

Attachment 1 Department of Planning, Industry and Environment Comments

Mamre Road Precinct

1. The draft Mamre Road Precinct Development Control Plan (MRP DCP) was publicly exhibited until 17 December 2020. The MRP DCP provides planning controls for future development in the Mamre Road Precinct including building design controls, a road network, drainage strategy, landscaping and biodiversity controls. Please provide a detailed assessment of the development against the MRP DCP, including justification for any departures from any planning controls.
2. Please update the Aspect Industrial Estate DCP to ensure its consistency with the draft MRP DCP.

Traffic, Access and Parking

3. The Department notes proposed Access Road 1 is identified as a higher order road in the draft MRP DCP as it provides a key controlled access location to Mamre Road for the development and future developments to the north, east and south of the site. The draft MRP DCP identified a required road width of 30.6 m at the Mamre Road/Access Road 1 intersection with a potential mid-block width reduction to 26.4 m, subject to design and Council agreement. The road is also 'accessed denied' meaning car park access and loading dock access should not be provided to/from this road.

The development does not achieve the nominated width and includes direct access from warehouses 1 (Stage 1 development) and 8 (Concept Proposal). A detailed justification is required for these departures from MRP DCP.

4. The draft MRP DCP requires Access Road 1 and Access Road 3 (as part of a north-south collector road) provide access to the adjoining sites to the north, east and south. The development must consider the access requirements (including the timing of providing access) for these adjoining sites to enable the orderly development of the Mamre Road Precinct.

Access Road 1 terminates as a cul-de-sac at its eastern end under the Stage 1 development, with no connection provided to neighbouring properties. Further justification for this approach is required, in the context of the concerns raised above.

5. The Department notes the Stage 1 development includes an interim arrangement for the Mamre Road/ Access Road 1 intersection to accommodate the currently anticipated 2026 background traffic flows and traffic from the Stage 1 development. Please clarify whether any further upgrades to the intersection are required to accommodate additional traffic beyond the anticipated 2026 background growth, the Stage 1 development, future development on the site and surrounding sites, and the authority who will undertake the required upgrades.
6. The Department concurs with Transport for NSW (TfNSW) that the Traffic Assessment (TA) should include an assessment of the Concept Proposal (11 warehouses) under the ultimate scenario (2036) which also considers traffic generated by development on surrounding sites.
7. The Department notes Section 7.1 of the TA states the proposed trip rates have been agreed by TfNSW. The Department is currently undertaking traffic modelling for the precinct in consultation with TfNSW and the landowner group. Please provide evidence of TfNSW agreement in the RtS. Should the consultation result in any changes to traffic modelling and trip generation rate, the TA must be updated to the agreed trip generation rate and include an amended traffic assessment.
8. Section 7.3 of the TA assigns a GFA of 200,000 m² to "adjacent landholdings" for the purpose of calculating traffic generated from those sites. Please provide further details on which landholdings are being referred to and how this GFA figure has been calculated.
9. Please provide a breakdown of car parking spaces for Warehouse 1 and the café in the RtS.
10. Please provide a Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) required by Control 1 of Section 3.4.2 of the draft MRP DCP.

11. Please clarify how access to and from the dedicated freight corridor will be achieved from lots 4 and 5 as required by Control 7 of Section 3.4.3 of the draft MRP DCP.

Riparian Corridor and Flooding

12. The development includes realignment of the existing riparian corridor. The Department requests you continue to consult with the Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) and provide evidence of its support for the realignment, including identifying the most appropriate location for the realigned corridor to exit the site at the eastern property boundary.

Should NRAR support the realignment, please provide written evidence from the neighbouring property owner to the east of their acceptance of the proposed location of the realignment corridor at the shared property boundary.

13. Please clarify if a bridge is required for Access Road 3 to cross the realigned riparian corridor. Please consult with NRAR, the Environment, Energy and Science Group of the Department, and neighbouring landowner to reach an agreed bridge design.
14. The Department notes the width of the proposed creek channel is inconsistent between documents. The Riparian Assessment Report states the channel would be 4.75 m wide, whereas Sections 1 and 2 in the Civil Drawing (No: 18-596-C1010) show the low-flow channel would be 5.6 m and 5.7 m wide respectively. Furthermore, the typical riparian corridor section in Civil Drawing (No: 18-596-C1006) shows a 3.75 m wide low-flow channel within a 20 m wide high flow channel. Please clarify the width of the channel.
15. Figure 3 of the Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) shows both low-flow and high-flow channels are proposed for the realigned creek. However, this is not indicated on all documents. Please clarify if both low-flow and high-flow channels are proposed.
16. The Department notes Civil Drawings show an Upstream Diversion Channel (the Channel) is proposed. Please clarify the need for the Channel, how the Channel will impact on water quality of the realigned creek, and what is the fate of the channel once the North-South Collector Road and Access Road 3 are built.
17. The Department notes the Flood Impact Assessment (FIA) does not include an assessment of the Concept Proposal when all 11 warehouses are constructed during all ARI events and the PMF event. The FIA must be updated to include the assessment.

Contributions and Planning Agreements

18. The site is subject to the requirements of Clause 29 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Employment Area) 2009 (SEPP WSEA) and must make satisfactory arrangements for the provision of regional transport infrastructure and services. The site is also subject to the draft Aerotropolis Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC) on public exhibition until 26 February 2021. Please consult with the Department's Infrastructure Contributions and Agreements team to discuss the requirements of Clause 29 of SEPP WSEA and the application of the draft Aerotropolis SIC to the development.

Earthworks

19. Please clarify how earthworks will be carried out in a coordinated manner, particularly in the eastern portion of the site considering level differences between the site and adjoining properties to ensure level transitions can be provided at the realigned creek and future north-south road.

Visual Impacts

20. The LCVIA states the potential visual impacts at viewpoint 14 would be high, but without photomontages of the development at this viewpoint, it is unclear how this conclusion is reached. Please clarify.
21. The LCVIA includes visual impact assessment for both Concept Proposal and the Stage 1 development. However, the LCVIA only includes a risk rating for the Stage 1 development. Please provide a risk rating for the Concept Proposal.

Noise and Vibration

22. Section 6.1.1 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) states 'vehicle movements were provided by Mirvac, taken from the Traffic IA for the site prepared by Ason Group (Ref: 1029r02v3, dated 29 May 2020). This is not the latest version of the Traffic Assessment (TA) report. The NVIA must be updated to ensure daily vehicle movements are consistent between the NVIA and the TA.

Development Description

23. Please clarify the area of Lot 1. The EIS states the lot area is 58,106 m², while the Concept Masterplan shows the lot area is 58,156 m².
24. The Quantity Surveyor report states the estimated capital investment value (CIV) of Stage 1 works is \$99,990,064 and Building 1 works (including Stage 1 Site Preparation and Estate Infrastructure) is \$79,200,635. Please confirm the total CIV for Building 1 and Stage 1 works.
25. Please clarify how many employees would be required for construction and operation of the Stage 1 development respectively.
26. Please clarify the construction timeframe for the Stage 1 development including any proposed staging.
27. Please clarify the total area of Mamre Road reserve along the western site boundary.