EMM

14 August 2018

Ground Floor, Suite 01, 20 Chandos Street St Leonards, NSW, 2065 PO Box 21 St Leonards, NSW, 1590

> T +61 2 9493 9500 F +61 2 9493 9599 E info@emmconsulting.com.au

> www.emmconsulting.com.au

Shaun Williams Planning Officer Department of Planning and Environment 320 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2001

Re: Smeaton Grange SSD 7424 Modification 1 Amendment - Condition B61

Dear Mr Williams,

This letter is in response to your email dated 13 August 2018 regarding Camden Council's (Council) response to the SSD 7424 Modification 1 application (modification), currently being considered by the Department.

In summary, Council's response makes the following points.

- 1. A decorative masonry fence is preferred for visual screening.
- 2. Landscaping treatment within the 1 m setback is preferred.
- 3. Mature plantings may provide sufficient visual screening.
- 4. The proposed fencing treatment generally complies with Council's Development Control Plan (DCP).
- 5. Council should not be an approval authority for the site security elements (ie Condition B61).

As noted in our letter to the Department dated 9 August 2018, the proposed fencing treatment meets the requirements of the DCP.

We do not agree that a solid wall and gate at the front of the site would significantly ameliorate views to the site for the following reasons:

- The site is offset from the Anderson Road visual corridor and cul-de-sac. There are negligible views to the site until the cul-de-sac is entered.
- The gate into the site will be open during the day, meaning that there will be clear views into the site regardless of the material of the fence.
- As noted in Council's submission mature vegetation 'may' provide sufficient visual screening. We note that the height for the screening vegetation is generally expected to be between 2 m to 4 m, and will provide suitable screening.

The DCP prioritises 'safer by design' principles for fence design. A key component of these principles is clear sight lines. This is beneficial for public and site security. Maintaining some sight lines will help ensure that there is an opportunity for passive surveillance onto the road and into the site, compared to the complete obstruction of solid fencing and gates.

A visually permeable fence would also maintain safety for any pedestrians, with clear sight lines between the drivers and pedestrians.

Council's main concern appears to be the nature of the activity within the site. It is noted that, Condition B54 requires that the site be clean and tidy at all times. As such, a visually permeable fence should not result in visual impacts not considered appropriate for an industrial estate. If any are identified, the Condition allows for rectification of the issue.

Additional screening within the 1 m setback is proposed to increase general visual amenity at the Anderson Road cul-de-sac. The landscaping plan at Figure 1 includes additional landscaping within the setback and would be implemented via the Landscape Management Plan (Condition B58/B59) as part of the modification. We believe that this will enhance the site and lead to positive outcomes for the area.

For all of these reasons, we believe a black palisade fence and gate at the front of the site should be approved.

Given the Council's views and the consideration that has been given to the front fence treatment, we continue to request that Condition B61 be removed, as the benefit of further post-approval consultation on the fencing is unclear.

Should you have any questions, I may be reached at 9493 9515 or trichardson@emmconsulting.com.au.

Yours sincerely

Taylor Richardson Senior Planner trichardson@emmconsulting.com.au



EMM

Landscaping plan Smeaton Grange Benedict Industries Landscape Management Plan Figure 1.1