

TO:

Planning and Assessment

Department of Planning, Industry & Environment

RE: ESR Horsley Logistics Park (SSD- 10436)

Our names are Tony and Linda Micallef and we live at 33-37 Greenway Place, Horsley Park. Our property is located on the south eastern side of the development.

We have a number of concerns regarding the above development, which are:

1. We are disappointed with how little trees and vegetation have been planted as a screen/buffer from the buildings to be erected. Our concerns are mostly related to the building on Lot 201, which will be clearly visible from our property. All that has been planted is a row of trees (only over the gabion wall) and they are sparsely placed with a few shrubs. CSR had indicated in the past that more trees were to be planted, to minimise the visual impact, however the ESR documents indicate that this landscaping has been completed. It has definitely not been completed to an acceptable standard. The pictures that are shown on the report (fig38 view point 7) are taken from our rear living area. It shows a photo montage with reasonable screening after a 15 year period. However, with the single row and small amount of trees that have been planted, even with growth over any amount of time, it's not possible to have any reasonable screening. The photo montage shown for Year 15 simply cannot happen without more rows of trees being planted. There should also be more trees planted on the terramesh bund wall, where there are open sections. More plants are required to screen these buildings a lot sooner. Therefore more established trees and vegetation need to be planted NOW along the whole southern boundary of the site.

Our understanding is that these requirements were agreed based on the Land & Environment Court's rulings. Therefore, the Planning Department should not be progressing this application without satisfaction of those requirements.

Please refer to Attachment A, a copy of the Visual Impact Assessment that had been prepared and lodged with Fairfield Council, following that Court decision. Cross sections of the landscaping show the multiple rows of trees in the design.

Below are photographs taken from my indoor and outdoor living areas. They show the clear and open view of the site that needs to be blocked by denser landscaping.





Close-up photo taken from my window, showing the sparse plantings above the gabion wall:



Minimal new plants added at the western end of the boundary:



2. We are also concerned about lighting spillage at night. We would hope that minimal lighting is put on the southern side of this building, to minimise the amount of light coming into our living and bedroom areas. Increased vegetation would also help to reduce this negative impact and improve the ongoing amenity of our home.

3. We are also concerned about the effects of noise on the amenity of our property, due to the ongoing running of the warehouses or manufacturing facilities. Especially at night, as it will cause sleep disturbance. Being a 24/7 operating warehouse, we feel that truck movements should be minimal at night. ESR's documents indicate that the landscaping will mitigate the noise impacts to ensure amenity of surrounding residential properties. As noted earlier, the current limited amount of landscaping that has been completed makes this inaccurate.

If noise levels exceed normal liveable levels, certain noise mitigation measures should be put in place. Due to the changing nature of warehousing over time, what may be considered satisfactory noise level within one phase of operation, may change if 24/7 manufacturing were to commence.

Because of this, some mitigation measures should be implemented now. Our house is located within approximately 200m of the site. We are within the Noise Catchment Area 2, as identified in the SLR Consultants' Noise Assessment report submitted with the EIS for this development. ESR's consultants have identified various 'at receiver' treatments that would help to ensure amenity of our home. We believe that the applicant has an obligation to implement this, especially considering their report already acknowledges that acceptable noise levels will be exceeded at night time.

4. We are also concerned with the landscaping and the buffer around the development and where the bund wall has been built. We feel what has been done, is nowhere near enough, to what was supposed to be done in the original plan.

5. The Department should ensure that there is a Vegetation Management Plan for the landscaped area along the southern boundary, to ensure it is maintained and that plants have survived and grown, for at least the first 5 years. This is needed to encourage faster growth to shield the residents from the development and to limit light and noise impact.

6. There was a Development Control Plan approved for subdivision of this property, which took into account reasonable measures to mitigate the impact on amenity of the rural residential properties that already existed here. We believe that these measures should still apply to ESR Developments (Australia) Pty Ltd, even though the initial applications were handled by CSR Building Products Limited. It is unfair for ESR to simply dismiss these as 'prepared by others' in the plans provided with this SSD application. It is obvious that this work has not been carried out in accordance with the documentation that CSR Building Products Limited had provided for the Land & Environment Court to make their decisions.

There were numerous opportunities for the residents to make submissions about this property and we have always raised the points included in this letter, that's why the landscaping was supposed to be implemented. We understand that the development is going ahead, but we are asking for delivery on what was promised. The company should deliver on their responsibilities in accordance with the Land & Environment Court and Fairfield Council's requirements. The Department of Planning should consider this when assessing this application, and it needs to be rectified before any final decisions are made.

Please refer to attachments A and B, showing original specifications of the buffer and landscaping which definitely have not been achieved.