

Oakdale West Estate – Consultation

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
Penrith Council	GMG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 08.03.16 - Telephone call to Kate Smith (Penrith Council) to discuss OWE proposal. 08.03.16 & 09.07.13 – Email to Kate Smith suggesting dates to meet to discuss proposal. 11.03.16 - Kate Smith responds by telephone stating they didn't have availability at the moment for a meeting to discuss OWE and would prefer we email draft plans and summary of the proposal 21.07.16 – Guy Smith emailed draft plans and summary of OWE proposal to Robert Craig at Penrith Council. Requested confirmation whether a meeting was required or satisfied to review plans and provide comments. Council confirmed by email 26.07.16 that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“may be best to meet once internal officers have had the chance to review the documentation and prior to Council making a submission on the proposal as part of the public exhibition process.</i> <i>Can you please let me know when the Department advises of the public exhibition dates and I will set up a time for you to meet with relevant officers that coincides with the initial period of the public exhibition period.”</i> From the above, council has confirmed that no comments will be provided prior to lodgement of the SSD proposal with DoP. 	
Fairfield Council Edward Saulig <ESaulig@fairfieldcity.nsw.gov.au>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Edward Saulig, Strategic Land Use Planner at Fairfield Council, on 22.07.16 inviting comment / meeting Emailed Mr Saulig again on 18.08.16 Further email sent to Mr Saulig on 30.08.16, seeking a response. Email received from Edward Saulig on 30.08.16 confirming: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Andrew Mooney, Strategic Planning Coordinator (9725 0214) is following up on the submitted information and hopes to provide a response before the 2 September deadline”</i> 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andrew Mooney, coordinator Strategic Planning at Fairfield Council, responded on 05.09.16 requesting clarification on WNSLR, access and traffic management and frequency generally. Guy Smith (Goodman) responded to Andrew Mooney by email of 06.09.16, providing a response to the access and other questions raised. A Mooney provided a response to Goodman by email of 06.09.16 confirming receipt of responses, but requesting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Given the significance of the function of the Southern Link Road it would still be informative (for both Council’s and DPE) if the traffic study is able to provide some insights into what stage of development proposed on the OWE & OSE the SLR will need to be constructed to service future industrial development in the area. The Traffic Assessment responds to the above query by confirming that the Western North South Link road will be able to accommodate all vehicles of OWE, without any operations reliance on the SLR. Traffic assessment undertaken on Oakdale South also confirms that there is no reliance on the SLR for operation of the fully developed facility. 	
Blacktown Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Judith Portelli on 22.07.16 inviting comment / meeting Judith responded on 22.07.16 seeking dates for meeting to discuss proposal. Email sent to Judith Portelli, 29.08.16 seeking meeting time to discuss OWE. Meeting scheduled with Judith Portelli to discuss proposal on 06.09.16, where the following was discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Layout of the proposal - Staging of development - Access - Flooding Council confirmed at the meeting that they had no initial comments to make, but that would review the submission package and provide any comments if deemed necessary. 	
Roads and Maritime Services		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Bill Chen and AJ on 22.07.16 requesting consultation. Bill Chen confirmed by email (26.07.16) consultation with RMS RMS Emailed again 18.08.16 seeking any further comment on proposal. 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<p>Bill Chen of GHD has noted the following consultation with RMS relating to traffic modelling have been discussed with RMS on 21 March 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable traffic models for this traffic impact assessment • Model recalibration and revalidation • Future land use and network assumptions <p>The following actions have been taken in the project based on the discussion with RMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As agreed with RMS, the Aimsun models (Version 2) developed on behalf of Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) for the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area (BWSEA) Structure Plan in 2013 is suitable for regional traffic assignment. The BWSEA models have been used to assign traffic and extract intersection traffic volumes. SIDRA software has also been used to assess detailed intersection performance with the traffic volumes extracted from the Aimsun models. • As agreed with RMS, there is no need to undertake a recalibration of Aimsun BWSEA model for the study area which was previously approved by DP&E, due to the significant road upgrade work currently under construction on Old Wallgrove Road. This construction may have significantly impacted the traffic patterns and conditions within the study area. • RMS agreed that as this project focuses on the localised impacts instead of regional impacts, the future land use, population and employment forecast for wider network are based on DP&E BWSEA Structure Plan. • The land use assumptions for the proposed development sites and other major developments in the vicinity have been updated with the latest available information. The traffic generation rates for the proposed development sites are based on the modelling undertaken as part of DP&E BWSEA Structure Plan. • The planned and committed future road upgrades have been kept consistent with DP&E BWSEA Structure Plan. • Details of the intersection layouts for proposed Western North-South Link Road (WNSLR) and development site access arrangements have been updated in the traffic models based on the latest information provided by Fitzpatrick and Goodman. 	
Department of Primary Industries	AECOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Blanche / Gitangali • Emailed 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. • Response email received from Kerry Ede on 29.08.16 stating: <i>"There is a Nil response from Department of Industry – Lands."</i> 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
DPI - Agriculture		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response received from Andrew Docking on 29.08.16 stating: 	<p><i>“The EIS need to address managing the boundary between the activities on the site and adjoining agricultural businesses. i.e. Providing adequate setback / landscaping to reduce potential for land use conflict.”</i></p>
Environment Protection Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. David Gathercole, unit Head of Regulation Unit North confirmed on 10.11.15: 	<p><i>“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). The EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an EPL under the POEO Act. Accordingly, the EPA has no comments regarding the proposal and has no further interest in this proposal.</i></p>
Office of Environment and Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed Marnie Stewart on 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. Emailed Marnie Stewart again on 30.08.16 chasing up comment on the proposal. Emailed Marnie Stewart on 03.02.17 chasing up comment on the proposal. Response received from Marnie Stewart on 03.02.17 stating: 	<p><i>“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SSD application. Please be advised however that OEH is unable to provide comment due to other priorities.”</i></p>
NSW Heritage Council Stuart Reid		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emailed 18.08.16. Email response received from Stuart Reid on 19.08.16: 	<p><i>“Thanks for this. I note our 26/10/2015 advice on the SEARS does not appear to have been incorporated (beyond a perfunctory Aboriginal Heritage section). I’ve pasted the guts of it below – which forms our preliminary pre-lodgement comments. These would seem relevant to bulk earthworks proposals, at the least.</i></p> <p><i>Kind regards and look forward to the post-lodged, referral, addressing these points!</i></p>

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A search of the Heritage Office Database has found no record of any State Heritage Register items within the SSD site, however the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should further scrutinise if there are any listed or potential heritage items within the proposed project area. If any listed or potential heritage items are likely to be affected, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) must be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced heritage consultant as part of the EIS. The HIA should assess how the development would impact on any places of heritage significance in or surrounding the SSD site. - A historical archaeological assessment should be prepared by a suitably qualified historical archaeologist in accordance with the Heritage Division, Office of Environment and Heritage Guidelines 'Assessing Significance for Historical Archaeological Sites and 'Relics' 2009. This assessment should identify what relics, if any, are likely to be present, assess their significance and consider the impacts from the proposal on this potential resource. Where harm is likely to occur, it is recommended that the significance of the relics be considered in determining an appropriate mitigation strategy. In the event that harm cannot be avoided in whole or part, an appropriate Research Design and Excavation Methodology should also be prepared to guide any proposed excavations. - The EIS should identify any impacts on places, items or relics of significance to Aboriginal people. Where it is likely that the project will impact on Aboriginal heritage, adequate community consultation should take place regarding the assessment of significance, likely impacts and management/mitigation measures. - Under the sub heading "Heritage and Aboriginal Cultural Heritage", EIS Key Issues should include an assessment of any aboriginal and non-aboriginal archaeological impacts, including any impacts on the overall archaeology of the site. It should outline any proposed management and conservation measures to protect and preserve archaeology. - The Office of Environment and Heritage Publications list, found at: (http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/publications/) should be added to Attachment 1 section of the SEARs "Technical and Policy Guidelines". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were reviewed and have been considered in heritage reports.

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
Rural Fire Service nika.fomin@rfs.nsw.gov.au	GMG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS) on 25.07.16 • Nika Fomin emailed 18.08.16. • Response received from Nik Foman on 19.08.16 requesting bushfire assessment • Bushfire assessment emailed to NF on 19.08.16 • Chaser email sent to NF on 29.08.16, seeking pre-lodgement comments by Wed, 31.08.16. • Email response received from Jason Maslen of RFS on 31.08.16 as follows: <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>I have briefly reviewed the bush fire report. I note that a number of the proposed buildings are noted as being located in the Flame Zone on eastern and western edges of the site. These also do not appear to incorporate perimeter access roads / internal driveways between the building and the hazard. At a planning stage, the NSW RFS seeks to avoid development located within the Flame Zone and the provision of roads (such as internal driveways in instances such as these) around the perimeter of the development. Given the nature of the existing bush fire hazard, this may not be a significant issue for the sites at the western edge of the site, however should be considered with regard to development abutting the future riparian corridor at the eastern end of the site.</i></p> • The above comments have been considered and the bushfire consultant has confirmed: <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>“...all buildings are to be setback from the boundary to provide perimeter access for fire appliances. The plans indicate this.</i></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>The eastern aspect has a managed Easement and the buildings will NOT be exposed to flame contact – except for Precinct 5 which clearly shows a defensible space and therefore perimeter access.”</i></p> 	
Water NSW neil.abraham@waternsw.com.au		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed AT&L on 22.07.16 • Emailed 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. • Received comment from Alison Kniha confirming we’ll receive a response by 26.08.16. • Response received from Alison on 25.08.16 as follows: <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>“Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Oakdale West proposal before lodgement. WaterNSW owns and manages the Warragamba Pipelines – critical water supply infrastructure located along the northern boundary of the Oakdale West site. WaterNSW has previously commented on various aspects of the Estate.</i></p> 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
			<p><i>The proposed North South Link Road, which will be a new road crossing of the Warragamba Pipelines, is of particular concern to WaterNSW. A review of the preliminary design identified that while adequate from an engineering perspective, the design was unacceptable from a continuing asset maintenance and operations perspective. Ongoing safe and efficient access to the pipelines corridor must be maintained at all times for WaterNSW staff and contractors. It is therefore imperative that WaterNSW is closely consulted on an ongoing basis, including all stages of detailed design and construction. Owners consent will be required for all road, bridge and associated works on WaterNSW land. Currently I can find no evidence to suggest this has been obtained or requested.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted a large detention basin (Basin 2) on the pipelines corridor boundary is proposed as part of Precinct 1 where a dam currently exists. Outflow from the dam crosses into and across the pipelines corridor near the valve house (the brick structure at the low point of the pipeline) and continues into the drainage depression on the northern boundary of the corridor. The development, including all earthworks, dewatering of the dam and changes in levels and impervious areas due to the development, must not cause the stormwater flows into the pipelines corridor to increase above their current levels. Additionally, the outlet for the basin is not indicated on the preliminary plans – flows from the basin must not exceed the volume of stormwater currently entering the corridor at this point.</i></p> <p><i>Note the presence of two scour valves on the pipelines, which must not be impacted by any proposed development. The smaller basin at the NW corner of Precinct 2 (Basin 5) must also not cause an increase in stormwater into the corridor.</i></p> <p><i>A previously supplied Overall Site Plan (November 2015) identified a retaining wall along the boundary of Precinct 2 and the pipelines corridor varying in height from 4.0 to 6.5m in height. WaterNSW's preference is for the retaining wall to be set back from the boundary, similar to Oakdale Central Stage 3, to allow for full safe access to the pipelines at all times for maintenance and operation purposes.</i></p> <p><i>It is noted the development, including Basins 2 and 5 are located above the underground Austral gas pipeline. Access to the pipelines corridor is prohibited without a written access consent, which must be obtained from WaterNSW.</i></p> <p><i>Security fencing meeting WaterNSW's requirements must be installed along the boundary of the Oakdale West Estate. The North South Link Road bridge fencing must incorporate throw screens.</i></p>

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<p><i>The pipelines have been assessed as having state heritage significance, but are not currently listed on the State Heritage Register. Relevant heritage information on the Pipelines can be provided on request by WaterNSW. The design, construction and operation of structures should prevent, or at least minimise, impacts on the heritage significance of the pipelines. An easement or licence agreement with WaterNSW will need to be established for the road bridge across the pipelines.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that due to the short timeframe available to WaterNSW to respond at this time, additional comments may be communicated to Goodmans as other sections of the business review the proposal.”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The above comments have been considered and taken into account by the engineers, AT&L, with a response included in the civil report included with the application. • An owner’s consent letter, dated 26.09.16 has been obtained (and included with the application) from Andrew George of WaterNSW, providing consent for the proposed bridge works over the WaterNSW pipeline infrastructure.
<p>Sydney Water Helal Morshedi (helal.morshedi@sydneywater.com.au); Suhanti Thirunavukarasu (suhanti.thirunavukarasu@sydneywater.com.au)</p>	<p>A&L</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emailed AT&L on 22.07.16 • Emailed 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. • Response received from Helal Morshedi on 18.08.16, stating: <i>“I suggest that with your Oakdale West DA to DPE, you include relevant pages (water and wastewater local area servicing/scheme plans) from recently endorsed water and wastewater LASP (July 2016). That will indicate to assessing authority that water related servicing options have been endorsed by Sydney Water, and that there is a preferred servicing plan/option for the sub-precinct of Oakdale West as well. On receipt of application, DPE may consult Sydney Water, and we will support the DA so far as it relates to water related services as we did for Oakdale South SEARS and Toyota Facility (see Attached). You are aware that all lead-in reticulation works are within the Oakdale Precinct and will be delivered by Goodman in stages to meet its development timing and staging, through Sydney Water’s E-Developer Asset Creation Developer process – s73 applications. Your Project Manager (AT&L) and Water Servicing Coordinator (WSC, is it Qalchek?) will be working with Sydney Water’s Case Manager (E-Developer process/s73 application), currently Jim Price. He will work with our asset planners to issue NORs in response</i>

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<p><i>to each s73 application Goodman will lodge as development occurs in Oakdale South, Central, West and East. NOR requirements will reflect identified works in the LASP for Oakdale.”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AT&L have taken the above comments into account in their design, with a response included in the civil report.
Transgrid	AT&L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting held with Transgrid (Tim Cowdroy and Skye Shanahan) on 25th November 2015 to discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - both the Oakdale South and Oakdale West developments. The general arrangement plans for both OSE & OWE were tabled and generally discussed. - TransGrid were consulted during the development of the Sydney Water Local Area Servicing Plan which includes the GA plans for OWE and the envisaged staging. • Emailed 'Skye.Shanahan@transgrid.com.au on 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal. No comment received to date. • Emailed Kylie O'Brien Pratt on 07.02.17 to seek any additional comment on OWE application prior to SSD lodgement. Requested any additional comments be received by 21.02.17. • Response received from Kylie O'Brien Pratt on 14.02.17 confirming: <p><i>“Since there are no amendments proposed since our original submission our advice remains the same (please see submission attached). I've attached a copy of TransGrid's Guidelines for Third Party Development for your reference.</i></p> <p><i>Where there are any proposed encroachments of our easements we require full detailed plans in order for our asset manager and our engineers to determine whether what is proposed is acceptable. Plans are required to be provided in 3D DXF format with an accompanying set in PDF format. Site plans and elevations will also be required that clearly identify any development proposed within immediate proximity of TransGrid's easements.”</i></p> 	
Endeavour Energy	AT&L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Goodman, AT&L & Endeavour Energy on 17.02.16 to discuss OWE. • Letter received from Endeavour Energy, Jason LU dated 22 February '16. This letter confirms the substation location within OWE (see attached letter) and that this satisfies Endeavour energy's requirements. 	
AGL	AT&L	Emailed 18.08.16 seeking comment on proposal.	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
<p>Emmaus Catholic Primary & High School / Anglican High School / Retirement Village</p>	<p>GMG</p>	<p>Meeting held on 17 March 2016 with representatives of Emmaus Catholic Primary & High School / Anglican High School / Retirement Village.</p> <p>The following points were discussed at the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of the Stage 1 development as well as the completed masterplan layout. • Advised that the application would involve development of infrastructure works across the masterplan, construction of the Western North South Link Road (WNSLR), and Stage 1 of warehouses. Stage one of warehouses would consist of 3 warehouses, with remaining stages of warehouses to follow. • Described ecological and other constraints as applies to the site. • Service provision layout and location and layout discussed, as well as overland flow path and flood mitigation measures. • The primary concern of the construction traffic and the impact this would have on the school peak pickup and drop off times. We confirmed we could discuss construction traffic management plans to ensure construction traffic avoids peak pick up and drop off times – to avoid any conflict. • As the proposal include approval for the WNSLR, operational access will be via the WNSLR – away from the schools and retirement village, so operationally their shouldn't be traffic conflict issues. • Discussed the mitigation measures which would be imposed to limit acoustic impact, such as implementation of acoustic walls to limit impact on the schools and retirement village. Goodman would ensure the acoustic impact on the schools and retirement village would be below the acceptable dBa threshold. • Visual impact would be mitigated by landscape setback and planting which would screen or reduce the appearance of bulk and scale. • Air quality impact as well as other environmental impact assessment would be undertaken as part of the assessment to ensure the proposal has acceptable impact on surrounds as far as ecology etc. • Confirmed that as the land has been zoned IN1, it would be developed for industrial / warehouse use regardless, but that as Goodman retain ownership of their assets, we are very eager to ensure they are maintained at premium level with landscape management plans etc. • Stakeholders requested potential inspection of the development in progress for students to get insight into large scale industrial / warehouse development. <p>Stakeholders said they didn't have any further comments at this stage but would assess full submission package once lodged.</p>	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<p>Meeting held with Emmaus College, Primary School and Retirement Village to discuss the proposal on 4 November 2016.</p> <p>Further meeting held with Emmaus College, Primary School and Retirement Village to discuss the proposal on 1 June 2017. The following was discussed at the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussed updated layout and changes which have been made to OWE, particularly the orientation of loading docks away from the western boundary, facing the school and village; • Staging including development timeframes; • Construction access and staging; • Resolution of any conflict with school drop off / pickup with construction vehicles; • Western boundary treatment, including 40m setbacks and landscaping; • Boundary sections provided to demonstrate how the visual impacts of the buildings have been mitigated; • SLR alignment and development timeframes; • Services, including electricity, telco, sewerage and NBN – connection to the site and how this may benefit the school and village; • Flooding and retention basins, particularly how they would operate to reduce any flooding to the west; • Noise wall locations and noise assessment results, particularly how the noise impact has been shown to be acceptable. Ongoing noise monitoring requirements likely to be included in the DA consent; • Snake proof fencing to be installed; • Employment generation resulting from the development; and • SSSA process including exhibition and assessment process discussed, including that DoP may seek an additional private meeting with the school and village. 	
<p>Edmond David 20 Aldington Road Kemps Creek NSW 2178 AUSTRALIA 0408868827</p>	<p>GMG</p>	<p>Owner of the nearest residential receivers to the south of OWE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone call to residential owner, Mr Edmond David (ED). Explained what we were seeking to do. He asked a number of questions but requested we send plans through for review • Email received from ED on 14 April 2016 confirming email address and requesting plans be sent through for review. • General description of OWE proposal and plans sent to ED on 14.04.16, requesting comments. 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<p>Further email sent to ED on 30.08.16, providing copy of plans and requesting questions / comment prior to 2 September 2016.</p> <p><u>29 November 2016 meeting</u></p> <p>Meet Edmond Davis held at 100 Parramatta Road, Silverwater on 29 November 2016, were the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWE context with surrounding uses and landscape • OWE layout, including road layout • Development staging discussed, including timing. • The two primary issues of noise and visual impacts were raised. • While the noise assessment of the proposal was incomplete by the time of the meeting, the visual impacts of the proposal on 20 Aldington Road was discussed. • Mr Davis stated that he was concerned about a warehouse being immediately adjacent to his property but acknowledged that the warehouses were set down and at a oriented in such a way as to reduce unacceptable visual impact. He felt the outcome was generally acceptable from a visual perspective. • Mr Davis asked about future rezoning opportunity of his property. • We confirmed that we would finalise the acoustic assessment for discussion at a later date. <p><u>2 February meeting</u></p> <p>Meet Edmond Davis held at 100 Parramatta Road, Silverwater on 1 February 2017, were the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the last meeting, the noise assessment for the proposal had been completed • Explained the methodology of the noise assessment including the acoustic contours and the impacts on surrounding properties. • Confirmed that while the assessment showed acceptable noise impact on 20 Aldington Road during neutral weather conditions, with noise barriers, there was exceedance during adverse weather conditions by around 5dBA. • While the acoustic walls would mitigate the acoustic impact to the site, the topography of the site reduced the effectiveness of the walls where located below 20 Aldington Road, which is located on a ridge. • Two options to mitigate noise exceedance was discussed including: 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape bund and noise wall at the boundary between 20 Aldington Road and the site, however this would have visual implications in that distance views of the Blue Mountains would be compromised. 2. Introduction of double glazing at the 20 Aldington Road dwelling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr David suggested he would prefer the views to not be compromised with the construction of the bund / wall at the property boundary, but agrees that double glazing would be good option. • It was agreed that double glazing could be included at 20 Aldington Road from the, but an option to be conditioned for Goodman to construct the bund and noise wall on the property boundary at a later stage if so required by Mr Davis (or owner / resident of 20 Aldington Road). <p>Mr Davis was issues with updated architecture, Visual Impact Assessment and Noise Impact Assessment.</p>	
<p>Jack Perica 23 Aldington Road Kemps Creek NSW 2178 Email: jp-co@bigpond.com</p>	<p>GMG</p>	<p>Meeting held with Mr Perica at his 23 Aldington Road property. The following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout of the OWE proposal and identified Mr Perica's property relative to the site. • Identified access to OWE during construction and operation, particularly that initial access for earthwork construction prior to the Western North South Link Road (WNSLR) being operational, would be via Bakers Lane. Following completion of the WNSLR, all access to the site would be via this road. • The site would have passive uses resembling that of Oakdale Central and South. It would be warehouse and distribution / logistics uses. Mr Perica queries whether office or residential uses had been considered. Advised that area had been earmarked for warehouse and distribution uses. • Timing wise construction of OWE development would likely commence in 2018 and take around 10 years to complete. • As far as visual impact was concerned, the OWE site was fairly well screened from 23 Aldington Road by existing trees. No view corridors would be obstructed by the proposal, due in part to the existing screening and topography. • Mr Perica was provided with the noise OWE noise assessment and shown how 23 Aldington Road was well outside of the permissible 39dBA noise contour for neutral conditions, and shown to be on the boundary of acceptable contour during adverse weather conditions. The noise impacts on 23 Aldington Road property was therefore considered acceptable. 	

Stakeholder	Responsibility	Consultation	Correspondences
<p>Klaus Brokic 25 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek NSW 2178 (postal address: P.O. Box 18, Kemps Creek NSW 2178) Ph: 0408 478 500</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telephone call made to Klaus Brokic, owner of 25 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek, to discuss the Oakdale West application. • Klaus advised that “not in a million years would you hear from me about whatever you want to do on the site”. He advised that he didn’t care what we planned to do on the site and wished us luck with the development. • It was noted that his property was relatively setback from the OWE site and separated by trees etc. He said that even if we were on his boundary he wouldn’t have any objection provided we didn’t come onto his land. • He did query whether Goodman were likely to be expanding over Aldington Road. He was advised that the Department of Planning were currently undertaken studies for a potential future rezoning of the surrounding land but wasn’t sure if / when this would occur. He said if Goodman was ever interested in making a purchase of their site to let them know. • I offered to email the plans for the site and he said that while he wasn’t concerned with what was proposed, I could send them to him with my business card to his postal address (he didn’t have an email address), P.O. Box 18, Kemps Creek NSW 2178. I said that I’d put a copy in the post and for him to let me know if he had any questions at all.

Telephone note:

Caller: Bill Jacoubs, owner of 54 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek

Telephone no: 0418 869 620

Date / time: 11 January, 10:10am

Topic: Oakdale West consultation

Bill Jacoubs called to discuss the Oakdale West application. He advised that he reviewed the material sent to him by email of 1 November 2016 and doesn't have any issues with the application. He did advise that there is an easement running across the Oakdale West site, one of which he has recently had extinguished. This he believed would offer Goodman the opportunity to increase it's developable area.

I offered Bill a meeting for us to discuss our environmental impacts of the proposal including acoustic and visual impacts on the surrounds. Bill said that a meeting would not be necessary in that he was not concerned with the proposal, particularly as his property was setback a distance from the site.

I advised that we intended to lodge the application with a months time, following which it would go on exhibition and he would then have further opportunity to comment.

Telephone note:

Caller: Klaus Brokic, owner of 25 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek
Telephone no: 0408 478 500
Date / time: 2 February 2017, 5.02pm
Topic: Oakdale West consultation

Klaus Brokic, owner of 25 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek, called to discuss the Oakdale West application. Klaus advised that “not in a million years would you hear from me about whatever you want to do on the site”. He advised that he didn’t care what we planned to do on the site and wished us luck with whatever we had planned for the site.

I did note that his property was relatively setback from the OWE site and separated by trees etc. He said that even if we were on his boundary he wouldn’t have any objection provided we didn’t come onto his land.

He did query whether we were likely to be expanding over Aldington road. I advised that studies were currently being undertaken for a potential future rezoning of the surrounding land but wasn’t sure if/when this would occur. He said if Goodman was ever interested in making a purchase of their site to let them know.

I offered to email the plans for the site and he said that while he wasn’t concerned with what was proposed, I could send them to him with my business card. While he didn’t have an email address he requested I post to his address, P.O. Box 18, Kemps Creek NSW 2178. I said that I’d put a copy in the post and for him to let me know if he had any questions at all.

Meeting note:

Attendees: Edmond David (owner of 20 Aldington Road, Kemps Creek / Guy Smith, Goodman / Richard Seddon, Goodman

Telephone no: 0408868827

Date / time: 1 February, 12midday

Topic: Oakdale West consultation

Meeting with Edmond Davis held at 100 Parramatta Road, Silverwater on 1 February 2017, were the following was discussed:

- Since the last meeting, the noise assessment for the proposal had been completed
- Explained the methodology of the noise assessment including the acoustic contours and the impacts on surrounding properties.
- Confirmed that while the assessment showed acceptable noise impact on 20 Aldington Road during neutral weather conditions, with noise barriers, there was exceedance during adverse weather conditions by around 5dBA.
- While the acoustic walls would mitigate the acoustic impact to the site, the topography of the site reduced the effectiveness of the walls where located below 20 Aldington Road, which is located on a ridge.
- Two options to mitigate noise exceedance was discussed including:
 1. Landscape bund and noise wall at the boundary between 20 Aldington Road and the site, however this would have visual implications in that distance views of the Blue Mountains would be compromised.
 2. Introduction of double glazing at the 20 Aldington Road dwelling
- Mr David suggested he would prefer the views to not be compromised with the construction of the bund / wall at the property boundary, but agrees that double glazing would be good option.
- It was agreed that double glazing could be included at 20 Aldington Road from the, but an option to be conditioned for Goodman to construct the bund and noise wall on the property boundary at a later stage if so required by Mr Davis (or owner / resident of 20 Aldington Road).

Mr Davis was issues with updated architecture, Visual Impact and Noise Impact assessment.