| Date | Item |
|------------------|---|
| 24 January 2017 | Pre-lodgement meeting |
| 27 February 2017 | Preliminary draft PP request received by Council |
| 15 May 2017 | Comments on draft proposal provided to the proponent via letter (Note this letter did not raise the FSR issue as no mention had been made of the intention to seek and increased FSR. To date, proposal indicated that the existing building would be used, an APU would be sought, and the existing FSR of 1:1 would be retained). |
| 19 May 2017 | Planning Proposal request lodged with Council |
| 1 June 2017 | Preliminary exhibition of proposal request commences |
| 5 June 2017 | Council letter (T052761/2017) to proponent providing and requesting additional information. Amongst other things, this letter notes the proposed increase in FSR from 1:1 to 1.2:1 and that this was not mentioned previously in pre-lodgement discussions or documentation. Letter notes strategic merit is unclear, FSR of 1.2:1 is considerably higher than possible FSR increases being considered for the remainder of this precinct (currently zoned (R2), and seems inconsistent to seek additional FSR when using and existing building and proposing and APU. Letter recommends retaining existing FSR of 1:1. |
| 29 June 2017 | Meeting between proponent/consultant, representatives of the Gallipoli Education Services, Council's General Manager and Group Manager Planning |
| 30 June 2017 | Preliminary exhibition for the proposal request concludes (min 28 days) |
| 3 July 2017 | Proponent provides response (T062486/2017) to letter of 5 June. Agrees to retain existing FSR of 1:1. |
| 9 August 2017 | PP Request Assessment Report considered by Cumberland IHAP Meeting (Minutes T084579/2017) Recommendations include: Additional information be provided including flooding, revised traffic impact assessment If intersection mitigation works are required, these are to be included in a letter of offer to be discussed with council Revise PP to seek FSR 1:1 as previously agreed Submit information supporting a building height of 12m (rather than 10m) |
| 6 September 2017 | PP Request Assessment reported to Council Meeting Resolution (T103649/2017) – Indicates council will proceed with |

| | 1:1 FSR and 12m maximum building height (as resolved) for the site |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 18 October – 2 November 2017 | Additional information submitted by the proponent (required by Council resolution) |
| 9 November 2017 | Letter to proponent acknowledging additional information received noting concerns/ inadequacies with their traffic impact assessment and confirming that council will proceed with an 1:1 FSR even though their documentation has not specifically been revised to reflect this (T098982/2017) |
| 27 November 2017 | PP submitted to DP&E (cover letter Council cover letter specifically states PP seeks to retain 1:1 FSR and 12m building height limit, as per council's resolution of 6 September 2017. Letter also flags potential traffic concerns and the need for further investigations prior to post gateway exhibition. |
| 20 February 2018 | DP&E issues a Gateway Determination(T013903/2018) for proposal requesting that the proposal proceed with conditions Gateway Determination includes requirement to undertake work to consider 1.2:1 FSR. |
| | Note: DP&E gateway report (T013906/2018) notes the proponent intends to vary the 1:1 FSR (p.9) (note discussions were had with council on this – proponent must have approached DP&E directly) |
| 7 March 2018 | DP&E holds a meeting with Proponent and Council to discuss the Gateway conditions issued for PP |
| 4 April 2018 | Council receives a letter of offer from proponent for a VPA including a monetary contribution of \$150,000. |
| 4 May 2018 | Council sends a response to proponent's letter of offer. |
| 28 June 2018 | Council requests GHD to model the Church Street link as (Variation 1) to the draft precinct study in light the proponent's proposed church street link proposal for the proposed new school |
| August 2018 | GHD submits draft Gelibolu Access and Study for Council's review |
| September 2018 | Council completes the view line and building height analysis for the Gelibolu precinct with the inclusion of the subject site (notes this will be reported to inform the draft Auburn and Lidcombe Town Centre Strategy (Precincts 16, 20, and 21). |
| SSD July/Sept 2018 | Proponent lodges State Significant Development (SSD) with |

| | DP&E for the site |
|-------------------|--|
| 20 September 2018 | Council submits a written submission in response to SSD |
| 24 September 2018 | Council refers 2 Percy St PP and the draft Gelibolu traffic and access study (GHD) to RMS and Transport for NSW for comments to fulfill requirements of Gateway Condition 1(d) |
| 4 December 2018 | Council receives referral comments from RMS and Transport for NSW on the PP, SSD and draft Gelibolu Traffic and Access study |
| 4 December 2018 | Council receives a written submission from NSW Sydney Trains objecting the proposed Church Street link and 2 Percy St Proposal |
| 15 February 2019 | GHD and Council meets to discuss a way forward for RMS and Transport for NSW referral comments dated 4 Dec 2018 (Tabs B, C and D) |
| 15 March 2019 | DP&E organises a meeting with Council, GHD, NSW Sydney Trains, RMS and Transport for NSW to discuss 2 Percy St proposal's Gateway Determination conditions and discuss the feasibility of the proposed Church Street link |
| 22 March 2019 | GHD and Council meets with RMS to further clarify and discuss traffic modelling and other comments (strategic costings and strategic concept drawings) |
| 25 March 2019 | Council receives a letter from proponent's consultant providing further justification that the proponent has met Gateway all Determination conditions for PP |
| 3 May 2019 | Council submits Addendum 1 (prepared by GHD dated 28 April 2019) in response to RMS's referral comments Tabs B, C and D (This excludes the strategic costing, concept drawings and Northumberland intersection modelling) |
| 23 May 2019 | Council receives an email response from RMS for Addendum 1 requesting further clarification and additional information from GHD. |
| | RMS confirms Council that the proponent would need to revise their traffic impact assessment prepared for the PP prior to exhibiting the proposal and requests the proponent delete the proposed Church Street link from the study and address transport provisions as discussed under Tab A prior to exhibition of PP. |
| | RMS further confirms that the draft Gelibolu Traffic and Access study is unlikely to identify any specific site improvements or land acquisitions for the 2 Percy Street PP, any improvements identified as a result if any would need to be addressed by the proponent's Traffic Impact Assessment and negotiated via a |

Revised Chronology of Events for 2 Percy Street, Auburn.

| | future VPA. |
|--------------|---|
| 27 May 2019 | Council informs the proponent's consultant to revise the GTA |
| | Traffic Impact Assessment (July 2017) submitted as per RMS |
| | request email. |
| 29 May 2019 | Council and GHD provides a further written clarification on |
| | Addendum 1 to RMS's email dated 23 May 2019. |
| | Council and GHD requests RMS to confirm dates to be modelled |
| | for the traffic modelling work for the Northumberland |
| | Intersection. Council and GHD are still awaiting a response from |
| | RMS to commence the balance work. |
| 3 June 2019 | Council submits Addendum 2 strategic concept drawings and |
| | costings (prepared by GHD) for RMS's review. |
| June 2019 | Proponent submits revised Traffic Impact Assessment study and |
| | preliminary site investigation report for 2 Percy St for exhibition |
| 11 June 2019 | Council sends email to Transport for NSW to confirm if the PP |
| | can proceed to exhibition since Council's draft Gelibolu traffic |
| | study was unlikely to identify any site specific improvement for |
| | the 2 Percy Street proposal as confirmed by RMS. |
| 13 June 2019 | Council receives confirmation from Transport for NSW to |
| | proceed with the proposal for exhibition and requesting the |
| | proponent to further revise the Traffic Impact Assessment study |
| | to remove relevant traffic/ intersection analysis relating to |
| | Church Street and surrounds. |
| 13 June 2019 | Council informs proponent about above |
| | Proponent submits a revised traffic impact statement |