

28 November 2017

Our ref: 217.065

General Manager  
Cumberland Council  
PO box 42  
Merrylands NSW 2160



VIA EMAIL: COUNCIL@CUMBERLAND.NSW.GOV.AU

SUBJECT: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE ASSESSMENT OF A PLANNING PROPOSAL REQUEST FOR 2 PERCY STREET, AUBURN

Dear Malcolm,

Reference is made to our planning proposal (PP) request for 2 Percy Street, Auburn, to the Cumberland IHAP recommendations adopted by Council at its Ordinary meeting of 6 September 2017, and to our subsequent meeting with you and Council staff on 12 September 2017.

As confirmed in our follow-up email of 20 September 2017, TPG Town Planning and Urban Design (TPG) would like to submit the following additional information for your consideration. We believe these documents satisfy the issues raised at our meeting of 12 September 2017 and that the information provided will allow Council to forward the Planning Proposal Request to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for a Gateway determination.

### *1. Flood Risk Management*

A letter, dated 18 October 2015, has been prepared by Northrop confirming that the future development of an 'education establishment' can be safely located on the subject site. The Flood Risk Management controls under section 6 of Auburn Development Control Plan 2010, requires that appropriate evacuation measures be put in place when the site is developed. The document provided by Northrop confirms that safe and effective warning time and reliable evacuation from the site can be implemented and achieved via North Parade or St Hillers Road. The proposed use of the site as an 'education establishment' will therefore not result in any increased risk to human life.

### *2. Play spaces*

A design statement, dated 20 September 2017, has been prepared by PMDL confirming that the final built forms for the school will allow for the provision of appropriate play/outdoor space for the future students of the school. The outdoor spaces will be well-placed and well-designed, and will adequately cater for the recreation needs of the students. At this stage the type and scale of school being proposed is unknown. However, it is recognised that the student population/building

footprints proposed as part of any future DA would in part be dictated by the need to provide adequate and appropriately designed outdoor play spaces.

### *3. Traffic assessment*

An updated traffic statement, dated 11 October 2017, has been prepared by GTA Consultants. The statement assesses the impact of the 10-year growth in traffic demand from potential floor space ratio (FSR) increases in the B4 and R4 zones between 2012 and 2021. At this stage the type and scale of school being proposed is unknown. The traffic calculations have therefore been based on a full scale school (i.e. primary and secondary school with associated administration) as this provides a worst case/maximum development scenario. The traffic assessment recognises that even without a new school, significant traffic congestion is expected to occur in the area as a result of development in the B4 and R4 zones. To assist with peak traffic flow, some traffic management changes are therefore likely to be required as a result of the proposed school. The submitted traffic assessment further suggests that a traffic management plan be implemented for the future school. Details of possible traffic mitigation and management measures are outlined in the report.

### *4. Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)*

A letter of offer to enter into a Planning Agreement, dated 17 October 2017, is submitted by the Australian Turkish Maarif Foundation. The letter outlines the applicant's willingness to work with Council to identify and provide potential public infrastructure through a VPA to support the future use of the site as a school. The attached letter recognises that the details of the VPA are to be further discussed and quantified as the PP progresses through to Gateway, and will need to be included together with the PP exhibition material.

### *5. Site view line review*

A view line study, dated October 2017, has been prepared by PMDL and TPG to review the possible built forms on the site and their visual relationship to and from the Mosque. The review has been based on a worst case scenario. The images clearly demonstrate that the Mosque is currently not identifiable from Percy Street due to the existing built forms, trees and other vertical elements. Redevelopment of the site, however, could potentially result in improved views to the upper levels of the Mosque. The view line review demonstrates that any redevelopment of the site for a school will not have a negative impact on views to the Gallipoli Mosque and in fact may improve them. On this basis, we further believe that an FSR and/or height control should not be imposed upon the site. Currently the site has an FSR 1:1 and no height limit. It is our intention, during the exhibition and consideration of the PP, to further demonstrate to Council that a suitable built form can be proposed for the site that meets the needs of the students, has minimal impact in terms of overshadowing or privacy, and as demonstrated by the submitted view line review will ensure that view lines to and from the Mosque can be maintained or improved.

As evident from our response it is our intention to work with Council and address all issues to your satisfaction. Should you have any queries in relation to our response, it would be greatly appreciated if we could have the opportunity to meet with you and any other relevant Council staff to discuss any issues raised and where necessary, address these matters further.

Should Council require further clarification on any of the above matters, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on 02 9925 0444.

Yours sincerely

TPG Town Planning and Urban Design

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'H. Deegan'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Helen Deegan  
Director of Planning