

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AT COMMUNITY MEETING 8 MARCH 2012

The following provides a summary of the issues raised at the community meeting held at Fairfield Council on 8 March 2012.

No.	Speaker	Issues Raised	Response
1.	Theresa McHale	New proposal does not meet the obligations of the applicant nor the provisions of clause 21 & 23 of the WSEA SEPP.	These clauses are addressed in detail at section 4.5 of the PPR.
2.		No buffer to the earth mound from the residential boundary – unacceptable	<p>The detailed design and landscaping of the mound, with allowance for the drainage swale, demonstrates an acceptable visual and acoustic solution without the need for a further distance separation or 'buffer' between the mound and the shared fence line.</p> <p>The proposal provides a superior visual and acoustic outcome than is required under the Penrith DCP and many other examples of industrial developments cited in the PPR.</p>
3.		Still significant community concern – over 150 submissions	Noted. Many of the submissions were submitted in prp-forma format and many of the objectors were significantly removed from the proposed development and will remain unaffected or marginally affected by the proposed development.
4.		Acoustic Impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Study shows minimal compliance – Study is based on averages – Assumes warehousing use and not manufacturing – Once the final uses are known the outcomes may not be correct – Assumptions not consistent with other examples in Erskine Park 	A revised acoustic assessment has been prepared which responds to the issues raised – see Appendix E .
5.		Visual Impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Incorrect property identified in photomontages – Individual impact should be assessed for each property – Landscaped mound is not an acceptable visual outcome – Section diagrams taken from limited properties – At a height of RL99 vegetation will totally block views from their property 	<p>Revised photomontages and sections are provided at Appendix K and B respectively. Both documents clearly articulate the visual impact of the proposed development and demonstrate that the earth mound and landscaping will predominantly screen the industrial buildings from view whilst also retaining long distance views towards the Blue Mountains.</p> <p>A section has been prepared from each of the properties adjoining the site.</p> <p>The vegetation has been further developed to screen buildings but retain long distance views.</p>
6.		Setbacks	The setbacks of the buildings nearest to the Greenway Place properties are now in the order

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal increase of 8m – 10m 	of 54m. As described in the PPR the proposed setbacks are significantly more than that required by the Penrith DCP (see Section 4.3). The proposal fulfils the objectives of the setback controls in that it provides visual screening and acoustic protection.
7.		Lack of detail <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application is not definitive No sense of final outcome 	<p>The concept plan application addresses all of the Director General's Requirements and provides significantly more detail of the interface treatment at the residential boundaries than that provided in other concept plans approved around the state.</p> <p>A concept plan is an overarching document that acts in a similar way to a DCP. Future applications will be lodged with construction details of the warehouses. These applications will need to demonstrate compliance with the development principles and performance standards established in the concept plan approval.</p>
8.		Failure to work with site topography	Refer to discussion on the site topography at sections 4.5 and 4.11 of the PPR.
9.		Hours of operation will impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties	The acoustic report establishes noise criteria for the site which will ensure that the 24 hour operation of the warehouses will not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
10.		Presentation of preferred option of an earth mound joining the two high points across the site by Greenway Place residents.	This option is assessed in section 4.11 of the PPR.
11.	Joe Crestani	Lack of consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further documentation or consultation from developer Failure to comply with 2007 guidelines on consultation 	Additional consultation has occurred, details of which are provided at section 4.12 and Appendix P of the PPR.
12.		Noted rural residential option as a compromise	Refer to discussion on alternative land uses at section 4.8 of the PPR.
13.		Removal of southern ridgeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridgeline still substantially removed Token retention of knoll Proposal does not answer issue of topography Whole area of Capitol Hill will be affected as you enter into the estate. 	Retention of the southern ridgeline is not proposed as this would result in the sterilisation of approximately 15ha of industrial zoned land. Consequently the development would not achieve the objectives of the SEPP or the Act in that the land would not be used efficiently and a reduced number of jobs would be provided on the site, mitigation measures along the boundary remove the need to retain the ridgeline.
14.		Gave support for the residential preferred option put forward by Greenway Place residents of creating a ridgeline between two high points of the site.	This option is assessed in section 4.11 of the PPR.
15.		Interface with residential properties unacceptable. 1 Capitol Hill Drive is the closest property. Provision of a drain in that location unacceptable.	<p>As noted previously, the proposal provides a superior outcome compared to that required under the DCP and that provided at other industrial developments such as Erskine Park.</p> <p>The stormwater detention basin is proposed in the natural low point of the site. The basin will be landscaped such that it appears as part of the natural landscape.</p>

16.		Noted acoustic problems at Erskine Park where a separation of 125m is provided – separation of 20 – 35m inadequate	See discussion on acoustic impacts at section 4.2 of the PPR.
17.		Visual Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This issue has not been attended to in detail or with any accuracy – Application should have included an assessment of different options – The removal of the southern ridgeline will have detrimental visual impacts – Views from upper levels of the dwelling will see warehouse buildings – Residents will feel confined by the view of the wall and the mound. 	The photomontages at Appendix K demonstrate that the residential properties along Capitol Hill Drive will retain a green outlook and that the proposed warehouses will not be readily visible from these properties. Additional screening, including views from the upper level of houses, can be achieved with taller planting on the mound if required. Details to be confirmed at the DA stage.
18.		Noise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Every submission has complained about 24/7 operation – Noise goals will be exceeded during construction – Only a margin of 1 dBA for operational noise – Report assumes warehouse use whereas manufacturing would be significantly louder 	A revised acoustic assessment has been prepared which responds to the issues raised – see Appendix E .
19.		DPI can't be satisfied that application meets all the relevant criteria.	The PPR provides sufficient information and detail to satisfy the consent authority that the proposed development complies with State objectives of increasing employment within the WSEA whilst reasonably protecting residential amenity.
20.		No objection raised to the development of the northern portion of the site, however alternative uses should be investigated for the southern portion of the site. Understands that rural residential is not permissible.	Refer to discussion on alternative land uses at section 4.8 of the PPR.
21.	Capitol Hill Residential Release Area – Deano Patzis	Southern ridgeline should be retained	Refer to previous discussion on this issue at point 13 of this table.
22.		Acoustic report is deficient for reasons already given	A revised acoustic assessment has been prepared which responds to the issues raised – see Appendix E .
23.		Maximum height of RL92 should be conditioned	This design element has been incorporated in to the plans and design guidelines so as to ensure that future development is consistent with this height limit.
24.	DPI	Advised that they were at meeting to hear issues to be addressed and explained process moving forward.	N/A
25.		Advised residents that they had separately raised issues with the proponent that they would like further addressed.	PPR addresses these issues.
26.		Will let residents know when the PPR is available for public viewing.	Noted.
27.	Jacfin Representatives	Advised of process that is going to be undertaken, including preparation of independent	N/A

		photomontages	
28.		Explained that the response to submissions was not the formal lodgement of plans and that the proponent has now been asked to prepare a Preferred Project Report (PPR).	N/A
29.		In preparing the PPR the consultant team will be focusing on the residential interface. Consultant team is genuinely trying to minimise impacts.	N/A
30.		Notwithstanding the above it is noted that views across the site will change regardless of what is approved. The proposal will aim to screen as much of the warehouse buildings as possible and will aim to retain long range blue mountain views.	N/A
31.		Sections will be prepared for every property.	N/A

HORSLEY PARK CONCEPT PLAN AND PROJECT APPLICATION



LIAISON WITH RESIDENTS OF GREENWAY PLACE, HORSLEY ROAD AND CAPITOL HILL DRIVE

The liaison with the above residents has occurred on the following occasions:-

- 08 June 2011 Public meeting with residents at Fairfield Council
- 28 June 2011 Meeting onsite with residents and DoPI
- 01 March 2012 Meetings onsite with each resident along with surveyors to obtain levels on their outdoor living areas
- 08 March 2012 Public meeting with residents at Fairfield Council
- 23 March 2012 Meetings onsite with each resident along with photographer to obtain view photographs

The list of residents spoken to individually since March 2012 has included:-

• 1 March 2012

✕ 41-43 Greenway Place	Josephine Stivala
✕ 38 Greenway Place	Theresa & Patrick McHale
✕ 33-37 Greenway Place	Tony & Linda Micallef
✕ 30-32 Greenway Place	Maria Ippoliti
✕ 21-26 Greenway Place	Robert & Melissa Borg
✕ 14-20 Greenway Place	Maria Colusso
✕ 1 Capitol Hill Drive	Joseph Crestani

• 23 March 2012

✕ 41-43 Greenway Place	Josephine Stivala
✕ 38 Greenway Place	Theresa McHale
✕ 33-37 Greenway Place	Tony Micallef
✕ 30-32 Greenway Place	Maria & Deni Ippoliti
✕ 21-26 Greenway Place	Melissa Borg
✕ 14-20 Greenway Place	Maria Colusso
✕ 10-13 Greenway Place	Antonio Straty
✕ 384-390B Horsley Road	Mary Micallef
✕ 1 Capitol Hill Drive	Kathleen Crestani
✕ Capitol Hill	Dino Seraglio

At each of these meetings the residents have raised their concerns regarding the potential impacts of the proposed development. The issues raised have been consistent from the first public meeting and residents have reiterated these issues at each meeting.

The specifics of the issues discussed in the meetings on the 1st and 23rd March 2012 are detailed in Attachments 1 and 2.

Regards

A blue ink handwritten signature, appearing to read 'Mark Tooker', is written over the word 'Regards'.

MARK TOOKER

t: +61 2 9906 8611 f: +61 2 9906 7318

level 4 10-12 clarke street crows nest nsw 2065 australia
po box 1060 crows nest nsw 1585 australia

www.npc.com.au

national project consultants Pty Ltd abn 40 084 004 160



ATTACHMENT 1

RESIDENT CONSULTATION – 1 MARCH 2012

1. 43-43 Greenway Place – Josephine Stivala

The resident pointed out the view to the west from the rear outdoor area including the rural lands on the Jacfin property and the Blue Mountains in the distance. She indicated that this view would be lost due to the proposed development. Their preference was for a mound to be constructed from the south western corner of the CSR property to the hill with the house in the south eastern area of the Jacfin property and no development occur between her western boundary and this mound.

I explained that we were taking surveyed levels at this rear outdoor area in order to accurately consider the potential visual impact and formulate a landscape screening to achieve what our experts consider an acceptable visual impact.

2. 38 Greenway Place – Theresa and Patrick McHale

The residents indicated that they had chosen this location to live because of the rural nature of the setting and the views to the Blue Mountains. They had engaged a visual impact assessment based on the JBA sections and photomontage which they indicated would result in a loss of their extensive rural outlook and view to the Blue Mountains. They also commented on the potential noise impacts and the degree to which noise controls would be maintained into the future. Their preference was for no development between their western boundary and a mound with the alignment discussed with the 41-43 Greenway Place residents.

I explained that we were taking surveyed levels in order to accurately consider the potential visual impacts. I indicated our preference was for a mound along the Jacfin eastern boundary but that specialist landscape and photomontage consultants were engaged to formulate an acceptable visual impact. The resident noise concerns had been passed onto our acoustic consultant to be considered for the PPR.

3. 33-37 Greenway Place – Tony and Linda Micallef

The residents indicated that their high elevation provided extensive views of rural land and the Blue Mountains. They explained that they had engaged a visual impact assessment which they indicated had concluded there would be a loss of the rural views and loss of some of the Blue Mountains views. Their preference was also for no development from their western boundary to a mound with an alignment as described by the 41-43 Greenway Place residents. They were also concerned about the noise impacts arising from a 24/7 day operation.

I gave the same response as indicated for the 38 Greenway Place residents.

4. 30-32 Greenway Place – Maria Ippoliti

I explained the proposed development on the Jacfin site and the further work we were undertaking to assess the visual impact and the other resident concerns. She did not make any comments. We agreed the location of the main outdoor living area for the visual impact assessment.

5. 21-26 Greenway Place – Robert & Melissa Borg

They showed us the main residence and its outdoor areas as well as the adjacent granny flat. They indicated that the view to the west of rural lands and the Blue Mountains was a major reason why they lived on this property. The main residence had been Melissa's family home since the 1970's. They were concerned with the impact the development would have on their views and noise levels. They wanted the hill with the house in the south eastern area of the Jacfin property retained and favoured no development between their western boundary and a mound with the alignment discussed with the 41-43 Greenway Place residents.

I gave the same response as indicated for the 38 Greenway Place residents.

6. 14-20 Greenway Place – Maria Colusso

I explained the proposed development on the Jacfin site and the further work we were undertaking to assess the potential visual and noise impacts on residents along the Jacfin boundaries. She showed us the rear of her property.

She did not make any comments.

7. 1 Capitol Hill Drive – Joseph Crestani

The resident raised a number of issues:-

- preference for no development between his property and hill/ridgeline within his view – hill with house in south eastern area of Jacfin property;
- preference for retention of this hill with house on Jacfin property;
- did not believe a mound would obscure the view to the proposed development;
- not sufficient liaison by applicant with the residents.

I indicated that our preference was for a landscaped mound and retention of the hill to screen the proposed development. I explained that specialists had been engaged to obtain levels at his outdoor living area and to prepare an accurate depiction of an outcome which would provide an acceptable integration of the visual impacts. The acoustic specialist would consider his concerns related to noise impacts.

A T T A C H M E N T 2

RESIDENT CONSULTATION – 23 MARCH 2012

1. 41-43 Greenway Place – Josephine Stivala

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin eastern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact. I indicated they would consider the distant views to the Blue Mountains.

She reiterated her previous preference for no development between her property and a mound with an alignment between the south western corner of the CSR property and the hill with the house in the south eastern area of the Jacfin property.

2. 38 Greenway Place – Theresa McHale

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin eastern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact. I indicated they would consider the distant views to the Blue Mountains.

She indicated her preferred location for the viewpoint of the photomontage and this was adopted. She also reiterated her concern that a mound would obscure her view of the Blue Mountains. I indicated that the specialists would take this into account when formulating their design.

She also reiterated (as had been done in the public meeting on 8 March 2012) that the photomontage in the JBA report indicated a location on the wrong property. I indicated that this would be rectified in the new photomontages.

3. 33-37 Greenway Place – Tony Micallef

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin eastern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact. I indicated they would consider the distant views to the Blue Mountains.

He indicated his concerns with the visual impact and the findings of his specialist view impact assessment. I indicated that our specialists would give consideration to his specialist report.

4. 30-32 Greenway Place – Maria & Deni Ippoliti

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment.

I explained our proposal would retain the hill in the south eastern area of the Jacfin site which was in line with their main view line.

Her response was that the development would proceed and other residents were expressing her concerns.

5. 21-26 Greenway Place – Melissa Borg

She indicated the position on the northern side of their property where they were planning to submit an application for a new house. It was to be designed to take advantage of the rural and mountain views to the west. At present, they were not proceeding with the house until the outcome of the Jacfin development was known.

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin eastern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact. I indicated they would consider the distant views to the Blue Mountains.

She reiterated her preference for no development between her western boundary and a mound as described in discussions with the 41-43 Greenway Place resident.

6. 14-20 Greenway Place – Maria Colusso

I explained the purpose of the photographs being taken and the proposed visual assessment. She indicated her outdoor area on the rear balcony and the rural view to the west. I explained the proposed mound and landscaping to mitigate the visual impact. She indicated that her opinion was the development was likely to proceed, her partly completed shed partially obscured some of this view and that there were attempts by the proponent to mitigate impacts on her views.

7. 10-13 Greenway Place – Antonio Staty

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin eastern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact.

I indicated that the hill with the house in the south eastern area of the Jacfin property would be retained to assist to mitigate the visual impact of the development.

He indicated that he preferred no development on the eastern side of this hill as the proposed development would adversely impact in terms of his views and the acoustic environment.

I explained that the landscape architects were formulating a design to mitigate the visual impacts and the noise concerns had been relayed to the acoustic specialist to consider.

8. 384-390B Horsley Road – Mary Micallef

I explained that the photomontage and landscape specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment. Our preference was for a mound and landscaping near the Jacfin southern boundary with landscaping to achieve what the specialists considered an acceptable visual impact.

She was concerned that her rural views from her front porch and her existing acoustic environment would be impacted by the proposed development.

I indicated that the hill with the house on the Jacfin property would be retained to assist mitigate visual impacts in combination with a mound and landscaping.

9. 1 Capitol Hill Drive – Kathleen Crestani

I explained that the photomontage and landscape architect specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment.

She reiterated her preference for no development between her property and the hill/ridgeline visible on the Jacfin property and in here view the significant impact the proposed development would have on their views and acoustic environment.

10. Capitol Hill – Dino Seraglio

I explained that the photomontage and landscape architect specialists were inspecting the properties and taking photographs for their visual assessment.

He understood the purpose and indicated he was interested in the outcome.

Horsley Park Employment Precinct

Adjoining Resident Consultation – Greenway Place and Capitol Hill Drive

Conducted by Julie Bindon and Mark Tooker

In all cases the most recent design work was explained including the design cross sections and photomontages to indicate views from future houses, the mound and vegetation screening and verification from the noise expert that noise levels would be within the acceptable government guideline limits.

16 July 2012

1. Deano Seraglio (Pazit) – Capitol Hill Drive Future Rural Residential Development

Although Mr Seraglio noted the screening of the development, he was concerned that he would have difficulty convincing potential purchasers of land that the proposed design would be acceptable.

2. Joe and Kathy Crestani – 1 Capitol Hill Drive

Although Mr and Mrs Crestani noted the screening of the development, they expressed disappointment that there was proposed development in between their property and the hill/knoll on the Jacfin property. They were concerned with the possible noise impacts especially at night as well as the impact of the mound on their outlook.

3. Maria Ippoliti – 27-29 Greenway Place

Maria's husband had been delayed at work and could not attend. Arrangements were made to meet both of them on the 18 July (see notes for 18 July).

4. Theresa and Patrick McHale – 38 Greenway Place

Both thought that the photos did not do the panoramic view justice and that the photomontage showed the elements in the view further away than in real life. The McHales questioned the accuracy of the photomontages.

They noted that the buildings appeared to be screened, but were still concerned about light spill and noise impacts, the proximity of the mound and the changed outlook including reduced views.

17 July 2012

1. Mrs Colusso – 14-20 Greenway Place

Mrs Colusso indicated that she thought the development would invariably proceed and that screening would minimise the impact of the development.

2. Tony and Linda Micallef – 33-37 Greenway Place

Mr and Mrs Micallef thought that the photos did not do their panorama views justice and that the photomontage showed the elements in the view further away than in real life.

While they considered that the mound and landscaping appeared to screen the buildings, they still were concerned about noise and light impacts.

3. Antonio Straty – 10-13 Greenway Place

Mr Straty accepted that the visual impact on his view was much improved as the knoll was now retained and the screening seemed ok. He was concerned about minimising the potential noise and light impacts from the building in the south eastern corner.

4. Roy and Josephine Stivala – 41-43 Greenway Place

Mr and Mrs Stivala thought that the photomontage showed the elements in the view further away than in real life. They were concerned that the proposed mound, when combined with the quarry's mound on their northern side would make their rear outdoor space feel 'hemmed in' and remained concerned about noise impacts.

18 July 2012

1. Robert and Melissa Borg – 21-26 Greenway Place

Mr and Mrs Borg thought that the photos didn't do their panorama views justice and photomontage showed the elements in the view further away than in real life.

They were still concerned with noise impacts and possible pollutant odours from the buildings. The issue of drainage was raised and it was explained that drainage pipes would be located under the mound to allow runoff on the properties along Greenway Place to continue to drain onto the proposed development site and be collected in its proposed drainage system.

2. Maria and Deni Ippoliti (and parents who own the adjacent property) – 27-29 and 30-32 Greenway Place

Mr and Mrs Ippoliti recognised that the proposed mound and landscaping would largely screen the buildings but were still concerned about the noise impacts and the uncertainty and potential impact this would have on land values. They were also concerned of the exact nature of future uses and buildings and the timing of works and about the accuracy of the photomontages.