Blacktown
City Council

Your ref: SSD 10469
File no MC-20-00004

26 October 2020

Department of Planning Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Recipient Delivery shaun.williams@planning.nsw.gov.au

Attention: Mr Shaun Williams

Dear Sir

SSD 10469 – EIS for the construction of a Data Centre, Augusta Street, Blacktown

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the State Significant Development proposal under Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.*

The proposal has been reviewed by our officers and we object to the proposal due to the number of unresolved key issues we have with the proposal. These issues are listed in **Attachment A** to this letter. We request that the items be addressed by way of amended plans and additional information and then referred back to us for reconsideration. Provided the applicant's responses are satisfactory, we can then provide a final set of conditions for inclusion in the development consent issued by the Department.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact our Manager Development Assessment, Judith Portelli on 9839 6228.

Yours faithfully

Glennys James PSM
Director Planning and Development

Attachment A

Blacktown Council's submission to SSD 10469 – Construction of a Data Centre, Augusta Street, Blacktown

1. Planning issues - general

a. Subdivision application

- Until the subdivision DA-20-00804 is determined, it is considered that this SSD application is premature.
- It is advised that there are a number of key outstanding issues pertaining to this subdivision application that need to be determined by the Blacktown Local Planning Panel. At this time, it is not known which Panel meeting the DA will be reported to, but it will not be reported until all the subdivision issues are addressed by the applicant.
- On this basis, it is recommended that the application not be determined until such time as the DA-20-00804 has been approved by the Panel.

b. Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)

- It is noted that the site is subject to a VPA between the applicant and Council which has not been executed. Prior to the approval of this application, the VPA must be executed.

c. Discussions with Council

- It is advised that following the request for SEARs and the lodgement of the EIS, no consultation has occurred with Council regarding the built form and visual presentation of the building.
- Appendix 31 of the SSD application states "a further Design Meeting will take place on 23 September 2020 to discuss DA-20-00804 (subdivision application) and the subject proposal."
- A meeting was held with Council on 23 September 2020, however this meeting only discussed outstanding issues/matters pertaining to the subdivision application, and there was no discussion about the SSD application at this meeting.

d. Notification of the application

- Careful consideration must be given by the Department if the public notification radius (as outlined in the Community Consultant Report) of the application is deemed inadequate in light of the context of the findings from the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report which suggests the bulk and scale of the development will be visible east of the M4/GWH to the nearby residential areas.

e. The visual dominance of the proposal on the surrounding area

- Section 5.9 – Visual Impact of Huntingwood Precinct Development Control Plan states the subject site as being in Zone 1 and is considered to have high visual sensitivity in that any change of land use would be highly visible and hence should be considered an impact. Visual mitigation measures therefore are important to this zone.
- The proposal in its current design form is unsatisfactory and will result in an unacceptable level of visual dominance over its locality. The proposal must be amended to reduce the visual dominance, and this should be achieved by reducing the overall height of the building and improving the architectural features of the building which are considered to be bland and lack architectural merit.
- The building's appearance from the residential areas of Prospect, and from the M4 and Great Western Highway, needs to be re-examined. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report prepared by Geoscapes and submitted with the application states the proposed development has a moderate/minor landscape impact.
- Council does not agree with this conclusion based on a number of locations addressed in the report being provided with either a major/moderate, moderate or moderate/minor visual impact. Based on the visual representations in the report, it is clear that the proposed building in its present design form will be major and will visually dominate the area from a high number of the key viewpoints in the area. This visual dominance will only diminish after 15 years when landscaping proposed to be provided has matured.
- The level of visual dominance is unacceptable and the proposal should be modified and redesigned.

2. Engineering issues

a. The parent DA subdivision plans have been commented on by Council (currently under assessment), including a meeting held to discuss some of the issues. The Data Centre development submission comments need to be considered in conjunction with the parent DA comments, including water quality and detention basin requirements with the related sub catchments. The parent subdivision DA is to clearly provide water quality and detention basin requirements that are in line with any future development. Any catchment plans must be in unison.

b. Show the proposed pedestrian path/cycling/shared path fronting Augusta Street.

c. All queuing of vehicles shall be entirely within the lot boundary. Show this on the turning path.

d. Provide a safe pedestrian path (and away from circulating vehicles/parking aisles/circulating roadway) from the carpark to entrances to the building. Clearly show this on the plan.

e. Further detailed design issues are listed in the attached Schedule 1.

3. Environmental Health Issues

a. *Noise Impact Assessment*, prepared by Acoustic Logic, dated August 2020:

- The use of the emergency back-up generators in case of a power failure has not been assessed by the acoustic consultant.
- Unable to establish if Acoustic Logic or consultant who completed report has membership to the Association of Australian Acoustical Consultants (AAAC) or the Australian Acoustical Society (AAS) – to ensure the qualifications of consultant.

b. *Additional Site Investigation*, prepared by WSP, dated May 2020:

- As the site will require remediation, Council requires the RAP and subsequent Validation Reports be made available for Council review prior to determination of the application.

c. *Air Quality Investigation*, prepared by Air Noise Environment, dated 29 July 2020:

- Air emissions from ventilation stakes for back-up generators, in worst case scenario, may exceed air quality goals for particulates, CO, NO2, and benzene, which is of concern to Council.

d. *SEPP 33 Preliminary Screening*, prepared by SLR, dated August 2020:

- Potentially hazardous material associated with the proposal is the storage of 3,984,480 litres of diesel.
- This exceeds manifest quantities and so Safe Work NSW will need to be notified of this exceedance.
- These amounts will also require EPA advice as an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) will be required if this facility is approved.

Schedule 1

1. Appendix F of the Traffic Impact Assessment Report prepared by Transport and Traffic Planning Associates should be amended to address the following:
    a. Clearly indicate the proposed property boundary line.
    b. The vehicular crossing (on the verge) shall be perpendicular to the kerb and gutter and the property boundary line.
    c. Show the dimensions of the vehicle for the turning path.
    d. Show the speed of the turning path.
    e. On SP 5, extend turning path to continue to exit the site and manoeuvre onto the road travelling westwards.
    f. On SP 8, show the vehicle start position on the road coming from the west and manoeuvring into the site.
    g. On SP 9, show the vehicle end position to be on the road travelling west.
    h. Provide turning path showing the vehicle start position to be on the east of the proposed vehicular crossing and on the legal side of the road, and then follow the turning path of SP 8.
2. Amend Page 1 of Appendix 32 – Swept Path Analysis to include title, legend of lines used, vehicle dimensions and specifications, to clearly demonstrate what is being demonstrated.
3. Provide a pedestrian/cycling refuge on the verge by proposing two vehicular crossings for entry and exit only. Ensure vehicle crossings are able to contain all turning paths of all vehicles.
4. Provide and show first flush for the rainwater tank.
5. Provide surface and invert levels of proposed pits.
6. On Drawing No. C2002, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:
    a. Ensure the batter drawing corresponds to the section plans on C2003 and C2004.
7. On Drawing No. C2003, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:
    a. Section 3: show on plan C2012 the proposed batters that are 'subject to approval'.
    b. Section 2: there appears to be two existing surfaces with two different line types (solid and dashed). Rectify the error - one is existing and the other is design.
    c. Section 2: the access road to the north (right hand side of the section) is 20 m as per plan C2011.
    d. Section 2: provide on plan the design contours on batter works or provide design batter lines as shown on the section.
    e. Section 1: show the detention tank, basin maintenance access tracks and Augusta Street.
    f. Show the height and level of the proposed retaining wall.
    g. Show levels on the sections.
8. On Drawing No. C2004, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

a. Section 4: Show part of the basins and access tracks on both sides.
b. Section 5: show part of Augusta Street on the left-hand side of the section.
c. Section 5: show the access track and design batters on the right-hand side of the section as per plan C2013
d. Show the height and level of the proposed retaining wall.
e. Show levels on the sections.

9. On Drawing No. C2010 to C2013, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

   a. Provide a sufficient number of notes on plans to clarify the design, i.e. provide a note for pit AA-10 and state that this is a GPT, mention the type and state "refer to details for more info"

10. On Drawing No. C2011, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

    a. Is pit AA-9 a splitter pit? otherwise the GPT can cater for this. Consult with manufacturers for further information. How are the 6 month flows diverted to the GPT? Provide calculations and catchment areas. If AA-9 is a splitter pit then provide calculations or the method of obtaining weir level and height.
    b. Amend to include the proposed vehicular crossing on future Augusta Street. The vehicular crossing shall be perpendicular to the kerb and gutter.

11. On Drawing No. C2012, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

    a. For the western catchment draining into Basin C, propose either OceanGuards in every grated pit or a proprietary GPT. OceanGuards and a proprietary GPT are shown in the MUSIC model screenshot Appendix C, clarify this and provide details for the GPT.
    b. For the eastern OSD tank, refer to design notes point 4 in the WSUD standard drawings sheet 5.
    c. Clearly identify which pits contain an OceanGuard on the plan.
    d. OceanGuards (Enviropods) treating only surface flows require a minimum clear depth of 500 mm from the grate to any inlet or outlet pipe obvert. OceanGuards (Enviropods) treating surface flows and upstream pipe flows require a minimum clear depth of 500 mm from the invert of the upstream pipes to be treated, to the obvert of the outlet pipe. Where these pits are treating upstream pipe flows, the inverts of all pipes in and out of the pit are to be shown. Provide a detailed drawing.
    e. Provide design contours as per sections 2 and 3 on Dwg. C2003 (P1) for the proposed sprinkler tanks. Repeat for C2013.
    f. Design the internal minor drainage system to cater for the 20-year storm, but ensure that a safe passage of the 100 year (major) is able to flow to the detention basins/tanks either via piped and/or surface flows. This can be a condition of consent.
    g. Provide the areas of each proposed building.
    h. All rainwater tank overflow pipes are to have a non-return flap valve at the discharge point immediately downstream.

12. On Drawing No. C2013, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

a. Drainage line starting from pit BZ-1 appears to be modelled as treated by on-lot GPT (Appendix C) though it is bypassing as shown on the plan. Clarify the stormwater strategy as it is currently confusing and provide additional notes to clarify the intent. This will need to be consistent with the subdivision application. It is simpler to suggest on-lot water treatment for the development independent of the subdivision treatment system; in this case the development drains directly to the subdivision OSD basin.

13. On Drawing No. C2019, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

a. The overall catchment naming conventions and areas are to match the MUSIC model (not yet submitted) and any other modelling undertaken.
b. Rename this to an OSD catchment plan and provide a separate water quality catchment plan.
c. The MUSIC catchment plan is to match the MUSIC model including names, areas and treatment train.
d. Ensure that the eastern OSD tank catchment + OSD basin 'B' catchment area matches the pre-eastern catchment area.
e. Ensure that the basin 'C' catchment area matches the pre-western catchment area.
f. Basin 'C' catchment area and boundary is incorrect. The lower southern portion of this sub-catchment does not drain to basin 'C' but rather drains to basin 'B'.
g. The roof of the 'proposed building 2' within Basin 'C' catchment appears to be draining to the east (Basin 'B') rather than as shown draining to the west (Basin 'C').
h. The sub-catchments are to reflect the drainage plans C2010 to C2013 in terms of pipe/surface flows.

14. On Drawing No. C2020, Issue P1, dated 05-08-20:

a. The screen mesh is to be Weldlok type as per the WSUD standard drawings.
b. The penetration pipe for the orifice plate details is to be sized for 2x orifice flows.
c. Section C: the invert of the GPT outlet is to be at minimum with the 1.5yr TWL.
d. Section A: Provide the size of the OSD final outlet. This is to be designed for the 100yr ARI uncontrolled flow.
e. Show the 1.5yr orifice plate as per the OSD spreadsheet on plans and sections.
f. Show the 1.5yr and the 100yr top water level on all sections.
g. Provide the full length and width of the OSD. Include dimensions. Provide a 'break line' in the OSD plan to show the entire OSD. Ensure a minimum 1% slope in the base of the OSD tank.
h. Nominate the size of the 45 ZPG cartridges. i.e. whether 460 mm height or 690 mm height.
i. Provide the OSD deemed to comply spreadsheet and provide design calculations to achieve the required volume.
j. Show the GPT inlet and outlet pipe size.
k. Show the pipe size entering/exiting the OSD tank.
l. Provide drawing details of the GPT, calculations and levels. This can be provided by the manufacturer.

m. Proposed GPT's should be designed for a minimum 6-month flow (75% of the 1-year ARI) and must contain an oil baffle. The device is sized to ensure the Treatment Flow Rate matches or exceeds the 6-month flow. Provide levels and notes.
n. Show the position of the orifice on the "ORIFICE PLATE DETAIL 100YR" to be central to the 375 mm diameter pipe.
o. Show the base of the DCP to be benched to the invert of the orifice post installation of the orifice plate.
p. Show the ceiling level of the detention tank.
q. Access openings shall be provided over inlet and outlet pipes.
r. Provide appropriate number of access openings and grates into the OSD Tank in accordance with Council's WSUD Standard Drawing A(BS)175M.

15. Appendix C 'MUSIC RESULTS' of the SSDA Civil Stormwater Report prepared by at&l dated 05-08-20 does not identify what the screenshots are for, i.e. why two screenshots?

16. Flood Impact Assessment report, dated 06.08.20 prepared by KBR is to be revised as follows (further comments are to be as per the subdivision comments):

    a. Provide a 1% AEP flood impact map with contour intervals of 0.5 m for Council to set flood planning levels.
    b. Ensure that building FFL's are a minimum of 0.5 m above the 1% AEP adjacent flood level. The tolerances provided on the engineering plans show (+-1m) and this is to be revised to ensure that the minimum negative tolerance achieves the freeboard.
    c. Submit the flood model used.

17. Ensure that the drainage model, MUSIC model, Flood report, the civil and infrastructure report and the engineering plans (subdivision and development submissions) correlate to each other.

18. Submit the electronic copy of the MUSIC model used for development including water conservation.

19. Submit drainage long sections with design HGL.

20. Submit the electronic copy of the DRAINS model of the development and consider all tailwater conditions such as GPT weir levels and the surrounding 20 year and 100 year tailwater levels.

Note:

Include Councils engineering requirements as a summary note on the engineering plans, e.g. OSD required/not required and whether temporary or permanent etc. Include design summaries where needed.