



**Planning &
Environment**

Planning Services

Industry Assessments

Contact: Chloe Dunlop

Phone: (02) 8289 6667

Email: Chloe.dunlop@planning.nsw.gov.au

Our Ref: SSD 8859

Mr Rohan Dickson
Director
Ae Design Partnership
PO Box 848
Rozelle NSW 2039

Dear Mr Dickson

**Request for Additional Information
Elizabeth Drive Business Hub, Cecil Park (SSD 8859)**

The Department has reviewed the Development Application (DA) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Elizabeth Drive Business Hub that was lodged on 14 August 2018, in consultation with Fairfield City Council and relevant agencies.

You are requested to submit a revised EIS for the proposal that effectively addresses the issues identified in Appendix 1.

This information is considered necessary for a proper assessment of your application, as per clause 54(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (the Regulation).

Note that under clause 54(5) of the Regulation, you may instead advise the Minister in writing that the requested additional information will not be provided.

Once you provide this information, or advise that it will not be provided, the Department will contact you regarding the public exhibition of the application.

If you have any questions, please contact Chloe Dunlop, Senior Planning Officer on the details listed above.

Yours sincerely

23 | 8 | 2018

Kane Winwood
Team Leader, Industry Assessments
Key Sites and Industry Assessments

Attached: Appendix 1

Appendix 1

SEARs requirements	Adequacy
A detailed description of the development	<p>In section 3.1 clarify what 'industrial and urban service' uses are.</p> <p>In section 3.1 clarify where the land use definitions in the Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan will apply and provide definitions of land uses not identified in the Standard Instrument including for 'large format retail' uses</p> <p>The EIS must describe in greater detail the proposed 'site preparatory works' including demolition of existing structures, bulk earthworks, construction of access roads, landscaping etc.</p> <p>Please update the EIS to ensure there is discussion on the retention of the dam in the north of the site as provided in the Appendix of the Stormwater, Flooding and Dams report.</p> <p>Provide in the body of the EIS a description of the proposed extent of cut and fill on the site and the construction of retaining walls.</p>
Need and justification for the development	<p>Section 8.1 'Justification of the Proposal' of the EIS provides general statements of the benefits of the proposed development however does not clearly indicate the need for the development. Provide further details on the need for the development, including the economic demand for the proposed land uses.</p>
Alternatives considered	<p>The Department requests further analysis in this regard including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section 1.5.2 – justification for the proposed site layout and why the proposed design is the most appropriate. ○ Section 1.5.2 – justification which demonstrates that the proposed business uses 'respond to the needs of the surrounding community whilst limiting any impact on regional centres'. ○ Section 1.5.2 – word missing in text and analysis of possible alternative sites lacking. The other possible sites and reasons these were discounted.
Likely Staging of the development	<p>The EIS must clarify whether the proposed early works will be staged and the development of the business hub will be subject to future development applications.</p>
Likely interactions between the development and any existing, approved and proposed developments in the vicinity of the site	<p>The EIS does not describe the nearby sensitive receivers including the rural/residential properties located directly to the north of the site. The body of the EIS must indicate the proximity of these receivers to the site and describe the surrounding landscape.</p>

	Figure 4 of the EIS identifies the proposed M12 motorway will be located directly to the south of the site. However, there is no discussion of this in the EIS. The EIS must include a description of all proposed developments in the vicinity of the site to understand how the locality may change in the future and any interactions between this proposal and the M12 motorway.
Plans of any proposed works	<p>As outlined in Attachment 1 of the SEARs, the plans must include a locality/context plan which identifies significant local features (including nearby sensitive receivers), the location of existing buildings and any public transport nodes. Please provide a locality/context plan as requested in the SEARs.</p> <p>Refer to comments on Stormwater Management Plan below.</p> <p>The 'Earthworks Grading Plan', the 'Earthworks Cut-Fill Plan', 'Pavement Plan' and 'Retaining Wall Plan' are in draft form. Provide final copies of these plans.</p>
Infrastructure upgrades or items required to facilitate the development and a description of any arrangements to ensure upgrades will be implemented in a timely manner and maintained	The plans submitted show that a roundabout is proposed at the Elizabeth Drive and Cecil Road intersection. However, this is not mentioned in the body of the EIS nor does the EIS outline the timing for the delivery of road upgrade works in general. The EIS must clearly outline the required infrastructure upgrades and the expected timing for the completion of all infrastructure upgrades.
Consideration of all relevant environmental planning instruments	Refer comments below in relation to Strategic Context.
<p>The EIS must also be accompanied by a report from a qualified quantity surveyor providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an estimate of the jobs that will be created by the development during the construction and operational phases of the development 	Section 6.6.4 of the EIS states that the operation of the site will generate 233 jobs. However, the CIV report does not provide an estimate of jobs generated by the proposed construction works.

SEARs requirements	Adequacy
<p>Strategic Need</p> <p>Demonstration the proposal is consistent with all relevant planning strategies, environmental planning instruments, adopted precinct plans, draft district plan(s) and adopted management plans...</p>	<p>Section 5.3.2.1 of the EIS references an Appendix 24. However, no Appendix 24 has been submitted. There are also missing references to Appendices in this section. Please revise.</p> <p>The EIS must include a more detailed assessment against the requirements of Clause 17 'Development on Private Land' of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Parklands) 2009.</p> <p>There is a distinct difference in the intent for the use of the land identified in the Parklands Plan of Management 2020 compared to the Parklands Plan of Management 2020 Supplement. This is not made clear in the EIS. A revised EIS must be provided which notes this and which demonstrates that the development is consistent with the more recent Parklands Plan of Management 2020 Supplement.</p>

	<p>Section 5.5.4 of the EIS references the Parklands Plan of Management 2020 and notes that one of the strategic directions is that 'Land uses should generate an appropriate commercial return and also add to the amenity of adjacent communities'.</p> <p>Generally, the justification in the EIS of the proposal against the following documents is lacking in detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Parklands Plan of Management 2020; - the Parklands Plan of Management 2020 Supplement; and - the Parklands draft Plan of Management 2030.
Biodiversity	<p>The BDAR report submitted is still in draft form. Please submit a final version.</p> <p>If the proposal is likely to have a significant impact on matters of National Environmental Significance, it may require an approval under the Commonwealth <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (EPBC Act). Please advise if an EPBC Act approval is required as the Commonwealth approval process may be integrated into the NSW approval process. This EPBC approval would be in addition to any approvals required under NSW legislation and it is your responsibility to contact the Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy to determine if an approval under the EPBC Act is required for your proposal.</p>
Socio-Economic	<p>Section 2.2.2 of the Economic Impact Assessment (EIA) states that the requirements of Clause 17 of the Western Sydney Parklands SEPP were considered and addressed as part of the SEARs request. However, a detailed assessment against Clause 17 must be provided in the EIS.</p> <p>No assessment of the potential social impacts and benefits to the community has been provided in the EIS. A revised EIS must be provided which assesses potential social impacts including both positive and negative social impacts.</p> <p>The Department's letter dated 29 November 2018 requires that effective and genuine community consultation is undertaken during the preparation of the EIS. The EIS does not provide any details on engagement with the community and surrounding residents. The EIS must include details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o who the affected community would be o the methods of consultation used during the preparation of the EIS o a description of any matters raised by the community and a response on how these have been addressed in the EIS
Traffic and Access	<p>The Traffic and Parking Assessment report submitted is still in draft form. Please submit a final version.</p>

	<p>The EIS only provides reference to the Traffic and Parking Assessment report held in the Appendices. However, the body of the EIS must provide a summary of the assessment of traffic, access and parking and any mitigation measures.</p> <p>Provide swept path analysis plans prepared in accordance with AUSTROADS showing the largest vehicles accessing the site can safely manoeuvre into and through the site.</p>
Urban Design	<p>The Urban Design Report submitted is over 45MB. Due to the size of the document we have had difficulties downloading and saving it. Please ensure all documents submitted have a maximum size of 10MB.</p>
Contamination	<p>The Preliminary Site Investigation report submitted is still in draft form. Please submit a final version.</p>
Soil and Water	<p>The Stormwater, Flooding and Dams report submitted is still in draft form. The report also references the wrong site in the footer of each page. Please submit a final version.</p> <p>The references to flooding in Section 6.3 of the EIS and in the Stormwater, Flooding and Dams report must include the actual flood levels predicted rather than referencing flooding mapping (Figures 10 and 11 in the EIS which are too small to decipher).</p> <p>Provide detailed stormwater plans showing the proposed stormwater treatment devices and update the Stormwater Management Plan to include reference to these detailed plans.</p> <p>Provide an updated Stormwater Management Plan which clearly shows the location of stormwater discharge points.</p> <p>The Preliminary Salinity and Geotechnical Assessment report submitted is still in draft form. Please submit a final version.</p>
Heritage	<p>The submitted Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment is still in draft form. Please submit a final version.</p>
Infrastructure Requirements	<p>The submitted Service Utility Infrastructure Assessment and the Preliminary Onsite Wastewater Assessment reports are still in draft form. Please submit final versions.</p>
Air Quality	<p>Provide a description of the air quality impacts from the proposed development including from dust.</p> <p>Describe in the EIS in what state the site will be left following the completion of the early works and measures to mitigate potential dust (and erosion) impacts.</p>