

20 June 2025

Lindsey Blecher
Team Leader – Industry Assessments
Department of Planning, Housing and Environment
4 Parramatta Square
12 Darcy Street
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attn: Penny White, Environmental Assessment Officer

Dear Lindsey,

ESR Horsley Logistics Park Stage 2 (SSD-71144719) – Request for Additional Information

This letter responds to a request for information (RFI) issued by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) on 30 January 2025.

To assist with the close out of assessment, a site visit was held on 11 February 2025 with DPHI, ESR, Nettleton Tribe, and Costin Roe. The purpose of this site visit was to highlight the existing context and its relationship to the proposed development, specifically discussing the changes to the retaining walls. Out of this site visit, documentation requirements were confirmed to enable ESR to respond to the RFI.

This letter provides response to the RFI items supported by the required documentation, which comprehensively addresses each of the issues raised:

- **Attachment A: Street Elevations Changes – Existing and Proposed**
- **Attachment B: Costin Roe Retaining Wall Plan w/ Nettleton Tribe Markup**
- **Attachment C: Fire Access Brigade Review**
- **Attachment D: Updated Architectural Plans**
- **Attachment E: Updated Landscape Plans**
- **Attachment F: Updated Visual Impact Statement**

A summary of the matters raised and a response to each item is summarised in Table 1 (overleaf).



Should you have any questions in relation to this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jacqueline Parker, Director – Urbis at 02 8233 7690/
jparker@urbis.com.au.

Sincerely,

Grace Macdonald
Planning Manager NSW
ESR Australia and New Zealand
0411 599 155
grace.macdonald@esr.com

Table 1 Response to Request for Information

Matter for Consideration	Response
<p>Earthworks and Retaining Walls</p> <p>Please provide further details of the proposed changes to pad levels and retaining wall heights, including sections and elevations which clearly show the proposed levels relative to approved levels. Please ensure these sections and elevations show the tallest retaining wall elements.</p>	<p>The site is currently serviced and benched with existing retaining walls supporting the pad. The pad is currently not level, which requires minor earthworks and amendments to retaining walls to support the proposed development.</p> <p>Attachment A and Attachment B details the proposed amendments to the retaining wall structure. It seeks an overall reduction of the existing walls to support the development. Summary as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Northern Elevation: The existing retaining wall is proposed to be reduced between 1.6m to 1.65m along the entire frontage. This is to support a car park, which sits lower than the warehouse pad. The road elevation rises by approximately 3m from west to east. At the western corner, the new retaining wall will reduce from 7.1m to 5.5m. The eastern corner, it reduces from 4.06m to 2.41m. - Eastern Elevation: The existing retaining wall varies from a fill wall along the northern half to at grade with the existing road to a cut wall at the southern boundary. The fill wall is proposed to be reduced by 1.65m. This will create a lower retaining wall at max. 2.41m or demolish the retaining requirement completely.

	<p>No changes are proposed to the cut wall at the southern extent except where a truck ingress/egress point is proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Western Elevation: The existing retaining wall is retained for the majority of this elevation. There is a reduction of 1.6m at the north-west corner. This is to support a car park, which sits lower than the warehouse pad. <p>The overall reduction of the walls from the existing to proposed is considered an improved outcome. It reduces bulk and scale of the warehouse and creates an improved connection of the site to the public domain. All relevant plans reflect this outcome under the proposed SSDA application.</p>
The VIA appears to show retaining wall heights will be reduced from the constructed levels, please clarify and provide necessary corrections.	The VIA reflects the reduction of the retaining wall height, consistent with the architectural, landscape and civil plans.
Visual	
The VIA shows perspective of the site at years 0 and 15, please provide perspectives with shorter time intervals to show the screening provided by the landscaping.	The VIA has been updated with shorter time intervals to reflect the growth of the proposed landscape, refer to Attachment F .
The year 0 perspectives appear to show plants in excess of 1m, which is inconsistent with the landscape plan, please clarify and provide any necessary corrections.	The VIA has been updated to be consistent with the proposed landscape plans, refer to Attachment F .
Fire Brigade Access	
The letter from Affinity Fire Engineering provides insufficient detail to demonstrate that the development is compliant with the FRNSW Fire Safety Guideline <i>Access for fire brigade vehicles and firefighters</i> . Provide compliance tables and plans showing how fire brigade vehicles would access the full perimeter of each building without reliance on performance	<p>A letter has been prepared by Affinity Fire Engineering to demonstrate a performance-based solution can be met on the site, refer to Attachment C-1.</p> <p>The east and west sides of Johnston Crescent are BCA Deem to Satisfy compliant. The northern road sits 36m from the</p>

solutions. Please also provide evidence of consultation with FRNSW and support for the proposed fire brigade vehicle access arrangements.

warehouse. This is due to a large setback for the future Southern Link Road, which timing on delivery is unknown. To support fire access from this boundary, two fire stairs are proposed along the northern boundary. This has been documented on the updated architectural and landscape plans at **Attachment D** and **E**. Fire stairs are also documented in the updated Visual Impact Assessment at **Attachment F**.

For access onto the hardstand, there is sufficient space to enable fire truck to maneuver to get in and out of the site should they require access.

An attempt to reach out to Fire and Rescue NSW (FRNSW) was made. No correspondence was received at the time of submitting this RFI response. However, similar performance-based solutions have been supported by FRNSW on similar industrial sites. ESR is confident performance requirements can be achieved to support all relevant BCA and FRNSW requirements.

Further dialogue was provided to the DPHI on Fire Access (**Attachment C-2**) demonstrating similar distances have been approved for adjacent developments, including Horsley Park Stage 1 (SSD-10436).