8 August 2024

Our Ref: SSD-2024/8
Our Contact: Bianca Chiu (02) 9562 1616

Jeffrey Peng
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124
Via Email: jeffrey.peng@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Jeffrey,

RE: Request for Advice – Environmental Impact Statement for Multi-Level Warehouse at 350 King Street, Mascot

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Multi-Level Warehouse (MLWH) at 350 King Street, Mascot.

Response to SEARs

Council notes that LOGOS (the applicant) had previously contacted the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) to request Project-Specific SEARs for a State Significant Development Application (SSDA) involving a MLWH at 350 King Street, Mascot.

Bayside Council previously provided a response to the SEARs on 29 June 2023, which identified the following issues to be addressed in the EIS:

- Built form and use
- Traffic, parking, access and public domain
- Sustainability
- Landscaping
- Stormwater management
- Flooding
- Council stormwater pipes
- Development near critical infrastructure
- Amenity impacts
- Soil and groundwater contamination

The Proposal

Bayside Council was notified of the EIS for SSD-59024711 via the Major Projects Planning Portal on 2 July 2024. The subject SSDA consists of the following:

- Demolition of existing site improvements (including removing asphalt) to facilitate the development.
- Site establishment works, including minor excavation / bulk earthworks and removal of 125 trees.
- Construction and operation of a warehouse and distribution centre within a five-storey building including:
    - Approximately 31,085m^2 of total gross floor area including:
        - 26,701m^2 of warehouse and distribution centre GFA
        - 3,788m^2 of ancillary office GFA
        - 59m^2 of ancillary retail (café) GFA
        - 537m^2 GFA including lobby areas and end of trip facility
    - Maximum building height of RL49.97 (44.07m)
    - Operation 24 hours per day seven days a week.
- Other associated works including landscaping (2,376.7m² or 14.4% of site area), car parking (140 spaces including three accessible spaces) and general site improvements.
- New vehicle crossings to King Street for heavy vehicle and car access.
- Building and business identification signage and wayfinding signage.
- The SSDA does not include the remediation of the land, which will be undertaken via the exempt development pathway.

Council's Submission

Council has reviewed the submitted documentation and raises the following comments for consideration:

Traffic, Parking and Access

*Traffic***:**

1. The development proposes vehicles up to and including a 20m long Articulated Vehicle (AV) as per AS2890.2:2018. The submitted swept paths indicate the necessity of widening the King Street and O'Riordan Street intersection based on the swept path of an AV.

   In lieu of widening the intersection to enable the AV to make the left turn, an alternative access route loop is proposed through Mascot, as per the below:

   - northbound along O'Riordan Street,
   - left turn into Coward Street;
   - left turn into Bourke Road;
   - right turn into O'Riordan Street; and
   - right turn into King Street.

   The proposed alternate route is not supported for the following reasons:

   a. The section of Coward Street proposed in the alternate route is a Council local road that is not designed to accommodate an 20m AV. An AV is not permitted on this section of Coward Street (local road), as it is not an approved road under the NHVR (National Heavy Vehicle Regulator).

b. The footage submitted by LOGOS indicates the 20m long AV is struggling to make the turns along this route. Of particular concern is the turning movement from O'Riordan Street into Coward Street, and Coward Street into Bourke Road. The truck can barely make the turn at a low speed and will impact traffic flows on O'Riordan Street and Coward Street. It is also a safety risk as the vehicle must navigate through a busy pedestrian crossing. Pedestrians moving along the pedestrian crossing will result in the truck queuing in the road carriageway of O'Riordan Street, blocking traffic because there is no slip lane. This will increase congestion on the State road network.

c. Given the tight turning manoeuvres necessary as shown in the footage, there is high likelihood for damage to occur to Council and State road infrastructure.

d. The route takes trucks through a very busy highly pedestrianised precinct of Mascot which is only going to decrease the safety of pedestrians and negatively impact residents and employees, lowering the amenity of the precinct.

e. The loop is unlikely to be adhered to by drivers due to the inconvenience it causes and the significant additional travel times for trucks.

f. The alternative access loop will induce significant congestion to local streets and intersections, which is not supported. Furthermore, the right turn into King Street from O'Riordan Street is LOS F, which will only be made worse by forcing all trucks to make this movement into King Street. For this reason, Council requires the intersection to be upgraded to accommodate the turning movements of a 20m long AV.

2. AV swept paths at the intersection of King Street and O'Riordan Street are only provided for an AV turning left into King Street from O'Riordan Street northbound, which is insufficient.

   Swept paths of an AV making all movements into and out of King Street west need to be provided. Furthermore, the currently modelled movement of an AV turning left into King Street is coming from the second lane on O'Riordan Street which is not considered to be a safe movement (a vehicle travelling in the kerbside lane can be cut-off by the AV making its movement entirely from the second lane). Hence, the intersection road widening needs to be wider than currently drawn to enable the AV to make the turn safely from the kerbside lane.

3. The extension of the no-parking on King Street East in AM and PM peak hours can be considered subject to community consultation however, the traffic impact on King Street east requires further investigation of alternate lane configurations to mitigate the impacts.

4. No information has been submitted to demonstrate that the existing road pavement of the entirety of King Street west is sufficient take the loading of an AV. On-site geotechnical investigations to determine the type of road base, thickness of the asphalt, etc, is required. A road adequacy assessment of the ability of the road to withstand the loading of an AV along the carriageway for a 50 year design life is required.

6. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is reliant on a single survey undertaken for a site in Chester Hill, which is not sufficient. Additional vehicle surveys of similar fully occupied new MLWH buildings in the local context near the port and airport are necessary (e.g. Banksmeadow and Alexandria) to have an accurate understanding of vehicle movements (both truck and passenger vehicles) to inform the traffic generation assessment. Surveys need to focus on Monday to Friday.

7. The traffic modelling involves an extensive and complex set of scenarios, however, many modelled scenarios are irrelevant. Council is primarily interested in the outcome of traffic modelling of Base flows plus approved developments and Planning Proposals (PPs), plus development at QF3 and QF4. Currently the submitted information is insufficient for us to make an informed decision. It would be beneficial to schedule a discussion with the applicant's Engineers, as well as TfNSW. The consent authority must ensure that the applicant's traffic modelling is assessed / peer reviewed by a reputable traffic engineering consultant to ensure it is an accurate representation of the traffic impacts of the development. The outcome of the peer review should be addressed by the applicant, and TfNSW should also be involved in this process.

8. The traffic modelling does not consider additional delays at the intersections from the follow issues:

    a. Delays from slow moving trucks are not considered in the SIDRA modelling.
    b. Delays from trucks occupying multiple travel lanes are not considered in the SIDRA modelling.

9. 350 King Street has vehicle access to both Ewan Street and King Street, which has not been adequately addressed. Insufficient detail has been provided as to the mechanisms that will be in place to control vehicular access to Ewan Street.

10. Table 7.7 of the Traffic Report has incorrect traffic generation rates for 342 King Street, 289 King Street and 215-235 O'Riordan Street.

    342 King Street:

Projected Future Traffic Generation Potential

	AM	PM
Hotel (187 rooms):	74.8 vph	74.8 vph
Commercial Office (12,192m^2):	195.1 vph	146.3 vph
Auditorium (500 seats):	50.0 vph	50.0 vph
TOTAL TRAFFIC GENERATION POTENTIAL:	**319.9 vph**	**271.1 vph**

289 King Street:

6.1.2 Proposed Extension Trip Generation

Application of the vehicle trip rates determined in Section 6.1 to the additional 400 car parking spaces proposed results in the following predicted trip generation volumes:

- 30 vehicle trips per hour (22 in, 8 out) during the morning peak hour; and
- 26 vehicle trips per hour (8 in, 18 out) during the evening peak hour.

The above predicted traffic generation is considered a conservative assessment, as it assumes a linear relationship between the number of parking spaces provided and trips generated.

215-235 O'Riordan Street:

Table 2: Development Trip Generation

Land Use	Size	Trip Generation Rate (veh/hr)		Trip Generation Estimate (veh/hr)	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Office	15,040 m²	1.6 per 100 m² GFA	1.2 per 100 m² GFA	241	180
Medical Centre	6,257 m² 88 consulting rooms	4.0 per 100 m² GFA 2.1 per room	4.6 per 100 m² GFA 2.4 per room	250* 185	288* 185
Retail	2,250 m²	1.6 per 100 m² GFA	1.2 per 100 m² GFA	36	27
Hotel/ Serviced Apartments	189 rooms	0.273 per room	0.345 per room	52	65
Total				**579**	**561**

*higher trip estimate has been considered

Based on Table 2, the proposed development is anticipated to generate 579 vehicle trips and 561 vehicle trips during the morning and evening peak periods, respectively.

11. Note that the traffic report for the Planning Proposal at 215-235 O'Riordan Street indicates a future scenario with development with a LOS F for King Street and O'Riordan Street, which is inconsistent with the QF3 & QF4 traffic reports which indicates a different LOS in the future 2036 scenario with development. Furthermore, the traffic modelling undertaken for this development indicated a need for an additional departure lane from King Street onto O'Riordan Street to mitigate the traffic impacts of 215-235 O'Riordan Street, which requires further road widening and consideration in the SSDA.

Figure 1: Suggested Setback and Intersection Treatments to better Align Intersection and Increase Capacity

Parking and loading:

12. The proposed fire truck set down parking spaces that extend into Ewan Street are not supported due to negative impacts on the public domain. The development already has an excessive number of driveways proposed and an additional driveway for two fire trucks to setdown is not ideal.

    The fire truck setdown needs to be investigated and be accommodated elsewhere on the site to mitigate impacts on the public domain. Furthermore, the swept path analysis indicates the fire truck will occupy most of the roadway on Ewan Street when manoeuvring around the building requiring the removal of all on-street parking along that frontage which is not supported due to the negative impacts on the locality.

13. The location and dimensions of the loading bays shall be clearly shown on the architectural plans consistent with the traffic report swept paths. The loading bay dimensions shall be designed for the maximum size vehicle permitted for each loading bay with dimensions as per AS2890.2:2018. The number of loading bays shall be in accordance with Section 3.5.6 and Table 5 of the Bayside DCP 2022.

14. The gradients and levels shown on the Civil Engineering Plans for the “fire truck only” ramp on the western side of the site adjacent to Ewan Street need to be revised to comply with AS2890.2:2018 for a HRV.

Public Domain:

15. 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 shall be shown on the Civil Engineering Plans. This is required for both QF3 and QF4

developments, including undergrounding of existing overhead wires on both frontages of the site as required by Bayside DCP 2022.

16. The driveway profile shown on drawing C014509.07-SK05 is non-complaint with Australian Standards and has scraping issues for both cars and HRV vehicles. The longitudinal driveway profiles submitted also do not start in the centre of the road as required.

Flooding and Stormwater

17. The Civil Engineering Report has not addressed Section 3.10 and 9.5 of the Bayside DCP 2022.

18. Insufficient flood mapping has been provided to assess flooding impacts. There is no flood mapping for the existing scenario for 1% AEP and PMF in the Appendix to the Civil Engineering Report. The flood mapping figures in sections 7.5 and I.4 are not legible. All flood modelling needs to be provided as full-page legible outputs in the Appendix. The flood modelling needs to model a full range of flood events including the 10%, 1%, 0.5%, 0.2%, PMF as per the Flood Risk Management Manual. Maps showing flood extent, flood contour, flood depth, flood hazard (H1 to H6), afflux and velocity of pre-development and post-development need to be provided for the full range of flood events.

19. Figures 7.13 and 7.21 of the Civil Engineering Report have different flood afflux compared to the respective drawings F12 and F22 in the appendix. Furthermore, section 7.5.7 of the report states that there are increases of 70-80mm to the 1% AEP flood level on Ewan Street in the 1% AEP event which is non-compliant.

20. The applicant shall demonstrate that the development will have less than 10mm flood afflux on surrounding properties in the 1% AEP event and less than 50mm flood afflux in the PMF flood event. Existing flood hazard shall not be increased for all flood events up to the PMF. Climate change shall also be modelled to determine the post-development flooding impacts. The following scenarios shall be modelled:

    - Scenario 1: Impacts of sea level rise in Year 2050 and 2100.
    - Scenario 2: Impacts of sea level rise combined with increased rainfall intensity in Year 2050 and 2100.

    It is to be demonstrated that the development will have no impact on flood levels considering future climate change (less than or equal to 10mm on surrounding properties).

21. Emergency management and flood risk management considerations need to be addressed in the Civil Engineering Report, including access to and from the site and management of flood risk associated with the flood storage area along the Ewan Street frontage. The flood risk shall be assessed for all flood events.

22. Council needs clarity around floor levels, particularly the plus/minus 500mm provided for the main building and service area as shown in the Civil Engineering Report. Certainty must be provided in the FFL to ensure building floors are provided with the required 500mm freeboard to the 1% AEP flood levels.

23. The Architectural Plans are inconsistent with the Civil Engineering Plans and must be amended to ensure consistency. The Architectural Plans nominate a RL 6.55m

AHD FFL on the ground plan SSDA-100, whereas the Civil Engineering Plans have floor levels as low as RL 6.00m AHD on drawing DA40. Furthermore, RL 6.55m AHD is adopted for the upper-level ground floor car park FFL on the Architectural Plans, whereas it is shown lower at RL6.25m AHD on the Civil Engineering Plans.

24. A Flood Planning level assessment has not been undertaken for the development (i.e. no assessment was made of the proposed finished floor levels on the Architectural Plans in relation to the adjacent flood levels). Section 7.6.1 of the Civil Engineering Report relating to Flood Planning Levels does not address this adequately. It needs to be confirmed that all habitable areas and non-habitable areas are sufficiently protected from floodwaters. A comprehensive review of all non-habitable and habitable floors on the ground level with the highest flood level (spot levels) taken adjacent to these floors from the post development flood modelling is required to determine the adequacy of the adopted floor levels.

    a. Café/lobby habitable floor level (including car park entrance to the lower ground C1 portion of the split level car park) needs to be confirmed to be at, or above the 1% AEP flood level + 500mm.
    b. The bicycle storage room, end of trip facilities, waste room and plant room non-habitable floor levels need to be set at, or above the 1% AEP flood level.
    c. The substations are a sensitive set of equipment that need to be physically protected to the 1% AEP flood level + 500mm freeboard.
    d. The warehouse floor levels need to be set to a minimum of the 1% AEP + 500mm to ensure warehouses are sufficiently protected on the ground floor.
    e. The waste room, pump room etc. need to be set at, or above the 1% AEP flood level.

    Furthermore, if a Shelter in Place Emergency Management Strategy is required then ground floor levels for the café /lobby, warehouse and car park will need to be physically protected to the PMF flood level, and confirmation required that the floor levels are above the PMF.

25. The flood compensation basin in the Civil Engineering Plans is not reflected on the Architectural and Landscape Plans. The Architectural Plans have a fire escape going straight through the flood compensation basin partly on a 25% gradient which is not acceptable. More detailed plans and sections of the proposed flood compensation basin are needed including:

    - Dimensions and materials of the basin.
    - Ongoing maintenance requirements to ensure the basin remains fully functional.
    - Safety measures to ensure that there is no unauthorised access to the basin.

26. The development of this site provides an opportunity to reduce the high hazard flooding in Ewan Street. The extent of the flood storage basin should be maximised to reduce flood depths and hazards in Ewan Street as much as possible.

27. An On-Site Detention System (OSD) is required for this site designed as per Section 6 of Bayside Technical Specification – Stormwater Management. The calculations in Table 5.2 do not demonstrate that the development complies with

the requirements in Section 6. The Permissible Site Discharge (PSD) from the site shall be designed to restrict the discharge to the predeveloped runoff in the “state of nature / greenfield” condition (predeveloped site must be assumed as 100% pervious - i.e. the site is totally grassed / turfed) for the 20%, 10%, 5%, 2%, and 1% AEP storm events. A DRAINS Model for the OSD must be submitted to Bayside Council for assessment.

28. The OSD is located within the flood affected area resulting in the outlet being drowned, this makes the OSD ineffective, which is not supported. Council requires the orifice for the OSD to be set a minimum of 100 mm above the Hydraulic Grade Line (the 1% AEP flood level) of the receiving system for the 1% AEP event to allow a free discharge. Currently, the orifice is significantly drowned and the OSD volume will need to be significantly enlarged as per Section 6.3.3 of Bayside Technical Specification – Stormwater Management. The OSD shall be relocated to a suitable location outside the 1% AEP flood affected area.

29. A scaled OSD Catchment Plan is to be provided showing the impervious (roof and hardstand) and pervious area draining into the OSD including the OSD bypass area. The OSD bypass it is not to exceed 15% of the site area. Where there is OSD bypass, the storage of OSD system shall be enlarged and the outlet control shall be revised to ensure total runoff from the development does not exceed the PSD for the entire development site.

30. A scaled WSUD Catchment Plan shall be provided with areas and catchments coordinated with the MUSIC modelling and the OSD Catchment Plan.

31. The WSUD Catchment Plan and OSD Catchment Plan shall have the Architectural Plan in the background.

32. Section 6.4.1 of the report details an 80kl rainwater tank is to be provided whereas the Civil Engineering Plans show only a 30kl rainwater tank. The MUSIC modelling doesn’t nominate the correct size of the rainwater tank. The Report, Civil Engineering Plans and MUSIC modelling are to be revised with a consistent rainwater tank volume of 30kl. The re-use of the rainwater tank to all ground floor toilets and the landscape irrigation system shall be shown.

33. The locations of the OceanGuards pit inserts in the stormwater design shall be detailed.

34. Council requests a soft copy of the MUSIC modelling to be provided for review.

35. A Roof Drainage Plan shall be provided with the amount of area draining into the rainwater tank maximised.

36. Details of WSUD elements are to be included in the proposal.

Landscape

37. New substations shall be relocated away from landscape setbacks and the frontage of the site. Proposed substations shall be enclosed within the built envelope. The applicant should investigate if additional substations are required given the retention of the existing substation on Ewan Street.

38. Location of Fire Hydrant Booster Valves shall be indicated on plans and be designed to be well integrated into the site with details of the enclosure to be

included in detailed plans. It is preferred that these service structures be located on the side of the site to minimise impact to the streetscape.

39. If the fire truck access setbacks are only being used in emergencies, the hardstand spaces should be better integrated into the landscape setting.

40. At least 10% of the development site shall be soft landscaped. As the site is over 2000m² the front landscaped setbacks are in addition to the 10% requirement.

41. Pavement treatments are to be minimised within frontages to a road and be limited to the minimum width required for driveways and pedestrian access. Other areas of use shall include soft permeable treatments.

42. The proposal should deliver a dense green canopy to enhance and increase local corridors of vegetation and soften the adverse visual impact created by the proposed built form especially the vehicle ramps to Ewan Street. The location of each proposed large and medium canopy tree shall be clearly shown on a plan.

43. *Landscape Plans and Arboricultural Impact Assessment*

    a. Setbacks to street frontages are to maximise the inclusion of large canopy trees. Landscape setbacks are to be fully landscaped and natural soil levels are to be retained. Where there are changes to the ground levels, these are to be clearly detailed to enable an assessment of tree development possibilities and functionality in relation to the public domain interface.

    b. Soil levels of all trees proposed to be retained are to be detailed and any proposed alteration of levels within the Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) is to be shown on Landscape Plans and assessed within the Arboricultural Report.

    c. The graphic selection of proposed planting is confused with the graphics used for existing trees. The Landscape Plans are to clearly indicate which trees are to be retained, removed and proposed canopy trees.

    d. At least three (3) trees shall be planted on site for each tree to be removed. In this regard, the Landscape information needs to demonstrate that the proposal can achieve the required tree replacement rate on site with the proposed large and medium canopy trees shown on Landscape Plans. Further information regarding tree offset is provided below.

Tree Management

44. *Tree Offset Controls*
    The proposed development includes the removal of one hundred and three (103) live trees. To offset the loss of canopy the applicant is required to replace the tree at a 3:1 replacement ratio, therefore a total of three hundred and nine (309) new trees shall be planted to offset the canopy loss for environmental reasons.

    If there is insufficient space to install all the conditioned replacement trees on site, the applicant may choose to offset the remaining trees by way to Council so it can facilitate replacement planting in Public Land.

    Section 3.8.2 of the Bayside DCP 2022 stipulates a monetary contribution of $333.00 per tree as outlined in Council's Fees and Charges. It is to be paid prior to the removal of the tree, suggested by imposing a condition of consent.

45. *Tree Protection Guidelines*
    Tree references have been adopted from the submitted Arborist Report, prepared by Canopy Consulting (dated 27 October 2023). Tree retention and protection refers to trees identified for retention in Table 16 of the Arborist Report, including retain – no protection, retain – generic plus and retention subject to root mapping. Tree pruning will be required for trees identified in Section 6.9 to accommodate the proposed development.

    In accordance with ***AS4970-2009*** protective fences consisting of chain wire mesh temporary fence panels with a height 1.8m shall be erected outside the drip line. The fence panels must be securely mounted and braced to prevent movement. The area within the fenced area is to be mulched with leaf mulch to a depth of 100mm and a weekly deep watering program undertaken.

    The protective fence shall consist of chain wire mesh mounted on metal posts, the erection of the protective fence shall be undertaken prior to the commencement of any work on site and shall remain until the completion of all building and hard landscape construction.

    Any pruning of branches or roots of trees growing from within adjoining properties requires the prior written consent of the tree's owners and the prior written consent of Council in the form of a Permit issued under Council's Development Control Plan 2022. The work must be carried out in accordance with **AS4373-2007** by an experienced Arborist with minimum AQF Level 2 qualifications in Arboriculture.

    Where drainage or paving works are proposed to be constructed in the area below the dripline of trees, the proposed works and construction methods must not damage the tree. Where either the trees or works were not shown in detail on the approved plans, Council approval must be obtained.

    Underground Services such as pipelines or cables to be located close to trees must be installed by boring, or by such other method that will not damage the tree, rather than open trench excavation. The construction method must be approved by Council's Tree Management Officer.

    Existing soil levels within the drip line of trees to be retained shall not be altered without reference to Council's Tree Management Officer.

    Building materials, site residue, machinery and building equipment shall not be placed or stored under the dripline of trees required to be retained.

Architectural Plans

46. *Screening on the Southern Elevation*
    The extent of the art screen on the western elevation should be extended to wrap around the southern elevation facing Ewan Street, as this is likely to be visible from Qantas Drive. This is echoed in the State Design Review Panel comments dated 26 August 2023. The response in the applicant's Design Review Report argues that Ewan Street is very narrow and does not afford good view angles of the Art Screen. However, the concern is the visual presentation from Qantas Drive and their supporting diagrams clearly show that the south-western corner and the southern elevation is clearly visible from Qantas Drive heading west as well as from the airport overpass. Extending the art screen will assist in improving

screening of the truck circulation ramps which should be increased to improve the streetscape outcome.

47. *Annotations and details*
    Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels are to be clearly detailed and annotated on plans. Bayside DCP 2022 prescribes that a minimum of 20% of car parking spaces are to be equipped with electric vehicle (EV) charging. In this regard, EV and electric truck charging shall be clearly shown and annotated on plans to comply with this requirement.

Other Issues

48. *Public Art Strategy*
    Council requests that the Public Art Panel referenced in the Public Art Strategy must include a Bayside Council representative – Bayside Council's Arts and Culture Specialist.

49. *Pedestrian Through-site Link and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)*
    The design of the pedestrian entrance to the eastern through-site link on the Ewan Street end should be redesigned to address CPTED principles. The existing substation on Ewan Street blocks clear sight lines to the pedestrian entry from the street and presents concealment opportunities. Furthermore, whilst lighting is provided to the eastern pedestrian thoroughfare, there appears to be limited opportunities for casual surveillance from the building over the length of the space and further CPTED consideration should be given to increasing activation on this elevation.

    As the through-site link is to be privately owned and maintained, it must be subject to a positive covenant on title ensuring unlimited, unimpeded access by the general public at all times.

50. *Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*
    Whilst it is acknowledged that the tenants are unknown at this stage, the modelling around the expected tenant types precludes temperature-controlled warehouse / distribution activities. It would be beneficial for the assessment to verify whether it is likely that acoustic treatments can be accommodated on site, if required, for such uses.

    The report recommends a number of noise mitigation and management measures to be implemented for the proposal to ensure that noise and vibration impacts remain acceptable. These noise mitigation and management measures should be detailed on plans.

51. *Solar Glint and Glare Assessment*
    It is noted that the report concentrates on the impact of the PV panels to aviation as the roof mounted solar panels are not visible from the road or residents. However, the panels are likely to be visible from the nearby hotel and commercial premises and the report should be amended to address any potential impacts to those occupants.

52. *Development near critical infrastructure*
    Please note the referral requirements previously raised in Council's letter to you on 29 June 2023.

We trust that the Department will carefully consider Council's submission when assessing this proposal.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact Bianca Chiu, Senior Urban Planner on (02) 9562 1616 or via email: Bianca.Chiu@bayside.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

Josh Ford
Coordinator Planning Policy