



27 May 2020

Mr Anthony Witherdin
Director Key Site Assessments
Department of Planning, Industry & Environment

via email: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Witherdin

Eastern Creek Business Hub Concept Proposal SSD 5175 Mod 5 and SSD 8858

I write in relation to the above Applications which are currently before the Independent Planning Commission (Commission) for determination. In its consideration, the Commission has identified a number of matters that require further clarification.

The Commission's initial view of the Applications and of the the site indicates that a meeting with the Department will not be required, and that a written response to the questions below only is needed. However, the Commission is happy to meet, should the Department think it necessary after reviewing this letter.

1. There is a reference to a pedestrian footbridge that will provide access from the internal road. Was this approved under the Early Works DA approved with the original Concept Proposal?
2. There are 3D drawings on the Department's website (DA12B/13C/14C and 15B), plus artist's impressions (drawing DA16A and DA17B). Is there any reason why these drawings have not been referred to in the draft consent, if they have been used to assess the DA? Also could you advise what drawing numbers have been used for Figures 12 and 13 in the Assessment Report.
3. Confirm that the total GFA in the DA (11,398m²) includes the vehicle repair station, indoor recreation facility and a possible child care centre (or is the child care centre on lot 1?).
4. In the concept proposal draft approval, where is the 'circulation space' referred to in the Table in Condition 7 and is this relevant to the DA?
5. There is reference on page 23 of the Assessment Report to updated civil engineering drawings and a stormwater report. However, no approved stormwater concept plans appear in the draft Schedule of approved drawings for the DA. Are there stormwater works to be approved with this DA? If so, could the drawings be provided please.



6. In terms of the modification to the concept proposal, can some additional explanation be provided in terms of how the development as modified will be substantially the same as the original development? There is discussion in the Assessment Report on pg18 in Table 5, but this only refers to the uses being the same, and does not assess changes to the envelope size and locations or compare the type and amount of approved versus proposed GFA.
7. Condition A9 in Schedule 2 Part A of the draft consent for the DA refers to allowances for future 'replacement' signage not requiring approval, subject to certain criteria. However, no details of the actual sign that is proposed for each tenancy has been provided, only the signage zones. Is it intended that each DA for a tenancy/fit out will include a sign for that tenancy, and from then on, any future change will be able to take advantage of Condition A.9?

The Commission would be grateful if the Department could prepare a response to these matters by close of business on 4 June 2020.

Should you have any questions, I have asked Ms Heather Warton, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] to liaise directly with you.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Barry
Planning Director