



Our reference:

Contact: Kathryn Saunders

Telephone: (02) 4732 8567

12 May 2022

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Attn: David Schwebel

Email: david.schwebel@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear David,

**Kemps Creek Estate - Mod 3 Response to Submissions (SSD-9522-MOD-3)
657-769 Mamre Road, Kemps Creek**

Thank you for providing Council with the opportunity to comment on the proposed State Significant Development (SSD) modification application. The following is provided for the Department's consideration.

1. Planning Considerations

(a) Proposal

Council understand that the subject modification application (MOD3) proposes the following:

- Deletion of Condition B4 and B18, and amendment of Conditions B52 and B54 of SSD-9522,
- Change to Lots 1-4,
- Alterations to Gross Floor Area,
- Amendments to Condition A22 which relates to Contributions,
- Inclusion of a new north-south access road off Bakers Lane which provides access to Lots 1-4,
- Reduction in warehouse tenancies from 6 to 4,
- Reduction in proposed building heights to a maximum of 21.65m.

Council has previously provided advice in relation to the modification application (**MOD 3**) under cover letter dated 3 February 2022.

This advice is issued having regard to the applicant's Response to Submission (**RtS**) document and the associated appendices.

(b) Mamre Road DCP

Council reiterates that the Mamre Road Precinct DCP applies to the subject application and site.



The site specific DCP referenced in the RtS has no statutory weight and is not adopted.

(c) Landscaping

The landscaping design needs improvement. Adequate screen planting is not provided, and components of this application seek to reduce landscaped areas and the amendments impact anticipated design outcomes.

The proposal for increased plant density and decreased landscaped area is not supported and is not adequately justified.

A landscape consultant should review the plans and confirm if the concentration of planting in smaller areas is sustainable (trees will compete and not thrive) and that canopy targets will be achieved.

Owing to the volume of excess parking proposed (as has been increased incrementally through the approval of subsequent modification applications), Council would seek that several car spaces in strategic locations be converted to landscape blister islands to offset the increased hardstand areas, assisting in increasing canopy and deep soil provision and reducing heat island impacts.

This would have the dual impact of elevating landscape quality and sustainability and addressing issues related to bulk and limited landscape screening.

Council does not support modifications to the SSD which will result in a decreased landscaped area or that reduce design quality or result in unsustainable canopy tree provision, or which erode or detract from the ability of landscaped areas to sustain trees and plant growth over time and to maturity.

Concern is raised that successive modification applications have been approved which have increased car parking, reduced road widths and the overall impacts have detracted from landscape quality and the original vision for the precinct.

It is requested that the Department ensure that the approved landscape outcomes are not eroded and that areas for meaningful and sustainable landscaping and canopy are not reduced or negatively impacted.

(d) Condition B4

It is Council's understanding from the explanation provided in the applicant's Response to Submissions (**RtS**) at p.11-12, that no further changes to, or deletion of Condition B4 is proposed under MOD 3.

(e) Condition B18

It is unclear from the RtS that the matters previously raised by Council and as have been raised by Transport for New South Wales (**TfNSW**) are addressed and as such, Council recommends that Condition 18 remain.

Council concurs with the advice provided by the Chief Engineer at page 32-34 of the RtS in relation to the advice stating that Condition 18 remain in the Consent.

(f) Photomontages

Photomontages are inaccurate and do not reflect the landscaping on landscape plans (refer Landscape review below).

(g) Roof top plant

Roof top plant heights are detailed in the applicant's RtS p.19. The Department is urged to review the impact of roof mounted plant on views (near and distant), streetscape amenity and overall height compliance, noting that top of building heights are measured from Finished Ground Level.

It is reiterated that any conditions in the consent clarify how height of building is measured and if roof mounted plant is inclusive.

(h) Noise Wall

The location and design quality of the noise wall is to be assessed. DPE is to ensure that the design of the noise wall as will be visible from the public domain is appropriately high in design quality and material and that graffiti removal and maintenance can and will occur, and that the noise wall is adequately screened by landscaping.

(i) Setbacks

Council seeks that all landscape setbacks are to be fully compliant with the Mamre Road Precinct DCP. Reductions in landscaping are not supported at Bakers Lane or elsewhere. The applicant is to demonstrate that landscaped setbacks to Bakers Lane are consistent the full length.

2. Traffic Considerations

(a) The separation width between driveways is not clearly shown on the Architectural Plans. Plans are to clearly demonstrate that the width of median islands between driveways is at least 1.5m to accommodate pedestrian refuge, as required in AS 2890.2:2018.

(b) The Department is advised to review the traffic data for correct assumptions noting that operational data provided by the applicant indicates that there will be 0 outgoing trips in the AM Peak and 4 outgoing trips in the PM Peak for the Lot 2 truck exit driveway.

At the Lot 3 car entry / exit driveway, there will be 18 trips (inbound and outbound) in the AM Peak and 13 trips (inbound and outbound) in the PM

Peak. This translates to 2 to 3 cars every 10 minutes during the peak periods. If this is the case, and the data can be relied upon, the updated driveway layout of the Lot 2 truck exit and Lot 3 car entry / exit on Bakers Lane provides wider refuge for pedestrians and no objection is raised.

- (c) In its previous submission Council's traffic engineers raised:

'Council recommends that Lot 3 truck swept paths (Sheet AG15) are to be modified to show that a truck can turn around while there are parked trucks'.

The applicant states that truck will be side loaded and thus no manoeuvring area is required. It is raised that the site will be utilised by numerous tenants over the life of the development and that adequate truck turning facility is to be demonstrated for worker safety and futureproofing reasons.

The Department will need to be satisfied that truck turning whilst parking bays are in use is not accommodated.

- (d) In its previous submission, Council had raised that:

'According to Table 19 of the Transport Assessment report, Lots 1 – 4 will be accessed by trucks up to 26m B-double. However, the swept paths presented in Appendix D only used 20m semi-trailers to demonstrate the movements in and out of the truck bays.'

The Department is advised to seek clarification on this inconsistency and ensure coordinated reports demonstrate compliance with the required access provisions for the Precinct'.

The applicant has not responded to this matter and the Department is advised to seek resolution as part of its assessment. This issue is not resolved.

- (e) In its previous submission Council had raised:

'Considering that the majority of the development trips would likely be travelling from Mamre Road, ingress car trips to Lot 3 would make a u-turn on Bakers Lane via Access Road cul-de-sac, since car entry to Lot 3 is restricted to left in only. Therefore, the Department is advised that inbound car trips to Lot 3 shall also be included in the intersection volume profile presented in Figure 21'.

The applicant's response does not address the matter raised. The Department is advised to seek resolution as part of its assessment.

To further assess the distribution of development traffic to surrounding intersections, the applicant should be advised to amend the traffic profiles presented in Section 6.6 to show the external traffic and the additional development traffic separately.

3. Development Engineering Considerations

Development engineering advice will follow under separate cover. Matters raised in Council's previous submission remain relevant and are to be assessed.

4. Landscape Considerations

The reconfiguration of warehouses represented in MOD 3 is not supported by Council as it has resulted in reduced landscaped areas, reduced screening of built forms (bulk and scale and roofscape), and an increase in hardstand areas including new roads.

In response to items in Table 2:

- (a) Parking - Due to the larger carpark of Warehouse 2, the applicant does not address the request to provide more canopy. There may be other opportunities for canopy planting across the development area, such as:
 - i. Depending on turning circles for trucks, reduced extent of hardstand areas and heat island. This is especially relevant at key corners such as the Bakers Lane and Mamre Road corner
 - ii. The applicant comments that there is extra parking at the entry point into the estate – it is unclear where this parking is provided on the landscape plans and the landscape impact to the estate entry
- (b) Landscaping within carpark areas and roadway
 - i. A 1.5m wide blister is unsatisfactory in terms of width to sustain trees to maturity. Council would ordinarily require 2.5m. The minimal 1.5m width will poorly impact long-term tree health and safety. It is recommended that the 1.5m wide blister detail should include engineered tree pits (structural soils or products such as Stratavault).
 - i. canopy trees proposed in carparks shall be min. 8m tall for increased canopy cover.
 - ii. at WH2, the applicant does not address the request to provide more canopy.

External storage

- (a) Road reserve street tree species are limited in height due to the limited verge width. The role of the front setback is to provide presentation landscaping with canopy trees of substantial height and spread to screen and ameliorate the visual impact of bulk and scape of built forms. Where carparking abuts road reserve, the front setback is less than 4m (refer Blister Landscape detail), a width that cannot sustain larger trees. It is not clear which species are proposed in the setback as the plant schedule is incomplete.

Staff breakout areas

- (a) Seating should be located to provide choice to sit in shade or sun.
- (b) The objectives and controls for staff areas in the Mamre Road Precinct DCP are to be complied with.

Rooftop plant

- (a) Frasers comment that the visual impact of roofscape from Mamre Rd is an improvement on MOD 1 is not a suitable response. The design needs to demonstrate that the visual impact from Mamre Rd is reduced

appropriately for a road of this significance.

Lot alternations

- (a) Level transitions – Council’s comment should apply to the perimeter boundary with adjoining land, regardless of the use or ownership. There are insufficient cross sections and information generally to explain proposed changes in level, including retaining walls, their resulting planting conditions and visual impacts (affects VIA photomontages).
- (b) It is unclear what is referred to by the comment ‘*a minor non-compliance along the southern boundary of Lot 4*’ and whether this has an impact on the future streetscape and if this may interface well with adjoining land.

As architectural plans are not provided, it is not clear whether large awnings are proposed over hardstand areas and clarification is to be sought for each of the warehouses.

- (c) The expanse of pavement north of WH2 is extensive, as is the introduction of a perimeter road to access lot 3. This has resulted in a reduction of planting in the northern corner (interface with Mamre Rd) which results in less visual amelioration from the elevated Pipeline vantage point. The applicant must improve the landscape design and increase tree canopy cover and landscaped area.
- (d) Lot 1 – there is no planting provided to screen the northern façade which is expected to be visually exposed from several vantage points including Mamre Rd pipeline, freight corridor and development to the north of the pipeline.

In response to the new Concept Plan:

- (a) Trees in turf (WH 2, east of entry road) and turf areas (WH3, south of hardstand) are opportunities for overflow parking storage resulting in negative visual and plant health impacts. These areas should be mass planted with screening shrubs and include canopy trees.
- (b) Mamre Road
 - i. Due to footings and above ground spatial impacts of the acoustic barrier (if required) there will be negative impacts to the extent and type of planting (canopy and screening) that can occur. Additional landscaping details should be provided, including the design and finishes of the wall that demonstrate minimal visual impact to the public domain.
 - ii. Single row of screen shrub planting is inadequate and a minimum of 3 staggered rows is recommended to ensure a dense screen. 3m height of screen plants is inadequate, recommend min. 5m height, which should physically and visually connect with the bottom of tree canopies.
 - iii. Within the 7m zone of the setback, min. 2 staggered rows of large trees is recommended to increase canopy area.

- (c) Internal access road

- i. Site entry features in road reserve and cul-de-sac island shall not include shrubs, grasses and groundcovers. Turf with trees and organic mulch only.
 - ii. There are two footpaths provided, the western path appears to be a shared path. The eastern path is considered superfluous
- (d) Some warehouses are visually exposed, and screening is required to reduce visual impacts, bulk and scale.
 - i. Eastern Mamre Road boundary – see Table 2 comment above.
 - ii. At service areas with tanks and pumps etc.
- (e) Northern boundary (northern façade of WH1) – there is no planting provided to screen the built form. This is expected to be visually exposed from several vantage points including Mamre Road pipeline, freight corridor and development to the north of the pipeline.
- (f) Northern boundary (northern façade of WH2) - the relationship between planting and retaining walls is not clear and therefore the screening of the built form.
- (g) Western boundary (WH4) – the landscape strip is not dimensioned and appears too narrow to sustain planting proposed. Planting beds should be wide enough to include screen planting (min. 3m tall shrubs).
- (h) Verge dimensions appear incorrect (detail 02 – Blister Landscape) showing inadequate width of 600mm between path and kerb which cannot sustain any tree planting.

Species and specifications

- (a) A full plant schedule is required to be prepared and submitted to DPE to enable interpretation of the plans and design - there are no letter symbols in the legend.
- (b) Street tree species are to be nominated on plans to enable Council/DPE approval and assessment.
- (c) *Angophora costata* and several other species listed in the indicative plant schedule are not suitable for this region. A greater range of screening species must be provided, including min. 5m height species.
- (d) Soil mixes and mulches and other planting specifications shall be amended to be suitable for native plantings.
- (e) Northern boundary planting should include tall screen shrubs (min. 5m) as well as the 10m canopy trees proposed. The trees alone will not provide adequate screening to the ground.

In response to Visual Impact Assessment:

- (a) There is no detail related to landscape screening of the noise barrier, if provided.
- (b) Planting represented in photomontages does not correlate with proposed landscaping in the Landscape Concept Plan issue G.

An example is Viewpoint 23 (below, view to the western boundary / façade of Lot 4) which shows dense and extensive planting however the landscape plans show only a possible 2m wide planting strip at this location.

Photomontages must be resubmitted to reflect the proposed design, or the design amended and resubmitted to reflect the intended visual effect.

It is therefore not clear whether each of the photomontages is accurate.

Given there is no tree species detail, the images of trees on the photomontages may not represent the true form, for example, northern boundary trees are of a form that is not typical of most species indicated in the schedule. Further clarification is required.



SSD-9522 MOD 3 Proposed Scheme Photomontage - Year 10



SSD-9522 MOD 3 Proposed Scheme Photomontage - Year 15

Figure 9c: Viewpoint 23 - View West of LOT 14 (RE1) - Looking Northeast (Proposed MOD 3 Photomontage Y10 & Y15)

Above image: Lot 4 western boundary – Photomontages are inaccurate and do not reflect the landscaping on landscape plans.



Figure 7c: Viewpoint 21 - Mamre Road, Kemps Creek at Northeast Corner of Proposed Warehouse 2 - Looking South (Proposed MOD 3 Photomontage Y10 & Y15)

Above image – Lot 2 northern boundary. – Photomontages are inaccurate and do not reflect the landscaping on landscape plans.

Should you require any further information regarding the comments, please contact me on (02) 4732 8567.

Regards,

Kathryn Saunders
Principal Planner