

MR WILSON: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and to the elders from our communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal seeking content approval
5 for alterations and additions to the Intercontinental Hotel, Sydney. My name is Chris Wilson. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner, Soo-Tee Cheong. The other attendees of the meeting are Casey Joshua from the commission secretariat and Matthew Rosel, consultant to the commission. Helen Mulcahy is also sitting in from the secretariat.

10 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of
15 this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we
20 will duly put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. I think it's probably – we should go around the room now and introduce ourselves, given there's a few of us.

25 MR SPENCER: Tim Spencer, executive general manager of Mulpha Developments.

30 MR DICKSON: Rohan Dickson from AE Design.

MR CHAMBERS: Bob Chambers from BBC Consulting Planners.

MR LOMAS: Ian Lomas, architect, Woods Bagot.

35 MS HART: Catherine Hart, design manager for Mulpha.

MR WATT: Michael Watt, planning manager for Mulpha.

40 MS BINNS: Fiona Binns, heritage consultant from Urbis.

MR KOCHOVSKI: Igor Kochovski, architect from Woods Bagot.

MS MULCAHY: Helen Mulcahy from the secretariat.

45 MS JOSHUA: Casey Joshua for the secretariat.

MR CHEONG: Soo-Tee Cheong, commissioner.

MR WILSON: Chris Wilson, commissioner.

5 MR ROSEL: Matthew Rosel on behalf of the secretariat.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you for coming. So as you see, per the agenda, we'll throw it over to you to go through your application and to address any of the issues in the department's assessment report. That's where we'll start. Yes.

10

MR SPENCER: So I might just kick off with a really brief introduction, and I'm sure you guys do look at the full integrated picture, but one of the things that we have felt from lower-level reviews, if you want to call it that – maybe it's inappropriate to say that – is also the consideration of actually lifting the assets from last-evolution asset into a new era asset. It's really important that that needs to be recognised on a global scale and, therefore, we do need to move Intercontinental Hotel into a global status. Our positioning on that is that having a good sized and reasonably economic function space attached to the hotel is of critical importance to ensuring the economic viability for the next 50 years of the hotel.

20

We have a 509-room hotel at the moment that, you know, if we are truly honest with ourselves, is running a four and a half star proposition and we want to take that up to five-plus star proposition. We have the fantastic Sydney assets of the Treasury building attached to the ground floor plan, but we're also in control of the adjacent Transport House heritage asset. When you kind of look at it from a development point of view, you know, getting the plans aligned to enable these things to actually go forward is actually really, really difficult. You need a proactive owner. You need proactive investors. You need a proactive operator and you need the guys on the ground to actually deliver it, and I think at the end of the day, we find ourselves – these projects don't happen overnight. We've been working on this now for probably four years.

25

30

It takes a long time for them to evolve, and therefore, it's really important to take these developments out of the, you know, existing current planning political scenario and look at them for over a 50-year horizon. So when we look at this, we've lined up \$200 million of direct investment. That delivers 428 jobs during construction over a two-year period, but it also consolidates 582 jobs every year moving forward and a value-added contribution to the city of about 130 million. For us, from a tourist angle, point of view, that's a critical asset for Sydney, and ensuring it's viable and its ongoing sustainability – for us, the function space and the ballroom space is of critical importance to this upgrade.

35

40

There's been question marks over the relevant size or the ability of us to fit in the relevant size of the function space, and I'll let the guys delve into that, but at the end of the day, we think that on merit, our proposal should be allowed to go through the process to ensure that it can hit those merit elements. What we've seen in the Department of Planning's proposed conditions is actually a restriction on our ability

45

to show merit in regards to the major issue, being the setback from Macquarie Street. We are truly seeking today the opportunity, only the opportunity, to actually show merit that we can go into that 30-metre space. For us, the other element that's really important is to consider the timings and to ensure that any approval we do get
5 enables us to break the building down and deliver it in different sections and stages to ensure that we can meet certain operating timelines. We all know that running hotel is a 24/7, 365-day a year operation.

10 So there's lots of considerations in regards to how we actually schedule the works. So, for us, it's just really important that we look at the full macro proposition and the practicalities of rolling it out. Is there anything I've missed, Michael, Catherine, just from a very high level?

15 MR WATT: No, Tim. I think you've covered that very well. Thank you.

MR SPENCER: So I might just hand over to Ian and Bob to really talk you through, I guess, the proposal in detail, and feel free to delve into the questions.

20 MR LOMAS: Did you want to go first?

MR CHAMBERS: No. You go.

25 MR LOMAS: So Ian Lomas from Woods Bagot. We've, as a company, been working on the project for a year. Mulpha ran a competitive interview process based on experience and kind of an approach to the project, which we were fortunate enough to win. I think one of the factors was my previous role as heading up Make Architects and working with the department on the sandstone buildings, the Lands and Education Departments. And they're feeding in new structures into existing buildings sensitively, and to also work for a high and luxury hotel. So there was that
30 experience, which we were also able to bring into this. Now, I've got some slides here, which we can share with you afterwards, I presume for the record.

35 What they show is very often when we've been looking at historic buildings, there's a tendency amongst all of us to look at the heritage buildings, or the context, as they are today, but, of course, we know that great buildings and great cities constantly evolve, and I've just got some slides here of how, you know, the Treasury Building, when it began, it had bigger plans and they start by building a corner of it, and then you kind of jump that corner and build a building just around the side, and then you look at adding.
40

45 And every time, even though you've got a bigger master plan, every phase always shows something different, which is what I think most of us here enjoy, the way they might just, you know – a different structural system is being used, or the stone is coming from a different quarry. All of these little pieces, and different craftsmen, that give another layer. And then there was a part of a bigger plan to complete the whole block. So taking the original Macquarie Street buildings and then going around, but they only got as far as the corner, and, of course, Treasury probably had

other priorities at the time. And then that site was left unfinished just going around to where you get that very awkward junction on the corner of Bridge and Philip, and then we had the hotel building coming in.

5 Now, at the beginning of the process, I looked at it and I thought I actually quite liked it. I think too often in the cities, we tend to take things away that are no longer fashionable. And so later on, when the future generations come back and look at that period of a city's development, you'll find that it's missing, you know, like many of the 1930s buildings have gone because they went out of fashion. So this was a
10 building which has defects, but it also has something quite strong and articulated. Now, it has a few weird things going in, the cortile being one of those spaces. The cortile is the name given for that central space. There is that staircase and lift, which wasn't actually there. It was over here by the entrance originally, and then it was moved and actually largely extended. So of the historical pictures show there was
15 some grills at the lower level, and then it suddenly grows grills all the way up and is encased by that clunky stair. That's probably one of the things that isn't so nice about it, and then the cortile, the courtyard, which was never finished, and there's some great pictures at the time which still show people using ladders to get between the levels. That was never really resolved and the work that was done in the 80s I
20 think exacerbated that.

So that's what we – I mean, I could talk about this for hours because it is those little bits that you unpick, and looking at the opportunities. Now, the original planning submission was made by HASSELL, and then I think it was about seven months ago
25 we were able to start coming in and looking at the scheme again and working very closely with the engineers at TTW, who are doing a lot of works looking at the area, and also with Urbis, looking at the heritage in detail. So we almost began from scratch, building up the scheme, understanding the economics and what it means to run a hotel, but also looking at how we can balance that with the heritage and also
30 with the comments from the department and the City. And I think we've got some things here which we're able to show now which, I think, address it in a very proactive way.

MR SPENCER: So just to expand on that a little, in terms of the journey that
35 Mulpha has been on, our respect for the heritage component has been a core pillar. The fact that we also refurbished the Transport House in 2006 to its existing state today, you know, we are long-term owners of these two major city iconic heritage elements and we do wish to celebrate them. We started this process with HASSELL architects, as a well respected master planning firm. We then actually did go to a
40 design competition, essentially in-house, where we ended up with the Rockwell Group out of New York to deliver a quintessential but international concept in regards to the full hotel refurbishment, and then we actually brought out what we believed, and Ian has just alluded to, in regards to, you know, a true local architect with good strong heritage respect and structural capability with Woods. So we've
45 very deliberately gone through three different architects to ensure that we are extracting the most out of this project and respecting the site and what we're trying to achieve during this whole process.

MR LOMAS: Yes. And I think the heritage experience, you can tell from my accent, which won't appear on the transcript, coming from Europe, every project you do involves heritage. So that begins with the very first projects, and I think one of the first projects I did was the Reichstag in Berlin, the parliament, and that whole idea of how you put a new layer into existing buildings which actually allows all of them to have a much stronger character which is something which fascinates me. Anyway, this is just a few diagrams to talk about where we are. This was the original SSD envelope, which shows, at that stage, it was envisaged that the whole cladding might be removed and replaced with a wholly new façade, and at the base here and Transport House, it was quite a robust kind of solution which actually removed part of the pylon, built out to the front of Philip and then came back over Macquarie. So the current submission, and then we'll go through the revisions, actually look at pulling it back completely behind the pylons, and then also reducing the bulk and form to fill it. Now, what we do – to Macquarie. But what we've been doing since then is looking at two items. One - - -

MR: There's also the façade.

MR LOMAS: Façade. Sorry. Yes. Thank you. When we've been reviewing it, the façade is being retained. So when we're looking at the submission now, we're talking about the tidying up of the roof and the addition of the ballroom. So there's quite, you know, a big shift, and that was a debate we had, you know, a healthy debate internally, about removing it or retaining it, and the feeling was that is the 20th century addition. We're adding the 21st century addition. So having all of those periods and layers visible and clearly articulated is important, rather than doing something which is pretending to be 80s, or pretending to be 1800s, allowing each period time to have its clarity and run through the building.

MR SPENCER: Well, certainly worth acknowledging there that that decision not to do the façade has certainly been architecturally driven, as opposed to economically driven, because we are still replacing all of the windows. We are still doing the maintenance upgrade of the actual façade. So in terms of the dollars point of view, it potentially could have been easier to just rip it off and put a new on, but there was a recognition that in the journey of this corner of Sydney that there has been decades of growth, so to speak, and that we should respect it rather than strip it. So we've probably taken the harder road on that front than the easier road, to be honest.

MR LOMAS: But I think for the city, that's the long-term, better solution. Now, we're going to talk through three scenarios in more detail. The first scenario is the current submission. Now, if we move from Philip to Macquarie, on Phillip Street there is an extension of the envelope over the top of the pylon to the south and there is then a connection across. That, in the current, revised submission, is removed.

MR WILSON: We noted that.

MR LOMAS: That was in the transcript. That's actually taken away now. So we could probably remove that.

MR WILSON: Which is in your letter of the 13th?

MR LOMAS: Yes.

5 MR WILSON: That's right. Yes.

MR LOMAS: So then if we focus on the ballroom itself, we can talk about the footprint, and then we can talk about options to reduce the height and I'll run through those in turn. The first one is the ballroom. Now, the ballroom in its current, 20-
10 metre setback is 36 by 22 metres. Now, when we do a comparison with other ballrooms in Sydney, and I have a sheet here which has got nine ballrooms – they range from the Shangri-La to the west into The Star – you'll see that that size of ballroom is more like the average of these. They vary a little bit in proportions. Some are a bit wider; some are significantly bigger, such as the Hyatt Regency or the
15 Westin, but most are around this size, and that is because you're getting to what is perceived as the minimum. So you're able to have cocktail events of around 900. You're able to have seated events of around 500, and these can flex a little bit, but that is the size that is demanding, which is why all of the ballrooms are at this size, because there's size for servicing. Now, when you reduce that down, as is being
20 suggested with the 30-metre set-back, you arrive at something which is 26 by 22 metres, which takes you to be smaller than all of the competition and starts moving more into the realms of the larger meeting rooms, rather than ballrooms. And when you're in that level, then you take yourself out of the market altogether and you're no longer a ballroom. Now, we understand and we listen to the concerns from the City
25 and we have new views. So we thought we'd look at it another way and also address some of the other concerns that were raised about the structural works in Transport House.

And one of those we're looking at is reducing the height of the ballroom by a storey,
30 having no structural intervention within Transport House, but retaining the 20-metre set-back. Now, that has been possible by going back to basics, in a way, of the structure. Now, I've got a structural diagram here. The option 1, which is more of a table-top, which I think you discussed in your meeting with the City there were a few versions, all of them had two levels of accommodation, one level for a wellness floor
35 and one level for a ballroom. All of them required intervention into the existing Transport House. We were able to utilise the gap between to put some structure, but we would need to either drop a series of large columns through the building, which would be located to minimise any impact and would be reversible, and this is creating almost like a table-top from which to build the floors. The second kind of
40 option – there's lots of sub-options within here – we're to go into Transport House and brace the original structure, and that would mean that you would take off some of the cladding and casings to the original and then brace that up. So we went through a whole series of options, but the one we're proposing is removing a level of accommodation so that we are only proposing a ballroom. We then looked at
45 utilising the original existing structure within Transport House and working with its loading. Now, if we build a ballroom which makes use of timber and steel construction to lower the load and we make use at the side here of that where there's

an access way of having a couple of columns coming down outside of Transport House and bracing it back to the tower, we can produce a solution that is lower with one less floor. Obviously then we're then losing some keys, but we don't need to do any intrusive works to Transport House to meet the requirements. Now, that has, we
5 think, huge benefits, because you'd take that whole structural works to Transport House out of the equation. Obviously it's completely reversible should we want to, in 100 years' time, or 50 years' time – hopefully 100-plus or never, you can remove it and there's no works done to Transport House. Also by using a timber and steel construction, we were excited, because it also takes it into something very unique,
10 because most of the ballrooms, you know, they're either in the basement, or when they're above there, then it's glass boxes, which means the blinds are down. So we can try to create something which has a very unique aesthetic driven by the structural needs, which – and as architects, we always love having those strong functional and programmatic reasons to do it, because then the building has true integrity. Now
15 - - -

MR CHEONG: Can I interrupt you?

MR LOMAS: Yes.
20

MR CHEONG: Just looking at the diagram, I notice on your plan you've got Level 8A being the roof void. Is that roof void can be eliminated?

MR LOMAS: Yes. So we drop the ballroom down, in effect - - -
25

MR CHEONG: Mmm.

MR LOMAS: - - - so we don't have that – we used to have a kind of a wellness floor between. If we take that out and move the wellness back to where it currently
30 is on the roof - - -

MR CHEONG: Right.

MR LOMAS: - - - we're then able to lower it. We can bring services below. So we
35 can feed the air in there, which means we're able to also slightly reduce the height and also dropping the floor down. So we're dropping it by a whole storey. So it goes at the moment from 51 down to 48 metres, which - - -

MR SPENCER: So, for us, managing all of those different issues, we've come to
40 the conclusion that to really simplify the structure and lighten the load on Transport House, ensuring very minimal works are occurring on the heritage component of Transport House, we've removed the wellness and the pool level and we've lowered the internal height of the ballroom slightly as well. So, you know, we think it's a fantastic outcome. We've also lost 17 rooms as a result of this solution. So, again, a
45 pretty long-term economic impact in regards to this proposed solution, but we think we've truly found the right one now.

MR CHEONG: So am I to understand the original proposal was like three-storey height ballroom plus a wellness?

MR LOMAS: Yes.

5

MR CHEONG: Which is actually in the space of the roof void.

MR LOMAS: Yes. It was in between – from the top of Transport House, there was then a whole floor, which was then used for wellness, and then above there you had the ballroom itself. So what we've done now, because we've moved it – the ballroom sits behind the pylons, we're then able to lower it relative to those pylons. Whereas before, you had the floor which went more or less up to the height of the pylons, and then the ballroom came on, in effect, over the top of the pylons towards Phillip Street. So by pushing it back behind the pylons, we can then look at dropping the whole piece down, so that we lose the wellness, and it was really when we worked with TTW and heritage to go back in the building and see what could be done and look at all the files, if we changed it to that timber and steel structure, we're able to take the loads out and the floor, that we could then rest it on the existing Transport House with no need for works to that building, which we thought was a great win for the building, but it also had the impact of losing keys, which then, as we know, has a link to the value of the property, but also by doing that, it allows us to lower it so we've got some townscape views, where we look at the impact of dropping the whole building by a storey and keeping the 20-metre set-back to give us the ballroom size that's required, versus doing the 30-metre set-back, but keeping the height, and we believe that it's more successful urbanistically to drop the building and have the 20 metre. Also from a programmatic point of view, by making the ballroom on the 30 metre, it isn't a ballroom any more. It's a meeting room, and then the knock on as well is how do you get people up there, because that 20-metre set-back also provides the space for the stairs and the escalators to take you up to that level, and if you cut back, then you don't have the means of access. We all know that you need to have a lot of easy access. Relying on lifts for ballrooms means that you're probably going to have one event before everybody knows it's the event. It takes an hour to leave, because we're above that. So it's all of these points as well which we've been trying to kind of balance. So when we look at the – I suppose I've got the three scenarios here, I think that one is with the 30-metre set-back, and then this one is with the 20, but pushing the building down into the site, which when we did the townscape views, has a disproportionate impact, I think as you can see here, because it's only having a reading from there of sort of two and a half, three storeys. You're actually taking about 30, 35 per cent of the height down, which then pushes you down in the context.

MR CHEONG: So what would be the minimum height of the ballroom?

MR LOMAS: We've got 48.3. Our clear height below all the services is about five metres. We're able to push up where we can, because if you had five metres across the whole, that could feel quite low. So what we're doing with our structure is being able to push up between so we can go up to the six and seven metres height and play

with the – because if you keep everything at five, that’s too low. That’s why we need to have an articulated ceiling so that you get height in there.

5 MS HART: And that allows for the lighting rigs and people to be able to - - -

MR LOMAS: Walk around.

MS HART: - - - do things within those areas.

10 MR LOMAS: It’s quite a heavily serviced area.

MR CHEONG: While you are on that drawing, I’ve just got a question: why would you need to enlarge that service area?

15 MR LOMAS: Sorry, this area?

MR CHEONG: Original design here.

20 MR LOMAS: So what we are bringing up here, this is – in the existing tower, this has a big transfer deck at this level, which is basically almost a floor of solid concrete. So you can’t actually put new lifts and escalators to take you up in that area. So we need to use this space here in order to get the vertical circulation up, and that’s also a part of the building which was added in the 80s.

25 MR CHEONG: The original design, you have actually a smaller area for that.

30 MR LOMAS: And as we’ve been going through the more detailed works, that area here is required to get the escalators working, because as we’ve been able to work into more detail and get the height down, we’ve also been able to look at the structure in more detail around the building.

MR CHEONG: Right.

35 MR SPENCER: So we’ve actually also moved from the original design to the existing design, we’ve moved from vertical transport in lifts to vertical transport with escalators. Now, we’ve done that for a couple of reasons. Firstly, to keep people flowing – and you can actually move people quicker on escalators than in lifts, and people – psychologically – feel better when they’re moving as opposed to waiting for a lift. But, most importantly, it’s given us the opportunity – and I think there’s four
40 sets of switchbacks in this building – it’s given our people the opportunity to go through a journey of the building. So when you’re on an escalator, you can actually look out and appreciate the building as you’re travelling down through the heritage components of the building. So, for us, the 1980s addition to the heritage component of the building is the perfect location for these escalators because it’s
45 right adjacent to it which means we can actually look off the escalators through the old heritage archways and onto the – the heritage façade. So we actually get a

journey as you're travelling up and down to the ballroom. So for us, it – it's been a real, um, experiential, ah, design change for us.

5 MR CHEONG: Mmhmm. Just one on that illustration.

MR SPENCER: Mmhmm.

10 MR CHEONG: In all of the illustration, you haven't actually touched on the cortile roof. Is that your intention to keep that shape of the cortile roof

MR SPENCER: So at the moment all of those works, the cortile, the roof and so on, are all staying as is.

15 MR CHEONG: Mmm.

MR SPENCER: And it would be some internal works to - - -

MR CHEONG: Right.

20 MR SPENCER: - - - you know, upgrade certain areas. But that's not part of the – the works here, the submission here.

MR CHEONG: I thought cortile is actually part of the, ah, submission in the original one.

25 MR SPENCER: It was part of the original. Um, so the roof has been considered as part of the façade, and so we do know that the roof has, ah, rightfully or wrongfully – we – ah, heritage overlays, ah, even though it's a subsequent addition to the space. Um, you know, we – we took the position that it didn't need to become part of this
30 process,.

MR WILSON: Okay. Right. So it's retained.

35 MR SPENCER: Yes.

MR CHEONG: It's retained.

MR WILSON: Okay.

40 MR LOMAS: I think on lots of these things, you – once you start to take away an heritage building you open up a whole - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

45 MR LOMAS: - - - can of worms.

MR SPENCER: Yeah. Should we - - -

MR LOMAS: And I think that was something with – ah, working with the – the design review panel on the Sandstones, there that was – the view was taken on that one not to do the design competition – was that we would meet probably about once every six weeks and we would have a full day where we would debate details and
5 junctions and really go through things in detail, whereas obviously with the design competitions, which have that really concentrated piece at the beginning, from then on you're really left – left to develop things on your own, which with heritage buildings is a – is a more difficult piece, because when we have – when we're having a robust design panel, then you can really get to the crux of some of those details.

10 MR SPENCER: Should we just jump to the external view considerations - - -

MR LOMAS: Yes.

15 MR SPENCER: - - - of those - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

MR SPENCER: - - - changes? Um - - -
20

MR WILSON: Which I already have.

MR LOMAS: Then you're already ahead of us. I think when you have – we've got them big, so that we can appreciate them.

25 MR SPENCER: So – yeah. They're the three different views.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is already in between - - -

30 MR WILSON: For – so just before you came in this morning, we were discussing that we'd like to see views of – from this viewpoint.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Viewpoint 9, yeah.

35 MR WILSON: And if – viewpoint 9, which you've provided. Thank you.

MR LOMAS: Good.

MR SPENCER: So just talk through the three different propositions here.
40

MR LOMAS: So this is the – the scheme as submitted, so that's with the 20-metre setback and the taller 51 metres. This is then with the 30-metre setback and the – and the 30 – and the 50 metres. And then this is with the 20-metre setback but the – the floor the 38. Now, what – on – on all the views, what we felt was, when we
45 lower the height it then can start to anchor it into what's quite a – an undulating roofscape and silhouette line. We're obviously still set back, and we would choose materials to not blend in with the Treasury but to allow that to be visibly red. We felt

that that was – there was a similar impact. You could argue that was better, but if – I think there could be an argument that this is probably the minimalest between the two. But what it does do, it allows us to build a ballroom, and it allows us to remove, um, impact on Transport House, vis-à-vis that one, which would still – this one – this
5 scenario 2 would still require us to drop structure and make amendments to Transport House.

MR CHEONG: Why – why would the, ah, height be – have to be increased on –
10 again on that surface area where - - -

MR LOMAS: So - - -

MR CHEONG: - - - the annexe to the ballroom.

15 MR LOMAS: No. It hasn't been. It's just that 'cause – 'cause this is a floor higher
- - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

20 MR LOMAS: - - - that – so this one is at 51 and that one's at thirty – ah, 48.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 48.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. Mmm.
25

MR LOMAS: So that's why that – that height is the same there and there.

MR CHEONG: It doesn't quite look - - -

30 MR LOMAS: And that's becau - - -

MR CHEONG: Unless you're taking from a different angle.

MR LOMAS: No. It's – it's because this building's taller.
35

MR CHEONG: True. True. But – hang on. If you take that across and - - -

MR LOMAS: And take that across. That's – that's – that's the one that's come
40 down.

MR CHEONG: It's – it obviously, you know, is – is a lot higher.

MR LOMAS: Um, so that – um - - -

45 MR WILSON: Mmm. Can I - - -

MR CHEONG: Just take that.

MR WILSON: The original one was set back about that.

MR LOMAS: But this is – this is – it's because this is the – is the whole kind of
- - -

5

MR CHEONG: I know.

MR WILSON: Set – set back in there.

10 MR CHEONG: I know what you're trying to say. But - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

15 MR CHEONG: - - - if you look at that, that – this one, okay, this - - -

MR LOMAS: I know what you're saying. That is - - -

MR CHEONG: This will be there. This will - - -

20 MR LOMAS: That's – and that one's – yeah, but that one's set back 30 metres and
that one's set back 20.

MR WILSON: Mmm.

25 MR CHEONG: Right. Okay.

MR LOMAS: So that's the – so that's 'cause that's much further back.

30 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR SPENCER: So the other thing we – so the other thing to consider with the
escalators is our desire to actually have a landing basically at that level. So you
come up and you do your walk-around to be able to look out the window, um, and –
and get some sky and glimpses of – of the gardens and – and the heritage roof space
35 as you're journeying up. So, um, you know, that leading corner – I don't know how
you'll take this, but I think it would be a real positive to see some – some activation
on that corner through the glazing.

40 MR LOMAS: And we've got one here – I don't know if it's relevant. I've just
dotted in where the Stamford's coming in. I don't know if that's something that's
coming to the – the panel as well. But the Stamford - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. It's not – the – the Stamford's not coming to the
panel.

45

MR LOMAS: So that's the - - -

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Mmm. To the panel.

MR LOMAS: That's the 10-metre setback along there.

5 MR WILSON: Right.

MR LOMAS: So if you were to – so it encroaches – if you were to go to the 30 – which they obviously wouldn't, because then they wouldn't have a building – but that's being brought out to the front on the adjacent property.

10

MS HART: So the site next door to the Department - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

15 MS HART: - - - of Transport building only has a 10-metre setback in the DCP, so the 30-metre actually steps at the Department of Transport – they have a – currently have a DA in with the City of Sydney which has that 10-metre setback. So in effect, um, we put it on here just so that you can understand that - - -

20 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MS HART: - - - there are changes that are gonna be happening to this streetscape.

25 MR LOMAS: Yeah. Which is – so that set – so after you – if this is going down, um, Macquarie down here, after you get from here, it then steps to the – the 10-metre.

MR SPENCER: Which is a tower going to 55 metres.

30 MS HART: Mmhmm.

MR LOMAS: So there's a kind of a fundamental shift. Notwithstanding, that is just a little bit of context. Then if we go to view 2, which you've got there as well, which has the scenario 1, scenario 2 and scenario 3. Scenario 2 is with the 30-metre
35 setback and scenario 3 is with the 20-metre setback. I think once you get to this height, because you're kind of more or less level, it - - -

MR CHEONG: Mmhmm.

40 MR WILSON: Mmm.

MR LOMAS: You can really – from the dif – from here with the – the height you have a dramatic change when you go to another 10 metres, but if we - - -

45 MR WILSON: Mmm.

MR LOMAS: If we bring it forward and drop the storey, then they're having a similar impact. What we're trying to do, obviously, here is – is positively address some of the comments on visual impact, structural work, but then also produce a ballroom that's, um, deliverable.

5

MR DICKSON: And – Ian, if – if I could interrupt. It's - - -

MR LOMAS: Sorry.

10 MR DICKSON: Rohan Dickson. These, um, montages have been set up in accordance as if you were doing them for the Land and Environment Court, so the model is accurate and the focal length has been determined and the type of camera, ah, takes the shots, so they're all taken from the same point for each three options.

15 MR CHEONG: Right.

MR LOMAS: Yeah. So it's not – it's – it's not - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

20

MR LOMAS: - - - me doing it by eye.

MR DICKSON: If you – if you'd like to see, this is how we present it to the Land and Environment Court. So you have the existing, the wireframe model, the – if you go out on site you'll see a yellow-greenish dot sprayed on the ground, which we would get surveyed, and then there's the montage which is constructed from it, in accordance with that.

25

MR CHEONG: Yep.

30

MR LOMAS: So we believe that on scenario – on view 2, then the – the impact of dropping have – have the – have the same beneficial impact. And then we go to view – oh, just get my views in order.

35 MR WILSON: Two are the same.

MR LOMAS: View 3.

MR WILSON: I got two – so - - -

40

MR LOMAS: Is – again, if we look at the current submission with the 51 and the 20-metre, and then we look here where we sec – set it back - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah, I know.

45

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MR LOMAS: - - - and then we compare that with the version where we drop the height but bring it forward – again, that’s probably – that – that interface there where it’s against the – the hotel the – the kind of – the relative impact is – is – is, I think, if you look at all three, having the same kind of visual benefits by dropping,
5 but pushing to the height – the – the limits that we need.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MR LOMAS: Shall I move on to the next views?
10

MR WILSON: So this has been brought across to - - -

MR CHEONG: Just looking at the – the – having that - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that’s - - -
15

MR WILSON: That really becomes apparent.

MR CHEONG: - - - surface area recess, you do have that articulation of a different bulk and
20

MR WILSON: So it’s pulled back that way, yeah, as well.

MR LOMAS: What we would want to be doing here - - -
25

MR WILSON: Yeah. Yeah.

MR LOMAS: - - - is expressing the ballroom as a volume - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.
30

MR LOMAS: - - - and expressing this as a – as a secondary one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.
35

MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR LOMAS: So the – that would be in – when we’re going into artic - - -

MR CHEONG: Articulated as – in detail. Yeah.
40

MR LOMAS: And that’s – and because we’ve also got the different structural systems, whereas the ballroom needs to be in timber and steel whereas the – the circulation area can be – can be done in something lighter weight. It can be done in a steel structure. It can be more of a pavilion on the top. We’ve got to be mindful, obviously, we’re quite exposed there, so we want to make something that is environmentally, um, responsive, that doesn’t require air conditioning - - -
45

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR LOMAS: - - - and blinds. But that's – that's starting up on a whole another round which isn't to do with this project, but is about how we approach architecture.
5 Um - - -

MR SPENCER: So to sum that up, we actually think – before he goes on – the differential between the bulk and scale of a 30-metre setback versus a 20-metre setback is reasonably minimal. We think that on, ah, the last iteration that we've
10 done, in terms of lowering the height of the building by a full level and separating it off, InterContinental, and separating the service space from the actual ballroom its – itself, has actually ended up with a – a nicer bulk and scale, um, a – more of a linear approach rather than a box approach to the design. Um, we would hope to get from the IPC the opportunity to further explore that, ah, encroachment and, um, believe
15 that there – there is an argument for merit, um, to have that increased encroachment, to the 10 metres.

MR LOMAS: And I think, as well, this is – I hope it's recognised that we've listened to the all the different comments that have come through over the process,
20 and on this one, rather than think, "Okay. We understand why they want a setback, in the context, but" – rather than which – "but then it doesn't work. It wouldn't be a ballroom and you wouldn't build it," how can we do that within the other constraints? Which is why these views were good to show us, okay, the visual impact, but actually lowering has dramatic. Now, on view 4, it's almost
25 embarrassing to show because you can't really see any difference, so I'm proposing that we don't look at view 4 in detail because the trees and the buildings just hide it. View 5. These were the ones where I almost want to be seeing it more, but, again, the trees and the – and the local buildings conspire to, um, lose it. View 6. This is where we get that clearing when we're coming forward. So this one I thought, for
30 me, was interesting. Because of the angle, view 6, when you – when you've got the 51 metres and you step back 20, you have a reading amassing of height which is pretty similar to when you set it back a further 10 metres. Yes, you get the articulation there of the form, but the actual – the – the actual - - -

35 MR WILSON: Mmm.

MR LOMAS: - - - height or appearance is similar. But when we drop a floor, because we're almost looking at an elevation here, that is where you get the – the significant drop in appearance between the 51 and the 48. And if you can see along
40 here, you've got the mansards here of Stamford going up, and there's different buildings. It starts – and it's kind of secondary, back – to tie more to this, to – more to those – the context, whereas on view 6, when you keep to the height, it's clearly the – the larger element. Now, the opportunity here to design would be to play up the ballroom and to recess the circulation area - - -

45 MR CHEONG: Mmhmm.

MR LOMAS: - - - and that's what we would be looking to do visually. And whether there's a - a gap between them - - -

MR WILSON: Mmm.

5

MR LOMAS: - - - that's something that we are working through at the moment. Thing on that one, from - for us, on view 6, it's clear that the dropping of the height - - -

10 MR CHEONG: Just one question.

MR LOMAS: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: What is the setback of the Stamford Hotel? Ah - - -

15

MR LOMAS: 10 metres.

MR CHEONG: No, no. Ah, existing mansard.

20 MS HART: Currently?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

25 MS HART: The - the mansard starts at 10. So - so - so the mansard steps back, and then the 10 mil - the 10 metres is actually there.

MR CHEONG: All right.

MR LOMAS: So the - the mansard starts straight on the boundary.

30

MR CHEONG: It's on the boundary. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. Yeah.

35 MR LOMAS: And then goes up to 10 metres at the top. And then, of course, we're set back further from that.

MR CHEONG: Mmhmm.

40 MR LOMAS: That's showing where the - um, the Stamford would be sitting.

MR CHEONG: Yep.

45 MR LOMAS: So it would be sitting directly behind there, and then rising up the 50 metres.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR LOMAS: Now, view 7. Again, it's the – the kind of progression, it's similar in the way that between the 30 and the 20-metre setback, because you're seeing it almost in pure elevation, you – the – the height impact is – is similar. You'll see on the original there's more, kind of, bits added. What we've done on the new
5 submission is clear away these little incursions. For example, the incursion on the pylon to Phillip and the incursions here on Macquarie, so that you're just getting this very simple volumes.

10 MS HART: By dropping the building down, we can now go straight into the fire stairs of the heritage - - -

MR LOMAS: Yes.

15 MS HART: Of – of Transport House, so rather than having to actually create a link.

MR LOMAS: Kind of, go on. So that's what those were doing, that, kind of, transition into the stairs. So dropping it has allowed the heritage buildings to remain as they are and we're, kind of, dropping what will be, in effect, the ballroom and the circulation boxes – two elements – onto that roofscape, and then, similar to the
20 previous one, by dropping it down, we're, kind of, lowering the visibility of that pylon. I think if you see it here with the Stamford, you can see where the Stamford is sitting in those volumes, but it's just bringing the – so it becomes a much lower – a lower form in the site, and so, looking at those three where we compare the submitted, the – the increased 10 metre setback and then here where we drop the
25 height, we're of the opinion that that has less of a – of an impact and, also, it starts to, again, lock it into a series of secondary roof structures which sit behind the main frontage.

30 MR WILSON: Yes, I understand that.

MR LOMAS: So with view 8 – again, this is a zoom in. This is the submitted model. That's with the – the setback and then this is, again, with the – the drop in height, but bringing the building forward. So the – obviously, the main difference between there is that's a floor higher, but it's 10 metres back from this.
35

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR LOMAS: But, again, if we do that, we – we – it would be worse for Transport House and we probably don't do it, because we don't have a ballroom anymore,
40 which is – and then you have a – view 9 is a zoom in again and, obviously, again, I think the difference between the 10 and the 30 is less marked, but the drop in height is – is significant in the – in the amount of sky and the anchoring of the – into the site.

45 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR LOMAS: And then we have view 9, which is just pulling that – just those – again, just putting them all together, which I think – these were these collection of ones that you got sent through with the whole – so shall we - - -

5 MR CHEONG: Do we have

MS HART: Not yet.

MR WILSON: Yes, yes. I understand that.

10

MR LOMAS: And then just one view here - - -

MR WILSON: This is – this is 20 – 20?

15 MR LOMAS: - - - which is the Circular Quay view - - -

MR CHEONG:

MR WILSON: Yes.

20

MR LOMAS: So this - - -

MR CHEONG: This one's the south view.

25 MR LOMAS: Yes, so this is a, kind of – a comparison. So when we – the original submitted scheme actually cut off some of the pylon to make the levels work. That was before my time, and then it brought it out to the street and then it – it went along, so that – and I think these ones probably show that line is a – is a bit – so that was where it was pulled back behind, and then what we've done here is drop it down, in effect - - -

30

MR WILSON: Right. Okay.

35 MR LOMAS: - - - so – so that our floor level on here – our floor had to be up there, because it was – sorry. On here, our floor level was running across there to the ballroom. We have to tie into the neighbouring structure, so that we can only tie in at certain points, which is why that was removed. This, the floor level was sitting just – just below the pylon, so it – but what we've been able to do now is drop, in effect, that three metres – 3.2 is the height of those floors, which are quite low, so that's

40 why we've gone from there to there and that becomes the height of the ballroom floor, so we're able to just drop the whole thing sitting between the pylons and then feeding out, and then you have a small zone there, which allows us to reticulate the air into the building, which then also takes out some of the height in the – the roof construction, so we're able to feed air from below and just have the top for structure

45 and access rigs.

MR SPENCER: So we responded, really, quite strongly to the – the heritage comments through the process in regards to Phillip Street and, you know, we really pushed that facade back from being on the boundary instead of the street to behind what Ian keeps referring to as the pylons on that side. So you can imagine that that substantially reduced the size of the ballroom itself on – on that side of the building. We started this process in conjunction with InterContinental Hotels as the operator and they believed, on a global scale, they wanted 1000 – 1000 person seated ballroom space. You know, where we've ended up – what we believe is the minimum viable outcome is 900 people standing and we've got them down to – how many people seated?

MR LOMAS: Five – five to 550-ish.

MR SPENCER: Right.

MR LOMAS: 560.

MR SPENCER: Seated. One of our major clients is the – how do I say this nicely? A political environment, so we get all the – the ambassadors, etcetera, at the InterCon due to its security benefits and – and situations in Sydney. They can get out by – by road. They can get to the airport. They can get out by boat and they're on the fringe of the city. They've got multiple exits. It's also an easy building to lockdown security-wise, and in discussions with – with those clientele, their function capability, they would love to have internalised, especially as the world gets more concerning, but for them, a 500 person composition is the right size – well, is the minimum size.

MR LOMAS: And, again, we included the bench marking, so you can see that that's where it sits, where – be just in that – in the smaller group, but smaller than that, it isn't – doesn't classify as a ballroom.

MR WILSON: In terms of – you've given us the benchmarking, but in terms of demand, I guess, is it - - -

MR LOMAS: The bigger, the better, to be honest.

MR WILSON: Is it? Is that right?

MR LOMAS: Because we're working on hotels – some of those hotels on that group and we're working on projects to increase the ballroom. They want it to be bigger because more and more events – what you're finding in business, as you know, is that people want to come together more now, because everybody feels – so when they have these big events, it's less about giving information. It's more about having more face-to-face, and so the demand of these is actually increasing as we become less connected, in a way, physically. We need – we still need that to communicate.

MS HART: Sydney does have a lack of large meeting spaces – ballrooms, cocktail rooms and that’s – that comes from the tourism association.

5 MR SPENCER: And, I guess, there’s – there has to be a recognition between the – the meeting room size and then the grand ballroom that you might get at the ICC, there really is a marketplace for the mid-tier, which it, kind of, goes from, basically, kind of, sub 500 up to your 1000, and there is a mid-tier that actually hits what you might relatively call is the large boutique tier, which is, really, what we’re – we’re trying to – to hit.

10 MR WILSON: Okay. Are there any other changes that you would like to discuss in relation to your submission that you made last week?

15 MR LOMAS: No. The – the main changes are the – obviously, the – the removal of the outlay pieces to Phillip.

MR WILSON: Yes.

20 MR LOMAS: The lowering of the building - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

25 MR LOMAS: - - - and the removal of a level, so there’s no works to Transport House, and then the views which allow – which put forward that we can work with 20 metres and still achieve what the city - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

30 MR LOMAS: - - - are concerned about.

MR CHEONG: And no – no work to be done to the cortile.

MR LOMAS: I beg your pardon? No.

35 MR CHEONG: The cortile.

MR LOMAS: The cortile is not - - -

40 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR LOMAS: No works to the cortile. No works to the tower façade, so it’s – it’s really focused around these – these two components - - -

45 MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR LOMAS: - - - on the ballroom.

MS HART: Can we just clarify that? No works to the cortile roof?

MR CHEONG: Yes.

5 MR LOMAS: Yes.

MS HART: There will be interior works in the cortile - - -

MS JOSHUA: Interior, yes.

10

MS HART: - - - but they're – or we're not touching – we're not proposing to interface, necessarily, with the heritage in those areas and that would be something that could happen at any stage in the process.

15 MR WATT: Mr Chair, there are two key points that I would like to just quickly address and I'm sure some of my colleagues might also the two points made in our submission, again, on the 13th of November that haven't already been here just here at the moment, the first one relates to the design competition process - - -

20 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WATT: - - - versus our request that – and our proposal of a design review panel strategy. We believe that, based on all the work that we've done to date, we've shown a very closely-managed and handled process working with officials is the best way to achieve the outcomes that we've been talking about and you can see how we've been able to demonstrate that already with the work that Woods Bagot and other consultants have been doing. The second point is in relation to the recommended conditions of consent. Our submission also makes reference to the conditions and just a couple of amendments. They will press with facilitating a consent which enables us to test that the stage 2DA – the impact of what a 20 mill setback might, in fact, be under the revised proposal at height 48.3. We've made adjustments and submitted those to you in that submission – for the wording of the condition of consent to reflect that. Secondly, the condition of consent recommendation amendments we have for you also relate to the design review of the panel process, and the final thing that we would like to identify for you is in relation to those conditions. A concern that we had over a restriction on MDA is being able to be lodged prior to a design review process or, if being the case, a competition takes place. We have, as Tim has mentioned, quite a component of work improvements that we do need to InterContinental Hotel involving internal works, which - -

40

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WATT: - - - as we know, you don't require any designing view or competition process to allow those works to be carried out.

45

MR WILSON: I mean, a philosophical question I would have is why concept approval? Why are you seeking concept, as opposed to full DA?

MR WATT: We went down - - -

5

MR WILSON: There's – there's no right or wrong answer. I mean - - -

MR WATT: No.

10 MR WILSON: - - - it's – it's open to you. I'm just saying - - -

MR WATT: Well, we went down - - -

15 MR WILSON: - - - you know, we – we've, sort of, questioned some of the issues in relation to the concept, so a lot of the works are simply internal works and works you would normally just seek DA approval for, but you've sought concept approval for them.

20 MR WATT: Yes. They are, indeed, and I think it goes back to the way in which these projects first started. It's that significant development – the idea that we're trying to secure a – a building envelope within which to work - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

25 MR WATT: Two conundrum scheme and what they've thrown in the process, in that consideration, was a whole range of heritage issues that relate to both buildings, the hotel, being Transport House, which we've been able to work our way through, or we are still working our way through with - - -

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WATT: - - - consultants – our heritage consultants on that – the CMPs and so on.

35 MR WILSON: Okay. Do you have any more questions, Matt?

40 MR ROSEL: Yes. So, Matthew Rosel. Okay. The – the Department's provided a – a summary, I suppose, of the components of the comprehensive upgrade works and that's on page 8 of their report. Just noting the discussion earlier on that the cortile replacement is no – no longer part of the application, it might be helpful if you guys actually provided just a quick update to this to make sure there's nothing else that's – that's removed from the proposal, just to clarify that position. That would be really helpful.

45 MR WILSON: What would be helpful, actually – and this is what we discussed at the Department – is just having a – a very small schedule of the changes you've made - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - in your letter. I mean, they're – they're, obviously all there, but if you could just – quickly just tabulate them and provide them to us, it would be
5 really helpful, including, yes, whether there's any changes to what you're seeking or not seeking approval for.

MR ROSEL: Yes.

10 MS HART: So just in looking at these, we are still looking at the rooftop addition to Transport House, but, again, that won't have the day spa - health and beauty salon. They'll go – they will remain on level 31.

MR ROSEL: Okay.

15 MS HART: So, again, that takes out the hotel rooms that were originally proposed on level 31. Just reading through this. The cooling towers, we're not leaving those on level 31, which has allowed us more space down on this area to work through the circulation and also bring down that small area to the – sorry, the circulation area
20 where the - - -

MR ROSEL: Yes.

MS HART: - - - escalators will come up. When we looked at this in detail, those
25 cooling towers didn't really work there and actually created issues for the hotel rooms that were directly adjacent to them. The cortile roof, we will be retaining as it is. We'll look to maybe do some internal work to create light within there, but, again, that won't impact the cortile. Street level works, we are reviewing whether we can actually do the canopy over Phillip Street and what that will be, so that's the next
30 stage of this staging of the works. Day spa - - -

MR ROSEL: Sorry, just - - -

MS HART: - - - and gym will stay where they are.
35

MR ROSEL: Just – just on that point, does that mean that, at this stage, for concept approval, you – you wouldn't be seeking approval for that canopy and – is it Macquarie Lane? Is that what it's called?

40 MS HART: No. This is the one for on the corner of - - -

MR ROSEL: It's Phillip Street.

MS HART: - - - Phillip and Bridge Streets.
45

MR ROSEL: Apologies. Yes.

MS HART: Yes.

MR ROSEL: Okay.

5 MS HART: The canopy to the laneway, we would look to extend that out from its current location, because we want to use that for access to the ballroom so that we don't have everyone coming in one location, and it creates a much better access to the building.

10 MR LOMAS: It's to try and bring more people through the Macquarie frontage, because that's your - you know, the beautiful entrance with the stairs and it's often forgotten. So what we're trying to do here is also try and reorient the building so that that has a presence in the life of the city. So with the ballroom and with that section where we can have the circulation, it's allowing people to come in there and join. So
15 there's a whole kind of city moves as well in here which we've been - when we've been looking at in that last year to just reshuffle and reorient the building, and I think on the design comp - obviously we do design comps and we do design review panels. For us, the design review panels give us a lot harder time, because we're able - they're given the time to do that, and we love it, because you can have a good
20 debate. We are very constrained here in the fact that we've got an existing building that we're tying into, both from the InterContinental, the Treasury and Transport House. So it's a very fixed volume. I suppose one of the things like looking at the site as we have been doing and working in detail to look at, "Okay. A timber and a steel structure allows us to innovate and bring down". Those are often the type of
25 things which you might be looking for in a design competition and might well have come forward as part of that, but really, where we are on here is a prescribed envelope and it ends up being a kind of cladding competition, which I know is not what they're intended to do, because when I've been in the other stage and doing stage 1's and working with the City to prepare it, they always want to have areas for
30 articulation and areas of movement to get the full benefit. We've probably been - during our process in here, been working in that. We've got so many structural options, from the heroic, the hanging, everything, to find the one, and in the end, we've only ended up with something that is very simple and unobtrusive. So we've kind of been going through that process and we can share with you the works that
35 we've been doing on there. Sorry. I was just saying - - -

MS HART: No. I was just going through. We would also update the gross floor area, because obviously the removal of that level below the ballroom, that will change our GFA a little bit. It will bring it down. So there will be less impact.

40

MR CHAMBERS: I'd just like to make a - Bob Chambers from BBC. We'd just like to make a comment following on from what Catherine is saying, because obviously the recommendations in the department's report require the proposed ballroom addition to get significantly smaller, and we think that that brings it to a
45 level where it's simply - or a size where it's simply not viable. The fundamental planning controls which apply to this site give a maximum floor space ratio of 14 to 1 for a hotel development, and the proposal which is before you had a floor space

ratio of 7.8 to 1, and Catherine is just saying that it is going to get less than that. So the floor space ratio that's proposed is 44 per cent less than the maximum. So as a measure of intensity on the site, what you have is something that's much less than what you'd normally expect in the City of Sydney. So please bear that in mind when
5 you're looking at the department's recommendation to make the ballroom smaller. We've also got the issue of height to bear in mind, where the LEP control is 55 metres and the height of the ballroom envelope as now proposed is only 31.2 metres above Macquarie Street, the Macquarie Street side of the site. So that's 34 per cent less than the maximum. So you have an envelope which is not only set back the 20
10 metres from Macquarie Street, but it's also 34 per cent less than the maximum height. And then in relation to that set-back of 30 metres, the reason why it's been referred to extensively in the assessment report is that it's a control in the DCP, and it's a control in the DCP which seeks to restrict tower forms encroaching too close to Macquarie Street, and that's in order to protect the cohesion and integrity of the
15 Macquarie street streetscape, which is the subject of special streetscape controls, and by only having a height which is 34 per cent less than the maximum, even though t's a 20-metre set-back, it achieves the objectives of the control in the DCP, and as you'll know, the normal approach to development applications when you're considering DCPs under section 415 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment
20 Act is that they have to be applied flexibly, and we say that what's proposed is achieving the objectives of the control. But more than that, you'll also be aware that under clause 11(a) of the State Environmental Planning Policy, State and Regional Developments Act (2011), DCPs do not apply to state significant development. So the 30-metre control that is referred to in the department's report must also be seen in
25 that light. Thank you.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR DICKSON: Mr Chair, if you would like I have copies of up - - -
30

MR WILSON: Yes, please. We'll need it electronically as well, if possible, because we'll need to put this on our website.

MR DICKSON: There's six copies there, a lot of extras if you need to - - -
35

MR WILSON: I see. Do you have anything else, Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: No more from me.

MR ROSEL: No. Nothing else from me.
40

MR WILSON: Okay. On that note, I think thank you very much. I'm sorry we were late and we are now at your mercy and we'll go and look at the site. Thank you. Thank you all for coming.
45

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[11.17 am]