

8 September 2022

Mr. Garry Hopkins Director, Western Region Department of Planning and Environment PO Box 58 Dubbo NSW 2830

Attention: Wayne Garnsey

Dear Garry,

Bathurst Integrated Medical Centre and George St Carpark – Additional Local Provision Planning Proposal (PP-2021-6620)

As you are aware, a Planning Proposal (PP-2021-6620) has been prepared by *Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd* (Keylan) on behalf of *BIMC Pty Ltd* (the Applicant), to support amendments to the *Bathurst Regional Local Environmental Plan 2014* (BRLEP 2014). The Planning Proposal relates to a 1.5 hectare site at 250 Howick Street and George Street, Bathurst in the Bathurst Regional Local Government Area (LGA).

Specifically, the Planning Proposal seeks to increase the maximum height for the Bathurst Integrated Medical Centre (BIMC) Site from 12m to 29m and the George Street Carpark (GSC) Site from 12m to 21m. It also seeks to amend the maximum FSR of the BIMC Site from 2:1 to 2.6:1. There are no additional proposed amendments to any other planning controls applicable to the subject Site.

On 23 May 2022, the Planning Proposal received Gateway Determination which includes a number of conditions that must be addressed prior to progressing to the next stage of the Planning Proposal process, being community consultation.

A revised Planning Proposal report and accompanying documentation has been prepared in response to the Gateway conditions and submitted to Bathurst Regional Council. A response to each Gateway condition has been prepared and included at **Attachment A**.

We trust that the accompanying response and documentation satisfy DPE's Gateway conditions, and the Planning Proposal can subsequently progress to community consultation.

Yours sincerely

Dan Keary BSc MURP RPIA Director

CC Janet Bingham, Neil Southorn – Bathurst Regional Council **Attachment A:** Response to Gateway Conditions



## Attachment A – Response to Gateway Conditions

Ostower Condition		
	eway Condition	Response
1. Prior to community consultation the planning proposal is to be updated to:		
(a)	clarify the extent of the site boundary and the site area (i.e., whether the northern end of Gallipoli Road forms a part of the site)	<ul> <li>This matter has been clarified in the revised Planning Proposal report.</li> <li>The Site does not extend onto Gallipoli Road. Figure 1 of the revised report demonstrates the site boundaries and extent.</li> </ul>
(b)	include a timeframe for the LEP amendment to be complete	<ul> <li>An updated project timeline has been prepared in coordination with Council and included in the revised report.</li> </ul>
(c)	clarify the bulk and scale impacts of a 29m and 21m high building envelope for the BIMC site and GSC site. Revised visual impact assessment is to be undertaken considering impacts of the full building envelope from all four streetscapes	<ul> <li>A revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has been prepared to address this Gateway Condition.</li> <li>The revised VIA specifically addresses the potential visual impact of the full building envelope under the proposed controls for the Site.</li> <li>The revised VIA is included alongside the Planning Proposal package.</li> </ul>
(d)	update the Heritage Impact Assessment to undertake a detailed assessment of the heritage impacts, including heritage view impacts associated with the proposed building envelope	<ul> <li>A revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared to address this Gateway Condition.</li> <li>The revised HIA identifies the potential impacts associated with the proposed envelope.</li> <li>The revised HIA has been included in the Planning Proposal package.</li> </ul>
(e)	provide additional justification for an FSR 2.6:1 for the health care facility noting that the proposed scheme only requires an FSR of 2.4 (based on a GFA of 9,634m2 as shown on the architectural plans)	<ul> <li>The proposed FSR for the BIMC of 2.6:1 has been calculated to provide an appropriate degree of flexibility for ongoing detailed design. While the concept architectural plans show a FSR of 2.4:1, there may be slight increases in GFA as the design progresses through DA and subsequent stages.</li> <li>The proposed FSR of 2.6:1 is therefore aimed at avoiding the need for either a further planning proposal or a clause 4.6 variation if there are increases in GFA through ongoing detailed design.</li> </ul>
(f)	clarify if the overshadowing diagrams provided in the Design Statement is accurate and resolve the discrepancy between the overshadowing diagrams provided in the Architectural Plans, dated February 2022 and the Design Statement dated February 2022.	<ul> <li>A revised set of Architectural Plans and Design Statement is provided with the planning proposal package.</li> <li>Both revised documents accurately reflect the overshadowing diagrams.</li> </ul>