

From: [Heather Warton](#)
To: [Keiran Thomas](#)
Cc: [Louise Starkey](#); [Brendon Roberts](#); "matthew@townscape.net.au"; [Silvio Falato](#); [Stephen Barry](#)
Subject: Follow up matters for Donnison Street SSD from Commission
Date: Friday, 4 September 2020 5:13:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Dear Kieran

Thank you for the assistance given by you and your team at the meeting with the Commission yesterday.

The transcript will not be available for a few days, but in the meantime this is the information as discussed which the Department indicated it would provide, follow up or respond to in more detail.

1. Confirmation from the DAP as to whether the decision that a design competition was not required applies to the subject application only, or to all future DAs as well. It is the Panel's understanding that clause 8.4(4) will apply at every DA stage, but the Applicant is under the impression (as explained in the meeting with the Applicant held yesterday), that the DAP has made a decision that no design competition is required, that applies to all future development as well.
2. Provision of the June 25 2019 minutes of the DAP and of the workshops.
3. In the draft consent for the Mann Street SSD application, TOA A12 referred to the proposed car parking provision, to be approved. This then also referred to FEARs C22 to C24. The Panel in determining that application, modified the approved development to refer to a different car parking provision, being that the commercial component was to comply with cl 8.5 of the GSEPP. The Panel moved the TOA to be a Modification Condition.

In the Mann Street proposal, as stated in the Department's Assessment Report, the Applicant sought a car parking rate (more than the RMS, less than the GDCP).

In the subject Donnison Street DA, as referenced in Table 2 of the AR, the Applicant also seeks a car parking rate for the various uses; which appears to be a rate based on being mid-way between the RMS/ADG rate and the GDCP.

However, there is no draft TOA approval that refers to this rate in the same way that was proposed by the Department in the Mann Street Scheme. There is a proposed ToA A.12 but this does not approve a rate, but refers to a FEAR.

Could the Department advise if based on the assessment, there was a reason why the car parking rate was not referred to specifically as a ToA, as it would appear to be similar to the scenario in the Mann Street proposal.

4. A copy of the Draft conditions provided to the Applicant. It was noted that the

Applicant's Response was in an email that is available on the Department's website for the DA.

5. The Applicant has been requested to provide some additional information, which I will forward separately to you. This also covers matters raised with the Department including if any proposed filling of the Site is required in Stage 1 to create the temporary car park.

Thanks and regards

Heather

Heather Warton

Senior Planning Consultant
Office of the Independent Planning Commission NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000
E: heather.warton@ipcn.nsw.gov.au | p: +61 2 9383 2121 | f: 9383 2133 | www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorised to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

FOLLOW US ON:



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.