

Oakdale West Estate, Stage 3 (SSD-9794683)

Response to Submission

April 2021

- **Appendix A:** Updated Noise report (track change and 'clean' versions included)
- **Appendix B:** ASON traffic comments
- **Appendix C:** Updated Architecture Plans
- **Appendix D:** Updated Landscape Plans
- **Appendix E:** Updated Civil Plans

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
NSW DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT, DATED 07.04.21	
Noise and Vibration Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by Wilkinson Murray does not identify the contribution of Buildings 2A, 2C, and 2D operational noise predictions. Please provide the operational predictions for Buildings 2A, 2C, and 2D in the RtS report. Please confirm the management and mitigation measures applied to minimise noise exceedances identified in the report. The noise assessments note additional screening effects of other development please justify these assumptions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The noise report has been updated to address DPIE's comments – please see attached Appendix A.
Traffic and Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Department concurs with TfNSW that Building 2D would have a shared driveway for light and heavy vehicles. Please provide justification for proposing a shared driveway considering the	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is constrained in nature, limiting the access opportunities for cars at Lot 2D, which is the reason for the proposed shared heavy and car access.• Traffic generation for Lot 2D is estimated to be 9veh/hr (light and heavy vehicle combined), which is considered minimal and therefore not anticipated to result

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>potential conflict of movements and safety impact when light vehicles mixing with heavy vehicles.</p>	<p>in unacceptable vehicle conflict between these vehicles in the slow speed environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should however be noted that proposed warehouse 2D will provide only 55 on-site car parking spaces within a dedicated car parking area completely separated from operational loading bays (see below). Staff at Lot 2D including truck drivers and staff using the car park will receive detailed onsite briefing on best practices for car parking prior to the operation of the site, to advice of safe traffic management. Truck drivers will be provided with a 'Code of Conduct' and will be made aware of any possible conflict with the light vehicle movements. Traffic operational measures will be installed to uphold safety requirements. • For these reasons any risk associated with vehicle conflicts is anticipated to be minimal and acceptable. • See attached, Appendix B, traffic response prepared by ASON.
<p>Building Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department concurs with Penrith City Council that the effective height of Building 2C is approximately 22.2 m exceeding the 15 m limit. Please provide justification for the non-compliance or amend the building design to achieve compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the pad level and the Estate Road 3 has been approved by DPIE. It is noted that there is a significant (approved) level change of between 0 and 8m between the Lot 2C pad and the Estate Road 3. • The building height is appropriate calculated from the approved pad level, considered the 'natural ground level'. From this calculation the warehouse has an effective height of 13.7m and is therefore below the 15m height limit and compliant with the height control.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that the proposed design prefers a gentle slope between the Estate road and Warehouse 2C rather than an aggressive retaining wall at the boundary to Estate Road 3, which is considered preferable from an urban design and presentation perspective. The level change is therefore accommodated in the setback between the road and Warehouse 2C, with the visual impact of the change mitigated by the landscaping. • Compared to the 28m height of the adjacent Warehouse 2B, Warehouse 2C will present recessively. Any perception of bulk or scale of warehouse 2C, as a result of the level difference between Road 03 and warehouse 2C, would only be industrial users of this road, rather than from any public domain vantage point beyond the Oakdale West Estate. For this reason the perception of bulk and scale is considered acceptable and well mitigated through landscaping. • For the above reasons, Warehouse 2C is considered compliant and within the 15m height control and is therefore acceptable.

PENRITH CITY COUNCIL

Planning Consideration

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warehouse Lot 2A: Overall the building arrangement, car parking setbacks and building form is generally supported. Of particular note are the setbacks to car parking areas forward of the building line which respect that of preceding stages and provide a setback width which is critical in the achievement of the DCP objectives, irrespective of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
---	---

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>minimum allowances afforded by the DCP. While minor encroaches into the established setback line at the north western and north eastern corners of Building Lot 2A are evident, the embellishment around these encroachments is considered sufficient to ameliorate the minor protrusions subject to address of landscape comments further within this advice. There are no concerns or design changes requested for this lot and building form.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Warehouse Lot 2C: The proposed arrangement and building form is not supportable as the design has not been sufficiently addressed visual prominence. The Statement suggests that the building is less than 15m in height to the ridge however the effective height of the building must be measured from existing ground level which when taken from the kerb line in the road presents visually as a 22.2m building. Elevation West – Warehouse 2C and Elevation North – Warehouse 2C best reflect the extent of exposed fill, retaining walls and height above the road level and above the adjacent development to the north being Amazon. This is an unsympathetic response to a challenging topographic fall through the site, which appears to be a cross fall of approximately 11m. The topography requires a stepped building form, with finished floor levels that are far more responsive to the ground level and development interface at the northern boundary of the lot. The exposed bulk and presentation of walls resulting from fill is emphasised due to inadequate landscape setbacks between the driveway and northern boundary which will not be able to ameliorate the visual impact of this wall from the roadway or from the adjacent development to the north. The issue arises from the adoption of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please see above response to question on building height and presentation of Building 2C to Estate Road 03. As above, Lot 2C has a pad level of BEL78.40, approved under SSD7348 MOD6. Warehouse 2C warehouse has a height of 13.7m measured from the approved pad level. The option of a retaining wall between Estate Road 03 and Lot 2C has not been approved under SSD7378 and would present as significant bulk and scale from Estate Road 03. The single pad level has been approved under SSD7348, rather than a stepped pad level as proposed. A pad level is not able to be provided which is inconsistent to that approved under SSD7348. Further, operationally the pad level would not be able to be split as the shared hardstand is required to be at a single level. SSD7348 approved a single slab level for the entire Lot 2C, and this is unable to be varied under SSD-9794683.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>the same finished slab level (RL78.70) between Warehouse 2C2 and 2C3.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered imperative that the building form provide a split slab, lowering the finished floor level and building height above ground level of Warehouse 2C-1 to respect the topographic fall of the site. This will require changes to floor plan arrangements, internal manoeuvring, parking arrangements and driveway ramping.. If the stepped slab and revised manoeuvring cannot be achieved, it is suggested that the allotment should only accommodate 2 x buildings (not 3 x buildings) and the spatial arrangement of that built form would require significant redesign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above comment. As explained a split level of the warehouse is not operationally viable.
<p><u>Development Engineering Considerations</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular access for the internal car park servicing Building 2D is shared with the heavy vehicle access and manoeuvring areas for Buildings 2C1, 2C2 and 2D which is not supported on safety grounds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above comment.
<p><u>Environmental Management Consideration</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is noted that the Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by Wilkinson Murray recommends that 'site operation' for affected buildings are to adhere to the mechanical and loading activity assumptions as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>outlined in Section 4.2 and 4.3 to ensure noise compliance is achieved'. It is requested that this be addressed as conditions of consent.</p>	
<p><u>Landscape Considerations</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As has been requested in preceding stages, continuous canopy street tree plantings in organic mulch is required for maximum shade and cooling to satisfy Council's Cooling the Cities Strategy. The spatial arrangement of street tree planting is inadequate, as continues to be indicated in the concept plans submitted within each stage. Additional infill planting between excessively spaced street tree groupings is required to ensure continuous canopy or layering of canopy planting within the verge as well as within the street setback zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscape design proposed is consistent with the landscape designs previously approved for the other lots on the estate. Street tree planting has been assessed and approved under SSD7348. Street tree planting for Estate Road 1 is therefore unable to be varied under SSD9794683. As previously advised, the road typology is designed to suit larger vehicle types with greater demands on clear sight lines. Driveway locations are in flux and this approach is more flexible and less likely to result in tree removals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscape plans suggest that corner treatments will feature small trees however tall canopy trees are recommended to minimise the visual appearance of bulk and scale of built forms from key vantage points. This will also assist to reinforce the spatial qualities of the road network. For example, the proposed mature tree height in the north west corner of Lot 2A is particularly important as the finished floor level if the built form is approximately 9m above natural ground presenting a poor interface to the public domain which is viewed from the roadway on the site approach but also further north through the Amazon car park. The visual impact of built forms in this area requires additional consideration and refinement as the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSD9794683 seeks approval for on lot warehouse construction for Lot 2A, 2C & 2D. This includes the on-lot and perimeter tree planting within Precinct 2. For information, the north west and north east corners of Lot 2A are designed in accordance with the required building setbacks and carparking requirements. The remaining landscape setback has been designed to be planted with large native trees consistent with the other lots and appropriately sized to this setback. Lot 2A/L.SK.201/Section 1 is cut through a 'site marker mound', that is smaller than the typical feature mounds designed for the site, due to the

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>existing side boundary setback, finished levels and visual bulk of the built form is currently inadequately addressed.</p>	<p>available setbacks in these locations. These feature mounds are in locations aimed to assist with estate wayfinding, which we feel is an important aspect to help orient people in such a large estate. In both the north west and north east corners of Lot 2A, there are stands of native perimeter trees either side of the feature mounds, which aim to visually screen built form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perimeter tree species include Corymbia eximia, C.maculata Eucalyptus crebra, E. moluccana and E.Amplifolia. These species are locally native and not considered to be small trees.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation submitted indicates discrepancies between sections and plans (ie. retaining walls on Southern Link Rd). The plans require verification to ensure that the landscape plan, landscape sections and architectural drawings are reflecting a consistent built form and streetscape outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear of the discrepancies referred to. Plans have been checked to ensure consistency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of canopy and density of planting within the setback to the South Link Road is inconsistent with verge treatments along this road corridor. Density and diversity of tree and shrub (medium and tall) species should be increased and retaining walls fully screened so the effect is dense and informal and biodiversity maximised. Tree species are shown as two, yet the number of tree species should be minimum of six. It should also be noted that hedges in this location are not supported by Council's Landscape Architecture Team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lot 2C & 2D/Section 4/L.SK.202 shows a 10-15m wide setback planted with staggered arrangements of large native trees Perimeter tree species include Corymbia eximia, C.maculata Eucalyptus crebra, E. moluccana and E.Amplifolia. These species are locally native and not considered to be small trees. The extent of planted setbacks recognises the future construction footprint of the SLR and allows some tolerance of this footprint so that planting is not destroyed during the construction process A combination of hedges (providing a sequence of dense screens at eye level) and more open areas (with mass planting and upper canopy screening) are utilised around the perimeter of all lots, in order to provide a variety of forms and textures. This approach is consistent with the entire

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	<p>estate, adjacent estates and are compliant with the LMP and Goodman Landscape Guidelines.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree plantings in the pavement at Lot 2D and carpark areas are supported provided a suitably qualified and experienced arborist specifies the engineered tree pit details including structural soil volumes and materials, based on proposed species. This is to ensure the best possible growing conditions for long term tree health and viability (refer sheet LSK.200) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape architect has provided the concept design for tree pits within car park areas, which define the extent of soil required to achieve adequate topsoil volumes for the specified trees. Structural design to support the adjacent pavement and kerbs and drainage requirements have been designed by the civil engineer. • The proposed tree pits are consistent with those provided throughout Oakdale South any tree growth and is therefore continues to be considered appropriate for car park planting d West Estates which have proven to provide good soil volumes to support healthy tree growth.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 03/LSK.202 is misleading in terms of retaining wall height. Spot levels indicate a change in level of approx. 8m. The section shows a wall height of approx. 2m. All retaining walls and fences on top of walls, seen from the public domain, should be densely screened to reduce visual impact and create microclimates suitable for plant growth e.g. not radiated heat from wall materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 2C/L.SK.202/Section 3 does show a retaining wall, 2m tall (with break line indicating that it varies) facing Estate Road 03. Regardless, the 7m wide setback includes continuous staggered planting of native trees to mitigate visual and reflected heat concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With respect to Estate Road 1, increased shrub and screening is required to maximise streetscape amenity and reduce visual access to roadways and vehicles /trucks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planting for Estate Road 1 has been assessed and approved under SSD7348. The CC drawings for the planting has been assessed and approved by Council. Estate Road 1A planting is therefore not able to be varied under SSD9794683.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organic mulches should be used for soil improvement and plant health, not inorganic mulches such as basalt. This could be addressed via conditions of consent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have not designed with ballast rock. This is in accordance with previous comments by Council.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With respect to the raised feature treatments with gabion walls, an arborist must inform and determine suitable dimensions of soil volumes and other treatments to ensure the best possible growing conditions for long term tree and plant health and viability (refer sheet LSK.201) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lot 2A/L.SK.201/Section 1 is cut through a 'site marker mound', that is smaller than the typical feature mounds designed for the site, due to the available setbacks in these locations. These feature mounds are located in locations aimed to assist with estate wayfinding, which we feel is an important aspect to help orient people in such a large estate. In both the north west and north east corners of Lot 2A, there are stands of native perimeter trees either side of the feature mounds, which aim to visually screen built form. Tree planting in mounds are smaller, adaptable species. The landscape architect will assist the site implementation team with ensuring adequate soil provisions to suit individual tree species are provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed extent of cut and fill requires a reconstruction of soil profiles to enable planting to establish and thrive in the long term. Details have not been provided. Planting into fill and sub-soils without amelioration and reconstruction will result in stunted, unhealthy and compromised vegetation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscape sections through the perimeter and car park trees show soil profiles, which will be used as a guide by the site implementation team to determine required soil depths. Typical soil depths proposed are 1000 for trees, 600 for hedges and large shrubs, 300 for low mass planting and groundcover areas. These depths are in accordance with the PCC DCP and accepted industry standards such as the ADG. Drainage and other requirements for planting areas has been designed by the civil engineers.

ENDEAVOUR ENERGY, LETTER DATED 04.03.21

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although industrial uses are not covered by Chapters 5 to 7 of NSW Rural Fire Service 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019' (PBP), the aim and objectives of PBP still need to be considered and a suitable package of bush fire protection measures should be proposed commensurate with the assessed level of risk to the development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accordingly the electricity network required to service the proposed development must be fit for purpose and meet the technical specifications, design, construction and commissioning standards based on Endeavour Energy's risk assessment associated with the implementation and use of the network connection / infrastructure for a bushfire prone site. In assessing bushfire risk, Endeavour Energy has traditionally focused on the likelihood of its network starting a bushfire, which is a function of the condition of the network. Risk control has focused on reducing the likelihood of fire ignition by implementing good design and maintenance practices. However the potential impact of a bushfire on its electricity infrastructure and the safety risks associated with the loss of electricity supply are also considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the foregoing Endeavour Energy's Asset Planning & Performance Branch has provided the following advice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endeavour Energy is in the process of establishing South Erskine Park Zone Substation with an anticipated commissioning of Q4-2022 and will supply the OWE with 22 kV reticulated distribution supply. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Underground reticulation for OWE is underway by Goodman to service the various lots from Mamre Zone Substation (which can be seen in the updated site plan from Endeavour Energy's G/Net master facility model) on an interim basis then reverts to back-up supply post South Erskine Park Zone Substation. - Arrangements have been made via Network Connections Branch for a load application for Site 2C - Warehouse A & Warehouse B as shown in the following Preliminary Site Plan. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to the foregoing recommendations and comments, Endeavour Energy has no objection to the Development Application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
WATERNSW, LETTER DATED 01.03.21	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WaterNSW has reviewed the EIS and associated documents and determined that the proposal is unlikely to impact on or interfere with WaterNSW lands, assets or infrastructure. It is considered that the mitigation measures outlined within the EIS will manage the project impacts adequately, including impacts to soil and water and sediment and erosion controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WaterNSW requests the following conditions are included in any consent issued: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>During construction, erosion and sediment controls are to be designed, installed and maintained in accordance with the Blue Book, Landcom (2004) Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction.</i> 2. <i>Effective sediment and erosion controls must be applied and maintained throughout the duration of the works or until sediment and erosion control measures are established</i> 3. <i>No stockpiles are to be located along the fence line of the Warragamba Pipelines Controlled Area or within close proximity to drainage lines or depressions.</i> 	
SYDNEY WATER, LETTER DATED 19.03.21	
<u>Water and Wastewater Servicing</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sydney Water has no objection to this proposal and our servicing requirements for this proposed development are in principle delivered under the Notice of Requirements for the S73 application that the proponent has already lodged with us – CN 185850. • Detailed requirements including water and wastewater extensions to service the proposed development will be provided at the Section 73 application stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
<u>Recycled Water Servicing</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While there is no existing Sydney Water recycled water supply to this area, Sydney Water is open to working in partnership with developers to consider recycled water servicing solutions that may offset potable water demands. • The proponent is advised to contact their Sydney Water Account Manager to investigate the potential for a commercial arrangement to supply recycled water to the development. 	
<p>TFNSW, LETTER DATED 18.03.21</p>	
<p><u>Active Transport Considerations</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transport Assessment (TA), includes 20 bicycles spaces at Lot 2A and that the provision of bicycle parking facilities for Lots 2C and 2D does not currently form part of the proposal. Further, the TA does not mention the provision of any end of trip facilities for the three lots. The NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling has been superseded by Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides, 2017, which recommends that bicycle parking for all-day use on a regular basis should be expected to be combined with end-of-trip facilities such as showers, lockers etc. • It is requested that prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate, the applicant be conditioned to provide bicycle parking and end of trip facilities for staff and visitors in accordance with Australian Standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Bicycle parking and End of Trip facilities may be included in CC drawings.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<p>AS1742.9:2018 Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices - Bicycle Facilities, and Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Locate bicycle parking and storage facilities in secure, convenient, accessible areas close to the main entries incorporating adequate lighting and passive surveillance and in accordance with Austroads guidelines. 	
<p><u>Green Travel Plan</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transport Assessment includes a Preliminary Sustainable Travel Plan, however it's considered that further inclusions are required in the plan. The recommendations below are provided to encourage the use of sustainable transport to the site, which will help reduce the use of single vehicle trips. • The applicant shall prepare a Green Travel Plan in consultation with TfNSW. The applicant shall submit a copy of the final plan to TfNSW for endorsement at development.sco@transport.nsw.gov.au, prior to the issue of the first occupation certificate. The Green Travel Plan should include, but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be prepared by a suitably qualified traffic consultant; - include objectives and modes share targets (i.e. site and land use specific, measurable and achievable and timeframes for implementation) to define the direction and purpose of the GTP; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. A detailed Green Travel Plan can be prepared as part of the Occupation Certificate (OC) stage of the project and can be included as a suitable Condition of Consent (CoC).

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- consideration of a staff travel survey and workforce data analysis to inform likely staff travel patterns and resultant travel plan strategies to / from the site;- implementation strategy that commits to specific actions (including operational procedures to be implemented along with timeframes) to encourage the use of sustainable transport and discourage the use of single occupant car travel to access the site;- details of bicycle parking and dedicated end of trip facilities including but not limited to lockers, showers and change rooms and e-bike charging station(s) for staff to support an increase in the non-car mode share for travel to and from the site;- a Transport Access Guide for staff and visitors providing information about the range of travel modes, access arrangements and supporting facilities that service the site;- a communication strategy for engaging with staff and visitors regarding public and active transport use to the site and the promotion of the health and wellbeing benefits of active and non-car travel to the site;- include a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of the measures of the plan; and	

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator responsible for implementing the plan and its ongoing monitoring and review, including the delivery of actions and associated mode share targets. • The plan shall be reviewed annually for at least the first five years and involve surveys, evaluation and review. • The plan (and any updates to the plan), shall be implemented and adhered to at all times by the applicant following the issue of the first occupation certificate. 	
<p><u>Heavy Vehicle Considerations</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All warehouses have been designed to accommodate 26m B-Doubles. • The proponent should consider PBS2B vehicles as the design vehicle. While the performance between 26m B-Doubles and PBS2B is similar, the issue will be the storage length e.g. bay and swept path. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swept paths analysis on the revised site plans for Lot 2A have been undertaken for 30 metres Super B-Doubles, as included in Appendix C, D & E (Architecture, landscape and civil plans).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Internal road is not designed for a one way flow. Heavy vehicles will be required to manoeuvre within the estate road and may cross path with opposing trucks. • The proponent should consider making internal roads one way to avoid conflicting movements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Plan for Building 2A has been updated to allow for continuous two-way flow of 30 metres super B-doubles to avoid any potential conflicting movements. • The heavy vehicle traffic generation of the proposed Buildings 2C & 2D is estimated to be approximately 9 veh/hr during peak periods (assuming 30% of all vehicles), which is considered minimal hence it is not anticipated to have significant conflict between these vehicles in such a slow speed environment.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is also considered that the GFA and layout of Buildings 2C and 2D developments have readily been approved as part of the MOD 6 and they are generally consistent with buildings 1B and 1C layout.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no details on driver facility or staging area that will be provided in OWE. It is requested the proponent provide details of any driver facilities or staging areas that will be provided in OWE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All staging is to be undertaken on the development lots.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unclear from Figure 7 provided in the TA whether Building 2D parking area will be accessed by both heavy vehicles and cars via the same driveway, or separately. The proponent should confirm whether there will be separate car/heavy vehicle access for Building 2D and provide justification if there is not. Sharing the access road will result in light vehicles mixing with a large amount of heavy vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Building 2D will provide only 55 on-site car parking spaces within a dedicated car parking area completely separated from the commercial areas and operational loading bays. It is noted that traffic generation of the proposed Building 2D car parking area is mainly related to the staff who will have detailed onsite briefing and inductions prior to the operation of the site. Same principle applies to the truck drivers attending Building 2D whom will be provided with a Code of Conduct and will be made aware of any possible conflict with the light vehicle movements. In any event the traffic generation of the proposed Building 2D in accordance with the traffic report now on exhibition has been estimated to be 9 veh/hr (light and heavy vehicle combined), which is considered minimal hence it is not anticipated to have significant conflict between these vehicles in such a slow speed environment. Having regard to the above, while the light and heavy vehicles will share the access, this will be managed to ensure safety of users.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<u>West North South Link Road (WNSL)</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that the WNSLR and Estate Road 01 and Lockwood Road are expected be delivered prior to construction of this SSD. This development application is dependent on the construction of these roads, it is therefore important to understand the timeline for the delivery of these road connections. Should the construction of these lots begin prior to the completion of these roads, what is the alternative access arrangements? • It suggested that timelines for the completion of the abovementioned roads be provided. In addition in the event that these roads are not complete prior to construction of these lots an alternative arrangement be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the WNSLR (Compass Drive) and Estate Road 1 are completed. Estate Road 1 is in the process of being dedicated to council. • Construction traffic and access will be appropriately considered in the CTMP for the development. This considers safe construction traffic routes.
<u>SSD 7348 Mod 6 Approval</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TfNSW notes that the increase in this development applications yield relies on the approval of SSD 7348 Mod 6. The approval will affect the proposed building height and ridge height for Building 2. • It is therefore advised that approval must be sort for SSD 7348 Mod 6 prior to any consent being provide for this development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Mod 6 has been approved.
<u>Trip Generation Rate</u>	

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TfNSW raises concerns to the Department with regard to the adopted trip generation rate. The adopted trip generation rate for this development of 1.892 vehicles per day per 100m² of GFA is considered very low. The various land-use changes within the Western Sydney Employment Area (WSEA) has meant that the current adopted trip generation rate is 2.91, which is a much higher than what has been used to assess this development. If an assessment is not completed based on the current adopted figure then there might be unknown adverse impacts on the network in future. It is therefore recommended that a model comparison of the traffic generation from this development application with the current adopted rate of 2.91 is undertaken to indicate if the model adopted is sufficiently calibrated to be fit for purpose. Justification and evidence should be provided to substantiate the adopted daily traffic generation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As discussed above, SSD 7348 Mod 6 has been approved including the latest changes relating to the OWE Stage 3 DA i.e. GFAs for Lots 2A, 2C and 2D. Furthermore, it is noted that the Mamre Road Precinct Study within WSEA is not yet finalised and is still subject to further reviews / consultations with both TfNSW and DPIE, hence not publicly available. In this regard, adoption of the previously approved traffic generation rates is considered appropriate for this SSD. An Operational Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) prepared for this SSD which sets out mechanism to limit the traffic generation of all these three buildings to the approved threshold adopted by the SSD traffic report. This can be achieved via a CoC requesting an OTMP at OC.
<p><u>Vehicular Access and internal road network</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The access for vehicular parking for building 2C is located in the centre of the development Lot (approximately 90m from the future SLR). Ideally the location of the vehicular access should be provided for away from intersections of major roads. Relocate the access for vehicular parking for building 2C north away further from the intersection of SLR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on SIDRA modelling undertaken at the intersection of Estate Road 03 and future SLR as part of the OWE MOD 3 assessment, the maximum queue length from the future SLR is approximately 62 metres at Estate Road 03 during road peak hours (during peak season). Therefore, it is considered that the proposed location of access for vehicular parking for Building 2C provides sufficient queuing storage for the intersection of Estate Road 03 and future SLR

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site access for Building 2A has been widened to allow for simultaneous entry/exit movements of super B-doubles. It now provides separate entry and exit points with 2 metres median for pedestrian refuge. • Relevant swept path analysis is included in Appendix B.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The swept path plans for Building 2A indicate that simultaneous entry/exit cannot be achieved with the largest vehicles. This can lead to conflict points at the access to the lots where 2 opposing vehicles are attempting to use these accesses at the same time. • The design of the access points should allow for simultaneous entry/exit movements of the largest vehicle. The swept path of the longest vehicle entering and exiting the subject site, shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS and to the satisfaction of Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site access for Building 2A (Appendix C) has been widened to allow for simultaneous entry/exit movements of super B-doubles. It now provides separate entry and exit points with 2 metres median for pedestrian refuge. • Relevant swept path analysis is included in Appendix B.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the above point it I noted that the design of the internal road network within Building 2A does not allow for continuous 2 way flow. • The design should be updated to allow for the continual 2 way flow along the main access road, in particular on the corners where there is restricted sight distance to the satisfaction of Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Plan for Building 2A (Appendix C) has been updated to allow for continuous 2-way flow of super B-doubles. Relevant swept path analysis is included in Appendix B.

Storm Water

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building 2C & 2D are located adjacent to the future Southern Link Road (SLR). A detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any changes to the strategic stormwater drainage system should be provided. • Should consent be provided a detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations of any changes to the stormwater drainage system are to be submitted to TfNSW for approval, prior to the commencement of any works. Please send all documentation to development.sydney@rms.nsw.gov.au. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed to approved stormwater / hydraulic assessment approved under SSD7348.
<p><u>General</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. A Construction Pedestrian Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) specific to the separate lots within this development detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. • b. The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including, driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements in relation to landscaping and/or fencing, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004, AS2890.6-2009 and AS 2890.2-2018 for heavy vehicle usage. Parking Restrictions may be required to maintain the required sight distances at the driveway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.

MATTERS RAISED	APPLICANT RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• c. Sight distances from the proposed vehicular crossings to vehicles on the Estate Road 03 are to be in accordance with the Austroads Guide to Road Design: Part 4A: Unsignalised and Signalised Intersections (Section 3 – Sight Distance) and AS 2890. Vegetation and proposed landscaping/fencing must not hinder sight lines to and from the vehicular crossings to motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.• d. It is noted that the Lots 2C-2D do not show bicycle parking facilities. It is recommended that to support and encourage active transport, bicycle parking facilities are provided within the development or close to it. Bicycle Parking should be provided in accordance with AS2890.3.• TfNSW requests the abovementioned information to be conditioned.	