## Attachment 1 – Department's RTS review comments

## Proposed land uses

1. Confirm whether last mile or local distribution premises (as per the standard instrument definition) are proposed for either warehouses 1 or 3.

### Waterway health

2. IDC has provided further comments on the MUSIC modelling. See Attachment 2.

## Traffic and Access

- 3. The Department notes the application will be amended to include the east-west local road along the northern boundary of the site, 50% of which will be built within the GPT site and the other 50% within the Aliro site. While this road has been identified in the civil drawings, it is not clear whether GPT are proposing to construct the half road along the northern boundary as part of this DA. Rather, the civil drawings (CO13874.06-SSDA460, Issue E) show a proposed retaining wall and rock batter along the northern boundary of the site adjoining the Aliro development. Confirm whether a half road along the northern boundary is proposed to be constructed under this DA and provide details of the arrangements in place to deliver the east-west road, including details of the consultation undertaken to date with Aliro. Update civil drawing, where required.
- 4. Confirm whether a temporary cul-de-sac head on the southern end of the North-South Road adjacent to Warehouse 1 is still being proposed. Provide further details and plans for the temporary cul-de-sac.
- 5. Appendix C of the TMAP indicates that the right turning movements on the AIE intersection would perform at a LOS E in the AM and PM peak. In its advice on the EIS dated 11/10/2021, TfNSW noted the LOS should be performing at C or better. Provide details of the mitigation measures that can be provided to improve the performance of the intersection.

#### Noise - Consideration of rural residential receivers in the MRP

6. Table 5-4 still compares noise levels at these receivers against the Industrial PNTL. The Department requested these been considered against residential criteria, to identify the need for any negotiated agreements. Please update, identifying the predicted exceedances.

# Civil drawings

- 7. The civil drawing set (Appendix H) submitted with the revised RTS does not include all drawings specified in the Drawing List (CO13874.06-SSDA100, Issue D). Provide a consolidated set of drawings.
- 8. The Retaining Wall Master Plan (CO13874.06-SSD600, Issue B) shows Retaining Wall 4 on the north-eastern corner of the site with a length of 425 m and maximum height of 13 m. It is not clear what this wall will look like particularly as it is located adjacent to a future local industrial road. Provide a typical section and a longitudinal section of this retaining wall. Also demonstrate that the retaining wall complies with the MRP DCP requirements.

#### Landscaping

- 9. The architectural plans and landscape plans show a bioretention basin in the landscape and building setback along Mamre Road. Section 4.2.2 of the MRP DCP outlines the controls for building setbacks and indicates that drainage works are not permitted within the defined setback for Mamre Road (see Control 2). Provide updated plans that show the bioretention basin outside of these setbacks.
- 10. It is not clear whether the future freight corridor on the eastern boundary of the site has been incorporated into the estate wide landscaping strategy. For example, typical cross sections in the landscape masterplan (e.g Appendix E, Drawing No 0011) do not show the future freight corridor. Amend the landscape plans to include the future freight corridor and provide details demonstrating the tree canopy targets and pervious surfaces targets outlined in the MRP DCP are being met.
- 11. Section E of the landscape masterplan (Appendix E, Drawing number 0012) shows typical cross section of the northern boundary indicating that a proposed pile wall and palisade fence is proposed along this boundary. Check consistency with the civil drawings CO13874.06-SSDA460, Issue E as it shows a retaining wall and rock batter.
- 12. Section G of the landscape masterplan (Appendix E, Drawing number 0017) shows the riparian cross section and tiered retaining walls with shrubs selected for planting on the tiers that are likely to be in shade for most of the day (as per the shadow diagram in Appendix C). Provide further information on the types of species that would be appropriate for planting in this area and whether a suitable growing medium has been proposed between the tiers to accommodate planting. Can these species thrive in the shade for long periods of time?