

# **Attachment F**

<p><b>Competitive Design Alternatives Process Report</b></p>
--

# COMPETITIVE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PROCESS REPORT

219 -231 BOTANY ROAD,  
WATERLOO





FEBRUARY 2018  
FINAL  
PREPARED FOR LANDMARK GROUP AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

**URBIS**

**URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:**

Director Sarah Horsfield  
Senior Consultant Jessica Ford  
Assistant Planner Jamie Fermio  
Project Code SA6879

**SELECTION PANEL MEMBER ENDORSEMENT**

Name	Signature	Date
Peter Mould (Chair)		1/02/2018
Darlene van der Breggen		1/02/2018
Arash Tavakoli		1/02/2018
Joseph Scuderi		1/02/2018

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction .....	1
1.1.	Overview .....	1
1.2.	Site Description .....	2
1.3.	The Proponent .....	2
1.4.	The Consent Authority .....	2
1.5.	Regulatory Framework.....	2
1.6.	Assessment Of The Scheme and Winning Design.....	2
2.	Competitive Design Alternatives Process.....	3
2.1.	Overview .....	3
2.2.	Participating Architectural Firms .....	3
2.3.	Technical Advisors.....	3
2.4.	Consent Authority Observers.....	4
2.5.	Selection Panel .....	4
2.6.	Key Dates .....	5
3.	Assessment of Final Submissions .....	6
3.1.	Overview .....	6
3.2.	WMK .....	7
3.3.	DKO .....	9
3.4.	PBD Architects.....	11
3.5.	Cottee Parker JPRA.....	13
4.	Selection Panel Recommendation.....	15
5.	Conclusion .....	16
	Disclaimer .....	17

**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

### FIGURES:

Figure 1 – Indicative perspective of front façade from Botany Road .....	7
Figure 2 – Indicative internal perspective .....	8
Figure 3 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road.....	9
Figure 4 – Indicative internal perspective .....	10
Figure 5 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road.....	11
Figure 6 – Internal perspective .....	12
Figure 7 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road.....	13
Figure 8 – Indicative internal perspective .....	14

### TABLES:

Table 1 – Technical Advisors .....	4
Table 2 – Key Dates of Competitive Design Alternatives Process.....	5

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Design Competition Report is to inform the City of Sydney Council (City of Sydney) of the process and outcomes of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process (Competitive Design Process) for the redevelopment of 219-231 Botany Road, Waterloo and the selection of the winning architectural design.

Landmark Group Australia Pty Ltd (the Proponent) invited four competitors to participate in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and prepare design proposals for the site. The four architectural firms that participated in the Competitive Design Process were:

- DKO
- WMK
- PBD Architects
- Cottee Parker JPRA

All four architectural firms participated in the Competitive Design Process and produced a final submission for consideration and assessment by the Selection Panel.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP 2012), the *Sydney Development Control Plan 2012* (Sydney DCP 2012), and the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012*.

Clause 4.3 of the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012* sets out the requirements for a Competitive Design Alternatives Report, as follows:

- (1) *When competitive design alternatives have been prepared and considered, the consent authority requires the applicant to submit a Competitive Design Alternatives Report prior to the submission of the relevant Stage 2 Development Application.*
- (2) *The Competitive Design Alternatives Report shall:*
  - (a) *include each of the design alternatives considered;*
  - (b) *include an assessment of the design merits of each alternative;*
  - (c) *set out the rationale for the choice of preferred design and clearly demonstrate how this best exhibits design excellence in accordance with the provisions of Clause 6.21(4) of the Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 and the approved Design Excellence Strategy;*
  - (d) *include a copy of the brief issued to the architectural firms.*
- (3) *The consent authority will advise the applicant whether it endorses the process and outcome and whether it fulfils the requirements of the competitive design alternatives process in the form of pre-development application advice.*
- (4) *The consent authority may need to determine whether the resulting development application or subsequent Section 96 modification is equivalent to, or through design development, an improvement upon the design qualities of the endorsed outcome. If necessary, further competitive processes may be required to satisfy the design excellence provisions.*

This report has been prepared in accordance with this Clause and outlines the Competitive Design Process, the Selection Panel's assessment of each scheme, and demonstrates the Panel's rationale for selection of the winning scheme. Each Panel member has reviewed and endorsed the content contained within this report.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in accordance with the approved Design Excellence Strategy (dated August 2017) for the site, and in accordance with the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney in October 2017.

## **1.2. SITE DESCRIPTION**

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process relates to the site known as 219-231 Botany Road, Waterloo. The site is legally described as Lot 2 in DP 554372 and is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA).

## **1.3. THE PROPONENT**

Landmark Group Australia Pty Ltd is the Proponent of this Competitive Process and invited four (4) architectural firms to prepare design proposals for the site.

## **1.4. THE CONSENT AUTHORITY**

The site is located within City of Sydney LGA. The Consent Authority for the approval of the Stage 2 DA resulting from the Competitive Process is likely to be the Central Sydney Planning Committee ('CSPC') given that the 'Development Cost' is likely to be over \$50 million (based on a revised construction cost which is still being determined by the Proponent as a result of the competitive process).

The Competition Process Manager liaised with Council officers throughout the competition. Council officers also observed the Competitive Process and the competitor's final presentations to ensure the integrity of the competition and its outcomes.

## **1.5. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

The key planning instrument applicable to the site is the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP 2012).

Clause 6.21(7) of the SLEP 2012 allows the Consent Authority to grant an amount of up to 10% additional floor space or height if it is satisfied that the development is the result of a Competitive Design Process and that the building exhibits design excellence.

The Proponent is seeking up to 10% additional floor space in accordance with Clause 6.21(7) of the Sydney LEP 2012.

## **1.6. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHEME AND WINNING DESIGN**

An analysis and assessment of the designs was undertaken in accordance with the assessment criteria contained within the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief. This included the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, compliance with the relevant planning controls (SEPPs, LEPs, DCPs) and the Stage 1 DA approval (D/2015/1358).

The Competitive Design Process has resulted in a winning scheme that was determined by the Selection Panel to demonstrate a high design quality. The Panel resolved that the Cottee Parker JPRA scheme best demonstrated the ability to achieve design excellence as per Clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012 and the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief requirements. The Cottee Parker JPRA scheme was subsequently awarded the winner of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process. The features that the Panel considered to be fundamental to the design integrity and elements that need to be resolved in design development and prior to the Stage 2 DA are detailed within Section 4 of this report.

Details of the Competitor's schemes and Selection Panel's deliberations are discussed in the following sections.

## 2. COMPETITIVE DESIGN ALTERNATIVES PROCESS

### 2.1. OVERVIEW

The Proponent invited four competitors to prepare submissions in response to a Brief as part of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process. The Brief was prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney Council (City). The process undertaken is described in more detail as follows:

- Four architectural firms were invited to participate in the Competitive Design Process, held over a period of 6 weeks.
- A briefing session was held on the 24 October 2017 to provide an overview of the site, outline the planning parameters and the Competition Brief, and provide an opportunity for the competitors to ask questions and seek clarification regarding the Brief and the Competition procedures. This was followed by a site visit.
- The Selection Panel members were provided with a copy of the Brief on the 18 October 2017.
- A mid-point review session was held on the 13 November 2017 during which each competitor presented their scheme as it currently stood. This session was attended by representatives of the Consent Authority, technical consultants, proponent and the Design Competition Process Managers.
- An optional meeting with the Quantity Surveyor (QS) was made available to each competitor during the Competition, and was attended by two out of the four competitors being PBD and Cottee Parker JPRA.
- A Register of Enquiries was kept during the Competition to document questions and responses without revealing the source of the question.
- All competitors submitted an A3 Design Report (Final Submission), articulating their proposed architectural scheme for the site.
- Each competitor presented their proposed architectural schemes to the Selection Panel during the Final Presentation date held on the 6 December 2017. One scheme was chosen as the winner of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process at the conclusion of the final presentations on the 6 December 2017.

The Competitive Design Process was undertaken in an open and transparent manner in consultation and disclosure with Council Officers in attendance as observers. In accordance with the City's Competitive Design Policy 2012, the City was involved in the Competition Process Brief as follows:

- Reviewed, provided comment and endorsed the Brief.
- Provided clarification on planning compliance and Competitive Design Process procedures.
- Council observers were copied into all correspondence between the competitors and the Competition Process Manager regarding questions or requests for additional information.
- Attended the Briefing Session, invited to attend the optional meeting with the QS, the Final Presentation dates and were present for the Selection Panel deliberations.

### 2.2. PARTICIPATING ARCHITECTURAL FIRMS

The four architectural firms that participated in the Competitive Design Alternatives Process were:

- DKO
- WMK
- PBD Architects
- Cottee Parker JPRA

## 2.3. TECHNICAL ADVISORS

Technical advice was provided to competitors throughout the Competition and an assessment of schemes was undertaken on the final submissions. The technical advisors involved in the Competitive Design Process were those outlined in Table 1.

Table 1 – Technical Advisors

Name	Company	Consultant
Jessica Ford	Urbis	Competition Manager/Planner
Sarah Horsfield	Urbis	Competition Manager/Planner
Joe Bergin	Altus Page Kirkland	Quantity Surveyor
Sam Haddad	SGC (NSW/ACT)	Civil Engineer
Ken Hollyoak	The Transport Planning Partnership	Traffic Engineer

## 2.4. CONSENT AUTHORITY OBSERVERS

The competition was overseen by several observers from the consent authority who attended the final presentation and provided planning and procedural clarification to the Panel.

The following observers from the City of Sydney Council were present at various stages of the competition:

- Nicola Reeve – Area Planning Manager
- Erin Dyer – Specialist Planner
- Marie Ierufi – Design Excellence Coordinator
- Anita Morandini – Design Excellence Manager
- Silvia Correia – Design Excellence Coordinator

## 2.5. SELECTION PANEL

The Selection Panel appointed by the Proponent for the Competitive Design Process included the following:

- Peter Mould – Adjunct Professor (UNSW Built Environment) and Former NSW Government Architect and Selection Panel Chairperson
- Darlene van der Breggen – Independent Architecture and Urban Design Consultant (DvdB Architecture and Urban Design)
- Arash Tavakoli – Managing Director (Landmark Group Australia)
- Joseph Scuderi – Head of Development (Landmark Group Australia)

Two Panel members were nominated by the City of Sydney and two were nominated by the Proponent. All members of the Panel have extensive experience in the development and construction industry.



## 2.6. KEY DATES

The key dates for the Competitive Design Alternatives Process were as follows:

Table 2 – Key Dates of Competitive Design Alternatives Process

<b>Date</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
18 October 2017	<b>Commencement Date</b>
24 October 2017	<b>Briefing Session and Site Visit</b>
8 November 2017	<b>Progress Submissions Lodgement Date</b>
13 November 2017	<b>Progress Review Session</b>
4 December 2017	<b>Presentation Material Submission</b>
6 December 2017	<b>Presentation Date</b>
6 December 2017	<b>Decision Date</b>
7 December 2017	<b>Notification to Competitors</b>
19 December 2017	<b>Written Notification to Competitors</b>
1 February 2018	<b>Competitive Design Alternatives Report</b>

## **3. ASSESSMENT OF FINAL SUBMISSIONS**

### **3.1. OVERVIEW**

Following the submission of the final competitive design schemes, a technical assessment and compliance review of the competitor's submissions was undertaken by the technical advisors. This review was provided to the Panel the day before the Final Presentation dates.

Each competitor presented their scheme to the Panel explaining their approach to the site, design concept, compliance with planning controls and the design, planning and commercial objectives of the Brief, as well as the benefits of their respective schemes.

In accordance with the assessment criteria within the Brief, the design schemes presented by the four competitors were analysed and assessed by the Panel with a focus on design quality, compliance and the design and commercial objectives of the Brief. Based on this method of assessment, a winning scheme was recommended by the Panel.

An assessment of the design merits and areas for further development were also identified and discussed during the deliberation process. The Panel noted that all schemes demonstrated a clear understanding of the Brief, site context and Stage 1 consent requirements, LEP and DCP controls. All schemes were accepted as generally fulfilling the submission requirements.

All schemes recognised the strategic importance of the site and its context, and the need to respond to both the commercial drivers of the Brief and the building's response to the public realm. However, all four schemes exceeded the budget. All competitors presented schemes which were non-compliant in varying degrees with the Stage 1 envelope, and may require a modification to the Stage 1 consent. All schemes also required further refinement to ensure compliance with the SEPP 65- Apartment Design Guide, particularly in relation to natural cross-ventilation, solar access to apartments and noise attenuation to Botany Road.

The following section outlines each of the four design schemes in more detail.

## 3.2. WMK

The WMK scheme focused on the form and texture of surrounding heritage buildings and the locality's industrial past, as well as achieving quality communal open space areas for future residents. The architectural expression was well considered and sophisticated, but there was some concern with the "commercial" appearance to Botany Road.

The proposal included substantial variations to the approved Stage 1 envelope, with the intent of creating better amenity for residential apartments. The key variation was the shift of the rear section of Building A further to the south to maximise solar access to apartments within Building A as well as creating a larger communal open space area that had an interface with the retail space at ground level. The Panel was concerned that solar access to this communal open space area may be compromised if adjacent properties to the north were to be redeveloped.

The proposal had a strong ground floor arrangement fronting Botany Road, with clear separation between elements of the public and private domain including a good delineation between pedestrians and vehicles. Although, within the site each building was designed to a different ground level RL and platform lifts were relied upon for common circulation. The location of the loading area in the basement was considered a good solution to ensuring pedestrian safety within the site and resulted in a higher than required floor to floor height and the need for the basement to be sunken lower into the water table.

The apartment layouts were well considered and capable of achieving compliance with the key ADG Design Criteria. The Panel noted that the internal layouts of Building B resulted in splayed walls and double loaded corridors which would affect buildability and future flexibility of internal spaces. The panel also noted that the scheme was inconsistent with the commercial objectives of the brief.

Figure 1 – Indicative perspective of front façade from Botany Road



Source: WMK

Figure 2 – Indicative internal perspective



Source: WMK

### 3.3. DKO

The DKO proposal drew from the heritage archway elements of the neighbouring Green Square Public School. It also had a strong emphasis on landscaping and ‘greening’ as a mechanism for screening noise and pollution from Botany Road. To this end, the scheme proposed a vertical green screen wall to Botany Road, which would sit separate to and setback from Building A, and which was reconfigured to minimise frontage to Botany Road. Overall the Panel recognised that there were successful and less successful elements of the scheme, including the green screen wall.

The green screen wall element was considered to be a novel approach amongst all the submissions, and the Panel appreciated that the scheme demonstrated originality in some its design strategies. However, the Panel considered that some of these lacked overall integration and required further resolution, and many were not considered capable of being resolved without compromising the design intent put forward.

The scheme presented a strong retail space, which would be appealing to future tenants. The general arrangement of apartments was considered efficient and the scheme was consistent with the commercial brief.

The Panel considered that there were several elements of the scheme which were unresolved, including the landscaping proposal and relationship between private and semi-public spaces at the ground plane within the site. It was also felt that pedestrian amenity would be compromised when approached from the south due to location of the residents pedestrian entry directly adjacent to what appears to be a narrow vehicular entry off Botany Road. The primary pedestrian entry to the north was more successful.

The Panel was concerned that the green wall element had not adequately solved the amenity issues to Building A, that it would be difficult to maintain and may appear unsightly when viewed from within the site. It was also expressed that the amenity issues to Botany Road would have been more successfully resolved through architectural built form strategies to mitigate external impacts as opposed to a ‘screen’ element.

Figure 3 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road



Source: DKO

Figure 4 – Indicative internal perspective



Source: DKO

### 3.4. PBD ARCHITECTS

The PBD Architects scheme was the most compliant with the Stage 1 envelope, and was developed to a high level of resolution. The scheme provided thoughtful context and design analysis.

The architectural design was considered to be accomplished, although the Panel thought that the façade to Botany Road presented a difficult public presence with open balconies to the street. The interface between the public and private domain including amenity of ground floor apartments adjacent to the vehicular driveways and car park also required further resolution, and the level changes across the site would affect buildability.

The Panel were supportive of the roof-level communal open space, as this would receive solar access and provide quality communal space to future residents.

Figure 5 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road



Source: PBD Architects

Figure 6 – Internal perspective



Source: PBD Architects



### 3.5. COTTEE PARKER JPRA

The Cottee Parker JPRA scheme presented a lively street façade, and thoughtful consideration of landscaping within the development. This was the only proposal where the advice and input of a Landscape Architect was apparent in the overall resolution of the project.

The scheme proposed wintergardens and enclosed balcony areas to address the acoustic issues to Botany Road, although the Panel noted that these areas are likely to contribute to gross floor area calculations and consideration to GFA would need to be given during detailed design development at the Stage 2 DA phase. The use of the Building B rooftop as a communal open space area was supported, noting that this space would achieve good solar access.

The Panel acknowledged that the scheme had the potential to be an excellent addition to the streetscape, and the incorporation of ground level awnings will contribute to pedestrian amenity at street level. However, the Panel was unanimous that the ground floor plane (including retail layout) required further resolution. The proposal for public art and landscaping was commended but not supported in its current form, particularly the seating blocks/ paving pattern throughout the communal open area. The proposal for vertical wall art, however, was supported. Entries and circulation spaces also required further resolution to ensure clear and safe separation of vehicle and pedestrian traffic.

The scheme was generally consistent with the Stage 1 envelope, although improvements and alterations had been made where better amenity to apartments could be achieved. Design refinements should address compliance with the height of the Stage 1 envelope, the size of apartments and acoustic issues of Botany Road. The internal layouts of apartments were generally efficient, and the scheme was largely consistent with the commercial, design and planning objectives of the Brief.

The Panel agreed that the scheme achieved good amenity to apartments and also presented an architectural resolution which has potential to achieve design excellence, subject to further design refinements.

Figure 7 – Indicative perspective of façade from Botany Road



Source: Cottee Parker JPRA

Figure 8 – Indicative internal perspective



Source: Cottey Parker JPRA

## 4. SELECTION PANEL RECOMMENDATION

The Selection Panel assessed the design schemes for the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the redevelopment of 219-231 Botany Road, Waterloo. Of the four schemes presented, the Cottee Parker JPRA scheme was considered to be the most convincing response to the planning, design and commercial objectives of the Brief. In the opinion of the Selection Panel, the Cottee Parker JPRA scheme is the most capable of achieving design excellence, subject to further design refinements listed below.

The Selection Panel selected the Cottee Parker JPRA scheme as the preferred scheme to progress to the Stage 2 DA phase, understanding the scheme would be further developed prior to progressing to a Stage 2 DA and reviewed by the City's Design Advisory Panel as part of the Stage 2 DA assessment.

In making of its decision, the Selection Panel provided the following comments and recommendations.

### Elements to be retained:

- The design of the front façade of Building A fronting Botany Road, including the intent of the proposed materiality, projecting window boxes, recessed elements, parapet articulation and other design features which help to modulate the scale of this frontage.
- The incorporation of vertical wall art.
- The retail and awnings on Botany Road, which help to activate and enliven the street.

### Elements requiring further design development:

- The proposal for public art (excluding vertical wall art) as proposed is not supported in its current form.
- The ground plane including landscaping and public art, requires further resolution, particularly in relation to the paving/ seating block pattern.
- The retail planning to be revisited to gain a better interface with the public domain. Consideration to be given to maximising an unobstructed frontage to the street as well as maximising an unobstructed internal rectilinear space to ensure the space is appealing and flexible for future tenants.
- The vehicular driveway length and location, and the location of waste collection and loading, to maximise the amenity of ground floor apartments that overlook and are located close to the proposed driveway.
- Further resolution of the interface between private, semi-private and communal open space throughout the site and particularly for north facing apartments of Building B.
- Design refinement to managing safety and legibility throughout the site including resolution of pedestrian/ vehicular conflicts.
- The resident/ visitor pedestrian arrival experience through the site (specifically the interface with the garbage room).
- The northern and southern ends of the façade of Building A fronting Botany Road should be screened or in-filled to maximise acoustic efficiency. Design development should improve acoustic and pollution issues, and maximise natural ventilation in accordance with the requirements of the ADG.
- Cross ventilation, solar access, apartment size and layout should be reviewed to ensure apartments can achieve good amenity and meet the requirements of the ADG.
- The southern elevation of Building C should be designed to allow natural light whilst also maintaining visual privacy to Green Square Public School.
- The use of winter gardens will contribute to GFA and the proposed height will breach the approved stage 1 envelope. Compliance with these factors should be addressed during the detailed design for the stage 2 development.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This report provides a summary of the outcomes of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process for the redevelopment of 219-231 Botany Road, Waterloo.

The Competitive Design Alternatives Process was undertaken in accordance with the approved Design Excellence Strategy (dated September 2016) for the site, and in accordance with the Competitive Design Alternatives Brief prepared by Urbis and endorsed by the City of Sydney on the 18 September 2017.

This report outlines the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and summarises the Selection Panel's comments and recommendations for the preferred scheme as follows:

- A Competitive Design Alternatives Process was undertaken for the redevelopment of 219-231 Botany Road, Waterloo. The relevant provisions of the Stage 1 DA consent (D/2015/1358), *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65* and the Apartment Design Guide, Sydney LEP 2012, Sydney DCP 2012 and the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012* have been considered throughout this Competition.
- The Competition was undertaken in accordance with Clause 6.21 of the Sydney LEP 2012. The submission of this report to Council also satisfies the reporting requirements of Clause 3.5 of the *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy 2012*.
- The Cottee Parker JPRA scheme was recommended by the Selection Panel as the winning scheme of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process. The scheme is to progress to the preparation of a detailed Stage 2 DA for lodgement to the City of Sydney. The Selection Panel considered this scheme to best meet the objectives of the brief with the potential to achieve design excellence.
- Subject to further refinement as outlined in Section 4, the winning scheme by Cottee Parker JPRA fulfils the design, commercial and planning objectives of the Brief and is considered capable of achieving design excellence, subject to design refinements as set out in Section 4.

The Selection Panel confirms that this report is an accurate record of the Competitive Design Alternatives Process and endorses the assessment and recommendations.

# DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 1 February 2018 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd's (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Landmark Group Australia Pty Ltd (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Report (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.



### **BRISBANE**

Level 7, 123 Albert Street  
Brisbane QLD 4000  
Australia  
T +61 7 3007 3800

### **GOLD COAST**

45 Nerang Street,  
Southport QLD 4215  
Australia  
T +61 7 5600 4900

### **MELBOURNE**

Level 12, 120 Collins Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000  
Australia  
T +61 3 8663 4888

### **PERTH**

Level 14, The Quadrant  
1 William Street  
Perth WA 6000  
Australia  
T +61 8 9346 0500

### **SYDNEY**

Tower 2, Level 23, Darling Park  
201 Sussex Street  
Sydney NSW 2000  
Australia  
T +61 2 8233 9900

### **CISTRI – SINGAPORE**

*An Urbis Australia company*  
#12 Marina View  
21 Asia Square, Tower 2  
Singapore 018961  
T +65 6653 3424  
W [cistri.com](http://cistri.com)

---

**URBIS.COM.AU**