



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1077971

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: ELF MUSHROOM FARM PROJECT AND SUBSTRATE PLANT

PANEL: PROFESSOR SNOW BARLOW

**PANEL ASSISTING: DENNIS LEE
MICHAEL WOODLAND
REBECCA GROTH**

**DEPARTMENT: ANTHONY WITHERDIN
SILVIO FALATO**

**LOCATION: IPC OFFICE,
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET,
SYDNEY, 2000**

DATE: 3.02 PM, WEDNESDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2019

PROF S. BARLOW: Well, good afternoon. It's – before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet. And I'll also pay my respects to the Elders past, present and, ah, and emerging of the communities, who will be here today. Welcome today, to the meeting and the
5 proposal seeking approval for a modification to the Elf Mushroom Farm. My name is Snow Barlow and I am the Chair of this IPC Panel. Joining today is my fellow, um, Dennis Lee from the Commission Secretariat and Michael Woodland and Rebecka Groth, um, from Keylan Consulting.

10 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. The meeting is one of, part of the Commission's decision-making process. And it's taking place at the preliminary
15 stage of this process and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commission to ask questions of the attendees and to clarify issues wherever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice, and provide any further information in writing.

20 I request that all members today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time. And all members ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript. That's it. Thank you. Well, um, we thought the best way to approach it, unless you have some other questions was, ah, for you to
25 give us, you know, a brief outline of the project, as you see it.

MR A. WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: And what the process has been to date. And then we might, ah, clarify some parts of that. But then we might move to, you know, your
30 recommended approval of the project.

MR WITHERDIN: Sure.

PROF BARLOW: And the conditions that you've placed on it. And just go through
35 those.

MR WITHERDIN: Okay.

PROF BARLOW: And given, bear in mind some issues might arise, as we go.
40 Which we might seek clarification. Is that good?

MR WITHERDIN: Yep, sounds good.

PROF BARLOW: Okay.
45

MR WITHERDIN: Ah, so, for the record, my name's Anthony Witherdin, I'm the
Direction of Regional Assessments. So I'll – I'll provide you with a brief – a brief
background on the proposal. I'll take you through the site and some of the key
assessment issues that we, ah, focused on and – and the outcomes that we, ah, arrived
5 at with those, with the assessment of those issues. So basically, the – the proposal
relates to a concept plan and project application for an approved mushroom farm.
Ah, it's located at The Northern Road in Londonderry in the Penrith Local
Government Area. Now, the site can be best seen in our Assessment Report on page
2, in figure 2.

10 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And it currently contains a single, ah, residential dwelling. And
the site is largely cleared.

15 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Except for some remnant vegetation at the western end of the
site.

20 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: The surrounding – the surrounding area comprises of a mix of
different uses. To the south is a car wrecker's yard. Ah, to the north, there's some
25 rural residential development. To the west is a poultry shed. And further to the west,
again, is some more rural residential development. And to the east is the Castlereagh
Nature Reserve. The site's zoned RU4, Primary Production Small Lots, and the
proposal is permissible within that zone.

30 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: So in terms of the proposal itself, essentially, the modification
seeks approval to expand the – the size of the development footprint of the approved
mushroom farm buildings. And it seeks to do that to accommodate new technology
35 for mushroom picking and packaging. The original proposal was designed to,
basically, um; allow mushrooms to be grown on shelves, vertically. So the building
had to be design in such a way that it was taller. The proposal seeks to implement a
new form of technology whereby the mushrooms will be picked on a single level by
machinery.

40 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And – and, and packed that way. So the building footprint has,
um, expanded, um, towards the south. And, um, as a result of that different
45 technology, the actual height of the building has been reduced by about two and a
half metres, at the ridgeline. So despite the – the size of the building increasing, the
overall production limit, ah, associated with that approval would stay the same. In

terms of the – the key issues associated with the proposal, um, concern was raised about the proposal not being compatible with the surrounding land uses.

5 However, the – the Department, um, assessed that in detail and – and is satisfied that the proposal was consistent with the strategic planning framework established for that site. Ah, we note the proposal was permissible within the RU4 zone. Um, and it would meet the objectives of that zone in that it would support, ah, a sustainable primary industry.

10 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And, ultimately, employ up to 113 people. A lot of concerns were raised about the potential land use conflicts associated with the proposal. And we'll deal with, ah, some of those, individually, in a moment. But, ah, essentially, 15 the department was satisfied that those land use conflicts could be appropriately dealt with. By way of condition, basically.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Ah, the next, ah, key – one of the key issues, raised, um, by residents, was about the potential visual impacts associated with the proposal. And while the – the proposal, um, while the overall size of the building increases quite substantially, the overall, ah, height of the building, ah, decreases by about two and a half metres. And the majority of that floor space, ah, is located towards the south, 25 where there's very limited viewing opportunities.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

30 MR WITHERDIN: Because, towards the south there's, ah, one resident – um, that would be, mainly, affected. And that's a resident that's associated with the existing car, um, wrecking yard.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

35 MR WITHERDIN: Um, further the – the potential visual impacts associated with the proposal would be mitigated by, ah, screening, vegetation screening and a – a mound that would surround the - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

40

MR WITHERDIN: - - - northern and the eastern, um, parts of the site. And that will help soften the appearance of the – the large building, basically.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45

MR WITHERDIN: And so for those – for those reasons, the Department considered that the overall visual impact, um, was going to be acceptable. In terms of amenity

impacts on the surrounding residents, despite the increased size of the proposed building, um, the Department considers the proposal won't result in a commensurate increase in impacts. Um, and for residents living towards the north and west of the site, ah, the proposal won't, um, result in any significant increase in impacts as
5 mentioned before the building height reduces. And the potential noise and odour impacts associated with the proposal comply with the relevant criteria.

Um, for the car wrecking yard and the associated dwelling located towards the south, um, the proposal would result in some additional visual and, ah, noise impacts.
10 However, these impacts can be appropriately mitigated by some, ah, by conditions of approval. And those conditions include, um, setting strict noise limits.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

15 MR WITHERDIN: And requiring the preparation of a noise management plan, ah, in consultation with the owner of that residence. Ah, there are a number of other issues the Department considered. All those – and those issues related to water management, biodiversity, bushfire protection, traffic and car parking. And, essentially, the Department was satisfied that those, ah, potential impacts have been
20 adequately addressed or can be addressed by the recommended conditions of approval. Um, but ultimately, in terms of the other impacts associated with the proposal, ah, the Department's satisfied that it wouldn't, um, result in any increase, increased impacts compared to the original approval.

25 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And, finally, there was some concern raised about whether the proposal could be dealt with as a modification, um, to the – to the original approval. Um, but the Department is satisfied that the proposal would fall within the scope of a
30 – section 75W modification. Primarily because, the proposal remains a mushroom farm. The height of the building is reduced; production limits stay the same. Traffic and employee numbers would reduce – wouldn't increase. And the proposal wouldn't result in any significant increase, ah, any impact - - -

35 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - beyond those already assessed and approved. So overall, while, while the building gets, ah, large in size, um, the Department's satisfied that the proposal wouldn't result in any significant increase in impacts compared to the –
40 the originally approval.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45 MR WITHERDIN: And so that's in a – in a nutshell. I'm happy to - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - answer any questions about it.

PROF BARLOW: Yes. Let's – let's, it's we – the general areas which you – you have considered, but we'd just like to go over them, the – the errors of, you know,
5 obvious errors of concern which we just need to talk through.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: Ah, clearly, there's a question of, you know, truck movements.
10 You know, what – what is the density we're creating at this site through production facilities, such as this. There's a – a visual amenity, ah, issue which has been raised, of course. Ah, thirdly, there's an issue which you have dealt with. But we'd just like to talk through it a bit, is the potential odour, ah, emanating from a mushroom
15 production site like this. And we – we are aware it's a production site rather than a – a substrate production site. Ah, and finally, ah, it's just a question that I had – just to look at, ah, or assure ourselves that the storm water considerations, ah, you know, have been adequately dealt with.

20 Because you have made a bigger shed. But it does seem, you know, there's been a recommendation not to increase the dam. So presumably, some calculations have been done that – that that extra stormwater, ah, can be dealt with without causing local flooding. So they're our issues we'd like to talk about, you know, ah, to begin – to begin with. And then we, maybe, branch out from that.

25 MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. Um, in terms of traffic impact, um, the Department is satisfied that the proposal won't result in any significant increase in traffic impacts.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

30 MR WITHERDIN: And that's primarily because the production limits associated with the proposal would remain the same.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

35 MR WITHERDIN: And there's existing conditions in place, already, to require the upgrade of the intersection that provides access into and out of the site.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

40 MR WITHERDIN: And the Department considers, ah, that that issue, ah, has been appropriately addressed as a part of the original assessment of the application. And, as I say, because that production limit stays the same, I wouldn't expect any increase in, um, traffic movements.

45 PROF BARLOW: But they have applied, haven't you – for an increase in total movements per day?

MR M. WOODLAND: Yeah. Um, Michael - - -

PROF BARLOW: From - - -

5 MR WOODLAND: Yeah.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Go ahead, Michael.

10 MR WOODLAND: Sorry – sorry, so Michael Woodland. Yeah. Anthony, they, um, just looking through the proposal, it talks about increasing vehicular movements for constructions. Um, from 70 per day to 100 per day. I guess my question was, “Was that limited just to construction? Or was that also in anticipation for operational traffic?”

15 MR WITHERDIN: Ah, no. I believe that’s, ah, only associated with, um, construction.

MR WOODLAND: Okay.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Um, but we can confirm that for you.

MR WOODLAND: Okay. Thanks.

25 PROF BARLOW: So we don’t have a view of what – what it might be in full production mode?

MR WITHERDIN: I don’t expect it to increase at all.

30 PROF BARLOW: No.

MR S. FALATO: Maybe, I’ll just add to that, Silvio Falato, from the Department of Planning. Just in terms of the - - -

35 PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR FALATO: - - - the, we had a discussion with the proponent about the actual capacity of the site, as well, in terms of production levels.

40 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR FALATO: And that came back to the fact that there is no increase in addition to what was already approved. So in terms of truck movements, there should be no increase in that sense, either.

45 PROF BARLOW: So - - -

MR FALATO: There is an increase for construction, during the construction period.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR FALATO: Um, and part of the issue of trying to deal with that is mitigating noise. So there's discussion in the documentation about, um, constructing the
5 mound, earlier on, during the construction period.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR FALATO: So the earlier that the construction, that the mound gets constructed,
10 the better it is in terms of reducing noise impacts - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR FALATO: - - - on adjoining properties.
15

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Yeah.

MR FALATO: And that's, I think, scheduled for the first six to 12 months,
20 maximum.

PROF BARLOW: And just - - -

MR WOODLAND: And - - -

25 PROF BARLOW: - - - you were, sorry - - -

MR WOODLAND: No.

PROF BARLOW: - - - Michael, I just think that we, um, we - we think we're clear
30 on is that this is the proposed facility. They haven't broken ground yet.

MR WITHERDIN: In terms of commencement - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.
35

MR WITHERDIN: - - - we could have to confirm that for you.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. If you could, that would be handy.

40 MR WOODLAND: Yes.

PROF BARLOW: Thank you.

MR WOODLAND: Oh, I was just going to add to condition - the new condition
45 number 30, presumably, has been added to ensure that the operational traffic is going to be satisfactory. It's for an Operational Traffic Management Plan.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. So in terms of the Operational Traffic Management Plan, RMS ah, asked the Department to – to consider whether or not a different type of intersection upgrade should be - - -

5 MR WOODLAND: Right.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - considered.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

10

MR WITHERDIN: Um, the Department, um, considered that request. And we asked the proponent to address that issue, raised by the RMS. And, essentially, because the traffic impacts associated with the proposal, that's the Operational Traffic Impacts, because they won't change compared to the original approval.

15

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: I didn't see that there was scope to – to change that current condition.

20

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And, instead, to basically, tighten up on any of those operational traffic impacts associated with the proposal. We've asked the proponent to prepare an Operational Traffic Management Plan, um, in consultation with Council and RMS. And that's to deal with a – a range of issues, in terms of, making sure that the Operational Traffic Movements were as safe as possible, that they limit noise impacts, where possible. And they, basically, adopt, you know, best practice in terms of operating to and from the site.

30

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. What – oh, I suppose, maybe Silvia, do you know, the nature of the – after the construction phase, we're talking about now, the operational phase. What's the nature of these truck movements? Are they the movement of materials in and then spent materials out plus product? Or - - -

35

MR WITHERDIN: Yah, so – I – maybe, I'll pick up on this question, 'cause - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yes, sorry, Anthony, yes.

40

MR WITHERDIN: - - - ah, I – I didn't know much about mushroom farms before this application came along. So we went out to visit an operating mushroom farm.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45

MR WITHERDIN: Um, to see how it does operate. And, essentially, ah, ah, there's – I think, there's three primary movements in terms of the operation or traffic that occurs at a mushroom farm. The substrate is brought in from a different site.

PROF BARLOW: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: It's unloaded. Um, and that is, basically, laid down on the mushroom growing shelves. And the mushrooms grow and then after that, they're
5 picked and they're packaged. And then there's a truck movement, ah, associated with taking the product away from the site and to markets.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

10 MR WITHERDIN: And then once that, um, substrate has been, um, used it is then, ah, basically, ah, packaged up again and then a truck movement is associated with removing it from the site - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

15

MR WITHERDIN: - - - once it's been used. So it's a bit of a circular - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yes, yes.

20 MR WITHERDIN: - - - production - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah, yes, yeah, yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - activity.

25

PROF BARLOW: Do you have to worry about, in this, you know, the spent compost is a, you know, is a waste product, essentially. Do you know where it goes?

MR WITHERDIN: Well, it's a good question for the proponent.

30

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, but I believe it is recycled into compost.

35 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes.

PROF BARLOW: For mushrooms or – or what? I guess, it's up to the component,
40 the proponent. Or is it – does it sell for garden, garden waste or something?

MR WITHERDIN: I think it might be used for, for garden waste. But - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

45

MR WITHERDIN: - - - it, we'd have to confirm that with the proponent.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR FALATO: That's my understanding, as well.

5 PROF BARLOW: Sorry?

MR FALATO: That's my understanding, as well. That it's just sold for domestic use.

10 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR FALATO: Yeah. So you can get it from your local hardware store or, you know.

15 PROF BARLOW: Yeah, yeah. We've all seen it there. Do you have, just, you know, it really comes over then to the question, though, is the unloading and, you know, is it stockpiled outside the building or inside the building? That's both the – you know, new substrate and the spent substrate.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Oh - - -

PROF BARLOW: It doesn't seem to be any - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Oh - - -

25

PROF BARLOW: Piles in, outside the building, in the – in the plan.

MR WITHERDIN: My – yeah, my understanding is there's an – there's an exterior, partly enclosed area for stockpiling of the waste product, if you want to call it that, um, before it's then processed.

30

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: So in terms of the, the waste leaving, there's a process for that.

35

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: The inbound, I thought, comes straight off the truck and loaded internal to the building - - -

40

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - is how I understand it to work.

45 MR FALATO: Yeah. And then the spent substrate, ah, would occur internally, into the building, as well.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR FALATO: But we can confirm that for you.

5 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. That would be – yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

10 MR WOODLAND: And I guess, following from that is the – is the – what Snow alluded to in terms of the odour. So the Odour Impact Assessment would have taken into account this process about moving product, waste product for want of another word off the site, as well as delivering it. That was the question that I had.

15 MR WITHERDIN: Yep. So there was an – an Odour Assessment, um, submitted with the application. And it considered a range of factors - - -

MR WOODLAND: Yes.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

20

MR WITHERDIN: - - - um, associated with the operation of a – of a mushroom farm. And it modelled the worst-case scenario associated with odour. And, ah, it, basically, found that the proposal would comfortably comply with the, um, relevant criteria.

25

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And so, from that regard, ah, the Department was satisfied - - -

30 PROF BARLOW: Yep.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - odour wasn't going to be an issue for this site.

35 MR WOODLAND: So that's the operation as well as the product coming to – transported to and from the site?

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: Thank you.

40

MR WOODLAND: Thank you.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah, it's – it's really a different odour level in the production of the substrate, too.

45

MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

PROF BARLOW: Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So I think, in terms of the overall mushroom production,
um - - -

5

PROF BARLOW: Process.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - process. I think, ah, there's an additional source of odour
generated from the manufacture of the – or, however, they do it.

10

PROF BARLOW: Composting process.

MR WITHERDIN: The composting process for the substrate. But that is much
reduced by the time it gets to this site.

15

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: Where it's – it's used for growing.

20 PROF BARLOW: Mmm, good. Okay. Now, Rebecka, really, I probably, you have
them or Dennis, do you have any other questions about the odour aspect?

MR LEE: No, not on odour.

25 PROF BARLOW: Just, so – so and, are we satisfied about the visual impact? Or
haven't we dealt with that properly, yet?

MR LEE: I don't have any particular questions around visual impact. I think the
Department's report deals with that issue.

30

PROF BARLOW: The objections, Rebecka, you dealt with those a bit and you
would have dealt with them too, Anthony, um, were largely around visual impact and
– and, also, for, perhaps, loss to real estate value. Is that? And you're – you're
satisfied that the visual impact is – is, you know, is workable?

35

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. So um, as part of the assessment process, we went, um,
and visited the residents - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

40

MR WITHERDIN: - - - um, that were, um, most impacted by visual impacts
associated with this proposal.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45

MR WITHERDIN: And when you're viewing, ah, the proposal from the north - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - ah, the building will actually be reduced in height.

5 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Compared to what was already approved.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

10

MR WITHERDIN: And so that was a – a big mitigating factor in terms of managing those – ah, those visual - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

15

MR WITHERDIN: - - - visual impacts. So the height of the building reducing, together with the landscaped mound - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

20

MR WITHERDIN: - - - along that full frontage of that northern elevation of the building.

PROF BARLOW: Yes.

25

MR WITHERDIN: We believe it would successfully reduce the visual impacts associated with the proposal.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

30

MR WITHERDIN: And in terms of view loss, because that area is so flat, um, there'll be no significant views lost associated with the proposal.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

35

MR WITHERDIN: Um, and so from a visual impact perspective, we were comfortable, um - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

40

MR WITHERDIN: - - - that this proposal would result in less impacts, compared to the approved - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45

MR WITHERDIN: - - - for those residents from the north.

PROF BARLOW: Yes. It's effectively a – a southerly view that's being impacted upon, isn't it? Yeah. The westerly view might be more contentious if – because that's the mountains. Um, and, ah, but it's not that view. Have you got any more questions on that?

5

MR WOODLAND: No, not on that issue.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. You have, well - - -

10 MR WOODLAND: Oh, I had a question about the bushfire conditions. I noticed that there are five conditions, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35, that have been placed on the draft instrument. Could you just take me through the reasoning behind that, those new conditions? I noticed in the report it talked about, it was at the recommendation of the RFS. Is that simply the reason why the condition was placed on? Or was
15 there a particular, um, issue relating to bushfire protection? And second to that, Anthony, is there's also a condition relating to an Integrated Bushfire and Vegetation Management Plan. So there's protection of a certain species on the site.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

20

MR WOODLAND: And how that worked with the APZ.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep, yep. Um, so in terms of bushfire protection, you're right. We, um, basically, have adopted the recommendations of the RFS.

25

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

30 MR WITHERDIN: And, as the RFS is the expert in that field, we always take their advice.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

35 MR WITHERDIN: And they have recommended these conditions be imposed on this approval. The bushfire impacts associated with this development will change as the building footprint expands.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

40

MR WITHERDIN: So it might get closer to a – a bushfire threat.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

45 MR WITHERDIN: And so we've adopted the RFSs conditions with regards to that. We did note that, ah, there could potentially be an issue associated with providing the landscaper mounds and retaining - - -

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - as much vegetation on the site as possible and how that would interact with the requirements for APZs. And so, that's why we've asked for
5 that, a Bushfire and Vegetation Management Plan to be prepared, so that we can look at that in further detail, in accordance with that condition.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Are there any conditions about – and it seems, so, ultimately, that plan will come through with the final plans for the – the construction,
10 really. And how – how will that be approved?

MR WITHERDIN: Sorry, could you repeat that question?

PROF BARLOW: Well, you know, the Bushfire Plan, yes?
15

MR WOODLAND: Yeah. I think Snow is referring to condition 36 - - -

PROF BARLOW: 36.

MR WOODLAND: - - - in particular, about how would that be enforced prior to commencement of construction works?
20

PROF BARLOW: Yes.

MR WOODLAND: I think is the answer. But that one is that going back to the Secretary for approval?
25

MR WITHERDIN: It is, to the satisfaction of the Secretary. So - - -

MR WOODLAND: Yes.
30

MR WITHERDIN: - - - essentially, that condition, um, requires a plan to be prepared.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.
35

MR WITHERDIN: Um, so that the proponent must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yes.
40

MR WITHERDIN: - - - that both a minimum of, a 25-metre APZ and the required landscaping could be provided at the same time.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Yeah.
45

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: Is there any, ah, forgive me for this. But is there any, um, recommendations from the RHS or whatever it is, Rural Fire Service, about the nature of the vegetation they put on the mound? You know, in terms of its flammability.

5

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, I'm not aware of anything. I know that RFS classify different vegetation. Um, - - -

10

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

PROF BARLOW: Yes. Yeah.

15 MR WITHERDIN: - - - but in terms of, ah, I think the – the primary issue there is that they require at 25 metre APZ.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

20 MR WITHERDIN: Just to provide that, that – that distance.

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

25 MR WITHERDIN: And I think if they provide that APZ distance, um, that would satisfy RFSs requirements.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Yeah.

30 MR WITHERDIN: Despite the – the vegetation that may occur on that – on it's, on that - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

35 MR WITHERDIN: - - - vegetated mound. But we could double check on that.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: With RFS.

40 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. It would seem, um, you know, I understand the – the APZ. But in terms of extreme fire days, um, 25 metres is nothing. And, you know, for embers. And, so the flammability of that vegetation, you know, may be a consideration that could be considered by whoever does the landscaping.

45 MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

MR WOODLAND: Yeah. I think there's also a – there's a comment in the report, Anthony, that – that nominates the particular type of vegetation. I guess, that's the question that I had, that – that, um, do any of, tenuifolia, ah, tenuifolia?

5 PROF BARLOW: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

MR WOODLAND: Excuse my pronunciation – ah, pronunciation on that.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Tenuifolia.

10

MR WOODLAND: Yeah. So I – I suspect – I suspect that's, that the vegetation that's referred to in condition 36. Because that's the – it's on page, ah, 29 of your report.

15 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WOODLAND: The Department has also recommended conditions requiring the Integrated Bushfire and Vegetation Management Plan to appropriately protect that species within the APZ. And just confirming that that's – that's, that's the 36B it's picked up in that condition?

20

MR WITHERDIN: Oh, I'd have to take that on notice.

PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

25

MR WITHERDIN: And get back to you on that. Ah, look, I think - - -

MR WOODLAND: Sorry?

30 MR WITHERDIN: - - - Sorry.

MS GROTH: That's a protected species.

MR WOODLAND: Yeah.

35

MS GROTH:

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

40 MR WITHERDIN: So condition, ah, 20 (e) - - -

MR WOODLAND: 20(e). Yes.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - picks up on that issue about that particular, um, species.

45

MR WOODLAND: Oh, okay. So it's more about protecting that plan, rather than having that as part of the landscape, the softening - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

MR WOODLAND: - - - landscaping screen to soften the appearance of the structure?

5

MR WITHERDIN: Yep. Yep. Yep.

MR WOODLAND: Okay. That – that’s answered that question for me.

10 MR WITHERDIN: And also, as a – just a, um, part of the overall, um – well, as a part of the post-approval process, the Department also, ah, consult with RFS as a part of assessing whether or not condition 36 - - -

MR WOODLAND: Mmhmm.

15

MR WITHERDIN: - - - would be satisfied in terms of providing the minimum 25-metre-wide APZ and then still providing that appropriate screening - - -

MR WOODLAND: Yeah.

20

MR WITHERDIN: - - - um, around the building.

PROF BARLOW: That 25 APZ must be provided on the property, mustn’t it? It’s not – can’t be included in any of the – ah, the neighbours’ land?

25

MR WITHERDIN: That’s correct.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

30 MR WITHERDIN: provided on property, yes.

PROF BARLOW: That’s right. Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

35

PROF BARLOW: Okay. Anything else, Michael?

MR WOODLAND: No, there’s nothing else from me.

40 PROF BARLOW: That’s just – there’s one more question, then we might go to the conditions and just

MR LEE: Stormwater?

45 PROF BARLOW: Stormwater. Yes. Um, just that question I asked, ah – really, we, ah – it seemed – without seeing the exact figures, it seemed a bit unusual that it was concluded there was no need to increase the size of the stormwater dam, even

though the building footprint had increased. So you wouldn't expect more stormwater.

MR FALATO: My understanding was that they did actually cater for additional.
5 I'm just trying to think of the figure, if it was 12 to 14 or 14 to 16 megalitres.

PROF BARLOW: It was 14 – 14 – I think I've got a figure in my head.

MR WITHERDIN: Yeah.
10

PROF BARLOW: 14.7, 16 - - -

MR FALATO:

15 PROF BARLOW: But then - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Originally, the proposal sought to increase it from 14.7 to 16.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.
20

MR WITHERDIN: But then they reduced it back to 14.7. But we had the same, ah, issue when we looked into it. And, um – I – I guess the important points were there, that they'd prepared some modelling. And they, ah – basically, that demonstrated that they'd have sufficient, um, capacity within that dam to cater for a one-in-100-
25 year storm event.

PROF BARLOW: Storm. Mmhmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, and that – the overall system there um, satisfactorily
30 manage that volume of water from that, um - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: From the size of that building. And then there's also, um, ah –
35 it's – the stormwater system's been designed to adequately treat the quality of stormwater, um, um, draining from, ah, the site as well. Um, so – um, but we – we – we did look into whether or not, um, it would have a sufficient capacity.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.
40

MR WITHERDIN: Um, and the modelling did show that it would cater for a one-in-100-year storm event.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. So that's why you left it at 14.7. Yeah. Okay. Okay. If
45 everyone's okay, why don't we move to the conditions now, just briefly go through those and – mmm.

MR WOODLAND: There's a hard copy there.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah, thanks.

5 MR WOODLAND:

PROF BARLOW: That's – that's welcome. So, um, I guess the the first bit is the usual, you know, stuff we need to do. But then we get to the farm site. And the weekly production, is that the usual thing for – the weekly production levels have to
10 be just kept, do they, and available for inspection if required?

MR WITHERDIN: Ah, yes. So, um, the production limit is, ah, 220 tonnes of mushrooms per week. But we've strengthened that condition to provide, um, um – to require the proponent, basically, to provide, um, some records - - -
15

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - um, that they actually meet that, um – that – that, ah, 220-tonne production limit.
20

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm. Okay. Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: But it is a usual condition, because, ah, basically, um, it sets, ah, how much, um – the – the – in terms of setting the production limit, it will, ah – if – if – if we didn't have that limit there, um, and they produced more, it could result in additional traffic movements.
25

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm.

30 MR WITHERDIN: So we like to, um, make sure we have a control on the – the overall, ah, amount of production on that site.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Yeah. No, that's sensible, because it could be that the automated equipment or production increases – you know, productivity increases
35 lead to greater production from the same plant. Um, and that perhaps could be an issue. Under that – so how would this work? If they wished to – to increase production, they would have to come back to the Department with that? Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.
40

PROF BARLOW: Good. Okay.

MR WITHERDIN: They'd seek a modification to increase the production limit. And we'd have to assess that on its merits.
45

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. I guess the next one is the sewerage plant – the sewerage plant and, um – you have had a look at that, too, have you? So they would – before they proceeded, they needed to seek approval from the panel for the council?

5 MR WITHERDIN: That's right.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. And that would be usual, wouldn't it, in this situation, if they're going to - - -

10 MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: But – did you – in your inspection – not this plant because it doesn't exist, but another one – um, are there considerable effluent issues at a production plant other than the substrate production plant?

15

MR WITHERDIN: Ah - - -

PROF BARLOW: It's all enclosed and - - -

20 MR WITHERDIN: Yeah. So the effluent, ah, that it – this, ah, condition in particular talks to is effluent from employees working on the site.

PROF BARLOW: Oh, is it? So it's - - -

25 MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

PROF BARLOW: - - - really just the - - -

MR WITHERDIN: It's an onsite sewerage management system.

30

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: And, ah, the approval for such a system is governed by, um, the Local Government Act.

35

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: And, ah, the Council administer those approvals. And, um, we've sought that the proponent provide those details to Council as a part of the approval process.

40

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm. Yeah. Have you got any questions about the noise management plan, um - - -

45 MR WOODLAND: No.

PROF BARLOW: No? It seemed to be, um, thoroughly done and And then we move to a vegetation plan. Ah, and they just have to report on the trees they need to remove, it seems. Yeah. Is that – that’s the usual provision, isn’t it?

5 MR WITHERDIN: Ah, so this condition’s been strengthened, basically, to, ah, pick up on all the recommendations that have been, um, provided within their, um, updated flora and fauna assessment report. Um, it also looks to manage that particular plant species that we were talking about and APZs.

10 PROF BARLOW: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Um - - -

15 MR WOODLAND: And presumably, this is a consequence of having a greater site coverage at the building?

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

20 PROF BARLOW: Mmm. So what actually happens, um, um – oh, yeah, “Any fauna found must be relocated.” I’m presuming that just happens down to the back of the block, does it? Um - - -

MR WITHERDIN: Ah, yes. So - - -

25 PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: - - - there – there is, um – for example, there’s the requirement there with the, um – any trees scheduled, ah, for removal, they must be cut up into two to six metre-lengths and relocated to – into the conservation area.

30 PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: And that’s towards the west of the site, where the remnant vegetation is.

35 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: And that’s going to be, um, conserved. And that will provide, um, you know, additional habitat for fauna.

40 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Mmm. And any fauna that happens to be on the site that will be disturbed will be just moved, will it, presumably? Yeah, presuming that’s snakes and - - -

45 MR WITHERDIN: Ah, yes. Ah, I guess the most important point here is that, ah, the development site is largely cleared.

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah, that's right.

5 MR WITHERDIN: Ah, so – yep. The Department's not, ah, expecting any significant fauna impacts associated with developing this part of the site.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. We move, then, to, well, the visual amenity. And I think we've discussed this, unless you have - - -

10

MR WOODLAND: Mmhmm. No.

PROF BARLOW: - - - any more questions on it. I – I don't have any more questions Ah, and with exception, that – you know, there – there is a
15 recommendation condition that they get underway quickly with that be minimised.

MR WITHERDIN: Yep.

20 PROF BARLOW: Shall we move, then, to car parking? Um, and have you got any real questions about car parking?

MR WOODLAND: Oh, we just noted that this – this condition talked about some flexibility around the car parking requirements as the development proceed through
25 certain stages. And I take it this was in the original condition. And this has just been strengthened but putting the – placing the word “must”; is that correct?

MR WITHERDIN: Ah, yes - - -

30 MR WOODLAND: And also, referring - - -

MR WITHERDIN: - - - so that is - - -

MR WOODLAND: - - - to stage 2.

35

MR WITHERDIN: Yes. So that's, ah, an original condition, um, which is attached to the original approval. Um, and it has just been strengthened, um, adding the word “must”. Ah, and just clarifying that it, ah, must be submitted to the satisfaction of the secretary prior to the commencement of the construction works in stage 2.

40

MR WOODLAND: Mmhmm. So this is envisaging that there may be different requirements as the proposal is constructed?

MR WITHERDIN: Yep. So it's – it's basically requiring a study to be provided, to
45 the satisfaction of the secretary.

MR WOODLAND: Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, and that study will provide, ah, some further details about car parking demand and how many spaces will be required.

MR WOODLAND: Mmhmm.

5

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Yeah. And how will that work? It may be covered in your condition here, but clearly it's going to be evolve as the production facility ramps up. Um, so there will be an overall traffic management plan that will cover it. What will happen as a – at full operation, or will it be staged?

10

MR WITHERDIN: Ah, so the – the, um, development will be, um, undertaken in stages.

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm.

15

MR WITHERDIN: So, ah, there'll be a certain amount of traffic and car parking demand - - -

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

20

MR WITHERDIN: - - - associated with, ah, those stages.

PROF BARLOW: Mmhmm.

25

MR WITHERDIN: Um, so these, ah, management plans, um, have to detail how that will roll out over time.

PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Yeah. Well, that's good. That's – clearly, you probably can't have final operational plan when you're only doing stage 1. Okay. I think we've been through bushfire protection.

30

MR WOODLAND: Mmhmm. Yes.

PROF BARLOW: And I don't think we need to delve into that any further. So I guess the other question about this is – this – and you'll make it explicit in your report – that this modification only pertains to the mushroom farm?

35

MR WITHERDIN: It does.

40

PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: So the original approval included, um, a substrate site at a different location.

45

PROF BARLOW: Mmm. Mmm.

MR WITHERDIN: And then this mushroom farm – this modification only relates to the mushroom farm.

5 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. And are there any other modifications in the works, or
- - -

MR WITHERDIN: Um - - -

10 PROF BARLOW: Regarding the mushroom farm? Because we're only dealing
with the mushroom farm.

MR WITHERDIN: Not to my knowledge. There is another team that deals with industry projects.

15 PROF BARLOW: Yeah. Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: Um, I'd have to confirm with them. But not to my knowledge.

20 PROF BARLOW: Yeah.

MR WITHERDIN: This is the only one.

PROF BARLOW: All right. Um, Dennis, do you have any more questions

25 MR WOODLAND: No.

PROF BARLOW: Well, I think we're just about done, actually. Um, so thanks very much for coming, Anthony - - -

30 MR WITHERDIN: No worries. Our pleasure.

PROF BARLOW: - - - and, ah, Sylvia. And I think that's the end of the transcript. Thank you very much.

35

MATTER ADJOURNED at 3.47 pm INDEFINITELY