that we will also have the use of the car-share scheme available on site, and there are also other opportunities for active transport and alternate car-share schemes available throughout the Chatswood CBD as well.

30 **MR SMITH:** Yes, okay, thank you.

35 **MR JASON GOLDSWORTHY:** I think just – sorry, Jason Goldsworthy, Co-Founder and Chief Development Officer at Novus. I think just adding a little bit more context to Novus' portfolio. So, we typically offer car parking between, you know, zero or one car space up until about 0.4 to 1. And that really just depends on its proximity to transportation.

40 So, a project down in Melbourne that's operational, that had 0.15 to 1 car parking. That's fully stabilised, fully leased, and that is actually on a tram route so it's not actually near the train station, but it's actually within close proximity to the Melbourne CBD.

45 Parramatta, we're on the fringe of the CBD, so we're offering a little bit more car parking there. Same with Burwood, we're a little bit further away from the train station so we offer a little bit more car parking. Epping is a project that we're probably

offering a little bit more because that's in a very, I guess, school catchment heavy area, so we've got more two beds and three-bedroom apartments to really cater for that.

5 But really, the predominant unit mix within this building is studios and one beds, which aren't going to necessitate the demand for those car spaces.

10 **MR MILLS:** Just in relation to that, can I turn and ask, because it's something that also concerns me, the two to three bedroom – there's still 66 two and three-bedroom apartments proposed for the development. And just hearing you in terms of those, that kind of design. Obviously, I think there's an acknowledgement that it will discourage people who want to use a car from meeting in this particular building.

15 Nonetheless, the need for a car from time to time might be higher than, for example, studio or one-bedroom apartment dwellers. So, that would then have an impact potentially, I guess, on the egress of vehicles or the accessibility of vehicles to potentially be either delivered, to be shared or what have you. Or for that matter, vehicles being hired for purposes of bringing in furniture and other kinds of things, the impact there as well.

20 Has that been taken into consideration? I know that there is intended to be a plan in relation to the egress, and I may be moving into something that I know has exercised Simon's mind as well.

25 **MR GOLDSWORTHY:** So, because it's a managed building and we have on-site staff, we're very much, I guess, aligned with our future residents in terms of that move-in/move-out process because that is a bit of a pinch-point when people come and occupy our buildings. So, it is a managed process. Now, that is booked in ahead of time, it's coordinated, it's scheduled, the on-site team helps with that.

30 So, yes, there may be a need for someone to hire a moving vehicle to move some furniture in, but that is something that we can coordinate and something that we do assist with. And that's clearly evident with our operational building down in Melbourne where there was, I think there ended up being about 10% of the occupants opted into that service. Otherwise, they moved in, utilising that loading vehicle or
35 loading dock within their allocated time slot.

40 Similarly, with the waste management, again, that is coordinated with the whole move-in/move-out process and of course because we've got that retail space there, there's going to need to be some due consideration as to how that operates and intertwines with the residents. But because we own 100% of the building, as per the requirements of build-to-rent in E2, it very much is a managed and coordinated response to ensure that all the loading, I mean, particularly for the site, is all happening internal and doesn't have an effect on the surrounding neighbouring buildings.

45 **MR SMITH:** Just to follow up a bit deeper in that. So, that sounds very encouraging, the management system for moving in and moving out and the waste collection and so forth. Is there – I noticed that you've requested the removal of a condition, I forgot the

number, I've got here the one that talks about all vehicles to be wholly contained on site before stopping.

I guess, firstly, I wanted to ask about if you're able to manage those sorts of movements, but you can't manage when Amazon want to just turn up and deliver some goods to some of your residents or when, you know, some other kind of random delivery generated by some other provider occurs. How is that – what's going to happen if I'm the Amazon guy in a white van and I've got a parcel to deliver to one of your residents. How am I going to deliver that?

MR MAXWELL: I can talk to that. So, in terms of the first item which was the adjustment to that consent condition, that request is mainly related to the design of the vehicular entry point on Victor Street, which was developed during the assessment process with Council and the Department.

Where we ended up, which was to maximise the activation and also to avoid potential CPTED issues by creating void spaces where visibility is reduced, we have a chamfered entry point on the corner of Victor Street. The intention is that for deliveries that are expected and scheduled, we would be able to have the loading dock ready and available so that vehicles could drive straight in.

But in instances where the roller shutter is closed, for example, that may require a vehicle to stop partially in the driveway while building management opens the roller shutter. So, really, the proposed amendment there was to cover situations like that, to, I suppose, more appropriately consider the operation of the building and the design that has been put forward and recommended for consent.

In terms of unexpected deliveries, if the loading bay is not in use, there would be an intercom system available for vehicles to enter. If not, there are loading zones on street nearby within the Chatswood CBD. So, it would be treated similarly to a delivery to any other building in that area – those drivers would just have to find a loading zone or a parking bay where they are able to legally stop, come out and make the delivery to the building and then go back to their car and exit the area.

That's good. So, just going back to the change of condition that you requested. So, you've requested the removal of that condition.

MR MAXWELL: Yes.

MR SMITH: Just explain exactly – so, I've seen the rendering of that part of the building, and it shows the Hansen doorway or gate or roller door you called it to control the access to the logistics area. So, how could you run something that looks like that and meet that condition? I mean, like I'm assuming that condition implies to me that you've got off-street open area where a vehicle can just drive in and stop, but there isn't space to do that at the current [cross-talk 00:43:51].

MR MAXWELL: That's right, and that's really driven by the constraints of this site. It is a relatively constrained and small footprint that we're dealing with. So, the design

has been developed to accommodate SRV loading, waste collection and those sorts of activities with a turntable in it. To provide an off-street stopping bay, when we take into account the structural considerations and column locations, the location of the lift core, we already do have quite a lot of complicated structural transfers happening in that zone to get the current arrangement to work and facilitate that off-street loading and waste collection. So, it's unlikely to be viable to have a separate stopping or pull-in bay within the site boundary to facilitate that.

So, the adjustment that we proposed to that condition effectively just enables vehicles to stop in the driveway and call the intercom and wait for a very short period of time whilst the gate can be opened and access can be facilitated.

MR SMITH: So, when you say you have on-site management, is that 24 by 7 or just business hours only or, like, is there someone there all the time or ...?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: So, if business hours, we'll call it from 7 in the morning till 7 at night. Outside of those hours, it's a very, we rely on technology for these buildings to really, I guess, put the control back with the residents but also kind of reduce that management burden as well.

So, for a delivery, for instance, our building down in Melbourne, they get access codes into our building. So, for someone who rocked up outside of those business hours, they would effectively get an access code, punch it into the intercom, it would then allow them to enter and then make their delivery and then exit.

MR SMITH: Right. Because they used the phone to talk to someone somewhere else who will give them the code, is that how it works or ...?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: No, no, no. So, it would be an access code that's given – so, all deliveries, so after a period of time, because there's only effectively a handful of courier companies, they basically get registered on our system and they each have their own individualised access code to the building and that would effectively be passed on and utilised each time that they access the building outside of those building hours.

MR SMITH: Okay. Great, that's good, thank you.

MS FORTU: Just moving through to Post Office Lane, vehicular access and the design refinements that we've undertaken to improve the amenity within Post Office Lane. So, you'll see on the left, the extract diagram of the ground floor which showed the original design competition winning scheme that we submitted as part of the SSDA. And then to the right, you'll see the response to submission scheme where we included design refinement to relocate that access to provide the improvements to Post Office Lane.

And essentially, the refinements are really aimed at prioritising pedestrian movements. So, removing traffic from Post Office Lane, and the activation to Post Office Lane, that's within the retail kiosk and the greenery that's added within that location, maintaining emergency access along Post Office Lane and Victor Street, and reduced

basement parking, which significantly reduces the vehicle movements and therefore assists with improving pedestrian safety and amenity within that area.

5 So, the refined scheme, as you see it now, also seeks to preserve the operation of the Chatswood Mall Markets during construction and then after completion when the building is fully operational.

10 And then just the last matter related to waste management. So, as I've previously mentioned, the site is proposed to be serviced by SRV, which is a private waste collection. So, we did look at all available options to obtain the heavy-rigid vehicle access and it's just not feasible in this location. Not only because of the site itself but the surrounding network and being able to access within the site. There has been supported private waste collection on other build-to-rent developments within Chatswood, Novus' other project, and it's very much supported within the DPHI
15 report, acknowledge that it is a constrained site, heavy-rigid vehicles can't access the site.

20 Having waste collection designed to reduced vehicle movements and preserve the pedestrianisation of Post Office Lane is seen as a priority, which we've been able to meet with the refined scheme. And the nature of the proposal as we've mentioned, having that on-site build-to-rent management really lends itself to being able to successfully manage private waste collection, minimising interruption to the surrounding network. And it's very much aligned with everything that goes on within the Chatswood CBD.

25 So, if the Council fleet were to change from that HRV down to a smaller vehicle, which may actually happen within a high-density area such as the Chatswood CBD, then that could be accommodated within the site in the future, if that became necessary.

30 **MR SMITH:** And how many waste truck movements a week do you think there would be?

35 **MR MAXWELL:** Off the top of my head, I don't know the answer to that. We do have a Waste Management Plan that's been prepared that we lodged alongside the application. So, we can go away and get that number and send it through to you for consideration.

40 **MR SMITH:** No, that's fine, if you've already done a plan, I'll be reviewing that. That'll be attached to your EIS, I guess, no, that's fine.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, that's right, yes.

45 **MR SMITH:** Thank you.

MR MILLS: I probably should know this, it's probably contained again in the EIS and attachments, but how do the residents get their waste down to the collection point?

MR MAXWELL: There'll be waste chutes located on every residential floor. So, residents will drop their – there'll be a general waste chute and a recycling shoot, as well as on each floor a recycling cupboard for larger bulky cardboard boxes and things like that.

So, for a resident, they'll take their general waste and recycling to the chute and drop it down. Or if it doesn't fit, they'll leave the box in the cardboard cupboard, which will be collected by on-site building management staff regularly to make sure that those cupboards are emptied.

MR SMITH: Thank you.

MS FORTU: And lastly, I think Charlie, I'll hand over to you to talk through the comments on the draft – sorry, the recommended conditions.

MR MILLS: Before we go there, can I ask a couple of questions in particular around the ADG variations?

MR MAXWELL: Of course, yes.

MR MILLS: I understand that what you're proposing is that – quite a number of them actually, and the apartment size in particular the studios down to as low as 27 square metres and other apartment sizes as well, reduced storage, the reduced private open space. Of course, we just spoke about car parking. And the lifts were the other one.

It does strike me as there is, I guess, any one of those by themselves you might go, yes, I understand, in terms of the other things. But the cumulative impact on the amenability of the apartments and the studios, would you want to make comment on that and the demand that ...?

MR MAXWELL: Yes, we're happy to talk to that. As a build-to-rent project, we do have a significant amount of communal space which is provided within the building. So, I guess starting from the bottom on level 2, there is a significant wellness facility, so a pool with an outdoor terrace area, gym facilities, yoga, all located on that floor, so it's a whole floor dedicated to residential amenity.

On the top of the podium, we then have another residential amenity space which includes things like co-working, a pet park and a pretty large outdoor terrace space there. We then have, on this project, a mid-rise plant floor which is on level 23. We didn't require the entire floor for plant uses, so there's actually further amenity located there in the form of an outdoor terrace and multi-purpose sports area.

And then up on the top floor of the building, there's a whole floor dedicated to co-working, residents communal lounge and the like. So, throughout the building, there is a very significant amount of both internal and external communal space which is going to be available for residents.

There are amendments or variations rather proposed to some of the ADG controls like apartment sizing and balcony sizing which you mentioned. But on the whole, the apartments have been designed with maximum functionality and utility in mind to make sure that residents are getting a functional and high-quality layout. And where there is a shortfall in the numerical ADG guidance for internal apartment areas and also balcony sizes, those are more than made up for by the level of communal space which is made available to the residents.

So, we have done an analysis on that, I believe, in the EIS documentation that was lodged, and there's a little bit of detail around that there and how the communal spaces do make up for any proposed variation to the ADG guidance.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I think I'd also further say, build-to-rent is a different form of housing that is currently contemplated under the ADG and mainly off-the-plan apartments. The ADG was really created to protect that future purchaser and making sure that they've got a high degree of, you know, what they're buying is fit for purpose.

For build-to-rent, you effectively go and inspect the apartment, if you don't like it, you're not going to rent it. So, the onus is on us to make sure that our product is fit for purpose. And the opportunity with build-to-rent is about creating, I guess, diversity and more choice for people by enabling us to deliver some slightly smaller apartments which come at a cheaper price point. So, it then starts to hit that affordability angle as well, now it's not affordable housing, but it becomes more affordable for people.

So, for instance, the studios in our project down in Melbourne and the one-bedrooms, they are by far the most popular product for people. And we have a waitlist for the studio project at that particular project.

MR MILLS: And are they of similar size?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. And similarly with the one-bedrooms and the two-bedrooms, we want to make sure that there's enough diversity within that subset studio. So, there will be smaller studios, larger studios, to make sure that you're catering for people's different needs and preferences, because everyone's got a different preference.

MS FORTU: And I think that point exactly is, you know, that the ADG applies but the provisions within the Housing SEPP say there are these areas where flexibility can be contemplated within a build-to-rent development. And those are exactly the areas, you know, based on ground-truthed experienced but also based on the flexibility that's embedded within the planning provisions where we have sought to leverage and deliver a development which is based on the future community that's wanting to move into this building.

MR MILLS: Are you open in that case to – sorry, Simon.

MR SMITH: No, you go ahead.

MR MILLS: I was just going to say, that does go to the size, the reduced size and the number of things. But the lifts, going from a standard of 1 to 40 to 1 to 87, is the impact end up with a lot of queuing in the vestibule areas and things like that?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: I mean, I think, Charlie, we've got a detailed lift analysis which kind of talks to that.

MR MAXWELL: Yes, yes, that's right. We have done that – we did that right at the inception of the concept design phase. Because I suppose, similar to the train of thought that Jason was talking about in terms of the apartment layouts and the marketability of those, it is an operational concern for us to make sure that residents aren't having to queue unreasonably for lift and that wait times are appropriate.

So, we've done lifting analysis with our vertical transport engineer to confirm that the provision of lifts in this project is appropriate. Notwithstanding the variants to the ADG guideline, we're comfortable that there won't be long wait times for lifts for this project.

MR MILLS: Okay. Simon, sorry.

MR SMITH: No, that's fine.

MR MAXWELL: I'm just conscious of time. So, in terms of the consent conditions, we did put forward a number of proposed amendments in the letter that we sent to the IPC. Those are primarily focused on making sure that the, I guess, construction certificate timing is viable and responds to the setup that was put forward in the definitions of the conditions of consent.

So, unless there's any specific questions on most of these, I won't go into detail on this letter, but we did specifically want to note condition D7, which seeks to impose fixed respite periods for certain works, which are over and above the standard construction hours. We view this as relatively onerous because it will result in quite a few challenges around resourcing and sequencing of activities on site. And it's also not consistent with the recommendations of the acoustic engineer that was set out in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment that we lodged alongside the application.

That report includes a number of recommendations that specify that the standard construction hours in the draft consent should apply to all works. But D7 does seek to impose further restrictions which will impact on our activities on site and likely delay the delivery of housing.

Noise and vibration impacts are best managed through the implementation of continuous monitoring and a complaints procedure which is all set out in the NVIA, rather than the imposition of arbitrary controls through consent conditions. It's also worth noting that recent approvals by Council and the IPC in the Chatswood CBD don't impose conditions similar to this, with all those works being approved to occur

within the standard construction hours. And we did set out numerous examples of those precedents in our letter that we sent through to the IPC.

5 So, to acknowledge those recommendations in the NVIA and protect the amenity of surrounding receivers via the recommendations that the acoustic engineer has put forward, and also to align with those precedents, our view is that condition D7 should be removed. Which will enable the project to be delivered in a timely manner and a viable manner and also acknowledge the monitoring requirements and other measures that are put forward to address potential impacts in the NVIA.

10 So, that was everything we had for the formal presentation. I'm aware that we've gone slightly over time, but if there are any questions, we're happy to address those now.

15 **MR SMITH:** If we could just go back on the matter you just concluded with, the condition on noise or noisy activities. I think one of the important nearby land uses is the markets, which I think are on Thursday to the weekend, aren't they?

MR MAXWELL: Yes, yes.

20 **MR SMITH:** And so, most of that sort of work that I've heard is pretty noisy, like that's going to have a significant impact on the markets, isn't it?

25 **MR MAXWELL:** There will be, I mean, there will be some impact, but the various reporting that we've put forward – and it's not just limited to the acoustic assessment – all identifies that those are able to be managed via the recommendations that each of those consultants have put forward.

30 So, I guess our request or our recommendation here is that we should be relying on the proposals that have been put forward by those expert consultants rather than this additional requirement which wasn't contemplated in that reporting.

MR SMITH: Okay. We'll look into that expert work that you've provided.

35 **MR MAXWELL:** Okay, thank you.

MR MILLS: Okay. Thank you, Simon, you have no other comments?

40 **MR SMITH:** I'm just going to have one other little one. I think the Council wants a contribution to public art. Have you resolved that with Council or is that ...?

45 **MR MAXWELL:** So, that hasn't been resolved in detail. What that is anticipated to fall under is the proposed public domain improvements to the Victor Street Plaza. So, you would have noticed in the consent conditions there's a requirement there for us to continue to develop and have that design completed in consultation with Council prior to the relevant CC. As part of that, we would look to implement a public art component within that public domain area to satisfy Council's request there.

MR SMITH: Okay. And so, the deal that in the conditions is drafted, you have to get Council to agree to that plan, like, Council's in control. Is that right?

MR MAXWELL: It's structured so that there's a concept plan that we prepared and lodged with our landscape documentation. That plan was called the Public Domain Concept Plan. The way the condition is worded is that we are to develop the design in consultation with Council and generally in accordance with the Public Domain Concept Plan, which will then be issued to the Planning Secretary for approval.

So, there's a clear process set up there which is to be guarded by the plan that everyone has had a chance to review and had buy-in through the assessment process. But ultimately that approval sits with the Planning Secretary.

MR SMITH: Yes.

MR MILLS: Just on that Victor Avenue Plaza part, when I was looking at the site, I've been comparing it to the plans, I got the impression that effectively it was just maintaining the existing trees that were there. Is that right or was there a proposal to replace the trees or do something different?

MR MAXWELL: The existing trees that are there are proposed to be replaced. There's a number of other public domain improvements that are proposed as part of that concept plan. When we worked through it with Council, their key consideration was making sure that that plaza area maintained its functionality, because it does serve a number of different uses at the moment. Primarily, it's a pedestrianised space which of course we're looking to prioritise, but it also does provide vehicular access to the Chatswood Mall Markets as well as emergency vehicle access to Victoria Avenue. Even though it's pedestrianised, there's a layback in the curb there and it is the main access point to Victoria Avenue.

So, the concept plan that we've ended up with balances all of those different functions that the Victor Street Plaza has to accommodate, and also brings into account Council's request through the assessment process, to give us all a framework that we can follow which, I guess, has already been considered and is pre-agreed, but then we can develop up the individual or more detailed items as we go, prior to the relevant construction certificate.

MR MILLS: Thank you. If there's nothing else that you would like to add?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Sorry. One further thing that I just might like to say with the public domain. I think it's, again, it's one of the consent conditions, it's we know that there's a journey that we're going to go on with Council to resolve the public domain. We want a great outcome, they want a great outcome, but we can't have that attached to an earlier construction certificate – it's got to be attached to the back end of the job, so that we've got time to work through it and not unduly delay the project, if that makes sense.

MR SMITH: And that's the reason for one of the requested changes to conditions in your letter?

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

5

MR MAXWELL: That's right. Which is also to allow enough time for us to develop the right outcome with Council and make sure that we're getting something that everybody is happy with.

10

MR SMITH: Yes, okay.

MR MILLS: All right. Thank you. And thank you very much for your time and presentation, that's much appreciated.

15

MR SMITH: Yes, it was very good, thank you, that's helped me understand it a lot better.

MS FORTU: Great. Thanks, commissioners, thank you.

20

MR MAXWELL: Thank you, all.

MR GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you. Thanks, everyone.

MR MILLS: Cheers.

25

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED