



Mr Paul Jewiss
Development Manager
Level 29, 20 Bond Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

09/10/2020

Dear Mr Jewiss

Temperature Controlled Warehouse Facility (SSD-8586218)
Response to Submissions

The public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Temperature Controlled Warehouse Facility (SSD-8586218) concludes on **1 October 2020**. All submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/38206>

The Department requires that you provide a response to the issues raised in those submissions, in accordance with clause 82(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000. In addition you are requested to provide a response to the issues raised in Attachment A. Please provide a response to the issues raised in these submissions by Friday 30 October 2020.

Note that under clause 113(7) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your response to submissions is received by the Planning Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

If you have any questions, please contact Thomas Bertwistle, who can be contacted on 8275 1025 or at thomas.Bertwistle@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Ritchie'.

Chris Ritchie
Director
Industry Assessments

as delegate for the Planning Secretary

Enclosed/Attached:
Attachment A: Request for further information

Attachment A: Request for further information

1. Built form

It is acknowledged the proposal meets the Site Design Guideline's setback requirements in relation to the Stuart Road boundary, however, part 2.1(1)(b) requires a 5 metre (m) wide vegetation buffer to this boundary, the development proposes 3 m.

In addition, 2.5(5) also requires a 15m setback from the boundary to the riparian zone, however, the development proposes approximately 8.4m.

Appendix E "Compliance with Design Guidelines" does not address these inconsistencies. Please provide a full assessment of any inconsistencies between the proposal and the controls, and if required, make changes to any of the supporting documentation for the Development Application (architectural plans, landscape plans etc).

It is noted the architectural drawings show roof plants with approximate heights only, resulting in a building height of 15.7m. Part 2.3(4) of Site Design Guidelines notes maximum height is 14m, with taller buildings permitted where it can be demonstrated certain criterion can be met. A review of the EIS does not appear to address the height inconsistency with the concept approval. As such, please provide clarification on the building height, a full assessment against the guidelines and if required, make changes to the architectural plans.

2. Construction Timeframe

Please provide details on the expected construction timeframe for the proposed development.

3. Signage

It is acknowledged that a condition to provide flexibility on signage as part of the development was requested in the EIS, with generic signage shown on the provided drawings. To ensure any future signage changes are appropriate, the condition is not supported. As such, please provide drawings detailing the specific signage proposed.

4. Bicycle Parking

It is acknowledged the proposal has supplied 15 bicycle parking spaces for 150 staff in accordance with the Liverpool City Council's DCP. However, the EIS has stated the development will result in 187 jobs. Please clarify the justification, and if required, make changes to bicycle parking rates.