

ASSESSMENT REPORT

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION (DA 177-6-2002-i): PROPOSED WAREHOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY (BUILDING B), HOMEBUSH WEST

File No: S02/00972

1. SUMMARY

Macquarie Goodman Development Management Pty Ltd (the Applicant) is proposing to construct and operate a warehouse and distribution facility on the former Ford site at 350-374 Parramatta Road, Homebush West in the Strathfield local government area.

In 1996, the Minister approved a masterplan for the site to be redeveloped in stages into an integrated warehouse, storage and distribution facility (DA 31/96).

This proposal forms part of Stage 2 of the masterplan consent. It involves:

- Demolishing existing structures;
- Constructing a warehouse and distribution facility (7,010 m²) with associated structures;
- Providing internal roads, car parking, and associated infrastructure to service the warehouse; and
- Landscaping the site.

The proposal would cost \$4.5 million, employ 45 workers full-time, and reuse strategically located industrial land more efficiently.

In addition, the Applicant is seeking to modify the masterplan consent (DA 31/96) to change the orientation of the building and extend the existing internal access road for the site.

These modifications are required to ensure that the proposal would comply with the masterplan consent.

On 6 June 2002, the Applicant lodged a DA application for the proposed development, and a Section 96(1A) application for the proposed modification with the Department.

Under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (the Act), the proposal is classified as State Significant, and the Minister is the consent authority for the proposal.

Between 19 June and 19 July 2002, the Department exhibited the DA in accordance with the requirements for public participation in Division 6, Part 6 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (the Regulation).

During the exhibition, the Department received three submissions from public authorities and one from the general public.

Strathfield Council, Sydney Water and the RTA did not object to the proposal but recommended issues relating to landscaping and car parking be addressed.

The Department has assessed the DA and submissions, and recommends that the Minister approve the DA subject to conditions.

2. SITE CONTEXT

The proposed site is located at 350-374 Parramatta Road, Homebush West (see Figure 1) and is referred to as Campus Homebush.

Figure 1: Campus Homebush

Until 1994, the Ford Corporation operated from the site, using the adjoining land to the south for waste disposal purposes. This land has since been remediated.

In August 1996, the Minister approved a masterplan for the site to allow the construction of new facilities and the refurbishment of existing buildings for warehousing, storage and distribution purposes. The site is still dominated by the old factory buildings but contains the newly constructed UPS warehouse building, which was approved by the Minister in July 2001.

Construction of the recently approved Building D in the south-east corner is expected commence within the next few months.

The proposed development zone is located on along the western boundary near the centre of the site alongside the UPS building. Two buildings, once used as a warehouse/workshop and canteen, are located within the development zone.

In general, the site is surrounded by industrial land uses, however there is a low-density residential area to the east of the site. Other key land uses in the vicinity of the site include the Sydney Olympic Park, the M4, the Main Western Railway line and Flemington Markets.

3. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal, which forms part of Stage 2 of the masterplan, involves:

- Demolishing existing structures;
- Constructing a warehouse and distribution facility (7,010 m²) with associated structures;
- Providing internal roads, car parking, and associated infrastructure to service the warehouse; and
- Landscaping the site.

The Applicant is proposing to construct the warehouse in two stages, with an additional two warehousing bays constructed at the northern end of the warehouse, when required.

Refer to Figure 2 & 3 for the proposed building layout and elevations of the proposed development.

In addition, the Applicant is seeking to modify the masterplan consent (DA 31/96) to change the orientation of the building and extend the existing internal access road for the site (refer to Figure 4 & 5).

These modifications are required to ensure that the proposal would comply with the masterplan consent.

The Applicant claims the proposal would:

- Cost \$4.5 million;
- Generate approximately 45 new full-time positions; and
- Use strategically located industrial land more efficiently.

4. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

Permissibility

Under the *Strathfield Planning Scheme Ordinance*, the site is zoned (4) – Industrial Zone. Warehousing and distribution development is permissible with consent in this zone.

State Significant Development

The proposal is classified as State Significant Development under Section 76A(7) & 76A(8) of the Act, and the Minister is the consent authority for the DA.

Relevant Planning Instruments/Policies

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant provisions in the following planning instruments/policies:

- *State Environmental Planning Policy No.11 – Traffic Generating Development;*
- *State Environmental Planning Policy No.55 – Remediation of Land;*
- *Strathfield Planning Scheme Ordinance;*
- *Strathfield Council's Code for Industrial Buildings;* and
- *Strathfield Development Control Plan No.4 – Provision of Off-Street Parking Facilities.*

This assessment concludes that the proposal is consistent with the relevant aims and objectives of these instruments, and satisfies the relevant assessment criteria (see Section 6 and Appendix A).

5. CONSULTATION

On 6 June 2001, the Applicant lodged a DA for the proposal with the Department.

The Department subsequently:

- Notified the surrounding property owners in writing;
- Advertised the DA in the *Inner Western Suburbs Courier* and the *Glebe and Inner Western Weekly*;
- Notified the relevant public authorities;
- Exhibited the DA between 19 June and 19 July 2002; and
- Put up site notices about the DA on the site.

This satisfies the requirements for public participation in Division 6, Part 6 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*.

During the exhibition, the Department received three submissions from public authorities and one from the general public.

Strathfield Council, Sydney Water and the RTA did not object to the proposal but recommended issues relating to landscaping and car parking be addressed.

The submission from the general public was seeking confirmation on a past development application.

6. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES

Building height

The masterplan consent restricts the exterior wall height of the building to 9.5m. This condition, which was based on the assumption that the building would have a 10 metre setback, was imposed to prevent any overshadowing of the adjoining residential area.

The masterplan consent has since been modified to allow flexibility in building height as long as the Applicant can demonstrate that the amenity of the surrounding residential area would not be affected.

The Applicant is now proposing to increase the exterior wall height to 12.8m. The Applicant claims that this increase in height would not impact on residential areas as

- The proposed building is 180 metres from the nearest residential property; and
- The view of the building would be obstructed by future warehouses approved under the Masterplan.

The Department has assessed the potential impacts of the proposed height increase, and agrees with the Applicant that the proposed development would not generate any significant impacts on residential amenity due to the substantial distance separating the development from the adjoining residential areas.

Consequently, the Department believes the proposed increase in building height should be approved.

Noise

Construction

Noise from the proposed construction activities could exceed the EPA's construction noise criteria and adversely impact residential amenity.

To prevent these exceedances, the Applicant is proposing to:

- Implement noise control methods as recommended in AS 2436-1981 *Guide to Noise Control on Construction, Maintenance and Demolition Sites*; and
- Implement a Construction Noise Management Plan.

However, the Department believes that the Applicant should be required to:

- Comply with the EPA's construction noise criteria;
- Carry out the proposed works during regular construction hours;
- Prepare and implement a Construction Noise Management Plan for the proposed works; and
- Conduct regular monitoring of the construction noise during the proposed works.

Although the Applicant has indicated that it may use a temporary concrete crushing plant during construction, the potential impacts of this activity were not assessed in the SEE.

Consequently, the Department believes the Applicant should not be allowed to crush any concrete or demolition waste on the site without the written approval of the Director-General. In seeking this approval, the Applicant should be required to submit a detailed report to the Director-General, which assesses the potential impacts associated with the proposed operations and describes what measures would be implemented to mitigate or manage these impacts.

Operational

The cumulative noise level generated by the proposed warehousing activities would exceed the EPA's *Industrial Noise Policy* day noise criteria at the nearest affected residences.

In order to comply with the EPA's noise criteria and minimise the impact on residential amenity, the Applicant is proposing to:

- Treat noisy plant and vehicle components;
- Incorporate the proposed building into the existing *Noise Management Strategy* and monitoring program for the entire site; and
- Undertake compliance testing once the building is commissioned.

The noise impact assessment report by Renzo Tonin & Associates concluded that these measures, combined with the required noise barriers, would ensure that the proposed development would comply with the EPA's noise criteria.

The Department is satisfied with this assessment, but believes that the Applicant should be required to:

- Comply with the EPA's operational noise criteria;

- Conduct a Noise Audit of the proposal within 3 months of commissioning the development to ensure that the development complies with the specified noise criteria, and if any non-compliance is detected, implement additional measures to ensure compliance; and
- Complete the construction of the noise barriers prior to occupation.

Contamination

Preliminary investigations indicate that the site of the proposed development is suitable for commercial/industrial land use, with contamination levels below the relevant standards.

Regardless of this, the Applicant is proposing to incorporate the proposed development area into a Site Audit that is currently being prepared for the entire site. The Applicant states that:

- The Site Audit Statement and Validation report would be submitted to the Department as soon as they become available; and
- Any recommendations made in the report would be implemented during demolition and construction works.

The Department is satisfied with this approach. However, the Department believes that the Applicant should be required to submit these documents to the Director-General before the Occupation Certificate is issued to verify that the land is suitable for the intended landuse.

Water Quality

Construction

If not properly managed, the proposed earthworks and construction activities could have an adverse impact on the water quality of the catchment.

To minimise potential impacts, the Applicant is proposing to implement a detailed Soil and Water Management Plan, prepared in accordance with the Department of Housing's *Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction Manual*.

The Department is satisfied that the implementation of the management plan would be sufficient in minimising any potential impacts. However, the Department believes that it must be approved by the Director-General prior to the commencement of construction.

Operational

Unless they are properly managed, operations in the proposed warehouse could pollute the surface water quality of the catchment. Despite this, the DA did not include any proposals to mitigate or manage these potential impacts.

Consequently, the Department believes the Applicant should be required to micro-grade the warehouse floors to ensure that any pollutants generated during operations do not drain outside the building and end up in the stormwater drainage system.

Air quality

The proposed earthworks and construction works will generate dust.

The Applicant is proposing to prepare and implement a Dust Management Plan to mitigate any potential air quality impacts associated with these works.

The Department is satisfied with this approach, but believes that the management plan must be approved prior to the commencement of construction.

Waste Management

The Applicant would generate construction and operation waste. In particular, the proposed demolition of the canteen and workshop/warehouse buildings would generate significant levels of waste.

To minimise this waste, the Applicant is proposing to:

- Incorporate the proposed development into the existing *Waste Management Strategy*;
- Recycle a minimum 60% of all waste generated during construction; and
- Manage waste in accordance with relevant Federal and State waste minimisation legislation and standards;

The Department is satisfied with this approach; however it believes that the Applicant should be required to implement a detailed Construction Waste Management Plan and a Waste Management Plan for the proposed operations.

Landscaping

To improve the general appearance of the proposed development, the Applicant is proposing to landscape the perimeter of the building and the car parking areas. The Applicant is also proposing to temporarily landscape the footprint of the second stage to minimise the visual impact of the incomplete development.

The proposed landscaping is generally acceptable, however Strathfield Council and Sydney Water requested that the landscaping plans should be modified to:

- Improve the visual appearance of the building vista; and
- Remove plant species that could cause substantial damage to sewer and wastewater systems.

Consequently, the Department believes that the Applicant should be required to:

- Revise the landscaping plan in consultation with Strathfield Council and Sydney Water;
- Prepare and implement a Landscape Management plan for the development, that describes how the proposed landscaping would be maintained and monitored over time, including any temporary landscaping areas; and
- Submit a Landscape Completion Report to the Director-General within 90 days of completing the approved landscaping works.

Site Access

To minimise impacts on neighbouring residential areas, the masterplan consent restricted vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access to and from the site via Parramatta Road.

The Applicant is now proposing to allow pedestrian access to the site from neighbouring residential streets.

However, this is prohibited in the masterplan consent for the site. Consequently, to guarantee that there is no access from the residential streets, the Department believes that the conditions of consent should require all vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian access to and from the site to be via Parramatta Road, and not via Manademar Avenue or Telopea Avenue.

Environmental Management

The Applicant has developed a range of environmental management plans and procedures for the whole site in accordance with the conditions of the masterplan consent, and the environmental performance of this proposal would be monitored and managed in accordance with these plans and procedures.

While these plans and procedures are generally acceptable, the Director-General has not formally approved them yet. Consequently, the Applicant should not be allowed to occupy the proposed development before the Director-General has approved these plans.

6. SECTION 79C CONSIDERATION

Section 79C of the Act sets out the matters that a consent authority must take into consideration when it determines a development application.

The Department has assessed the DA against these heads of consideration (see Appendix A), and is satisfied that the:

- Proposal is generally consistent with the relevant planning instruments;
- Proposal would not result in any significant environmental or socio-economic impacts;
- Site is suitable for the proposed development; and
- Development is generally in the public interest.

7. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

The Department has prepared a set of proposed conditions of consent for the proposal.

These conditions are required to:

- Modify details of the proposal;
- Minimise any adverse impacts associated with the proposal;
- Provide for the ongoing environmental management of the development;
- Provide for regular monitoring and reporting on the development.

The Applicant has reviewed, and does not object to, these conditions.

8. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE MASTERPLAN CONSENT

The proposed modifications to the masterplan consent are required to ensure that the proposal would comply with the masterplan consent.

The potential impacts of the proposed modifications have been assessed in detail in Section 6 of the report, and the Department is satisfied that they would not result in any adverse impacts on the surrounding residential area.

9. CONCLUSION

The Department has assessed the DA, SEE and submissions on the DA.

The proposed development offers several benefits as it would re-use under-utilised industrial land and create approximately 45 new full-time positions. Yet the proposed development would generate several impacts on the local residential amenity, particularly with regards to construction and operational noise impacts.

However, the Department is satisfied that the potential impacts of the development would be effectively managed and/or mitigated through the implementation of a construction management plan and the incorporation of the proposal into existing operational management plans.

Consequently, the Department believes that the Minister should approve the DA subject to conditions.

10. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Minister:

- (a) Consider the findings and recommendations of this report;
- (b) Approve the DA subject to conditions, under Section 80 of the Act;
- (c) Approve the proposed modification of the masterplan consent under Section 96(1A) of the Act;
- (d) Sign the attached Instrument of Consent; and
- (e) Sign the attached Notice of Modification to the masterplan consent.

Endorsed:

Gordon Kirkby
Team Leader

Sam Haddad
Executive Director

Prepared by Caitlin Bennett