

From: [Grace Macdonald](#)
To: [Sam Burns](#)
Cc: [Lindsey Blecher](#); [Luke Rayner](#); [Caitlin D'Arcy](#)
Subject: RE: Information Request (SSD-9138102-Mod-6)
Date: Friday, 9 May 2025 1:53:44 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[P2959101v03_DA_Lot_3_Westlink_Estate_SSD_Modification.pdf](#)
[Updated Modification Report - Westlink Mod 6 \(SSD-9138102-Mod-6\).pdf](#)
[12587_DA131\[P1\] - Office Sections.pdf](#)
[12587_DA161\[P6\] - Estate Signage - LOTS 1 & 4.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hi Sam,

Further to our discussion on Tuesday, the following items have been updated to address the following from your email on Tuesday.

- *As discussed early, there are discrepancies in the parking numbers between the Architectural Drawings, Traffic Statement (page 4) and Mod Report (page 24). There are also discrepancies in the traffic generation numbers between the Traffic Statement (page 4-5) and Mod Report (page 21). Are you able to get amended documents to me with these details aligned?*
 - **ESR Response:** There was a mistake in the Traffic Report referencing 148 spaces. The updated traffic report now reference 146 to align with the Architectural Plans and Modification Report. Further the Modification Report has been updated to reflect the correct traffic generation to reflect the original SSDA approval.
- *Are you able to also provide a section plan for the office components of the warehouse, both the main office and dock office, showing the ceiling of the office in relation to the ceiling of the warehouse?*
 - **ESR Response:** Updated architectural sections have been provided showing the overall height for the dock off at 3965mm and main office at 4042mm. Further, we also realised we were missing a car entry/exit sign on the signage plan at the southern carpark entrance. We have amended the signage plan to include the 1 S2 sign.
- *Additionally, landscaping within the proposed carpark is not in accordance with Section 4.2.3 (9) of the MRPDGP, which requires one planter bed per 10 car spaces within car parks. Are you able to provide amended plans to address this matter too?*
 - **ESR Response:** The incorporation of island planter beds in the proposed overflow car park cannot be accommodated as they may have to be removed in the future to facilitate the operational needs of another tenant if the current tenant were to vacate. The proposed modifications seek to maintain the future flexibility of the southern portion of the hardstand for loading purposes, with the approved roller doors proposed to remain in-place, allowing for the conversion to on-grade loading docks and use of the adjacent hardstand for heavy vehicles. Further, a 20m wide awning will be constructed above the southern portion of the hardstand, shading more than half of the spaces within the proposed overflow car park. On this basis, and given compliance with the MRP DCP is achieved in relation to pervious area on Lot 3 and tree canopy coverage at an estate level, variation to Section 4.2.3(9) of the MRP DCP is justifiable.

Can you provide an update via email or give me a ring on the progression of the assessment report? Has Lindsey reviewed it? Just ascertaining timing on this modification. As discussed, we're needing to make a call on ordering additional steel for the project to support the office extension.

Kind regards,

Grace Macdonald | NSW Planning Manager



ESR Australia & New Zealand
Level 13, 39 Martin Place, Sydney 2000 | au.esr.com
M +61 411 599 155 **D** +61 2 9186 4759 **E** Grace.Macdonald@esr.com
Follow us on [LinkedIn](#)

This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and may be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. Any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or use of this communication, or the information it contains, may be prohibited, or if you are not the intended addressee, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this e-mail. Delivery of this email is not intended to waive any applicable privileges. Any views expressed in this e-mail are those of the individual sender, except where specifically stated to be the view of ESR or its subsidiaries.