



Appendix A: Summary of Submissions and Responses to Issues Raised in Submissions

Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
Department of Planning		
1A	<p>Consultation</p> <p>Please provide detail of consultation undertaken with adjoining landowners and the nearby community.</p>	<p>In March 2015 Swire engaged with Lindt (the adjoining owner and occupier) to seek feedback on the evolving building design.</p> <p>Feedback from Lindt included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ consider moving the high-rise to the northern end. ▪ lower all signage to below 16m. <p>As a result of this feedback the design was further amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The high-rise section was moved more towards the site centre, and was set back from Hollinsworth Road, and set further away from Lindt; and ▪ Signage was maintained below 16m for the overall development although the temporary sign on the south wall of Stage 1 has been positioned 19m to better suit the interim Stage 1 architectural treatment until Stage 2 is built at which time the sign will be relocated and lowered to 16 metres.
1B	<p>Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>Please provide a discussion on cumulative traffic across the surrounding road network in addition to that provided of the cumulative traffic within the Sydney Business Park.</p>	<p>A cumulative assessment has not been undertaken as part of this project as the road network servicing the Sydney Business Park, including Richmond Road, has been designed to accommodate the traffic generation from the Marsden Park industrial estate.</p> <p>Richmond Road currently carries approximately 33,000 vehicles per day. Richmond Road it is a designated heavy vehicle route with heavy vehicle volumes currently accounting for 15.6 per cent of vehicles.</p> <p>Richmond Road is being upgraded now from 2-lanes to 4-lanes in order to</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
		<p>ensure it is suitable to accommodate the future projected traffic demands associated with growth in the North West sector of Sydney. As part of that project, modelling has been completed to inform the design of the intersections along Richmond Road. It identifies that peak hour traffic flows through the South Street intersection are approximately 2,300 vehicles per hour, and for the traffic modelling future traffic flows are forecast in the order of 5,000 vehicles per hour. As specified in the Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix I of the EIS), the RMS guideline would specify approximately 200 vehicles per hour from industrial land, and this should have been factored into the background traffic growth assumptions for Richmond Road upgrades. However, the actual predicted peak hour traffic from the proposed Swire facility is less than 30 vehicles per hour.</p> <p>In the context of the Richmond Road upgrades and the forecast baseline traffic assumptions, it is not considered necessary to undertake cumulative traffic impact assessment. It is also highlighted that cumulative traffic impact assessment was not required for nearby developments for Ikea, Hargraves shopping centres and masters, all of which contribute substantially higher peak hour volumes to the regional road network.</p>
1C	<p>Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please confirm consultation with RMS in relation to super b-doubles servicing the site in relation to the Sydney Business Park road network and the surrounding road network. ▪ Please confirm that the proposal complies with all relevant Australian Standards. 	<p>Advice from Sydney Business Park confirms that all major roads within the Business Park have been designed to accommodate Super-B Doubles.</p> <p>As detailed in Section 5.5 of the GTA Report, the Sydney Business Park road network has been design to accommodate B-triple vehicles. The swept path requirement of Super B-doubles are comparable to a B-triple and as such, their use on the Sydney Business Park road network is considered appropriate.</p> <p>In time, a formal application with RMS may be required to formalise access to and from the site by Super B-doubles. We did not specifically liaise with RMS regarding this.</p> <p>The relevant Australian Standard (AS2890.1-2004) indicates that car</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
		<p>spaces should be a minimum 2.4m by 5.4m (User Class 1A) accessed by a 5.8m wide aisle. This Standard also allows up to 600mm overhang over unobstructed areas effectively reducing the minimum length of the spaces to 4.8m.</p> <p>The proposal provides wider car spaces at 2.6m which are considered to be more appropriate for today’s vehicles. The length is slightly shorter at 5.2m consistent with the wider spaces and overhang areas are available at many locations. The access aisles are the same at 5.8m. It is considered that the proposed arrangement will provide a better result but if strict compliance with AS2890.1 is required (without reliance on overhangs), the proposal can accommodate this with only minor revisions to the car park layout and arrangement.</p>
1D	<p>Visual</p> <p>Please provide further justification regarding the visual impact from locations surrounding the proposal site. This should include detail of high-quality architectural finishes. Justification should be incorporated into the clause 4.6 variation request.</p>	See issue 7A below.



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
1E	<p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please provide further detail regarding road traffic noise, particularly if super b-doubles would be servicing the site. ▪ A commitment is made to assess noise from mechanical plant at a later stage. The Department requests that this information be sourced and noise assessed to ensure compliance with noise emission objectives. This should be included within the Response to Submissions report. 	<p>B-doubles have been modelled on site as per Table 7 of the report. Semi-trailers and b-doubles will both have a source noise level of 105dB(A) sound power level.</p> <p>Noise impacts associated with vehicle movements on the local road network to Richmond Road will be negligible as the proposed routes do not pass any residential or sensitive uses which would warrant assessment.</p> <p>Further Noise assessment</p> <p>In summary, major plant items, that being compressors located within the refrigeration plant room, have been addressed in Section 5.4 of the ALC report submitted with the EIS.</p> <p>Other plant including cooling towers, air handling units, fans, condenser units are unlikely to contribute noise that would impact on the modelled noise at the nearest receptors. This is further discussed at Section 3.3.1 of the RTS.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
1F	<p>Soils and Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please provide further detail on water supply, usage, sewer and a water balance for the site. The Sydney Water submission provides additional requests in this regard. ▪ Noting that there are to be some earthworks at the site, please provide detail of how impacts on soil and water will be avoided and managed. 	<p>Services will be delivered to the site by Sydney Business Park under a separate approval (Development Application 11-2284 as approved by Blacktown Council on 18 March 2013) prior to construction of the cold storage facility. The demand expected to be generated by the proposal will be adequately met via the provision of services delivered by Sydney Business Park.</p> <p>The site will be connected to Sydney Water potable water supplies in Hollinsworth Road. The supply is adequate to accommodate the anticipated demand from the development.</p> <p>The site will be connected to Sydney Water reticulated sewer mains in Hollinsworth Road. The supply is adequate to accommodate the anticipated demand from the development.</p> <p>Section 3.14 of the EIS provides a detailed breakdown of the total water usage for the proposed development. The modelled site water balance water supply requirements are estimated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12,300 kL/year from rainwater harvesting. • 4,500 kL/year from towns mains. <p>An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan was submitted as part of the EIS (see Appendix J). All works shall be undertaken in accordance with Blacktown City Council’s Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Policy and Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction Volume 1 (the Blue Book).</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
1F		<p>The site is already a construction site, with control measures, including a sedimentation pond already in place. The sedimentation pond and boundary control measures will remain in place, as appropriate until the site's stormwater system has been constructed and is available to replace the sedimentation pond.</p> <p>Swire will comply with all Sydney Water requirements as specific in the submission, including obtaining necessary permits and certificates.</p> <p>Since the exhibition of the EIS Sydney Water has issued a Section 73 Certificate (see Appendix E).</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
Roads and Maritime Services		
2A	<p>Standards</p> <p>RMS provide the following conditions are included in the Consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed development shall comply with the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct Master Plan and Blacktown City Council's Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan 2010 (DCP). ▪ The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including, driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1- 2004, AS2890.6-2009 and AS 2890.2-2002 for heavy vehicle usage. 	See Issue 1C.
2B	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council prior to the issue of a construction certificate.</p>	Swire has no objection to the imposition of a condition requiring the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan as specified.
Transport for NSW		
3	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of any works on the site, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) prepared by a suitably qualified person shall be submitted to the Principal Certifying Authority (PCA). The Plan must be prepared in consultation with Blacktown City Council, Roads and Maritime Services and TfNSW. The CTMP should specify any potential impacts to traffic, pedestrian, cyclists and bus services within the vicinity of the proposed site from construction vehicles during construction. Any potential impacts to pedestrian access or public transport infrastructure</p>	Swire has no objection to the imposition of a condition requiring the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan as specified.



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	<p>including bus stops should also be specified in the CTMP. The CTMP should also include mitigation measures to manage these impacts.</p> <p>The CTMP shall include the cumulative construction impacts of all the projects adjacent to the site. The Applicant shall submit a copy of the CTMP to Blacktown City Council, prior to the commencement of work.</p>	
Office of Environment and Heritage		
4	No issues raised.	Noted.
Environment Protection Authority		
5	No issues raised.	Noted.
Sydney Water		
6	<p>Advice and requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 is required from Sydney Water. ▪ Building plans are to be stamped by Sydney Water prior to the commencement of any construction. ▪ A permit to discharge trade wastewater must be obtained prior to business activities commencing. A boundary trap and/or a backflow prevention device may be required – subject to consultation with Sydney Water. 	<p>A Section 73 Compliance Certificate has already been issued by Sydney Water and is attached at Appendix E.</p> <p>Swire will comply with all Sydney Water requirements as specific in the submission, including obtaining necessary permits and certificates.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
Blacktown City Council		
7(1)		<p>Given the earlier consultation with Blacktown City Council, especially in relation to the building height and architectural treatment, we are both surprised and disappointed that Council is now not supporting the proposal in its current form. Accordingly we summarise below the earlier consultation undertaken with Council as well as provide a detailed response to the specific concerns now raised by Council in their 16/9/2015 response.</p> <p>A summary of the consultation history is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 10/4/2014 - Swire and JBA met with Council to discuss the proposed development (particularly the high-bay concept) to ensure there were no 'show stoppers' prior to Swire committing to the land purchase. ▪ 17/11/2014 – Swire and JBA met with NSW Planning & Environment to discuss the building height and preliminary drawings. Council was invited but did not attend. Copies of the drawings (first pre-lodgment submission) were left with NSW Planning & Environment who forwarded copies to Blacktown Council. ▪ 27/11/2014 – Council's initial comments were issued as part of the SEARs issued 11/12/14. ▪ 20/1/2015 – Second pre-lodgment submission made directly to Blacktown Council by JBA for comment comprising a site plan, building elevations/sections, a design rationale statement and a photo of Swire's recently completed development in Laverton, Vic. ▪ 21/1/2015 – Council's comments/concerns issued. ▪ 2/3/2015 - Third (revised) pre-lodgment submission made to Council by JBA which included sketch perspective images at all four corners of the building and a commentary to explain the new building design



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
		<p>elements. It is noted that an extensive review of architectural options was carried out by Beca P/L during this interim period to address the Council comments relating to the bulk, scale and visual interest of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1182 507 2042 1117"> <p>▪ 13/4/2015 – Council’s email response received which in full said “Further to the below, Council considers the revised design an improvement, however requests that a revised schedule of colours and finishes be submitted to ensure a variety of colours and finishes are proposed. This should include 3D modeling/photomontages of the proposal “. JBA also spoke with Council at that time who indicated they were generally happy enough with the design solution presented and would be keen to see more details by way of a schedule of colours and finishes as well as the montages. JBA advised them that these would form part of the DA and Council was happy for this to be the case. This meant the design could move forward with confidence on the finishes and articulation measures. Following this response from Council and to better address Council’s earlier concerns, the size of the high-bay section of the building was reduced by 25% and the building was re-orientated through 90 degrees to move the high-bay further from Hollinsworth Road and give the building an apparent frontage to Hollinsworth Road as well as Road 5A. This amended layout retained the same architectural philosophy and treatment adapted to suit the new layout.</p> <li data-bbox="1182 1136 2042 1324"> <p>▪ 16/9/15 – Council’s submission to NSW Planning & Environment lodged. It is noted that Items 4 to 8 inclusive of this submission are identical to Items 9 to 14 of Council’s first response 27/11/14 (but in a different order) despite there being two rounds of consultation in between with the last round response 13/4/15 indicating Council’s in-principle support of the proposal.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	<p>Whilst the economic need for the high-bay component is acknowledged, it is considered that the Clause 4.6 request is not well-founded, for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Swire's responses to the 14 concerns now raised in Council's response (16 September 2015) are as follows:</p>
7(1a)	<p>The non-compliance represents a significant 18.8m departure from the height of building development standard (equivalent to 117% or over double), noting that the lower component of the building also breaches the 16m height standard by up to 4.3m at the ridgeline (representing a 26% variation).</p>	<p>The 16m height standard is considered to be very restrictive for many modern day warehouse buildings permitted in this industrial zone. The proposed significant height departure of the high-bay section of this building from the 16m height standard has been known to Council from the very first discussions, including the Meeting on 10/4/14.</p> <p>The height departure is necessary in order that the building configuration can accommodate the proposed specialized automated storage system. The high-bay section only represents 23% of the total building area and will add visual interest to the low-bay sections that largely surround it. In respect to the low-bay building components, it is noted that the eaves height is shown on the drawings as 16m above the existing ground level at the center of the building and only the roof rise of approx. 4m is above this 16m height.</p> <p>However, due to the original fall diagonally across the site, the south and west sides of the site have been excavated significantly below street level resulting in the street level at the corner of Hollinsworth Road and Road 2 is approximately 5m higher than the existing ground level at the center of the building.</p> <p>Therefore, in the important south-west view (corner of Hollinsworth Road and Road 2), the whole low-bay building is for all intents and purposes less than 16m above the street level and the high-bay ridge height is also lower at approx.30m above street level.</p>
7(1b)	<p>This proposal is located in a prominent part of the estate on the corner of two sub-arterial roads. The high-bay component has dimensions of 57.1m x 126.8m, comprising 70% of the southern fagade to Hollingsworth Road and 43% of the western fagade to Road No. 2. Therefore, the proposed height exceedance will be readily visible by the public in a part</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the high-bay comprises 70% of the southern façade to Hollinsworth Road but the high-bay is now well set back (over 70m) from the Hollinsworth Road boundary (compared with 23m in the first submission) and does have a low-bay section full length on the Hollinsworth road side which breaks up the bulk of the building.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	of the precinct that is subject to the lowest height standard.	Moving the high-bay section northwards to the north end of the building was investigated but this was not a Transgrid preferred option due to the proximity to their transmission lines and this position didn't suit Swire's development staging for the site. While the high-bay height exceedance will be visible by the public passing through this industrial area, the large set back from Hollinsworth Road along with the lower site levels and the extensive landscaping along both streets will significantly reduce the impact and the resulting visual impact should not be at all unexpected to passers-by.
7(1c)	No analysis or supporting information in the form of photomontages and streetscape elevations along Hollingsworth Road and Road No. 2 have been provided to demonstrate the effect of the variation on the desired future character of the locality and bulk and scale in the streetscape.	<p>Streetscape elevations along Hollinsworth Road and Road 2 have now been prepared and are attached to this response (drawing 2520460-96-0-502S Revision A) to supplement the Building elevations submitted with the EIS (drawing 502 Revision B). A perspective drawing of the south-east corner of the site was also submitted with the EIS (2520460-96-0-507 Revision B).</p> <p>These Streetscape elevations illustrate the majority of the building is within 16m height envelope when viewed from Hollinsworth Road and Road 2. The Streetscape elevations also indicate the extent of intensive landscaping along these site frontages that softens the way the development addresses the streets.</p> <p>The Streetscape elevations and perspective present well, and are considered to be consistent with the future desired character of this industrial area and the bulk and scale in the local streetscape.</p>
7(1d)	Further, no analysis or supporting information has been provided to demonstrate the effect of the proposed height variation in terms of impact on the skyline and views lost from Richmond Road when compared with a compliant proposal.	<p>A photomontage of the development viewed from the Richmond Road/Hollinsworth Road intersection was provided in the EIS submission (drawing 508 Revision B).</p> <p>A second photomontage has now been prepared showing a compliant height proposal (drawing 508C Revision A). As can be seen from the first photomontage, only the very top of the high-bay will be visible from Richmond Road compared with the second photomontage where the</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
		<p>building can't be seen at all.</p> <p>The additional height will not be intrusive and will barely impact on the skyline and views from Richmond Road where other closer buildings (including Bunnings, Ikea, and Masters) dominate the views.</p>
7(1e)	<p>No shadow diagrams have been submitted to demonstrate that the additional height proposed will not adversely impact any adjoining properties.</p>	<p>A shadow diagram has been prepared and is now attached (drawing 509 Revision A). This clearly demonstrates that the additional height has little added affect to the shadow cast across the boundaries of the site and will have minimum impact on the adjoining properties.</p>
7(1f)	<p>It has not been demonstrated that the proposed design of the development exhibits a high quality built form in an appropriate location in accordance with the relevant objectives (b) and (d) of the Height of Building standard.</p>	<p>Contrary to Council's statement, it is considered that the proposed design does exhibit a high quality built form for this location and the submitted drawings and statements support this claim.</p> <p>Even the second submission to Council had a visual treatment that surpasses all Swire cold store facilities in other Australian cities and we would expect to be at least be equal to any other large cold store facilities in Australia.</p> <p>The third submission to Council (on which the current design has been based) has a particularly responsive treatment that is considered to significantly surpass other facilities and takes cold store design to a new architectural level.</p> <p>The architectural enhancement between the second and third submissions to Council has a significant additional capital cost tag (in excess of \$1M) which significantly impacts on the commercial viability of the development in this very competitive industry. While Swire is very supportive of having a high quality development consistent with Council's objectives for the Estate, they are also very conscious that their competitors in other locations in Australia are not incurring similar cost premiums.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
7(2)	<p>Any approval would significantly change the desired future scale and form of development as currently set out in the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct Plan. Due to the likely precedent to be set in the event of approval, consideration should be given to revisiting the precinct-wide Height of Building development standards under an amendment to the SEPP. This should only be on the basis of architectural design excellence being demonstrated.</p>	<p>It is considered that architectural design excellence has been demonstrated for this 'state of the art' cold store facility which properly addresses the 23% high-bay component. If this requires an amendment to the SEPP, it is requested that this be carried out so development approval for this development can be granted.</p>
7(3)	<p>It is acknowledged that an attempt has been made to provide a variety of materials and finishes. However, it is considered that the site can only accommodate a proposal of this scale if it exhibits high quality architectural design, which further articulates the expanses of colourbond material fronting public roads in a prominent part of the precinct. For example, further consideration should be given to the use of a variety of external structures, finishes, etchings, recessed patterns, vertical garden 'green' walls, upper storey display windows, and protrusions and penetrations in building elements. In this regard, it is considered that the controls and objectives of Sections 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and 6.4.5 of the Blacktown City Council Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan (BCC Growth Centres DCP) 2010 have not been satisfactorily addressed.</p>	<p>The current design not only provides a variety of materials and finishes but employs a number of layered components that articulates the facades fronting the street. The length of the main building is interposed by the offices and service building areas located along all three road frontages. A glass-like stair tower protruding from the south-west corner of the high-bay serves as a point of interest at the intersection of Hollingsworth Road and Road No.2.</p> <p>The use of high quality translucent multicell polycarbonate cladding for the tower, along with Alucobond and perforated mesh feature panels, elevate the usual expression of this building type and provide articulation to this corner of the site. The use of these panels and perforated screen elements, along with differing colorbond colours serves to effectively break up the large expanses of colorbond steel cladding inherent at large warehouse buildings.</p> <p>The Council's suggestion for introducing the use of "redundant external structures, etchings, recessed patterns, vertical garden 'green' walls , upper storey display windows , protrusions and penetrations" is considered more appropriate for smaller commercial buildings. These items are not considered appropriate for a large scale warehouse like this and would only add unnecessary complexity/clutter, capital cost and maintenance in an attempt to try to make the building look like something it isn't.</p>

Swire Cold Storage Warehouse and Distribution Facility, Marsden Park (SSD 6799)



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
7(4)	Details of screening to all tanks that are proposed to be visible to a public road / place.	There is only one above ground tank and that tank faces Road 2. This tank will be screened from Road 2 with perforated aluminium screen panels as shown on drawing 502. Please refer to the west elevation shown on this drawing and the Materials Legend at the top right hand corner.
7(5)	Full details of external finishes and colours including photomontages. Council is very concerned at a lack of architectural merit and treatment to the 33m high building. The plans provide no mix of colours and finishes. The colours are considered to be too dark and will impact on the skyline.	<p>Details of the proposed external finishes and colours are shown on the building elevation drawings and on the perspective drawings already submitted. Further detail will be available later once Planning Approval has been issued and detailed design can proceed but there is sufficient information on the drawings for this proposal to be assessed.</p> <p>As noted above, there is a mix of colors and finishes. One of the main colours is shale grey which is a very pale grey. The other main colour is Deep Ocean which is a mid-range darker colour which will provide a good contrast. When compared with existing buildings in the vicinity, these colours are not darker than the precedent set by these buildings. Swire would be happy to consider other colour suggestions preferred by Council.</p>
7(6)	Particular concern is raised with the elevation to Hollinsworth Road, which is a major collector road, the elevation is unacceptable in its current form as it is just a 'shed' with no mix of finishes, the building should have more masonry elements.	The Council's concern with the elevation to Hollinsworth Road is not understood. The building can be described a 'shed' by its very nature but the architectural treatment makes it a very smart 'shed' consistent with an industrial development of this type (refer to Item 3 above). Additional masonry elements would add further complexity to the building and considerable further capital and maintenance costs. It is difficult to understand how these would help.
7(7)	Full details of all boundary fencing and any retaining walls including materials of construction shall be submitted as a part of the application.	<p>The only boundary fencing is along the common boundary with Lindt on the east side. Elsewhere the fencing is set back behind the 7.5m landscaping strips and further within the property. The fencing details are shown on drawing 501 and meet the requirements nominated by Sydney Business Park.</p> <p>The details of the external retaining walls are shown on the Civil</p>

Swire Cold Storage Warehouse and Distribution Facility, Marsden Park (SSD 6799)



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
		<p>drawings 604 and 607 submitted with the EIS. These are faced with Keystone charcoal straight face units being the standard set by Sydney Business Park. The retaining walls along the loading dock faces of the building (north and south sides) will be precast concrete.</p>
7(8)	<p>Concerns are raised regarding the "empty pallet" areas located towards Hollinsworth Road. No storage of any goods is to be permitted within the setback to Hollinsworth Road. Any external storage areas are to be fully screened to the full height of the goods to be stored. Any screening of storage shall not impede sight distances for trucks or vehicles. Full details shall be submitted as a part of the application.</p>	<p>The empty pallet areas at the NE and SW corners of the building are part of the building in that they are roofed and screened areas as indicated on the drawings submitted with the EIS.</p> <p>No storage is proposed in the open area between the building and the roads. The empty pallet areas do not impede the sight distances for trucks or other vehicles given this site have a one way traffic flow. Sufficient detail of the empty pallet areas has been provided to allow this application to be assessed.</p> <p>Full details will be available during the detailed design phase of the project which follows the EIS.</p>
7(9)	<p>As raised in Council's correspondence dated 27 November 2014, the overall building design was considered to result in a poor presentation, and this concern remains as the proposal in its current is not considered to demonstrate high quality building design. This is particularly the case given the proposal is almost double the permitted building height and provides a built form which is considered to contravene the objective of clause 4.3 Height of Buildings as follows:</p> <p>"(d) to establish parameters for and promote a high quality built form."</p> <p>It is recognised that the central building form is the result of the internal functionality of the high bay storage system sought by the Proponent. However, this internal system does not constrain the exterior presentation of the building, which is capable of providing a high quality built form, as is the expectation of other recently approved warehouse buildings within the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct. To maintain the quality of the new built forms in this precinct, the design of the building is required to be improved so as to demonstrate design</p>	<p>The design aspects again raised by Council in this item have largely been answered in previous items above. The design solution adopted has the external building shape following the internal functional shape. It does not attempt to have an external shape that disguises the internal shape.</p> <p>As noted in earlier correspondence to Council, as a storage facility, the recognizable forms and materials of the "shed" typology is seen as an honest and low impact aesthetic approach to the design solution and at the same time not add unnecessary cost to the building. The colour-blocking and layering of decorative panels have been used in restraint to not overly decorate but to visually tie the high-bay to the rest of the building as a balanced composition. It is considered that an excellent design has been achieved that at least matches the standard of the existing designs that can be viewed at this industrial estate precinct.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	<p>excellence and comprise suitable architectural design measures. The proposal in its current form is not supported.</p>	
7(10)	<p>The absence of landscaping within the car parking areas and lack of communal open space is not supported, given it contributes to the dominance of hard-stand and the built form and reduces the level of amenity provided to employees. In this regard, it is considered that the controls and objectives of Sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 of the Blacktown City Council Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan (BCC Growth Centres DCP) 2010 have not been satisfactorily addressed.</p>	<p>The car parking areas are located within the Transgrid easement. Landscaping has been excluded from these areas as Transgrid requires unrestricted access to be able to operate large mobile plant and equipment on the easement. Car parking areas without internal landscaping achieve this Transgrid requirement. Even if shade trees could be provided, their benefit would be limited as Transgrid restricts the mature height to 3m.</p> <p>It is also noted that the car parking areas are long and narrow and are flanked on the long side by extensive landscaping which will soften the areas.</p> <p>Contrary to Council’s comment, employee communal space has been provided as shown on drawing 501.</p> <p>The area is 1,085 square meters which is a large area of land representing a very generous 17.5 sq.m for each employee on site during the main (day) shift. The communal area is flanked by a 7.5m wide landscaping strip effectively further improving its amenity. It is considered that objectives of DCP have been adequately addressed considering the constraints and size of this site and relatively low employee numbers.</p>
7(11)	<p>While no objection in principle is raised with the proposal from a traffic management point of view in terms of access, internal traffic circulation and heavy vehicle movements, concern is raised with the proposed number of parking spaces.</p>	<p>Car parking rates have been generated from first principles, based on the actual intended employment levels for each stage of the development, and the observed car occupation rate established by the</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
7(12)	The proposal only makes provision for 44% of the BCC Growth Centres DCP parking requirement based on the anticipated staffing number which may change in future and Council will have no control on it.	RMS in its Guide to Traffic Generating Development. The assessment indicates a peak accumulation of staff and visitors on-site of 123 parking spaces. However studies show the mode share of car use is 84%. Accordingly the park car park requirement will be 103 spaces. Swire has a firm understanding of the employment requirements for this form of development as outlined in the EIS. Accordingly, the on-site car parking provision of 128 car spaces is considered to be more than sufficient to accommodate the anticipated peak car park demand of 103 spaces.
7(13)	This is a significant departure from the DCP requirement, which may have negative impacts on surrounding developments.	
7(14)	It is considered that a maximum 30% departure (i.e. a minimum of 201 car spaces) from the BCC Growth Centres DCP parking requirement is reasonable based on the type of development and the survey undertaken at a similar development in Melbourne. Accordingly, amended plans should be provided demonstrating the provision of an additional 63 car spaces onsite either as permanent or overflow.	Reference to the RMS 'Guide to Traffic Generating Developments' indicates that car parking for warehouse uses should be applied at a rate of 1 space per 300sq.m GFA. The RMS Guide does not distinguish between warehouse and any ancillary office uses. Therefore applying the RMS rate to the overall floor area of 36,287sq.m indicates a parking demand of 121 spaces. This predicted demand is less than the proposed parking provision of 128 spaces. In addition, 12 bicycle parking spaces and space for motorcycle parking has been provided. Additional car park spaces could be provided by reducing the generous size of the communal area. In the very unlikely event that additional short term parking is required the site has very large yard areas that can provide overflow parking if required.
TransGrid		
8A	Earthing modifications to the transmission tower on the subject site must be undertaken at the developer's expense and this is an essential condition of TransGrid's conditional consent issued herein. An Earthing Study to determine the most appropriate modified earthing design must be undertaken in the first instance, followed by the actual earthing modifications to be undertaken taking into account the findings of the	Accepted.



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	<p>earthing study.</p> <p>TransGrid requires a written undertaking that the developer will reimburse TransGrid for the costs associated with the earthing study and the actual earthing modification works, before initiating same. The earthing modifications must be undertaken before any development work within 30 metres of the tower can commence.</p>	
8B	<p>Referring to Drawing 650 (Site Overview), TransGrid's use and access to the transmission line easement must be preserved and provided at all times. This is an essential condition of consent and TransGrid will refuse access to parts of the easement from time to time in order to undertake essential works to our high voltage infrastructure and this includes the truck exit situated immediately adjacent to the stanchion.</p> <p>During times when the Truck Exit is closed for TransGrid service of the transmission line, egress will only be possible using the Truck Entrance. TransGrid will require a set of keys to the property security and boom gates be provided to ensure we are able to access our easement and stanchion at any time.</p>	Accepted.
8C	<p>The car parking areas and other hardstand areas proposed to be situated on the easement must be constructed to withstand the weight of a 100 tonne crane and other large mobile plant and equipment that is used by TransGrid from time to time. To this end, TransGrid will not be liable for any damage to surfaces arising from the use of our easement on the subject land.</p> <p>TransGrid requires a safe working platform to undertake maintenance on the stanchion and transmission line infrastructure. Attached to the back of the TransGrid Easement Guidelines for Third Party Development (Guidelines), is a pictorial example of the safe working platform required.</p> <p>On account of vertical safety clearances, TransGrid does not permit any</p>	In order to not overly penalize the design of the carparking and hardstand areas, it should be requested that this condition include the proviso that Transgrid provides heavy duty timber spreaders under the crane outrigger feet to spread the loads consistent with industry best practice.



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
	<p>truck parking on the easement at any time. The passenger car parking areas must not be used by any form of truck or trailer or vehicle higher than a sedan/wagon/ Four Wheel Drive. To this end, the car park areas should be constructed so as to be physically separate to the warehouse driveway and hardstand areas. Further, shipping containers and pallets must not be stored on the easement at any time.</p>	
8D	<p>Referring to Drawing 653 (Utilities and carpark lighting), there are vertical and horizontal clearance concerns regarding the proposed overhead lantern lighting in the car parking areas. Further, on account of the already constrained access to our easement and stanchion on the subject site arising from the proposed development, the light poles must be removed. This is to preserve unobstructed access for TransGrid to be able to operate large mobile plant and equipment on the easement, including cranes and elevated work platforms with out-riggers etc, pursuant to the WorkCover NSW 'Work Near Overhead Power Lines' Code of Practice 2006. Lighting for the car parking areas should be positioned off the facing side of the proposed warehouse.</p>	Accepted.
8E	<p>Fencing proposed on the easement cannot exceed 2.5 metres in height. Each fencing panel must be earthed and every second panel isolated from the next pair of fencing panels. Please consult with TransGrid for further instructions on the required earthing for the proposed boundary fence.</p>	<p>Given the considerable distance of the car parking areas from the warehouse building, it will be difficult to achieve an economical lighting design without glare and light spill issues at the carpark and Road 5A if the lighting for the car parking areas is positioned off the facing side of the proposed warehouse as proposed by Transgrid. It should be requested that this Transgrid initiated condition provides the opportunity for Swire and Transgrid to discuss and agree a mutually acceptable alternative design where the 4.2m high lighting poles in the current design are moved to be adjacent to the fencing lines or alternatively higher poles are provided at locations just outside of the easement....in order to reduce the constraints within the easement that Transgrid is seeking.</p>



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
8F	Gates to be constructed on the boundary must be designed so as to not exceed a height of 2.5 metres. Height restrictions also apply to boom gates proposed on the easement. The design of the boom gate proposed for the Truck Exit is yet to be finalised. Therefore is boom gate is subject to TransGrid's assessment and determination to ensure safety and operational compliance.	Accepted.
8G	Height restrictions must be applied to cranes, elevated work platforms plus any other plant and equipment proposed to operate on the easement. This restriction applies to all mobile plant and equipment that is capable of exceeding a height of 4.2 metres.	Accepted.
8H	Referring to Daring 15006 (Landscaping Plan), all vegetation and landscaping proposed within TransGrid's easement must not exceed the limit of 3 metres at a mature height as per the direction issued by TransGrid's Transmission Lines and Cables Asset Manager.	Accepted.
8I	No mounds of earth or other materials may be left on the easement during and after earthworks, even on a temporary basis, as doing so effectively creates a hazard by reducing the vertical clearances to the transmission lines.	Accepted.
8J	During construction, traffic control measures need to be implemented to prevent vehicles colliding with TransGrid's transmission towers. Any temporary fencing will need to be earthed and every second panel isolated. No works are permitted within the 20 metre exclusion zones around TransGrid's towers.	Accepted.
8K	All works must be carried out in accordance with the NSW WorkCover 'Work near Overhead Power Lines' Code of Practice 2006. Please also refer to the accompanying TransGrid Easement Guidelines for Third Party Development and contact TransGrid in the event of any uncertainty.	Accepted.

Swire Cold Storage Warehouse and Distribution Facility, Marsden Park (SSD 6799)



Issue no.	Key Issues Summary	Swire Response
8L	TransGrid requests notification before the construction work commences. This is to ensure a TransGrid Easement Officer attends the site induction and can assess the construction site mindful of any key safety issues pertaining to TransGrid's infrastructure.	Accepted.
8M	TransGrid request formal notification of any amendments I modifications to the proposed development including changes to ground surface levels within the easement.	Accepted.