

## Oakdale South SSD6917 MOD 4 – Response to Submissions

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<p><b>Department of Planning</b></p>	
<p><u>Urban Design and Visual Impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The screen planting provided between the Estate Road 01 and Warehouse 1A is unlikely to reach the maximum height before the Estate has been operating for several years. Please provide details regarding the maturity of the trees when they are to be planted, growth rates, care and maintenance to facilitate vegetation reaching its maximum growth potential and address the visual impact of the loading dock addressing Estate Road 01 prior to vegetation reaching its maximum mature height.</li>   <li>+ The EIS states "the site configuration would create an irregularly shaped 'splay' wall to the building which is functionally problematic with respect to internal racking layouts and movement of materials handling equipment through the warehouse." Warehouse 1C, however appears to have a 'splay' wall addressing Estate Road 01. Please clarify</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Trees along the Lot 1A frontage shall be specified as 100L trees, which will have an installation height of approximately 4 metres from 'day one'. Shrubs will be installed in a dense formation and installed in 300mm pot size, the largest option for shrub installation size, to ensure quick and vigorous shrub growth. Generally mature landscaping is estimated to be around 5 years, which will provide significant screening and softening of build form, particularly along the Estate Road 01.</li> <li>+ In regards to maintenance, Condition E61 of the Concept approval SSD6917 requires a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) prepared and submitted to both DoP and Council for approval prior to construction certificate (CC) for landscape works.</li> <li>+ As is demonstrated by Goodman facilities across NSW, landscape and site maintenance and quality is considered a high priority.</li>   <li>+ Building 3C does have a splay however the splay is less obtuse and given the depth of the building much easier to provide a workable racking solution. Site 1A is very restricted in the north-west corner due to the proximity of the roundabout and hence will require a much larger splay to accommodate an efficient building layout. The original building design was set back from the corner so as not to provide an imposing façade above the 3m high retaining wall. (Refer to SBA Diagram, <b>Appendix G</b>)</li> </ul>
<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Please provide an amended Precinct Landscape Plan with a key or labels to clearly identify the planting to correspond with the tree schedule already provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The landscape plans for MOD4 are consistent in format and detail with the landscape plans submitted and approved by DoP for both the SSD6917 Concept and MOD1, providing an appropriate level of detail for DA stage drawings. More detailed landscape plans including specifications and maintenance guidelines are</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="136 328 981 595">+ Several of the plant species proposed to be planted across the Estate are known to bear fruit and/or seeds. Please identify any fauna that may be attracted to the area as a result of the fruit and/or seeds borne by the proposed vegetation. Outline management strategy to ensure safety for fauna, flora and human users of the area. Additionally, please address how any dropped fruit and/or seeds will be managed and cleaned up.</li>   <li data-bbox="136 802 981 927">+ Address and provide a justification for the proposed reduction of landscaping within Precinct 1. Please also provide calculations for concept landscaping across the entire Estate site and justification for any reduction.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1032 260 1581 288">required and will be provided and CC stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="994 328 2040 427">+ While there are species that are more prolific in fruiting than others, species have been selected for their ecological contribution, such as non-weed species and appropriateness to local conditions.</li> <li data-bbox="994 432 2040 595">+ In regards to plant species that may bear fruit or seeds and attract fauna, a Landscape Management Plan (LMP) is required to be prepared under existing Condition E61. This LMP will be reviewed and approved by both DoP and Council prior to CC, and will consider the management of the landscaping to the estate, including how vegetative detritus is to be managed effectively.</li> <li data-bbox="994 600 2040 762">+ Site cleaning and maintenance will be arranged by site managers and will occur as and when necessary in order to ensure the estate remains well presented. Goodman as land owners have significant brand incentive to maintain its properties in a clean and tidy manner. This is reflected in the very neat state Goodman assets are maintained across NSW.</li>   <li data-bbox="994 802 2040 1102">+ While there is a reduction in landscaping for Precinct 1, this is primarily attributable to the addition of Estate Road 07, which has a road reserve of 4,580sqm. The landscape controls approved for SSD6917 concept approval are complied with in MOD4 proposal. The on-lot landscape treatment and presentation remains substantially as approved under original concept and MOD1 approval. Landscaping is provided along the boundaries in accordance with the approved boundary landscape treatment and will soften and screen the warehouses from the public domain. Tree planting is included in car parking areas to provide shade amenity for users.</li> <li data-bbox="994 1107 2040 1270">+ It should also be noted that a substantial portion of the estate, over 54%, comprise landscaping or vegetation. Around 11% of the site area for Precinct 1 is landscaping. The proposed area attributable within the estate to landscaping and vegetation is considered generous for industrial/warehouse precincts. The aggregate figures are as follows:</li> <li data-bbox="994 1281 1189 1310">+ OSE Estate:</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted states "all spaces located adjacent to obstructions greater than 150mm in height are to be provided with an additional width of 300mm. This includes any landscaping ...". Has the provision of car parking considered the maximum mature height of the landscaping proposed within car parking areas? Please provide details and clarification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Total OSE Site Area = 1,171,170sqm</li> <li>+ Total Landscape area = Approximately 637,000sqm (54%)</li> <li>+ Precinct 1:</li> <li>+ Site Area = 164,776sqm</li> <li>+ Landscape Area = Approximately 18,506 (11%)</li> <li>+ Typically, this requirement is for when a car parking space is located adjacent to a wall or other vertical surface. The proposed space for car door opening within the car parking area is considered satisfactory, with the proposed landscape designed to ensure adequate width of the kerb is at least 300mm, eliminating this issue. The car park planting proposed for MOD4 in Precinct 1 is consistent with that approved and implemented in Goodman's warehouses in Oakdale Central and throughout NSW, which has proven to work effectively in terms of operation and amenity for users.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Parking and Access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The plans submitted show "provisional car parking" within the loading dock area of Precinct 1A. Please provide further details including the type of vehicle proposed to be parked here, when and for what purpose. In the case this car parking is proposed to be used for light vehicle car parking, this will not be considered. The TIA submitted outlines principles for design including "to separate commercial (heavy vehicle) and passenger vehicle traffic" and the EIS submitted notes separate vehicle entry points for heavy and light vehicles.</li> <li>+ The swept path analysis attached to the TIA identifies the requirement of turning bays within some car parking areas within Precinct 1. Have turning bays been considered and incorporated into the car park design as recommended?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The architecture plans have been updated to relocate the provisional spaces from the hard stand space to the fire access track area immediately to the north of the WH1A. These spaces would be accessed via the car park area. This relocation will remove potential heavy vehicle conflict with the car parking. It should be noted that the updated proposal maintains the building and setback requirements as per the Oakdale South DCP controls.</li> <li>+ Refer to updated Architecture (<b>Appendix A</b>); Landscape Plans (<b>Appendix B</b>); and Civil Plans (<b>Appendix C</b>) reflecting this relocation.)</li> <li>+ Turning bays have been provided as necessary or in areas where sufficient room to allow a vehicle to turn is not provided. All car parks comply with the relevant requirements of AS2890.1.</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<p>Please provide further details.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Please provide a table clearly illustrating the car parking provision for each Precinct across the OSE in accordance with the approved car parking rates. Please provide a break down of the proposed amended GFA to clearly show warehouse and office floor space for each Precinct.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The architecture plan 'SSD Masterplan, OAK MP 02 (QQ)' (<b>Appendix A</b>) has been updated to include a table of GFA and parking numbers as requested. Please note parking provision is provided in accordance with the approved minimum parking rate of 1 space/300sqm (warehouse) and 1 space/40sqm (office).</li> </ul>
<p><u>Signage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ In accordance with SEPP 64, please provide details regarding proposed illumination of signage, addressing all points of Schedule 1(7). Subsequently, please provide greater detail in the signage plans identifying which signs are proposed to be illuminated, their location and any special treatment required.</li> <li>+ Signage Precinct 1 Plan (OAK MP 11 (M)) does not include details for "S7 Estate signage on landscaped wall". Please provide details. Please also provide the depth of all proposed freestanding signage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Proposed illumination of estate signage is considered in attached signage detail report (<b>Appendix D</b>), which assesses the proposed signage illumination against SEPP64. It should be noted that proposed illumination will be recessive in nature and mirror illumination adopted in estate signage in other Goodman warehouse precincts. Considering the low intensity illumination, the scale of the signage relative to the proposed warehouses, and that OSE is located away from residential and other sensitive development, the illumination is considered appropriate and acceptable.</li> <li>+ The 'Signage Precinct Plan OAK MP 11 (N)' has been updated to remove sign S7. Sign S1 has been relocated to a more appropriate location adjacent Estate Rd 01. The updated S1 location will provide enhanced visual presentation for this important estate sign.</li> </ul>
<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Table 10 of the EIS submitted appears to be missing comments for MPD 4 relating to fill and realignment of the Ropes Creek Tributary. Please provide clarification.</li> <li>+ The Heritage section of Table 16 refers to another document however the reference point states "error". Please clarify.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The proposal will result in the reduction of imported fill required. A total of 899,734m<sup>3</sup> of fill will be imported to the site over three stages. This is a reduction of approximately 32,666m<sup>3</sup> (3.5%) from MOD 1 and approximately 107,266m<sup>3</sup> (10.65%) from the original SSDA approval.</li> <li>+ There are no changes proposed to the realignment of the Ropes Creek Tributary as a result of MOD 4. The retention of the Riparian Corridor remains.</li> <li>+ The EIS has been updated to correct this. Please find attached the 'Excavation Summary Report' (<b>Appendix E</b>) prepared by Artefact. The comments provided in the EIS remain valid.</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<p>+ Please provide clarification regarding the developable and non-developable area calculations in Table 9 f the EIS. How would the developable area increase as a result of MOD 4 but the non-developable area would not change from the previous approval?</p>	<p>+ The Non-Developable Area was erroneously calculated, the correct area should be 33.48ha which relates to a reduction of 200m<sup>2</sup> between MOD 1 and MOD 4 and an overall reduction from the original SSD approval of 2.37ha. This has occurred due to minor adjustments during design development. Please see attached updated SSDA Masterplan OAK MP 02 (QQ) dated 4 August 2017 (<b>Appendix A</b>).</p>
Penrith Council	
<p>+ The information accompanying this notice has been reviewed and Council raises no objections to the proposed modification. However, following matters are for your consideration and action in the assessment of the modification:</p> <p>+ The key issues highlighted by Council in previous submissions for the Oakdale South Industrial Estate still remain relevant in the assessment of this modification. In particular, your attention is drawn to the following key matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The configuration and layout of warehouse 1A results in a further undesirable presentation to the main entrance of the estate and opportunities to improve this presentation should be explored.</li> </ul>	<p>+ Noted.</p> <p>+ Goodman's response to the issues raised by Penrith Council for MOD1 RTS, dated 30.01.17 (<b>Appendix F</b>), remains valid for MOD4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reorientation of loading docks away from the Estate Road 01 is operationally unfeasible. The reason for this is that the site configuration would create an irregularly shaped 'splay' wall to the building which is functionally problematic with respect to internal racking layouts and movement of materials handling equipment through the warehouse. In addition as a consequence of the constructed levels on the site if the hardstand was located on the east of the site an extensive ramp would be required which would reduce the available operational dock face to the warehouse to the point that it would be undesirable for operators. The visual amenity of the proposed layout with hardstand facing Estate Road 01 is considered acceptable for the following reasons:</li> <li>• A large portion of the building pad for Lot 1A is elevated above Estate Road 01. Refer plan C1038 (civil plans) and plan LP1-002 (landscape) which shows the road is at a level of RL59.4 whereas the hardstand is at a height of RL62.67 some 3.3m above. This will significantly reduce the visual appearance of hardstand from</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council's previous comments on general engineering matters in relation to the technical design and layout of the local road network; and</li> <li>• Council's previous comments on flooding and Water Sensitive Urban Design in relation to the design and management of the proposed bio-retention basins.</li> </ul>	<p>the road (see included sections in the updated landscape plans). This level difference diminishes along the western boundary to 0m at the southern end however this is compensated by an increase to the landscape setback along this frontage;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional planting has been incorporated into the Estate Road 01 landscape setback and Lot 1A (See attached updated landscape plans), which has been increased from 3.5m to 7m which is 200% of the required minimum landscape setback (3.5m). This will result in an effective visual screen to soften the hard stand area; and</li> <li>• The significant setback of Building 1A from Estate Road 01 will reduce the appearance of bulk and scale of the building from the road, which would otherwise occur were the building to be located adjacent to the road frontage, particularly given the raised pad level. The raised pad would also significantly exaggerate the appearance of building height by a further 4m. Therefore in terms of visual amenity the proposed layout with both the setback and landscape screening to Estate Road 01 is considered a preferable urban design outcome.</li> <li>• Noted. All previous responses to Penrith Council's comments on SSDA6917 MOD 1 relating to general engineering matters, including technical design and layout of the local road network and WSUD, still apply and remain relevant to MOD 4D (<b>Appendix F</b>).</li> </ul>
TransGrid	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Clarify whether the proposal includes any amendments to the approved works within TransGrid's easement, e.g. is the proposed fire track around building 3C located partially within the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ There are no changes to the proposed works within the Transgrid easement. No buildings or fire tracks are proposed to penetrate into the Transgrid easement. It is also confirmed that there is no proposed change to the location of the road which</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<p>easement? Although it's not listed as an amendment it appears that the road within TransGrid's easement may be located closer to the tower.</p> <p>+ If there are proposed modifications within TransGrid's easement then a technical assessment will be required to be undertaken prior to providing final comments regarding this application. TransGrid is required to assess the vertical and horizontal clearances to TransGrid's lines and structures to ensure the safety of the community and assess impacts on our assets. The applicant would need to submit an amended 3D DXF file with corresponding plans in PDF format which clearly show the location and details of the works including distances from TransGrid's structures.</p>	<p>passes through the easement to Precinct 6.</p> <p>+ As discussed above, there is no change to the proposed works within the Transgrid easement.</p>
<b>Environment Protection Authority (EPA)</b>	
<p>+ On the basis of the information provided, the proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). However, if future tenancies of the new building constitute a Schedule Activity under Section 1 of the POEO Act, these premises will require an Environment Protection Licence to be issued.</p> <p>The EPA has no further comments regarding the proposal at this time.</p>	<p>+ Noted.</p>
<b>Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)</b>	
<p>+ Please be advised that the OEH Greater Sydney Planning Team will not be providing comments on modification 4 for SSD 6917. This should not be taken as support for the proposal.</p>	<p>+ Noted.</p>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<b>Sydney Water</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ We have reviewed the amendments and have no further comments to make to our previous correspondence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Noted.</li> </ul>
<b>RMS</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Roads and Maritime has reviewed the submitted documentation and raises no objection to the proposed modifications subject to the development Gross Floor Area (GFA) does not exceed the approved threshold as part of the masterplan. The development should comply with the approved masterplan with regard to access arrangement to the broader road network.</li> <li>+ The proposed car park spaces are well above the parking requirements for the site. Council should be satisfied with the parking provision within the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Noted. MOD4 with a total GFA of 92,769sqm for Precinct 1, results in a reduction of 11,970sqm GFA from the 104,739sqm approved under MOD1.</li> <li>+ Noted. Council have not provided any comment in respect of the proposed car parking for the site.</li> </ul>
<b>RFS</b>	
<p><b>Asset Protection Zones</b></p> <p>1. A 26 metre asset protection zone (APZ) is to be provided along the eastern boundary of Biodiversity Lot 1 and the northern boundaries of Biodiversity Lot 2 and Lot 3 and a 10 metre APZ is to be provided along the southern boundary of Biodiversity Lot 2 as shown on the plan titled 'Bushfire Protection Plan' OAK MP 13 (N) prepared by SBA Architects dated 2 August 2017. APZs to be maintained in accordance in 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006' and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document 'Standards for Asset Protection Zones'.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Noted. The Bushfire Protection Plan (MP13 (N) has been updated to incorporate all these suggested protection zones.</li> </ul>

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<b>Water and Utilities</b> 2. Water, electricity and gas are to comply with section 4.1.3 of Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006.	+ Noted.
<b>Access</b> 3. Public Road Access shall comply with section 4.1.3 (1) of Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006	+ Noted.
4. Fire trails shall comply with section 4.1.3 (3) of Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006.	+ Noted.
5. A Bush Fire Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan shall be prepared consistent with 'Development Planning- A Guide to Developing a Bush Fire Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan December 2014'.	+ Noted. As recommended in the Bushfire Report prepared for the SSD application by ABPP, new buildings located adjacent to the bushfire hazard in Ropes Creek are to include evacuation planning for bushfire emergencies.
<b>Design and Construction</b> 6. New construction of the northern, southern and western elevation(s) and roof of building 1C shall comply with Sections 3 and 8 (BAL 40) Australian Standard AS3959-2009 'Construction of buildings in bush fire-prone areas' or NASH Standard (1.7.14 updated) 'National Standard Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas - 2014' as appropriate and section A3.7 Addendum Appendix 3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.	+ Noted. Building 1C will comply with this requirement.
7. New construction of the eastern elevation(s) of building 1C shall comply with section 3 and section 7 (BAL 29) Australian Standard AS3959 -2009 'Construction of buildings in bush fire-prone areas' or NASH Standard (1.7.14 updated) 'National Standard Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas - 2014' as appropriate and section A3.7 Addendum Appendix 3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection' 2006'.	+ Noted. Building 1C will comply with this requirement.

Matters Raised	Applicant consideration of matter/response
<p>8. New construction of the northern, southern and western elevation(s) and roof of building 1A shall comply with section 3 and section 6 (BAL 19) Australian Standard AS3959-2009 'Construction of buildings in bush fire- prone area' or NASH Standard (1.7.14 updated) 'National Standard Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas - 2014' as appropriate and section A3.7 Addendum Appendix 3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection' 2006'.</p>	<p>+ Noted. Building 1A will comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>9. New construction of the eastern elevation(s) of building 1A shall comply with Sections 3 and 5 (BAL 12.5) Australian Standard AS3959-2009 'Construction of buildings in bush fire-prone areas' or NASH Standard (1.7.14 updated) 'National Standard Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas - 2014' as appropriate and section A3.7 Addendum Appendix 3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.</p>	<p>+ Noted. Building 1A will comply with this requirement.</p>
<p><b>Landscaping</b> 10.Landscaping of the site shall comply with the principles of Appendix 5 of "Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006.</p>	<p>+ These principles are noted and have been considered in the landscape design and will be implemented in the landscape delivery.</p>