

25 August 2023

Our Ref: F23/470  
Our Contact: Christopher Lazaro (02) 9562 1627

Pamela Morales  
Industry Assessments  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Locked Bag 5022  
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124

Dear Pamela,

**RE: Request for Advice – Environmental Impact Statement – Multi-Level Warehouse, 297 King Street, Mascot [SSD-49734709]**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Multi-Level Warehouse at 297 King Street, Mascot.

Bayside Council provides this draft submission on the EIS. This submission will be considered by Council for formal endorsement at its meeting to be held on 25 October 2023 and a final version provided immediately following.

**The Proposal**

Bayside Council acknowledges that LOGOS Development Management Pty Ltd contacted the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) to request Industry-Specific Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) at 297 King Street, Mascot.

A response to SEARs was not required from Council, as per the Industry-Specific requirements for SSDAs.

Bayside Council was notified of the EIS for SSD-49734709 via *Major Projects Planning Portal* on 26 July 2023. The subject application consists of the following:

- Site establishment works, comprising minor excavation / bulk earthworks
- Removal of 230 trees (*including 28 trees previously approved for removal*)
- Construction and operation of a warehouse and distribution centre within a five-storey building, with a total gross floor area (GFA) of approximately 31,266 sqm:
  - Warehouse and distribution centre: 26,145 sqm
  - Ancillary office space: 5,121 sqm
  - Café tenancy within the King Street lobby
- Maximum building height of 45.09 metres / RL 50.32
- Landscaping: 3,902.8 sqm / 14.9% of site area

**Postal address**

PO Box 21, Rockdale NSW 2216  
ABN 80 690 785 443

**Bayside Customer Service Centres**

Rockdale Library, 444-446 Princes Highway, Rockdale  
Westfield Eastgardens, 152 Bunnerong Road, Eastgardens

**E** [council@bayside.nsw.gov.au](mailto:council@bayside.nsw.gov.au)

**W** [www.bayside.nsw.gov.au](http://www.bayside.nsw.gov.au)

**T** 1300 581 299 | 02 9562 1666

- Parking spaces:
  - 151 car parking spaces including 4 accessible spaces
  - 10 motorcycle parking spaces
  - 92 bicycle parking spaces
- New vehicle crossings to King Street for truck and car access
- Building and business identification signage
- Estimated Capital Investment Value (CIV): \$164 million (*excluding GST*)
- Hours of operation: 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

The existing structures (partial construction of the Qantas flight training facility) and hardstand will be demolished under a Complying Development Certificate. Demolition does not form part of this SSDA.

### **Council's Submission**

Council has reviewed the submitted documentation and raises the following objections:

#### **Built form**

1. Details of the screening system should be provided. The aim of the screen should be to allow natural light and ventilation into the development whilst screening the vehicular ramps. Consideration should be given to wrapping the screen further around the northern corner of the elevated ramps to better conceal the building.
2. Large scale (1:20) details of the proposed façades to all elevations should be included as part of the approval documentation, to ensure the design intent is realised by the building when constructed. Details should clearly specify and dimension all materials.

#### **Traffic, Parking & Access**

3. The extent of works in the Public Domain Works Plan (C014509.03-DA70 prepared by Costin Roe) is not sufficient and must be expanded. The entire section of King Street (full width) adjacent to the site needs to be reconstructed given the road is currently in a very poor condition. This is required for both QF3 & QF4 developments including undergrounding of existing overhead wires fronting the site as required by the Bayside DCP 2022.

A minimum 1.5m wide footpath is to be provided along the entire frontage of the site within the public domain (designed to ensure existing street trees remain and more street trees can be planted). The location of the existing street trees as shown on the public domain plan does not match the survey plan. It is unclear whether the street trees proposed are to be transplanted to new locations or retained in their current locations. An increased number of kerb inlet pits and inground drainage is necessary. Driveway access shall be provided to the rail line. A signage and line marking plan should be provided.

4. The swept paths of 20m long Articulated Vehicles (AV's) entering and exiting the site (swept path drawing A10) depicts opposing AV's movements conflicting with each other which is not supported. The turning head design should be modified to ensure that opposing AV movements do not conflict with each other. Amended swept paths and turning head design are to be submitted for assessment by Council staff.

5. All swept paths shall be revised to show the centreline of the road, show the on-street parking spaces and regulatory parking restrictions (existing and proposed).
6. The driveway width for truck entry shall be increased to be a minimum of 12.5m wide at the new property line with an additional 1.5m splay from the property line to the kerb as per AS2890.2:2018.
7. A longitudinal driveway profile is to be submitted for each driveway. The profiles shall start in the centre of the road, be along the critical edge (worst case) of the driveway and terminate at the end of the internal driveway. Gradients and transitions shall be in accordance with AS2890.2:2018. The profile shall be drawn to a scale of 1 to 25 and shall include all relevant levels, grades (%), headroom clearances and lengths. The existing boundary levels shall be clearly shown on the profile. Any change to the existing boundary levels requires approval from Bayside Council.
8. The proponent needs to confirm whether the largest vehicle that will visit the site is a 20m long AV. The following information needs to be submitted for council assessment to understand whether the 20m long AV's can adequately access the site:
  - a. Swept path analysis shall be provided for all 20m long AV movements through the intersection of O'Riordan Street and King Street (from O'Riordan Street into King Street west and from King Street west into O'Riordan Street).
  - b. The traffic report is to detail the routes and roads through the Council area that 20m long AV's will use to access the site. These size vehicles are not permitted to use King Street east of O'Riordan Street.
  - c. An assessment needs to be undertaken of the existing King Street road pavement west of O'Riordan Street to determine whether it can support the loading of 20m long AV's.
9. Council requires further justification to support the proposed reduction in office car parking traffic generation from the TfNSW traffic generation rates in TDT2013/04a. Further technical analysis and evidence of reduced traffic generation (supported by traffic surveys of similar commercial development with similar parking rates) needs to be provided. If the proposed reduction in traffic generation cannot be adequately supported to Council satisfaction, then the traffic modelling needs to be revised to use the traffic generation rates in TDT2013/04a.
10. The Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment Report is to undertake a cumulative traffic impact assessment for 'all developments' in the area. There is an approved development at 5-11 Ewan Street (also known as 342 King Street), 289 King Street and on 205 O'Riordan Street. The traffic impact assessment shall also consider a potential future development at 215-235 O'Riordan Street, as a Planning Proposal to increase the permitted intensity of development on this site was recently notified.
11. The developments SIDRA modelling indicates AM existing + development (both QF3 and QF3+QF4) experiences a Level of Service (LOS) F and degree of saturation exceeding 1.0 on King Street East which is not supported. The applicant needs to improve the performance of the intersection so that the LOS is satisfactory for King Street East.
12. A breakdown on heavy vehicle and passenger vehicle % of the traffic generation needs to be provided and incorporated as part of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

13. Justification needs to be provided for how the approach and departure routes in table 7.2 were determined.
14. The existing site has driveway connections to 10-12 Bourke Road, the railway land and 65 Kent Road + 263 Coward Street. Clarification is sought on the following points:
  - a. Whether these driveway connections be retained as part of this development.
  - b. Whether the driveway access through 10-12 Bourke Road is to provide direct access to Bourke Road or if it is just for coach/service vehicle parking for the office building on 10-12 Bourke Road.
  - c. The driveways and bridge access (western bridge over Sydney Water open channel) to the railway land and 65 Kent Road and 263 Coward Street appear to provide access to Qantas Drive and Kent Road. Confirmation will need to be provided that legal mechanisms are in place for vehicles to traverse over neighbouring properties.
  - d. If existing vehicular access points are to be retained through neighbouring properties in perpetuity.
  - e. How the Traffic Impact Assessment has addressed traffic flows from this development being dispersed through these neighbouring properties.
  - f. Whether service vehicles (trucks) will be using any of these existing driveway connections to adjacent lands.
15. The driveway access to 10-12 Bourke Road shall be adjusted to not rely upon using 65 Kent Road land.
16. It is unclear if any legal mechanisms are in place for vehicles to traverse over the Sydney Water owned land that currently bisects the site (69 Kent Road).
17. TfNSW comments shall be obtained on the Traffic Impact Assessment and addressed by the applicant.

## **Landscaping**

18. The proposed outdoor dining is located within the landscape setback which is not suitable. Setbacks shall prioritise the planting of trees and minimise the use of pavement in these areas to allow aerial and soil space for canopy trees. All landscape setbacks shall prioritise deep root planting with indigenous canopy trees. Structures within the landscape setbacks shall be limited to the required minimum width access for pedestrians, and vehicular access.
19. Substations shall be relocated from the landscape setback to within the built envelope where possible.
20. Fire Hydrant booster valves shall be integrated with the built form or driveways where possible, to maximise the greenery delivered to the streetscape.
21. Indicate the number of trees required to be removed and demonstrate the proposal can achieve the required tree replacement. Replacement rate is 3:1, for each tree removed, three new trees shall be planted. The Landscape Plan shall nominate at least the proposed large and medium canopy trees prior determination.

22. Clarify location and retention status of trees 21, 22, and 23.
23. The proposed canopy trees are limited, in particular along the setbacks. Larger canopy trees shall be included to offset the canopy loss and to increase the local canopy cover and for environmental reasons.
24. The proposal includes an above retention basin. More details shall be provided to ensure the structures can effectively filter runoff water.

## **Flooding**

25. The Flood Assessment Report has not addressed section 3.10 of the Bayside DCP 2022. It shall be revised to address section 3.10 of the Bayside DCP 2022.
26. The Flood Assessment Report has not demonstrated that the flood modelling has been undertaken in accordance with section 9.5.4 of Bayside DCP 2022. It shall be demonstrated that the flood modelling undertaken complies with section 9.5.4 of Bayside DCP 2022.
27. The pre-development case has significant differences from Council's existing MRE flood model, in particular flood extents in the northern car park and flood extents in all surrounding properties are different. There is no justification provided for these differences in the existing base scenario.
28. Existing LIDAR/elevation/survey data relied upon in the flood model needs to be provided for review. The appropriateness of using a combination of survey data for the subject site and other sourced elevational data for areas external to the site needs to be justified.
29. The flood afflux plans are accompanied by a legend which does not clearly explain the flood afflux.
30. The pre-development flood velocity plan does not accurately show flood velocities in the Sydney Water channel. Overall flood modelling within the Sydney Water channel does not appear to be correctly modelled.
31. The post development flood model shows the On-Site Detention System (OSD) completely inundated by floodwaters. This is not acceptable, the OSD shall be redesigned so that it is not subject to inundation by 1%AEP flood waters, this may require an elevated suspended OSD.
32. It's not clear how overland flows will be managed internally within the development. The cut and fill across the site needs to be designed to ensure adequate overland flow paths to the Sydney Water channel are provided for floodwaters.
33. The post development flood model diagrams provided are inconsistent, each depicting different flood extents post development. This is assumed to be because some diagrams are cutting certain flood depths from view. The post development flood models are to be revised to be consistent with each other. Flood depths less than 20mm should be shown in the flood modelling.
34. A Flood Planning Level (FPL) assessment has not been undertaken adequately (i.e., no assessment was made of the proposed Finished Floor Levels (FFL) on the architectural plans in relation to the adjacent 1% AEP flood levels). It needs to be confirmed that all habitable areas are set a minimum of 500mm above the 1% AEP

flood level, and it shall be confirmed that all non-habitable areas are set at or above the 1% AEP flood level. The proposed building appears to have levels set below the 1% AEP flood level which does not comply and is not supported. The proposed flood proofing of the building with floor levels set below the flood level is not acceptable. The lobbies and retail must be set 500mm above the 1% AEP flood level.

35. Climate change/sea level rise has not been adequately addressed.
36. PMF and sea level rise flood impacts have not been addressed. A PMF afflux plan and a sea level rise flood afflux plan needs to be provided with flood afflux not exceeding 10mm.
37. The 1% AEP flood afflux on neighbouring properties/Council land is not to exceed 10mm. The flood afflux diagram does not show flood afflux less than 20mm which is not supported. The flood afflux diagram does not correctly depict the flood afflux of the development and the legend is not clear.
38. A Floodplain Risk Management plan was not submitted for the proposal. This is required and must make provision for, but not be limited to, the following:
  - a. Recommendations on all precautions to minimise risk to personal safety of occupants and the risk of property damage for the total development, and
  - b. Flood warning signs / depth indicators for areas that may be inundated, and
  - c. A Flood Evacuation Strategy, and
  - d. A Flood Awareness Strategy, and
  - e. On site response plan to minimise flood damage, demonstrating that adequate storage areas are available for hazardous materials and valuable goods above the flood level.
39. Flood emergency management/evacuation routes has not been addressed. This is required.
40. The proposed flood mitigation measures on the civil plans such as “grated drains in overland flow path to intercept flood water”, “2.0m wide deep cut-off drain” and “OSD/Flood compensation basin” etc. are not mentioned or explained as to how they will provide flood mitigation in the Flood Assessment Report. Furthermore, the reason for 2.7mx 0.6m box culvert is not addressed.
41. The requirement for providing an OSD and flood storage across the site, including combing both into one, shall be rationalised.
42. The 1% AEP flood hazard in the northern car park is H2 which is not suitable for the parking of small vehicles (i.e. passenger vehicles). This has not been addressed.

### **Stormwater Management**

43. All stormwater run-off from the site is to be directed to the existing Sydney Water owned channel traversing the site.
44. Further information is required in relation to the OSD:

- a. The OSD design appears to be capturing overland floodwaters which is not supported because it's not clear as to how the OSD can operate satisfactory if being inundated by floodwaters. The OSD design is to be redesigned to not capture overland floodwaters on the site.
  - b. The OSD design is to consider the tailwater level and ensure the OSD orifice invert level is set a minimum of 100mm above the HGL of the receiving system in the 1% AEP event.
  - c. A DRAINS Model is to be submitted for assessment for the drainage system on the site and each basin/OSD. The DRAINS parameters are to include a sag pit and on grade pit blocking factor of 50% for minor systems, a sag pit blocking factor of 100% for major storms and a 50% on grade pit blocking factor for major storms. ARR2019 is to be used.
  - d. Its not clear how the OSD storages and PSD were calculated in table 5.1 and 5.2 of the Civil Engineering Report.
  - e. An OSD Catchment Plan is to be provided showing the impervious (roof and hardstand) and pervious area draining into each system. Also show the bypass area. It needs to be demonstrated that an appropriately sized OSD tank is provided for each catchment on the site.
45. The drainage system shall incorporate a device capable of removing oil and sediment from 100% of the driveway and carpark stormwater run-off as per the Bayside Technical Specification Stormwater Management.
46. A Base Plan (showing 1% fall to the outlet) and Lid Plan (showing the distance from pit centre to centre with the spacing of the access grates to be 6m) is to be provided for all stormwater tanks.
47. A Base Plan is to be provided for each of the three basins with bund levels, base levels, weir levels and embankment levels.
48. The basin sections are to show the extended detention depth level, embankment levels, weir levels and show inlets + outlets.
49. The sections of the tanks and basins are to be revised to show base levels and minimum 1% fall to the outlet.
50. The use of seepage holes in tanks is discouraged due to presence of shallow groundwater.
51. Orifice size calculations need to be provided.
52. More details need to be provided for the existing open concrete lined Sydney Water Channel bisecting the site.
53. A long section of the proposed 2700 x 600 RCBC shall be provided including providing connection details with the Sydney Water channel.
54. A WSUD catchment plan is to be provided which clearly shows the survey and architectural plan in the background. The catchment areas in the catchment plan are to be accurately reflected in the MUSIC Model.

55. The proposed cut and retaining walls at the front property boundary is not supported. The levels in the front setback to King Street shall be flush with the public domain levels to provide an appropriate interface.
56. The rainwater tank shall be connected for landscape irrigation and all toilet flushing. The rainwater tank shall be sized as per section 7.2.1 e) of Bayside Technical Specification Stormwater Management which requires a 40,000L rainwater tank for the 10750m<sup>2</sup> of roof area proposed.
57. A referral is to be made to Sydney Water to undertake an assessment of the stormwater design. Sydney Water comments shall be obtained on the civil engineering report and shall be addressed by the applicant.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact Christopher Lazaro, Senior Urban Planner on (02) 9562 1627 or via email: [christopher.lazaro@bayside.nsw.gov.au](mailto:christopher.lazaro@bayside.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Smith', with a stylized flourish at the end.

David Smith  
**Manager Strategic Planning**