

Submission Received & Points Raised	LOGOS Clarification to Submissions Received
1. Penrith City Council Mathew Rawson (Senior Environmental Planner) Summarised: "Council has no objection to the proposed modifications however the following comments are provided or your consideration"	1. Clarifications / Response to Each Point Below
1.1 – Ensuring the building is of significant architectural and design merit "Ordinarily buildings of this scale would go through Council's Urban Design review process to discuss and address key urban design issues. Prominent elevations, such as those with a frontage to the street or public reserves or those that are visible from public areas, must present a building form of significant architectural and design merit"	1.1 LOGOS provide the following clarifications to reinforce that the building form being proposed, does present significant architectural and design merit: • The office facade takes a sculptural design approach to express the dynamics in the logistic industry. • Contrasting neutral colour scheme is used as a tool to break up the bulk of the structure and to blend in with neighbouring industrial developments • The use of feature graphics to give a sense of place • Landscape design integrates with the existing stormwater swale softening the environment Please see drawing 'DA-M-01-RevB' for new façade perspective elevations (also attached to email)
1.2 – Ensuring large expanses of wall are broken up through architecture and design elements Whilst it is noted that the proposed modifications result in an improved outcome for the site in terms of architectural merit, large expanses of wall (eastern end of the southern elevation) are still proposed at the street frontage which should be broken up with by the use of additional architectural treatments, building articulation, fenestration and a variety of external finishes in terms of both colour and type of material used.	1.2 • LOGOS agree with this point. • All large expanses of wall have now been broken up with additional colours in patterns and some graphical features (like the LOGOS client branding dots to the Eastern end of the Southern elevation) Please see drawing 'DA-M-01-RevB' for new façade perspective elevations (also attached to email)
1.3 – Requesting pre-cast concrete panels over the proposed colorbond The use of colorbond wall cladding at the southern elevation (1) shown on drawing number ERSK-DA-200 is not supported and should be replaced with feature groove patterned pre cast concrete panels.	1.3 • LOGOS Disagree with this point; given that the proposed design and building form will be functional and aesthetically pleasing with the proposed colorbond. • LOGOS are confident that the proposed colorbond achieves the desired architectural standards desired; as shown in the drawings provided. • It should also be noted that the 'feature groove patterned pre-cast concrete panels' are significantly more expensive than the proposed colorbond; and do not provide any additional benefits.
1.4 – Requesting items like Sprinkler Tanks be relocated away from visible areas Servicing requirements for the buildings such as sprinkler tanks and the like, should not be located within the front setback or be visible from public places. These requirements shall be integrated with the building and landscaping design.	1.4 • LOGOS understand the visual concerns raised but cannot relocate the servicing elements, like the sprinkler tanks; as this would reduce the loading areas or car-parking spaces. • To ensure that the servicing elements are not a focal-point; LOGOS have amended the color for the servicing elements, like the sprinkler tanks; this will now be a darker grey color to ensure it blends in with the building façade behind it. • LOGOS will also reduce the visual impact of the Sprinkler Tank by placing an architectural screen directly in front of it. Please see drawing 'DA-M-01-RevB' for new façade perspective elevations (also attached to email)

1.5 – Ensuring all front fencing is located behind landscaping and is of a specific type All front fencing shall be located behind the landscape setback and not along the front boundary, be a maximum height of 2.1m and of an 'open' nature. Such fencing should be black powder coat steel palisade fencing similar to that existing through the estate.	1.5 - LOGOS do not currently plan on having fencing to this property. - However, this may become a future requirement for a tenant of the building. - Should a fence be required, LOGOS are happy to locate it behind the landscape to a maximum height of 2.1m and of an 'open' nature. - The installed fencing would be black powder coat steel palisade; similar to that existing through the estate.
2. Roads & Maritime Services – Transport Greg Flynn (Manager, Strategic Land Use, Network & Safety) <u>Summarised:</u> no issues with the development modification proposal. RMS would provide concurrence under section 138 of the Roads Act 1993; subject to the conditions, highlighted by Greg Flynn, being included in any consent issued by the Dept of Planning & Environment.	2. LOGOS have fully reviewed the report submitted by Greg Flynn and confirm that all conditions highlighted will be adhered to.
3. Sydney Water Greg Joblin (Manager, Growth Strategy) <u>Summarised:</u> no issues with development modification proposal & outlines where infrastructure is located. "Water – for the proposed development, the available point of connection is the 300mm main in Lenore Drive. Detailed drinking water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase" "Wastewater - for the proposed development, the available point of connection is the 225mm main traversing the development site. Detailed wastewater requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase"	3. No LOGOS Response Required.
4. Transgrid Skye Shanahan (Enquiries Services Coordinator) <u>Summarised:</u> no issues with development modification proposal. "We are pleased to advise after review of the abovementioned modification request using <i>TransGrid's Asset Management Information System (TAMIS)</i>, TransGrid can confirm this proposed development does not affect our infrastructure. Therefore, TransGrid does not object to the development application"	4. No LOGOS Response Required.
5. Endeavour Energy Pat Woodbury (Network Environmental Assessment Manager) <u>Summarised:</u> no issues with development modification proposal. "There is no need for us to respond with a formal submission in relation to this project. There appears to be capacity in the electricity supply network in the vicinity of this proposal. However this will be investigated in detail when an application for electricity supply to the development is made"	5. No LOGOS Response Required.