

---

**Sent:** 6/02/2020 9:32:49 AM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

06/02/2020

MR Robert Malicki  
65 Dareen ST  
Frenchs Forest NSW 2086  
rob@aimoverseas.com.au

**RE: DA2019/1340 - 100 / 0 Meatworks Avenue OXFORD FALLS NSW 2100**

I have reviewed the proposal along with many of the documents and submission attached.

There are a number of concerns that should be addressed before this development is allowed to proceed.

1. I find the arguments presented in DR Elvira Lanham's submission about ecological impact compelling and worthy of investigation. Having studied botany at university, this is a well justified submission.
2. I'm concerned about the stormwater/run-off provisions in the plans. These must be addressed, in line with Council's own assessment.
3. Bushfire risk - many local residents have identified this as a source of concern. The single road in/out into a significant bushfire prone area does look like further consideration is needed (which is recommended by the bushfire consultant anyway).
4. Traffic - there has been a fairly shrill social media campaign in the local area about this. I'm more pragmatic on this issue - I've never been impacted by existing traffic to this site. If it is not already, the issue of "more trucks" could be mitigated with a 3.5t weight restriction on the upper section of Oxford Falls Rd East (which I have a feeling it may already be). Most additional traffic will be via the Wakehurst Parkway. My primary concern about traffic would be on the safety of school kids.
5. Some residents point out that this is out of character for the local area. I can see this both ways. I understand that locals want to maintain the character of their local area. However, the site location is out of sight of the vast majority of the local area. Function spaces are also not uncommon in rurally zoned areas. Almost no one will be visually impacted. It will also bring more employment to the area, which is positive.

I think more work needs to be done on this application to ensure the local natural environment is suitably protected. Subject to that being done, I have no in-principle, anti-development objection as to whether the development should proceed.