Your ref: SSD-41807966
File no: MC-22-00011

14 December 2022

NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Recipient Delivery rebecka.groth@dpie.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Rebecka Groth

Dear Ms Groth

SSD-41807966 – Roussell Road Warehouse and Distribution Centre

Thank you for your correspondence dated 9 November 2022 requesting our advice on the proposed Roussell Road Warehouse and Distribution Centre at 9 Roussell road, Eastern Creek which is a State Significant Development proposal under section 4.36 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.*

The proposal has been reviewed by our officers and we object to the proposal until all our issues listed in the Attachment to this letter are addressed in a revised Environmental Impact Statement and the information required is referred back to Council for reconsideration before any determination is made of this development application by the Department.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Judith Portelli, our Manager Development Assessment, on 9839 6228.

Yours faithfully

Peter Conroy
Director City Planning and Development

Blacktown Council's submission to SSD-41807966 – Roussell Road Warehouse and Distribution Centre

1. Planning issues

a. The proponent must address urban heat in the context of Western Sydney's climate. In this regard:

- it must be demonstrated that the roof of the distribution centre and awning and associated offices will utilise high albedo and high emittance roofing materials in accordance with Blacktown City Council's Responding to Climate Change Strategy (https://www.blacktown.nsw.gov.au/About-Council/What-we-do/Environmental-Plans-and-Policies#section-2). The colour of the roofing materials is light coloured and is therefore considered acceptable.
- opportunities to incorporate additional landscaping where possible is highly encouraged. The proposal entails a significant proportion of the site as hardscaped surface.
- tree planting is required every 9 car spaces, this has not been provided in either of the car parking areas and is required to be shown on amended plans.

b. The fire tank is to be suitably screened and protected by bollards to prevent incidents with passing vehicles or trucks.

c. Dimensions of the car, pedestrian and truck wayfinding signs are to be provided.

d. There are no pylon signs in the immediate vicinity of the site, the 8m high pylon sign should be reduced and signage at the entrance should be simplified as there are currently 3 signs in one location, these could be consolidated onto 1 sign.

e. Clarification is requested regarding the tenants of the proposed warehouse, as it is unclear whether there will be multiple tenants given that there are 2 separate offices, car parks and warehouse dispatch areas.

f. The colour palette of the proposed building is limited to predominantly dark and light greys. A greater variety of materials and colours are to be provided to enhance the visual appearance of the development.

g. The applicant proposes to use Council land as part of the access arrangement to facilitate vehicle movements to the site. However, the applicant has no owner's consent from Council's Property section to access the site and this can't be assumed. On this basis the application is pre-emptive and premature. The applicant should have resolved this before the application was lodged. The applicant is now required to liaise with Council's property team and provide written evidence of an in-principal agreement is required to be submitted demonstrating that the access arrangement is supported before this proposal can progress any further.

h. We recommend you consult with Sydney Water in regards to the proposed works and retaining wall along the boundary of Lot 3 DP 229769.

2. Asset Design issues

Infrastructure

a. The Applicant is required to demonstrate that the development is considered as part of the existing detention basin configuration on Lot 368 DP 1094500. This lot is on land currently owned by Council. Where additional discharge is directed to the basin, any amendments required to the basin will require endorsement by Council's Manager Asset Design. The existing freeboard requirements are to be maintained.

b. Stormwater quality for the development is required to be provided in accordance with the original Part 3A major project approval (DA 308-12-2004) or Part J of Council's DCP-2015. Any GPT/s or inlet sediment pits tare to be accessible for debris removal and maintenance as required.

c. Access to existing detention basin right of ways is required to be maintained.

Drainage

a. The subject proposal is required to provide On Site Detention onsite, unless the applicant can demonstrate that the existing basin located north of the proposal can cater for OSD volume as required for the site. Provide detailed calculations.

b. The subject proposal is required to provide on lot water quality treatment for the entire site. Whilst the current proposal indicates that the runoff is being directed to an existing basin north of the site, there is no evidence provided to demonstrate that the basin is bio retention basin and it has the capacity to cater for treating the subject proposal.

c. There are extensive battered areas west of the site that will bypass treatment. These areas are to be considered as bypass in the treatment model.

d. Provide detailed sections for the existing OSD basin including volumes, top of water levels, overflow weir levels to enable assessment of the drainage system upstream.

e. There are multiple stormwater pipes collecting from the upstream catchment east of the site and being diverted to the existing basin. There is no evidence provided to demonstrate that the existing basin can cater for the additional catchment runoff. The existing connections are to either be reinstated or evidence is to be provided that the existing basin can cater for the additional runoff.

f. Provide catchment assessment for the upstream existing pipes that are proposed to be diverted.

g. The applicant is to provide a digital MUSIC model for the water conservation assessment.

h. Provide details of the non-potable water demand rates utilised in the MUSIC model. Refer to section 11.14.2 for minimum non-potable water demands that can be utilised in the model.

i. A gross pollutant trap is required to be provided prior to discharge to the existing basin. This is to provide treatment for hydrocarbons and primary treatment. Ensure GPT chosen is an approved device by Blacktown Council and is suitable for hydrocarbon treatment. The size of the GPT as well as the invert level designs are to

be in accordance with section 11.3.1 and 3.6 of Council's WSUD developer handbook.

j. The discharge in to the existing basin shall be via an inlet sediment pit. Refer to Council's WSUD standard drawings A(BS)175M drawing number 5 of 25.

k. Provide a swale along the southern boundary to direct external flows away from the existing WSUD system. Provide swale calculations and connections accordingly.

l. Provide additional pit adjacent to pit number 14-1 to collect runoff from the kerb invert that is proposed to be replaced north east of pit 14-1.

m. The pipe long sections indicate that most pipes are proposed with a fall below what Council standard requires. Amend pipe falls so that fall is not less than 1%.

n. Clarify which storm event the pipe design capacities relate to as indicated on the pipe long section.

o. Provide colour coding for the blue and purple lines shown on the pipe long sections.

p. Demonstrate, to the satisfaction of Council that:

- the annual volume and annual average and maximum flow rate of the stormwater from the development site to the bushland conservation area during the operation of the proposed development will be the same as, or less than, what it is prior to the commencement of construction of the proposed development; and
- the water quality of the stormwater from the development site to the bushland conservation area during the operation of the proposed development will be the same as, or better than, what it is prior to the commencement of construction of the proposed development; and
- describes, to the satisfaction of Council, the measures to be used as part of the proposed development to achieve the outcomes in (a) above.

3. Open Space issues

a. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) is required to identify the trees that will be affected by the development and those that can be retained and protected from construction activity.

b. An amended landscape plan is to be submitted which indicates the existing trees on the site and identifies the number and location of trees to be removed and retained. This is also to include how opportunities to retain significant trees have been explored.

4. Biodiversity issues

a. The Biodiversity Assessment Report identifies that the native vegetation along the western boundary is Endangered Ecological Community 'Cumberland Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest' (PCT 1800). It is estimated to cover 6,396 m^2 of the site. The proposal seeks to clear 6000 m^2 (6ha) ha of this, or some 94% of the Endangered Ecological Community on site. In addition, the lack of deep soil (4% post build) and

inability to have canopy tree planting throughout the site post construction with this proposal has poor outcomes for quality of landscaping, visual impacts of the development, biodiversity, shade and heat island effects.

b. Examination of several map sources – (SixMaps, Mitchell Landscape mapping, the NSW Biodiversity Values basemap and NearMap), shows Reedy Creek crossing the Lot boundary at the western end. The works outlined in the proposal occur within a few metres of the creek by this mapping. 'Top of bank mapping' should accompany the proposal to clarify the channels of Reedy Creek and ensure adequate buffer zones to the creek and riparian corridor. Blacktown City Council recognises this arm of Reedy Creek as a biodiversity corridor and does not support its loss with development.

c. Comments on the Biodiversity Assessment Report dated 30 June 2022 by Ecologique:

- The ecologist who prepared the Biodiversity Assessment Report is to work with the proponent to try to avoid and minimise biodiversity impacts of the proposal via siting and extent of works in the design;
- A larger patch size than has been calculated is indicated for the proposal. Patch size to be reassessed to include all native vegetation on the subject land and that which has a gap of less than 100 m from the next area of native vegetation, per the Biodiversity Assessment Method 2020. Gaps to the south that are less than 100m have currently not been included in the patch size calculation;
- The BDAR does not demonstrate how the proposal will impact on water quality and hydrological processes that sustain adjacent PCT 1800 Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest;
- Indirect impacts are inadequately addressed. Indirect impacts are those that are induced by, or are 'by-products' of, development activities, but are separated from direct impacts by time or distance. Indirect impacts may include erosion and sedimentation impacts and lighting impacts which the Biodiversity Assessment Report currently considers during construction only. Longer term erosion and altered flows through the increased run-off from hardstand areas and light spill into natural areas have not been assessed.

d. The development does not adequately assess the impacts of the development on adjacent Endangered Ecological Community vegetation to the north west of the site. An assessment of the impacts of stormwater on the adjacent riparian area is required. A water strategy designed by a stormwater engineer, is to demonstrate how the various non-potable water sources (stormwater, rainwater, wetland and recycled wastewater [if used]) will be used for what end uses and integrate together to protect the Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest Endangered Ecological Community. It should contain

- a stormwater reuse management system to prevent potential offsite water quality and quantity impacts on the wetland;
- mitigation measures like guards at pits, treatment units at stormwater tanks prior to entering the sediment basin and release off site;

- Pre to post MUSIC modelling for water quality
- An acceptable sediment and erosion control plan during construction;
- a water monitoring plan.

e. A fully costed Vegetation Management Plan must be prepared for the riparian areas by a suitably qualified and experienced bush regenerator or restoration ecologist. The Vegetation Management Plan must set out a timeline of activities and performance criteria over 10 years covering tasks on how the area will be revegetated, rehabilitated and maintained, replacement planting species selection and densities, how weeds on site are to be controlled, how native fauna habitat is to be improved and benchmarks for annual monitoring with annual reports to Council.

5. Environmental Health issues

a. A Stage 2 Detailed Site Investigation is required to be prepared and submitted to demonstrate that the land is suitable for the proposed development.