



KEYLAN
consulting pty ltd

Suite 2, Level 1
1 Rialto Lane
Manly NSW 2095

6 December 2021

Mr Chris Ritchie
Director, Industry Assessments
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
Sydney, NSW

Dear Mr Ritchie,

Oakdale West Estate Stage 3 (SSD 9794683)– Response to Request for further information

We write on behalf of *Goodman Property Services (Aust.) Pty Ltd* (the Applicant) in relation to the amended State Significant Development (SSD) application for Stage 3 of Oakdale West Estate SSD 9794683 (Amended Application).

We note receipt of the following correspondence on the Amended Application report for the above proposal:

- Penrith City Council
- NSW Rural Fire Service
- Transport for NSW

Please find attached (Attachment A) a table summarising the issues raised in the above correspondence and information in response to these issues. Also attached are updated architectural plans (Attachment B) and landscape plans (Attachment C) to incorporate revised landscaping within driveway and parking areas of Buildings 2C and 2D.

The updated plans do not materially affect the outcomes of the assessment in the Amended Application Report dated 9 November 2021.

Please do not hesitate to contact Kane Winwood on 02 8459 7507 or kane@keylan.com.au if you wish to discuss any aspect of this correspondence.

Yours sincerely

Dan Keary BSc MURP MPIA
Director

Attachment A	Response to Agency Submissions
Attachment B	Updated Architectural Plans
Attachment C	Updated Landscape Plans

Attachment A

Response to Agency Submissions

Penrith City Council

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<p>Planning matters</p>	
<p><u>Introduction of roof mounted plant machinery</u></p> <p>The Department is to be satisfied that the proposed maximum heights of the buildings inclusive of roof mounted mechanical plant is below 20 metres are measured from Natural Ground Level. Maximum heights, inclusive of rood (sic) mounted plant is to be shown on plans.</p>	<p>We note the building height controls for the development are established in the concept approval under SSD 7348 which exclude rooftop plant and solar, and the proposal is compliant with these controls.</p> <p>A modification application (SSD 7348 Mod 9) has recently been lodged to clarify the relative building heights of Buildings 2C and 2D. This modification application was lodged in response to PCC's submissions on SSD 9794683 regarding the relative height of the buildings when measured against the lowest point adjoining the lot.</p> <p>The proposed buildings are consistent with the maximum height restrictions under Conditions B10 and B11 of the concept approval, which exclude rooftop plant and solar panels.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, no further consideration of building height is required.</p>
<p><u>Introduction of driveway along southern elevation of Buildings 2C and 2D</u></p> <p>Council does not support the location of the internal driveway being within the 20m landscaped front setback previously proposed.</p> <p>Should the Department accept the proposed amendments, Council strongly recommends that larger scale more substantial blister islands within the car parking hard stands be introduced along the frontage.</p> <p>It is also recommended that a round-a-bout landscaped blister island with feature tree (or trees) be provided within the north-eastern car park hardstand proposed to the east of Building 2D.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered PCC's comments and has revised the landscape plans to accommodate blister islands through the driveway and carpark along the southern side of the buildings and a landscaped roundabout at the north-eastern carpark adjacent to Building 2D (Attachment C).</p> <p>These changes will maintain adequate access and turnaround capability for emergency services vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed amendments remain consistent with the building setbacks required by SSD 7348.</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<p><u>Additional car parking for building 3A (sic)</u></p> <p>The addition of 47 spaces will need to be justified as car parking requirements are met and the extent of the associated car parking hard stand is excessive in the re-arranged layout.</p> <p>If the Department is in support of this aspect of the proposal, it is requested that landscaped blister planting with canopy (shade providing) trees is provided at greater intervals, with more substantial blisters at aisle ends or in strategic locations.</p>	<p>The additional car parking spaces are required to support the tenant's specific requirements for Building 2A. This was clearly outlined in the DA documentation.</p> <p>See comment above regarding landscaped blisters.</p>
<p><u>Landscape Considerations</u></p>	
<p>A greater number of street trees are required, and planting along future Southern Link Road is to be elevated in quality and must be engineered, installed and planted by qualified and experienced landscape consultants</p> <p>Should the Department support the reduction in landscaping along the frontage of the site to Southern Link Road, Council strongly recommends that larger scale landscape blisters be introduced to the car parking proposed along this frontage at a minimum of 1 in each 6 spaces, the loss of car parking spaces is considered acceptable (and is encouraged) to facilitate this outcome.</p>	<p>Street landscaping is designed to ensure adequate sight lines for drivers, as approved under Stage 1 of SSD 7348 and is not subject of this application.</p> <p>The street tree plantings are in pairs to improve visual presence and shade provision, compared with single tree plantings.</p> <p>Architectural plans and Landscape Plans have been updated to incorporate Council's recommendations for additional landscaped blister islands as shown in Attachment C.</p>
<p>The RRFI Dated 18 October 2021, prepared by Keylan Consulting does not include any response to landscape matters raised by Council in its letter dated 19 March 2021.</p>	<p>A response to PCC's submission dated 18 March 2021 was provided in April 2021, including updated Landscape Plans.</p> <p>The Stage 3 Amended Application request, dated 9 November 2021, includes revised landscape plans which address PCC's comments.</p>
<p>Section 05 on landscape plan no. L.SK.202 revision C indicates the landscape setback to the future Southern Link Road is 6.579m wide exclusive of the proposed internal driveway kerb and proposed catch drain. This is not consistent with the landscape plans which indicate 7.150 landscaped setback.</p>	<p>The section drawings in the Landscape Plans have been revised to correct the landscape setback, which is now consistent with the setback shown in the landscape site plan.</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<p>Previously raised landscape considerations are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As has been requested in preceding stages, continuous canopy street tree plantings in organic mulch is required for maximum shade and cooling, and to satisfy Council's Cooling the City Strategy. Additional infill planting between excessively spaced street tree groupings is required to ensure continuous canopy or layering of canopy planting within the verge as well as within the street setback zones. The landscape plans suggest that corner treatments will feature small trees however tall canopy trees are recommended to minimise the visual appearance of bulk and scale of built forms from key vantage points. This will also assist to reinforce the spatial qualities of the road network. For example, the proposed mature tree height in the northwest corner of Lot 2A is particularly important as the finished floor level if the built form is approximately 9m above natural ground presenting a poor interface to the public domain which is viewed from the roadway on the site approach, but also further north through the Amazon car park. The visual impact of built forms in this area requires additional consideration and refinement as the existing side boundary setback, finished levels and visual bulk of the built form is currently inadequately addressed. Documentation submitted indicates discrepancies between sections and plans (i.e. retaining walls on Southern Link Rd). The plans require 2qa verification to ensure that the landscape plan, landscape sections and architectural drawings are reflecting a consistent built form and streetscape outcome. The extent of canopy and density of planting within the setback to the South Link Road is inconsistent with verge treatments along this road corridor. Density and diversity of tree and shrub (medium and tall) species should be increased and retaining walls fully screened so the effect is dense and informal, and biodiversity maximised. It should also be noted that hedges in this location are not supported by Council's Landscape Architecture Team. 	<p>These matters were addressed in the Response to Submissions dated April 2021 (10-05-21 - OWE Stage 3 Response to Submissions Report (RtS))</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree plantings in the pavement at Lot 2D and carpark areas were previously supported, provided that a suitably qualified and experienced arborist specifies the engineered tree pit details including structural soil volumes and materials, based on proposed species. This was suggested so as to ensure the best possible growing conditions for long term tree health and viability (refer sheet LSK.200) • Section 03/LSK.202 is misleading in terms of retaining wall height. Spot levels indicate a change in level of approx. 8m. The section shows a wall height of approx. 2m. All retaining walls and fences on top of walls, seen from the public domain, should be densely screened to reduce visual impact and create microclimates suitable for plant growth e.g. not radiated heat from wall materials. • With respect to Estate Road 1 (Sepia), increased shrub and screening is required to maximise streetscape amenity and reduce visual access to roadways and vehicles /trucks • Organic mulches should be used for soil improvement and plant health, not inorganic mulches such as basalt. This could be addressed via conditions of consent applied by the Department. • With respect to the raised feature treatments with gabion walls, an arborist must inform and determine suitable dimensions of soil volumes and other treatments to ensure the best possible growing conditions for long term tree and plant health and viability (refer sheet LSK.201) • The proposed extent of cut and fill requires a reconstruction of soil profiles to enable planting to establish and thrive in the long term. Details have not been provided. Planting into fill and sub-soils without amelioration and reconstruction will result in stunted, unhealthy and compromised vegetation. 	
<p>Environmental Management Considerations</p>	
<p>The NVIA proposes and assesses construction noise impacts based upon standard construction hours whilst the letter written by Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd and dated 18 October 2021 advises that construction of Building 2A will occur between the hours 6am-10pm Monday-Sunday with internal concrete pours occurring within the building from 3am-10pm.</p>	<p>Construction activities will be limited to the standard construction hours as assessed in the NVIA.</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<p>It is recommended that the Department seek clarity in relation to the proposed hours and is to be satisfied of the NVIA recommendations on this basis.</p>	
<p>It is raised for the Department’s consideration that the documentation includes reference to MOD7 SSD 7348 but does not reference MOD8.</p>	<p>SSD 7348 Mod 8 deals only with minor amendments to Lot 1 of the OWE and is not relevant to SSD 9794683</p>
<p>It is also raised for the Department’s consideration that the NVIA makes assumptions for operation of mechanical services and fixed plant that have not been finalised due future tenancy unknowns.</p> <p>This will need to be considered and reviewed as development and occupancy of the Estate progresses with mechanisms established to implement mechanical plant and equipment operational limitations and ensure compliance with noise criteria.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>
<p>Development Engineering Considerations</p>	
<p><u>Lot 2A</u> The architectural plans for Lot 2A (SBA, ref 21110, rev H, dated 21.10.2021) are inconsistent with the civil engineering plans (AT&L, ref 15-272, rev B, dated 18.10.2021) and plans in the Transport Assessment report (Ason Group, ref P1518r01v5, rev 5, dated 18.10.2021).</p>	<p>These plans were updated in a subsequent revision to the amendment report which reflect the revised architectural designs, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil plans: Revision C dated 4 November 2021 • Transport Assessment: Revision 6, dated 1 November 2021
<p>The northern heavy vehicle access driveway along Road No 3 (Emporium Ave) proposes conversion of an existing kerb inlet pit into a butterfly grate within the driveway which is not supported on safety grounds for maintenance access and to the additional ‘wear and tear’ caused by heavy vehicles driving over the grate. It is suggested the driveway be relocated a minimum of 1m from the kerb lintel.</p>	<p>Noted. However, moving this driveway access in the other direction results in impeding other services. The throat that exists at this point cannot be reduced.</p>
<p>It is noted the traffic assessment report shows this access is proposed for a 12.5m HRV, however the driveway width appears to have been designed to cater for articulated vehicles without any turn paths supplied to substantiate the width.</p> <p>Access driveway widths for heavy vehicles shall be in accordance with AS2890.2 - Clause 3.4 and Figure 3.2. Fully dimensioned plans and</p>	<p>The driveway has been designed to provide future flexibility.</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
vehicle turn paths are to be provided for each access driveway demonstrating compliance.	
Access driveway widths for passenger vehicles shall be in accordance with AS2890.1 - Clause 3.2.1, Table 3.1 and Table 3.2. Fully dimensioned plans are to be provided demonstrating compliance.	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
Any driveway shall be located a minimum of 1m from the lintel of any kerb inlet pit.	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
<p><u>Lots 2C and 2D</u></p> <p>The access driveway for passenger vehicles for Lots 2C & 2D (off Road No 3 – Emporium Avenue) is shown as 9.5m wide. Access driveway widths for passenger vehicles shall be in accordance with AS2890.1 - Clause 3.2.1, Table 3.1 and Table 3.2. Fully dimensioned plans are to be provided demonstrating compliance.</p>	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
Turn paths for the left turn movement out of the heavy vehicle access driveway onto Road No 3 (Emporium Avenue) are to be included. Turn paths are to be shown for a 26m B-Double (PBS Level 2 Type B). Road No 3 will ultimately connect to the future Southern Link Road which will become the main access route to the site.	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
Any driveway shall be located a minimum of 1m from the lintel of any kerb inlet pit.	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
<u>Traffic Management Considerations</u>	
The applicant proposes for 30-metre-long super B-Doubles to access the site, however it is raised that the Oakdale West Estate roads are only designed to cater for 26 metre long B-Doubles. Therefore, the use of super B-Doubles or any other heavy vehicle larger than a 26 metre B-Double is not supported.	The approved estate under SSD 7348 is designed to accommodate B-Double and super B-Double vehicles.
The gates to the site should be located so that the largest vehicle is contained within the boundary of the site when the gate is closed.	The layout of Building 2A has been designed to enable this to occur.
	Given the shared nature of heavy vehicle access to Buildings 2C and 2D, the gate will not be closed during operational hours.
There should be a separate, safe, DDA and Australian Standards complying accessible pedestrian path of travel from the road frontage and	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
the car parking areas to the buildings that are clear of any heavy vehicle traffic movements.	
The development shall be supported by a Traffic Impact Assessment of the proposed development, road and footway network, heavy vehicle and light vehicle access, complying number of heavy vehicle parking, loading and manoeuvring areas and complying numbers of light vehicle staff and visitor parking spaces including compliance with Australian Standards, Austroads Guidelines, TfNSW (RMS) Technical Directions / Guidelines and Council's Development Control Plans (DCPs) including DCP C10.	A Traffic Impact Assessment was prepared for the development which addresses these requirements.
The Traffic Impact Assessment shall include the proposed development driveway accesses for heavy vehicles and visitor / staff car parks, sight distance compliances at intersections and driveways, arrangements for waste collection vehicles, emergency / fire service vehicles and other service vehicles, accessible parking and at least 1.5 metre wide accessible pedestrian access from the road frontage and the car park to the buildings, car parking and bicycle provision numbers and bicycle facilities , electric vehicle charging station provisions and manoeuvring swept turn paths. This should include compliances with Austroads Guidelines, TfNSW (RMS) Technical Directions / Guidelines, AS 2890 including parts 1, 2 & 6, AS 1158, NSW Government Walking and Cycling Guidelines and Council's Development Control Plans.	As above
The Traffic Impact Assessment and documentation shall include dimensioned plans of the proposed accessible paths of travel, driveways, access aisles, loading and vehicle swept path manoeuvring areas and parking spaces and sight distance requirements at intersections and driveways including compliance with Austroads Guidelines, TfNSW (RMS) Technical Directions / Guidelines, AS 2890 including parts 1, 2 & 6, AS 1158, NSW Government Walking and Cycling Guidelines and Council's Development Control Plans	As above
Heavy vehicle access from the public road shall be physically separated from vehicle access to the car parking areas for safety reasons.	This is achieved through the proposed layout designs in the Amended Application
To allow a thorough assessment of the development by the Department, plans are to include dimensions of driveways, ramps, aisles, parking spaces, accessible parking, bicycle parking, 1.5 metre wide concrete	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
<p>footpaths from the street frontages to building accesses, from the car park to building access, other internal footpaths, services vehicle manoeuvring and loading areas complying with AS 2890, AS 1428, Council Development Control Plan (DCP) C10 and other Council guidelines.</p>	
<p>Council recommends that A minimum of two Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (EVCS) are to be provided within the car parking areas of each warehouse development. The charging stations are to be designed to accommodate the requirement of commercially available public vehicles and their required connector types (currently known as Type 1 and Type 2 connectors).</p>	<p>The proposed development includes 13 EV charging bays for Building 2A.</p> <p>Specific customer requirements are yet to be finalised for Buildings 2C and 2D, however the Applicant will provide EV charging bays in 5% of car spaces on the lot.</p>
<p>A minimum of three additional car parking spaces are to be designed to as to be readily retrofitted as EVCS parking spaces. The installed EVCS car parking spaces are to be signposted and marked as for the use of electric vehicles only and are to be located as close as possible to the building accesses after accessible parking space priority. EVCS are to be free of charge to staff and visitors.</p>	<p>These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.</p>
<p>Complying numbers of secure, all weather bicycle parking, end of journey facilities, change rooms, showers, lockers are to be provided at convenient locations at each warehouse development in accordance with Council Development Control Plan (DCP) C10 Section 10.7, AS 2890.3 Bicycle Parking Facilities and Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling (NSW Government 2004).</p>	<p>These are provided for each building as demonstrated in the architectural plans.</p>
<p>Accessible pedestrian paths of travel at least 1.5 mete wide are to be provided from the car park to all offices and staff facilities of the building.</p>	<p>These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.</p>
<p>Accessible parking is to be provided with accessible paths of travel to the facility in accordance with AS 2890.6.</p>	<p>These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.</p>
<p>Council would require that all vehicles are to enter and leave in a forward direction.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>
<p>Appropriate signage, visible from the public road and on-site shall be installed to reinforce designated vehicle circulation and to direct staff / delivery vehicle drivers / service vehicle drivers / visitors to on-site parking, delivery and service areas.</p>	<p>This is provided in the architectural design package for the application.</p>

PCC Issue	Comment/Response
The required sight lines around the driveway entrances and exits are not to be compromised by street trees, landscaping or fencing.	Noted and agreed. These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
Sight distance requirements at driveways are to be in accordance with AS 2890.2 Figure 3.3 and Figure 3.4.	These matters will be addressed during detailed design and prior to the issue of construction certificate.
<u>Biodiversity Considerations</u>	
Council recommends that the proposed plant species <i>Eucalyptus amplifolia</i> is swapped for <i>Eucalyptus tereticornis</i> (as this species is usually associated with riparian and areas that are prone to inundation) and that proposed species <i>Corymbia eximia</i> is swapped with <i>Angophora bakeri</i> as <i>Corymbia eximia</i> would be out of place and may not be suited to the environment it is planted into.	Noted.

Table 1: Response to Penrith City Council's comments

Rural Fire Service

RFS Issue	Comment/Response
<p>1. From the start of building works and in perpetuity, the entirety of each site/precinct 2A, 2C and 2D must be managed in perpetuity as an inner protection area (IPA) in accordance with the requirements of Appendix 4 of Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019. When establishing and maintaining an IPA, the following requirements apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree canopy cover be less than 15% at maturity; • Trees at maturity are not touching or overhang the building; • Lower limbs are removed up to a height of 2m above the ground; • Tree canopies are separated by 2 to 5m; • Preference is given to smooth-barked and evergreen trees; • Large discontinuities or gaps in vegetation are provided to slow down or break the progress of fire towards buildings; • Shrubs are not located under trees; • Shrubs do not form more than 10% of ground cover; • Clumps of shrubs are separated from exposed windows and doors by a distance of at least twice the height of the vegetation. • Grass to be kept mown (as a guide grass should be kept to no more than 100mm in height); • Leaves and vegetation debris are removed; and • NSW Rural Fire Service's document Standards for asset protection zones. 	<p>Noted. The subject development site will be managed as an IPA.</p>
<p>2. Landscaping within the entirety of each site/precinct 2A, 2C and 2D must comply with Appendix 4 of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i>. In this regard, the following principles are to be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum 1 metre wide area, suitable for pedestrian traffic, must be provided around the immediate curtilage of the building; • Planting is limited in the immediate vicinity of the building; • Planting does not provide a continuous canopy to the building (i.e. trees or shrubs are isolated or located in small clusters); • Landscape species are chosen to ensure tree canopy cover is less than 15% (IPA) at maturity and trees do not touch or overhang buildings; 	<p>Noted. The principles of PfBFP 2019 have been considered during the development of the landscaping scheme for Stage 3.</p>

RFS Issue	Comment/Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid species with rough fibrous bark, or which retain/shed bark in long strips or retain dead material in their canopies; • Use smooth bark species of trees species which generally do not spread fire up the bark into the crown; • Avoid planting of deciduous species that may increase fuel at surface/ ground level (i.e. leaf litter); • Avoid climbing species to walls and pergolas; • Locate combustible materials such as woodchips/mulch, flammable fuel stores away from the building; • Locate combustible structures such as garden sheds, pergolas and materials such as timber garden furniture away from the building; and • Low flammability vegetation species are used. 	
<p>Construction Standards</p> <p>3. New construction of the warehouse building 2A must be entirely non-combustible materials only and provided with measures to improve ember protection.</p> <p>Ember protection improvements are achieved by enclosing all openings (excluding roof sheet and tile spaces) or covering openings with a non-corrosive metal screen mesh with a maximum aperture of 2mm. Where applicable, this includes any subfloor areas, openable windows, vents, weep holes and eaves. External doors are to be fitted with draft excluders.</p>	<p>All new construction undertaken for Stage 3 will comply with the corresponding BAL as outlined in the Bushfire Report prepared by Blackash Bushfire Consulting.</p>
<p>4. Any new Class 10b structures as defined per the National Construction Code must be non-combustible.</p>	<p>Agreed. Any new Class 10b structures as defined per the National Construction Code will be non-combustible.</p>
<p>5. The provision of water, electricity and gas must comply with Table 7.4a of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i>.</p>	<p>Agreed. The provision of water, electricity and gas will comply with Table 7.4a of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i>.</p>

Table 2: Response to NSW RFS comments

Transport for NSW

TfNSW Issue	Comment/Response
<p>TfNSW reiterates its concern with regard to the proximity of the Building 2C 'car entry' access to the proposed signalised intersection at the future Southern Link Road (SLR). It is noted that the issue of potential queueing to the signals is further exacerbated by the addition of the carparking to building 2D.</p> <p>It is recommended that the carpark entry be located further northwest (away from the future signals) or demonstrate that there would be no disruption to the future signalised intersection.</p>	<p>The Applicant has considered TfNSW's recommendation to relocate the car access driveway approximately 50 m to the north, to be further from the future Southern Link Road (SLR) intersection with Estate Road 3.</p> <p>Because of the sloping landform on the site, a 50 m driveway relocation would require a lowering of the ground level by approximately 2.5 m, which would also require lowering of the office floor level. This would increase the height difference between the office floor level and warehouse floor level to effectively require a three-storey office building.</p> <p>The lowered level would require additional earthmoving and increase the apparent height of the warehouse building from the estate road. It would also increase the slope of the driveway and parking areas along the warehouse to meet the level of the driveway and parking access to Building 2D.</p> <p>Therefore, relocation of the driveway further to the north is not a preferred option and would only add to both Council's and DPIE's concerns regarding the bulk and appearance of the property from the street.</p> <p>As noted in its response to TfNSW submission on the EIS, the SIDRA modelling of estate traffic generation predicts that the maximum queue length from the future SLR is approximately 62 metres at Estate Road 03 during road peak hours (during peak season). As the driveway is approximately 100 m from the intersection with the future SLR, this provides sufficient queuing storage for the intersection.</p>

Table 3: Response to TfNSW comments

Attachment B

Updated Architectural Plans

Attachment C

Updated Landscape Plans