Attachment A6

Design excellence strategy

Design Excellence Strategy

Competitive Design Process

84 - 94 Parramatta Road, Camperdown

Submitted to City of Sydney
on behalf of Wentworth Capital

Prepared by Colliers Urban Planning

25 February 2026 | 2240137



'Gura Bulga'

Liz Belanjee Cameron


'Gura Bulga' – translates to Warm Green Country. Representing New South Wales.



'Dagura Buumarri'

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Dagura Buumarri' – translates to Cold Brown Country. Representing Victoria.



'Gadalung Djarri'

Liz Belanjee Cameron

'Gadalung Djarri' – translates to Hot Red Country. Representing Queensland.

Colliers Urban Planning acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of Country throughout Australia and recognises their continuing connection to land, waters and culture.

We pay our respects to their Elders past and present.

In supporting the Uluru Statement from the Heart, we walk with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in a movement of the Australian people for a better future.

Contact	Ella Coleman Principal	ella.coleman@colliers.com

This document has been prepared by		**This document has been reviewed by**	
			
Noa Galapo, Ella Coleman	25 February 2026	Andrew Duggan	25 February 2026

Version No.	**Date of issue**	**Prepared by**	**Approved by**
A (DRAFT)	04/08/2025	NG, EC	AD
B (DRAFT)	12/10/2025	EC	EC
C (FINAL)	25/02/2026	NG, EC	EC

Reproduction of this document or any part thereof is not permitted without written permission of Colliers International Urban Planning Pty Ltd. Colliers Urban Planning operates under a Quality Management System. This report has been prepared and reviewed in accordance with that system. If the report is not signed, it is a preliminary draft.

Contents

1.0 Introduction 4

1.1 Overview 4

1.2 Project description 4

1.3 Background and planning context 5

1.4 Objectives of the Design Excellence Strategy 6

1.5 Key stakeholders 6

2.0 Design Excellence Strategy 8

2.1 Location and extent of the competitive design process 8

2.2 Type of competitive design process to be undertaken 9

2.3 Competitive Design Brief 9

2.4 Selection of competitors 10

2.5 Establishment of the Jury 10

2.6 Technical Advisors 11

2.7 Impartial Observers 11

2.8 Jury decision 12

2.9 Competitive Design Report 12

2.10 Proposed allocation of up to an additional 10% building height and floor space 12

2.11 Ecologically sustainable development targets 12

3.0 Design integrity 13

3.1 Lead Design Architect 13

3.2 Design Integrity Panel 13

Figures

Figure 1 Site aerial – The location and extent of the competitive design process 8

Tables

Table 1 Summary of roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders 6

Table 2 Lot details 8

Table 3 Draft competition program 9

Table 4 Competitive Design Brief – Annotated table of contents 10

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview

This Design Excellence Strategy has been prepared by Colliers Urban Planning on behalf of Wentworth Capital (on behalf of Spark Sub TC) (the Proponent) under a long-term ground lease from University of Sydney as a landowner. This Strategy establishes a framework for design excellence in the delivery of a life sciences research facility and associated retail and educational uses, at 84-94 Parramatta Road, Camperdown (the site).

Wentworth Capital, under a long-term ground lease from University of Sydney as a landowner, envisions creating a world-class life sciences and mixed-use campus upon the site. The proposal aims to establish Camperdown as Sydney's premier biomedical hub, centred around top-tier life science facilities. The site will be integrated and complement the larger University of Sydney life science and innovation ecosystem and will enhance the existing research facilities and strategic infrastructure currently being developed by the University, including the Sydney Biomedical Accelerator, as well as the Royal Prince Alfred (RPA) Hospital redevelopment.

Clause 6.21C(1) of the *Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012* (Sydney LEP) refers that development consent must not be granted unless, in the opinion of the consent authority, the proposed development exhibits design excellence. Clause 6.21(2) lists the matters the consent authority must have regard to in considering whether a development exhibits design excellence. Clause 6.21D requires that development must undertake a competitive design process on land outside of Central Sydney which will have a height above ground level (existing) greater than 25m, or development having an estimated development cost (EDC) of more than $100 million.

Development at the site will be for a health research facility with an EDC of more than $30 million, and will therefore be State Significant Development (SSD) in accordance with clause 14, Schedule 1 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021*.

In accordance with the Government Architect NSW's *Design Competition Guidelines* (GA Guidelines) and clause 2 of the draft *City of Sydney Competitive Design Policy* (amended June 2025) (the draft Policy), this Design Excellence Strategy defines:

- the location and extent of the competitive design process.
- the number and type of competitive design process to be undertaken;
- the number of designers involved in the process;
- whether the competitive design process is pursuing additional floor space, additional building height, or both; and
- target benchmarks for ecologically sustainable development.

1.2 Project description

The development will propose a new life science and mixed-use campus, and will include:

- Health research facility, comprising spaces such as:
  - Laboratories including dry labs, wet labs, specialised labs and incubator labs.
  - Write-up spaces.
  - Conference spaces.
  - Office and education spaces.
- Ground floor active use opportunities, such as:
  - Science on display.
  - Retail premises.
  - Food and drink premises.
- Additional stories for services apartments at 84 Parramatta Road (Veriu site).

1.3 Background and planning context

Planning Proposal

This Design Excellence Strategy supports a Planning Proposal which seeks to introduce new floor space ratio (FSR) and height of buildings development standards for the site. Collectively, these proposed amendments will unlock additional floor space that will be used to enable the development of a purpose-built life sciences research facility and other associated uses, consistent with the vision of the Tech Central and the Camperdown Health, Education and Research Precinct. The proposed amendments to the Sydney LEP 2012 will enable the redevelopment of the site into a vibrant precinct that will co-locate education, research and other suitable co-located land uses to support the purpose-built facility.

Specifically, the Planning Proposal seeks the following amendments:

- A new maximum building height of part 80m, part 30m.
- A new mapped maximum floor space ratio for the Veriu site (84 Parramatta Road) of 4.8:1.
- A new site-specific provision for 88-94 Parramatta Road that enables 6.5:1 of additional floorspace for non-residential uses.
- A site-specific clause limiting the maximum amount of residential floor space that can be provided on the site.
- The requirement to retain the existing warehouse at 88-90 Parramatta Road.
- Amendments to the *Sydney Development Control Plan 2012* (Sydney DCP 2012) to address site-specific outcomes.

The Planning Proposal and draft Sydney DCP 2012 amendments envisage a podium and tower envelope that can accommodate a building envelope that is inclusive of the 10% additional building height and floor space.

To ensure that the development of the site proceeds in a timely manner, it is envisaged that the competitive design process will begin as soon as practical after the post-exhibition endorsement of the Planning Proposal by the Central Sydney Planning Committee and the endorsement of the Competitive Design Process Brief by the GANSW, in consultation with stakeholders.

Sydney Local Environmental Plan and Development Control Plan - Policy and Housekeeping Amendments (LEP/DCP Update)

The City of Sydney (the City) has publicly exhibited an update to its planning framework, proposing changes to Sydney LEP 2012, Sydney Development Control Plan 2012, and to the City's Competitive Design Policy. Of particular relevance, the proposed amendment to clause 6.21D(3) of the Sydney LEP 2012 and the draft Policy allows the consent authority to consider granting an additional amount of building height, floor space, or both up to 10% of the maximum permissible to a development that is the result of a competitive design process and exhibits design excellence

Connecting with Country Approach

There are a number of identified potential opportunities for a Connecting with Country approach at the site. Approaches include celebrating the site as a place of knowledge and learning, interpreting the original walking track between Sydney and Parramatta, and improving ecological function, deep soil, tree canopy and water management.

The University of Sydney's Walanga Wingara Mura Design Principles is a guiding document that informs the integration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures, world views and practices into the physical design of university buildings. At a future detailed design stage, the proponent will demonstrate alignment with the principles in the document, with opportunities for integration in the physical built form and in the public art commissioned for the development.

1.4 Objectives of the Design Excellence Strategy

The objectives of this strategy are to:

- Establish a methodology for the Proponent to implement a competitive design process for the redevelopment of the subject site, in accordance with the GA Guidelines.
- Ensure that the competitive design process works within the framework of this approved Design Excellence Strategy.
- Confirm the number of design practices to participate in the competitive design process and how these will be selected.
- Establish the process for the selection of a competition jury.
- Set out the approach for establishing a Competitive Design Brief that ensures:
  - The Proponent's objectives are balanced with the consent authority's design excellence requirements.
  - The achievement of design and architectural diversity.
  - The alignment of the project design with key local and State policies, such as *Better Placed* and the *Connecting with Country Framework*.
  - Procedural fairness for competitors.
- Target benchmarks for ecologically sustainable development, in alignment with the ESD Report
- Ensure that design excellence integrity is continued in the subsequent detailed development proposal through construction phase to completion of the project.
- Explain the requirements of the design integrity phase.

1.5 Key stakeholders

The key stakeholders in the competitive design process are outlined in **Table 1**.

Table 1 Summary of roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role and Responsibilities
The Proponent Wentworth Capital (under a long-term ground lease from University of Sydney as a landowner)	Wentworth Capital is the Proponent of the competitive design process. Wentworth Capital will lead the competition process and are responsible for: • Ensuring the competition proceeds in accordance with the GA Guidelines and the draft Policy. • Engaging and directing the Competition Manager. • Procuring and overseeing technical advice to Competitors and the Jury. • Funding the competition.
The Competition Manager Colliers Urban Planning	The Proponent have appointed Colliers Urban Planning as the Competition Manager. The Competition Manager will coordinate the competition process, guide the Proponent, and provide advice and services in relation to each stage. The Competition Manager will: • Prepare the Design Excellence Strategy and Competitive Design Brief. • Prepare a list of professional appointments including the Jury and Technical Advisors appropriate for the competition, as required. • Engage with DPHI, GANSW and the City of Sydney as required. • Manage responses to questions from the design team during the competition process. • Prepare the Competitive Design Report for the Jury to endorse and sign.
Assessing and/or Consent Authority Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will be the assessing and/or consent authority of the future SSD Application(s). The competitive design process will be overseen by an impartial observer appointed by DPHI (Social and Infrastructure Assessments Team) and may be present during the progress session and presentation day.

Stakeholder	Role and Responsibilities
Government Architect NSW	As the project will be SSD, GANSW will administer the competitive design process. This includes: • Reviewing and endorsing the Design Excellence Strategy and Competitive Design Brief. • Nominating one member of the Jury, who will also be the Jury Chair. • Post competition, endorsing the overall competition to confirm it has met the requirements of the competitive design process. • The competitive design process will be overseen by an impartial observer appointed by GANSW.
Council City of Sydney	The site is located within the City of Sydney Local Government Area (LGA). As the local Council, the City of Sydney will: • Be responsible for nominating one member of the Jury. • Nominate an impartial observer/s to oversee the competition process.

2.0 Design Excellence Strategy

2.1 Location and extent of the competitive design process

The competition site is at 84-94 Parramatta Road, Camperdown, as shown at **Figure 1**. The site consists of four lots and is legally described as detailed in **Table 2**. The site's area is 6,194m^2, has an approximate 85 metre frontage to Parramatta Road, an approximate 25 metre frontage to Sparkes Street, and is irregular in shape.

Of note, the existing warehouse building at 88-90 Parramatta Road is proposed to be retained as a requirement of the Planning Proposal. The building is a historic, Inter-war warehouse structure that was likely previously used as a showroom to house vehicles in the 1940s, and then as a shop and office space with various tenancies until 2017. The warehouse has been vacant from 2017.

The site is directly opposite to the University of Sydney's main campus. As identified within the Greater Sydney Regional Plan, the site is located in the Eastern Economic Corridor, with Camperdown described as a Health, Education and Research Precinct within Tech Central. In addition, the site is identified within the Camperdown Precinct of the Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy (PRCUTS).

Table 2 Lot details

Address	Legal description	Site area
84 Parramatta Road	Lot 1 DP 1216911	839m^2
88-90 Parramatta Road	Lot 1 DP 178634	977m^2
92-94 Parramatta Road	Lot A DP 402925	3,320m^2
	Lot 1 DP 965792	1,064m^2




Figure 1 Site aerial – The location and extent of the competitive design process

Source: Nearmap annotated by Colliers Urban Planning

2.2 Type of competitive design process to be undertaken

The development is required to undertake a competitive design process in accordance with clause 6.21D of the Sydney LEP 2012. The Proponent has elected to conduct a single **'Invited' Architectural Design Competition** in accordance with the GA Guidelines and supported by the draft Policy. The process is to be undertaken prior to the lodgement of the SSD Application for the redevelopment of the site, as envisaged in the Planning Proposal.

The competitive design process will comprise a single-stage competition with the following key components:

- An initial Competitor briefing.
- A 6-week working time for Competitors to prepare design proposals in response to the brief.
- A progress session where Competitors are able to attend a session with Technical Advisors to seek high level technical and planning compliance matters only.
- Final submissions and presentations by Competitors to the Jury.
- Jury deliberations with selection of a winning proposal.

A draft competition program is provided in **Table 3**.

Table 3 Draft competition program

Week	Description / Milestone
Pre-commencement	• GANSW endorsement of the Design Excellence Strategy. • GANSW endorsement of the Competitive Design Brief, including the evaluation criteria.
Weeks 1-6 (6 weeks)	• An initial Competitor briefing, including site visit. • Working time (6 weeks). • Progress session with Technical Advisors and the Proponent. • Final submissions by Competitors to Competition Manager.
Week 7-8 (2.5 weeks)	• Undertake technical review of final submissions and issue to the Jury. • Jury briefing.
Week 9	• Technical Advisor presentations. • Competitor final presentations. • Jury deliberations.
Total: 9 weeks	
After completion	• Preparation of the Competitive Design Report and endorsement by the Jury. • Design integrity.

2.3 Competitive Design Brief

The Competitive Design Brief will be prepared by the Proponent's Competition Manager and in accordance with the City's *Model Competitive Design Process Brief*. The Proponent will seek endorsement from GANSW, as well as feedback from other stakeholders during the preparation of the Competitive Design Brief. In establishing the Competitive Design Brief, the Proponent will ensure that:

- All details regarding the conduct of the competitive design process are contained with the Competitive Design Brief, including procedural fairness for Competitors.
- The evaluation criteria and associated weightings are clearly defined and agreed in the Competitive Design Brief.
- The planning context and relevant development controls will be clearly defined in the Competitive Design Brief.
- The objectives and aspirations of the project are expressly stated in the Competitive Design Brief.
- The Competitor's fees are clearly defined.
- The Competitive Design Brief and appended documents are reviewed and endorsed in writing by GANSW prior to its distribution to Competitors, the Jury and Technical Advisors.

An annotated table of contents for the Competitive Design Brief is outlined in **Table 4**.

Table 4 Competitive Design Brief – Annotated table of contents

Section	Content
1. General information	Outline of the purpose and timing of the competitive design process, and an overview of the project.
2. Site description and context	Description of the site and the surrounding context.
3. Planning context and controls	Outline of the strategic and statutory planning framework, including the Sydney LEP 2012 as proposed to be amended by the Planning Proposal.
4. Design objectives and controls/guidance	Explain the planning and design objectives of the project, including the Connecting with Country Framework.
5. Technical objectives	Explain the technical objectives and considerations of the project, including the commercial objectives as they relate to the project budget.
6. Competition procedures	Set out the procedural matters of the competitive design process, including the responsibilities and obligations of the Proponent, Jury and the Technical Advisors; the role of DPHI, GANSW, the City of Sydney; the basis for participation; and the intent of the design integrity phase.
7. Submission requirements	Outline of the documentation to be provided in each Competitor's submission.

2.4 Selection of competitors

A minimum of **three (3) invited competitors**. The selection of the invited Competitors will be shortlisted and determined by the Proponent. The final invited Competitors will be selected in consultation with GANSW.

The invited Competitors will be required to satisfy the following eligibility requirements:

- A Competitor may be a single person or firm, or a number of firms working in partnership, constituted of a principal/lead architect supported by an executive architect(s).
- Invited Competitors are to have demonstrated capabilities in design excellence by being the recipient of an Australian Institute of Architects architecture award or commendation or, in the case of international competitors, the same with their equivalent association.
- Each Competitor must be a person, corporation or firm registered as an architect in accordance with the NSW Architects Act 2003 or, in the case of interstate or overseas competitors, eligible for registration with their equivalent association.
- A minimum of 50% of invited Competitors must be Australian based architects.
- The selection of Competitors should include a mix of emerging and established architectural practices.
- Proven capability and experience in health-related and/or research facilities.

Competitors are encouraged to include:

- A balanced gender mix within each design and leadership team.
- Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- People who are culturally diverse.
- People with a disability.

2.5 Establishment of the Jury

The Jury will comprise a total of **three (3) members** in the following composition:

- One (1) member nominated by GANSW.

- One (1) member nominated by the City of Sydney.
- One (1) member nominated by the Proponent.

Further to the above the Jury is to have a gender representation target ratio of 40% male, 40% female and 20% any gender.

A detailed set of obligations will be provided in the Competitive Design Brief for the Jury, but in general, they are to:

- Represent the public interest.
- Be appropriate to the type of development and context of the site.
- Include persons who have expertise and experience in the design and construction professions and industry.
- Include a majority of registered architects with urban design and architectural expertise and experience.

The Chair of the Jury will be nominated by GANSW and will have expertise in architectural design and be a recognised advocate of design excellence.

2.6 Technical Advisors

Technical Advisors will be appointed by the Proponent for the duration of the competitive design process. The role of Technical Advisors may include:

- Provide technical information and input into the Competitive Design Brief and/or supporting technical briefs.
- Provide guidance to the Competitors as instructed.
- Review Competitor's work-in-progress material and provide clarification in the progress session.
- Assess the final submissions against the evaluation criteria and requirements of the Competitive Design Brief.
- Following an assessment on the final submissions, present to the Jury on their relevant disciplines.

The Proponent shall engage Technical Advisors to provide high-level review and assistance to the Jury in the assessment of final submissions. Technical Advisors are to strictly limit advice to technical and compliance matters pertaining to their professional discipline only and refrain from commenting on matters outside their remit.

Technical Advisors will issue advice through the Competition Manager. The Competition Manager will distribute advice to Competitors and the Jury as required. The role of each Technical Advisor will be defined in the Competitive Design Brief.

Technical Advisors may also be called upon to provide advice, post competition, in the design integrity phase.

2.7 Impartial Observers

A number of stakeholders will be invited to attend and observe the key milestones of the competition. These stakeholders include:

- GANSW and Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure: GANSW and DPHI (Social and Infrastructure Assessments Team) will each nominate an impartial observer/s.
- City of Sydney Council: The City will nominate an impartial observer/s.

Further, the role of the impartial observer is to verify that the competitive design process has been followed appropriately and fairly. The observer/s will be invited to attend all meetings involved with the competitive design process and design integrity process, and is to be provided reasonable notice of all meetings.

The attendance of impartial observers throughout the Jury's deliberations will be at the discretion of the Jury Chair.

2.8 Jury decision

The Jury will select a winning competitor based on an assessment of their final submission against the weighted evaluation criteria presented in the Competitive Design Brief. The Jury's decision will be via a majority vote. The Jury must evaluate a minimum of three (3) competitive submissions and make every effort to arrive at a consensus in the selection of a winner. If, in the opinion of the Jury, key design issues require further resolution before a decision can be made, the Jury may recommend that design amendments be made to up to two (2) of the final submissions.

The primary function of the Jury Chair is to ensure that the deliberations proceed in a fair and orderly manner.

The Jury decision will not fetter the discretion of the consent authority in its determination of any subsequent SSD Application(s) associated with the site/proposal that is the subject of this competitive design process.

2.9 Competitive Design Report

Following the presentation day and Jury deliberations, a Competitive Design Report will be prepared by the Competition Manager on behalf of the Jury. The Competitive Design Report will contain findings and recommendations of the Jury. An assessment of each entry against the evaluation criteria provided within the Competitive Design Brief, and input from the Proponent and Technical Advisors, will be appended to the Competitive Design Report as required.

The Competitive Design Report will include the Jury's rationale for the choice of the winning design, outlining how in the opinion of the Jury, the scheme is capable of achieving design excellence. The Competitive Design Report will identify the qualities and attributes that must be retained to achieve design excellence, and also include any further recommended design amendments relevant to the scheme's capability of achieving design excellence and the requirements of the Competitive Design Brief.

2.10 Proposed allocation of up to an additional 10% building height and floor space

The future SSD Application will seek up to an additional 10% building height and floor space in accordance with draft amendment to clause 6.21D of the Sydney LEP 2012.

2.11 Ecologically sustainable development targets

The Competitive Design Brief will require ecologically sustainable development (ESD) targets to be considered for the future development as set out below:

- Retention and adaptation of the existing warehouse results in reduce embodied carbon and maintains the current street character.
- Targeting of a 5-star Green Star rating ensures the future development is Net Zero ready.
- Best practice procurement and management will be embedded via Green Star rating.

A Green Star rating of 5-stars is to be targeted, integrating the following criteria into the building design:

- Commitment to 100% renewable electricity purchase for base building requirements.
- Commitment to 100% renewable energy for all non-electric energy, base building and tenant requirements.
- 20% reduction in annual energy use relative to benchmark building performance.
- 20% reduction in upfront carbon emissions relative to benchmark building design.
- Offset of all scope one emissions.

ESD targets and sustainability initiatives will be carried through the competition phase, design development, construction, and through to completion of the project to deliver an exemplar of ESD.

3.0 Design integrity

3.1 Lead Design Architect

The architect of the winning scheme, as selected by the Jury, will be appointed by the Proponent as the Lead Architect for the subsequent SSD Application and will perform this role until completion of the project. Where the winning architect is a consortium, partnership or other joint authorship, each must retain representation and a leadership role in all processes following.

To ensure design continuity and excellence of the winning scheme is maintained throughout the development process, the role of the Lead Architect will include at a minimum the following:

- Preparation of the architectural documentation for a detailed SSD Application for the winning design.
- Preparation of the architectural documentation for a Construction Certificate.
- Preparation of the architectural documentation for contract documentation.
- Provide a lead role in ensuring design integrity is maintained.
- Maintain design continuity during the construction phases through to completion of the project.
- Provide any documentation required by the consent authority verifying the design intent has been achieved at completion.
- Representing the project in meetings with or reviews by the DPHI, GANSW, the City, as well as other stakeholders and the community, as required.

The Lead Architect may work in association with other architectural practices but is to retain a leadership role over design decisions.

3.2 Design Integrity Panel

Following the competitive design process, the original Jury members will form the Design Integrity Panel (DIP). The DIP will ensure that the design integrity of the winning scheme has been maintained, and that specific requirements as identified in the Competitive Design Report have been addressed. The DIP will reconvene to review the design at the following stages:

- Prior to the lodgement of any SSD Application, providing sufficient time to allow for meaningful input by the DIP on design development.
- During the assessment of the SSD Application as deemed necessary by the consent authority.
- If required, prior to the submission of any modifications to an SSD Development Consent.
- Prior to an application for a Construction Certificate (if deemed necessary by the DIP or consent authority).
- If required throughout the detailed design process by the consent authority or if requested by the Proponent.

Each meeting of the DIP is to be documented within a report or minutes. At each milestone, certification is required confirming that the design retains, or is an improvement upon, the design excellence qualities exhibited in the competition winning scheme.

The DIP will take the place of any separate design review panel (such as the State Design Review Panel (SDRP)).

All costs of DIP meetings will be borne by the Proponent. Secretariat services will also be provided by the Proponent.

Should a member of the DIP not be available to participate in future design integrity process reviews, the original agency who nominated them shall propose a replacement. Any replacement must be approved by the consent authority. At least three (3) members (or their alternatives) are required to form a quorum for the DIP, which will be responsible for ongoing design reviews.

> Note. For private projects on private land, the SDRP is required to review such projects with an estimated development cost threshold of $100 million. However, SDRP reviews are not required if it is part of an endorsed alternative to a competitive design process.

Should the SDRP threshold change or be removed for private projects on private land, and this project would no longer have ordinarily triggered the threshold for an SDRP review, then section 3.2 of this Strategy would no longer apply. This would have the effect of removing the requirement for a DIP.

At Colliers, we are enterprising.

We maximize the potential of property and real assets to accelerate the success of our clients, our investors and our people.

Our expert advice to property occupiers, owners and investors leads the industry into the future. We invest in relationships to create enduring value. What sets us apart is not what we do, but how we do it. Our people are passionate, take personal responsibility and always do what's right for our clients, people and communities. We attract and develop industry leaders, empowering them to think and act differently to drive exceptional results. What's more, our global reach maximizes the potential of property, wherever our clients do business.

colliers.com

Colliers Urban Planning