



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-1074805

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: GAZCORP INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

PANEL: **CHRIS WILSON (CHAIR)**
WENDY LEWIN
PROFESSOR CHRIS FELL AM

PANEL ASSISTING: **GEORGIA SEDGMEN**
BRAD JAMES
CALLUM FIRTH

DEPARTMENT: **CHRIS RITCHIE**
BRUCE ZHANG

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

DATE: **10.35 AM, THURSDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 2019**

MR C. WILSON: Okay. Shall we commence? Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal People. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting
5 today. Gazcorp Proprietary Limited, the applicant, has lodged a State Significant Development application seeking approval to establish an industrial warehouse estate, known as the Gazcorp Industrial Estate, at 813 to 913 Wallgrove Road, Horsley Park, within the Western Sydney Employment Area and Fairfield Local Government Area. My name's Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel.
10 Joining me is my fellow commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Professor Chris Fell. The other attendees of the meeting are Brad James and Callum Firth from the Commission Secretariat, and Georgia Sedgmen from Mecone – Mecone Urban Planning - - -

15 MS G. SEDGMEN: Mecone.

MR WILSON: Mecone. Sorry. And Development who are assisting the Secretariat. 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
20 produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If
25 you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer it, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will
30 now begin. Chris, thank you very much for coming. We understand that you've, ah, produced presentation for – for today, so I guess we'll throw it over to you.

MR C. RITCHIE: Sure. So to introduce myself, so I'm Chris Ritchie, the Director of Industry Assessments, and with me today is Bruce Zhang, who's a senior planner
35 that works in my team. Bruce has been helping me the last, ah, sort of three weeks to finalise the recommendation and get it over to the IPC. A lot of the planners that have worked on this before are no longer here, so that's unfortunate, but Bruce has been helping out. What I might do, in terms of presenting our report, if we just present one of the first slides or two, just to sort of orientate where we are, and what I
40 want to do is – is touch on what the Western Sydney Employment Area is about, a little bit about – around the background to the employment area, and to touch on some challenges, ah, that exist, which are highlighted through some of the assessment work that we do.

45 So the Western Sydney Employment Area actually commenced some time ago in the northern part of that image there, around where the Australia's Wonderland used to

be on that northern part near the M4 and near the Wallgrove Road. The idea of the – I think it was set at 59 at the time was to try and consolidate a lot of large lots for industrial warehouse and employment generating development. And when the M7 road was constructed, it kind of opened up the door to a lot of activity. So that employment area over time has grown quite significantly and it's ended up in 2004, I think it was, with the Western Sydney Employment Area SEPP. So going back at the day there was – I'm not sure if there's a pointer on this.

MR: I can grab one.

MR RITCHIE: So you had the northern part which was the employment hub – Western Sydney employment hub. To the west you had the Erskine Park Employment Area which I might just try - - -

MR JAMES: Maybe one with the mouse.

MR RITCHIE: Okay. Can you see that on the screen.

MR: Yeah.

MR RITCHIE: Okay. So the hub kind of started up here to start with. Then you had what was called the Erskine Park Employment Area in in here. Then I think in about 2004 the hub turned into the Western Sydney Employment Area so they basically encapsulated all of this area here, went south along here, along the bottom of the – I think it's the CSR quarry, and along the bottom of what we know now as the Gazcorp site which is here. There are about 10 – eight or 10 precincts. There's other parts of the Western Sydney Employment Area outside this map so there's one there, there's some more further to the – to the east. And over time you can see that it has rapidly developed.

And one of those first challenges that we have is that given the road infrastructure work that's there there's a lot of interest in land; aspects of it do develop quite quickly. And one of the challenges we have is always that infrastructure catch-up in terms of roads and road design and road development. So from the inception of when I first started doing these projects, some of that infrastructure work was always a key issue in – in delivering those projects. The Western Sydney Employment Area is rapidly filling. They are looking at expanding that area but that's still being looked at. In the context of what we know as the LUIIP or the land use infrastructure planning that's been done around the aerotropolis.

So there's still a bit of work being done in terms of the delineating the boundary of the aerotropolis and the future WSEA. So our site at the moment, which we're talking about, is the Gazcorp site here. It's bordered by the pipeline that runs from Warragamba Dam to Prospect Reservoir to the – to the east. We've got the M7 and Wallgrove Road that run along the eastern boundary and you have a couple of creeks around. You've got Ropes Creek along here. One of the other issues that we have is

that in this part of the Western Sydney Employment Area there's a lot of different council boundaries quite close to each other. So while we're in Fairfield here, across the way over here is Penrith and just up over here is Blacktown. So we're kind of on a bit of a boundary with a number of local government areas. And I know in terms
5 of one of the issues you want to touch on is section 94 and we can touch on that issue as we go through the assessment.

Touching on one of those first issues that we had, and the reason where there's been some delay on this, and you would have seen that through our assessment, related to
10 road access infrastructure. Now, while the proposal, when it was original submitted – I'm not sure if there's a closer image, Bruce. Originally, the application actually had an access way coming through here. Just to sort of clarify, the project is a stage 1 DA with a concept. So the whole concept area is this here. But the first stage
15 physical activity is actually this building here, and also the proposed access to the site. Like a lot of areas in the WSEA, a lot of the projects are done in this fashion. There is a large staged development part which is the physical works you're building and then there's a conceptual envelope for the other components.

So in this particular project, the trigger for it to be SSD was this large building here.
20 And the only physical works will be this building plus access into the site and some infrastructure works. Going back to the first key issue which is around transport and access, originally there was a proposal to have access through here but also there is a larger network – road network infrastructure that's going on and that related to the Southern Link Road network. Now, while that was identified in the Western Sydney
25 Employment Area SEPP there – there has been a lot more detailed design work that has been done by Transport New South Wales around the location of that, and also the area that they're looking at in terms of the length of that road.

So it originally started only being Wallgrove Road to the west, but now it's going all
30 the way to Mamre Road so there's a more detailed analysis as to the alignment of that road. Now, that alignment issue had resulted in some delays in our assessment which we have outlined in the report and that has meant that we've had to come up with a – quite a flexible arrangement through the VPA. Now, the reason why we do have VPAs in the Western Sydney Employment Area is primarily it relates to the
35 contribution to regional infrastructure works. So if you go back to the Western Sydney Employment Area map, there is a network of road which we see as being quite critical which we deem as being regional roads.

And any development that does occur in that location – whether we assess it or
40 council assess it, there has to be a contribution to those regional roads – not to local roads, but only to the regional road network, and the way we do that, because there's no SIC contribution plan, is through a VPA, and that's in around – I think it's about 185 to \$193,000 per developable hectare. And that's managed by an infrastructure contribution scheme that we have in the department, and we can't proceed on
45 determining or recommending a determination until we get an internal satisfactory arrangement certificate saying that those issues have been addressed. So in the context of this site, that took some time to sort out.

MR WILSON: That's similar to a SIC, though, isn't it?

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

5 MR WILSON:

MR RITCHIE: Yes, it's equivalent, yes. Yes. And the reason why it took some time is – a number of reasons. One is the alignment is still being worked out. I think it's September. RMS are firming up its orientation or location. The other issue, which I won't go into in a lot of detail, relates to who are the roads authority for these roads, and so the option that we have got here is that Gazcorp has proposed its own access, which is a sacrificial – so there's two options. They can either align themselves with the link road once it's known and they can build part of that as a works-in-kind – so your contributions are either works-in-kind or an equivalent amount in financial contributions.

10
15

In this instance, there's the VPA set up to allow both – to allow facilitation of the project, and that internal road there will be an internal road that Gazcorp will just build themselves and maintain themselves. So the VPA allows either works-in-kind to the standard of a road or an interim access that they will build. Either way, there will be signalised intersection of the access road with Wallgrove Road, and what has meant is this intersection road here has actually been removed, because what RMS do not want is signalised lights in close proximity to each other along Wallgrove Road.

20
25

So the VPA has basically allowed that. That has meant that we been able to finalise our assessment, which is why we've presented it here. So that was probably the main key issue, and one of the broader issues about why that design has taken some time too is as you head the west, you'd start getting to a couple of creeks, and it comes down to – designed to cross those creeks, which actually flood quite a bit during wet periods of time. So that's – I suppose that was one of the questions you had – was around the VPA and the contributions - - -

30

MR WILSON: Just one more - - -

35

MR RITCHIE: - - - and the plan.

MR WILSON: - - - question on - - -

40 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - the VPA.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

45

MR WILSON: It was publically exhibited - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - before it was executed.

5 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: Is it a public document?

10 MR RITCHIE: Well, it was notified. I'd say it should be.

MR WILSON: It would be nice to get a copy if that's - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes.

15 MR WILSON: - - - the case. That's all.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Well, it's referred to in a consent, so I'm assuming – I think it's okay to provide - - -

20 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: They are, as you say, notified, and once they're notified, then they're executed. Moving on to some other issues – so some of the other challenges that we have or issues that arise, particularly on the fringes of the WSEA, is the
25 interface it can have with some residential or rural residential areas. So in terms of this project, there is a couple of issues that we had to look at carefully, visual issues being one, and also noise issues and lighting impact being another. So you can see to the south – and the predominant submissions that we received – around about 31 – were from residents to the south of the site. Issues raised primarily related to noise,
30 traffic and visual.

Bearing in mind that we are looking at detail of the stage 1 aspect, and there were some things that we looked at in terms of managing the potential visual impacts. To the boundary of that site, which you can't quite see, there is actually a transmission
35 line that runs along here, and there's a staunch and it sits roughly around about there, and that, to a degree, limited some of that visual mitigation measures that we could do, because there are some guidelines around what you can do under transmission lines. You can't put big trees. One thing that we were able to do is have the project actually move a little bit to the east to get to limit it's clearing of some of this
40 vegetation and retaining some of this vegetation along the boundary, which would allow some visual amenity relief, but also we went through more vegetation detail design to put some lower planting at the front, but also some more trees, which were similar trees to what's there, along more to the eastern side where the existing trees weren't.

45

And as you can see from there, there is quite a separation. Some of those trees that are located on the part of Ropes Creek can be maintained, but there's also a really

big staunch, and it's located there as well. So there were some limitations on what we could do. There's also going to be a wall – like, a noise-wall put along the boundary as well and vegetated planting where we can.

5 MR WILSON: Chris, just one question that we had. We're just trying to understand where the easement is for – the corridor is for - - -

MR RITCHIE: The freight line?

10 MR WILSON: - - - Western Sydney Freight Line.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So we're – we're actually plan on that, and that's another thing that raises some competing issues in terms – there's a freight line that's actually proposed along that boundary. So we do have a plan, which - - -

15

MR WILSON: Was it in - - -

MR RITCHIE: - - - we probably didn't send. We actually have it in here.

20 MR WILSON: Okay. Was it our assessment package? I didn't think it was.

MR RITCHIE: Did you bring that plan?

MR WILSON: Okay. That's okay.

25

MR RITCHIE: No, I have a large plan, which I brought.

MR WILSON: Okay.

30 MR RITCHIE: So on figure – looks like figure 5 – figure 5 of our report – but we did bring a large A3 to show you. There's a zoomed out image.

MR WILSON: Oh, I've got you.

35 MR RITCHIE: So with

MR WILSON: Just go back to that one where you had the – thanks, Chris.

MR RITCHIE: And then – sorry, join these up.

40

MR WILSON: Oh, okay.

MR RITCHIE: If you join those up - - -

45 MR WILSON: Oh, I've got you.

MR RITCHIE: I think, from memory, that's the 60 wide – 60 metres wide and some – as the freight line moves slightly to the west, it will narrow down to maybe 40 metres, but I think from that onset, it's roughly 60 metres, but I – I can check that.

5 MR WILSON: No, that's okay. We just wanted to understand - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes.

10 MR WILSON: - - - where it was lying in context to the - - -

MR RITCHIE: And that – and that's the other - - -

MR WILSON: - - - transmission line.

15 MR RITCHIE: - - - I suppose, issue too – is there is that proposed freight line that runs through there. Being when – when I went out on site as well, one of the other issues from a visual point of view is there's actually a very high knoll, for want of a better word – mound right here, so that will provide some visual relief for some of those other future stages of the project, but in the way the consent structured those
20 future envelopes that you would have seen – are subject to separate applications through – through the relevant consent authority and there are issue – requirements in there that we identified to say, "Look, future would have to also look at potential amenity issues or – or visual issues." When I actually went out there, I was actually quite surprised that is. That's a very high point. You wouldn't think it's there, but
25 it's a very high point in that part of Western Sydney.

MR WILSON: But this must have – this must have occurred – this similar situation must have occurred in other boundary areas of the – of the Western Sydney employment area.

30 MR RITCHIE: Yes. So they're – we had – another similar site that I had was a long Horsley Park, which was roughly, maybe, half a kilometre to the west. The – similarly, had boundary issues here, but not – he was a bit more – there was a bit more intense residential development. He had a – had a residential approved
35 subdivision to the south. There was existing properties here. They're actually quite elevated, looking over the site, compared to here. I mean, here – it is a bit more rural in this location. One of the properties here, I think it's a piggery. I think it's roughly here, and there's some poultry farms too on – on this side as well.

40 PROF FELL: Okay. Thank you. There's quite a – plenty of civil work going to be done - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

45 PROF FELL: - - - on levelling the site.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

PROF FELL: Are you taking that into account then?

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes. So there's a – there's a – not quite a balance, but there is a close cut and fill amount that will – that will occur here.

5

PROF FELL: Yes, I noticed that. Yes.

MR RITCHIE: And what they do propose to do – as I was mentioning that high point here, they do propose to utilise that to some degree in terms of mitigating noise and – and visual, but a lot of these sites in Western Sydney do require quite a fair bit of civil work to enable the development plans to – to occur. Apart from that site there, which is quite high, it is relatively flat, particularly here where they are proposing to build, but there are – are conditions and issues that we've identified in here that I'll have to manage or address, and – and when you go out, there is a lot of activity. There's, you know, roadworks occurring. There's a potential freight line occurring. There's other projects that we've determined that are underway and being constructed.

MR WILSON: Is – is there timing? Is there any timing provided by or given by the government in relation to the delivery of the Western Sydney freight line.

20

MR RITCHIE: I can take that on notice and get back to you.

MR WILSON: Thanks.

25

MR RITCHIE: But certainly a lot of the other sites I've dealt with to the west, we've had to account for setbacks to enable that freight line to occur, particularly as it – as you head a bit more to the west, it gets a lot closer to the pipeline and things like the Oakdale West project, which we're finalising our assessment. We've had to make sure that development was off that easement.

30

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR RITCHIE: So from a – a noise point of view, that's – that's another issue, given that's relatively close. We looked at that quite carefully from a – a stage DA, but also from a concept or envelope point of view. We were satisfied in terms that noise can be managed appropriately. There – as I mentioned before, there is an acoustic wall that we've asked to put in and put some landscaping there. You can see that red line there is the three metre acoustic wall and there is some natural setback with that transmission line easement that's there as well and the – the properties are roughly 130 odd metres from the – from the actual site itself.

40

A lot of the loading that you do get as a noise source are located on the boundary. They're not on the side of the building facing the residents and that's where you often get your – your noise from with these facilities. It's the trucks reversing and pallet jacks bouncing as they – as they, sort of, operate and being located there does allow, sort of, further separation from those residents as well. There's conditions in

45

there about meeting noise requirements and ongoing requirements as – as each DA comes up to – to demonstrate that that envelope is still the same.

5 In terms of biodiversity issues, there is some clearing that will occur – some EECs on site, roughly 14 hectares. As I mentioned before, moving slightly out – or part of the right pairing corridor as reduced some of that clearing, but there is a need in the conditions, which they've indicated will be addressed through their biodiversity assessments that all biodiversity credits will be met and achieved to address that clearing on site. So there are requirements needed to meet those biodiversity - - -

10 PROF FELL: They – they were seeking exemption on some of those.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

15 PROF FELL: Your feeling is - - -

MR RITCHIE: So we didn't agree to that. So there will be biodiversity credit offsetting required for their clearing.

20 PROF FELL: All of it?

MR WILSON: All of it.

25 PROF FELL: All of it. That's fine.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. Then in terms of contributions – now, we touched on the SIC, which is the regional-based contribution. The – on the agenda, there's some questions around the local contribution. I am going to go away and look at that in more detail, because as I mentioned before, in – in the Western Sydney employment area, you have a number of different council areas located nearby. Penrith, for instance, don't have – which is just over the other side of the creek – don't have a contributions plan. Blacktown hadn't had one for a while. I'm not sure if they've got one.

35 So I just want to go back and check this recommendation. I think verbally we have indicated to the applicant that we'll be requiring contributions for the stage 1. In terms of the conceptual component, you can't levy that, because there's actually no physical work related to those contributions, but the future assessment requirements do indicate that they will have to address that with council, but we will take that point away and look at the stage 1, because, from memory, our intention was that we would levy for that as well.

40 PROF FELL: They were arguing because they have to construct this road, they shouldn't be paying us much.

45 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

PROF FELL: You'll – you'll take that into account.

MR RITCHIE: We'll take that into account, because my memory is it's a 94A, which is based on a one per cent, so we'll – we'll look at that and come back.

5

MR WILSON: So just in terms of the VPA and the – and the contributions to the state, does that – what does that – okay, predominately roadworks, I presume?

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

10

MR WILSON: Are there other – like, does it cover storm water or – no?

MR RITCHIE: It's in – in Blacktown, for instance, where there's no stormwater connection, a lot of the applicants would deal with their own onsite detention - - -

15

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and it would be contributed towards that. In here, from memory, there are connections and uses of services, but the contributions here are only for the roadworks - - -

20

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: - - - because they're quite – they are quite expensive.

25

MR WILSON: My understanding is detention systems for each individual lot in this proposal.

PROF FELL: Yes.

30

MR WILSON: Okay. So that's

MR RITCHIE: We will go back and look at all that and come back. They're probably the same key issues for the project that we had. So visual, which we talked about; noise; the – the road access; the BPA; biodiversity. Is there any other particular questions that you had?

35

MR WILSON: We had a – we had a list of – of questions. We had a number of questions.

40

MR RITCHIE: It's all right.

MR WILSON: One around dangerous good, which, Chris, do you want to - - -

45

PROF FELL: Yes. I – I'm conscious that these are warehouses - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

PROF FELL: - - - and although there are requirements, and you've suggested a condition, I'm concerned that if there is a - a loss of stuff, how will they handle the effect, because it's an elevated site. You've got Reedy Creek there - Sydney Catchment - the whole shooting match. The EIS didn't really address that all that well.

MR WILSON: We - we note you've got a condition, which - - -

MR RITCHIE: They'll be direct - - -

MR WILSON: Which is a standard condition where I understand - where you don't think - - -

MR RITCHIE: They'll be bunding requirement for - is that the one you mean?

MR WILSON: No, no, no. I - I guess we're just trying to understand whether or not the stage 1 warehouse is going to be used for dangerous goods at thresholds above the - at - well, at quantities above the threshold.

PROF FELL: If, in fact - - -

MR RITCHIE: I - - -

PROF FELL: If, in fact, you say it can't be used for dangerous goods, that could well solve our problems - - -

MR RITCHIE: Right.

PROF FELL: - - - but what happens if there's a major spill of transport fuel?

MR RITCHIE: So there's two - I mean, I - I can come back and look at a consent in more details, but usually there's two - two aspects. There's a clear bunding requirement. If you are storing fuels, you've got to have appropriate bunding to - I think it's 110 per cent of the storage volume, but from a hazard or dangerous goods - - -

PROF FELL: You have to go through the - yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - I mean, in our assessment team are the - the hazard and risk advisors, where - this particular proposal is not proposing to store dangerous goods, from what we understand. Sometimes these warehouses do and they seek a modification to allow it or are proposing it as part of the DA, because even aerosols and things like that can exceed the - the threshold numbers and we do have some sites that only store spray cans and stuff like that.

PROF FELL: But at this stage suggest there's no - - -

MR RITCHIE: This one here, we – we don't understand it is, but an option is – if it's not already here is to put a condition in there saying you can't. That way that if they seek to, they'll have to come back and – and change and address those issues.

5 PROF FELL: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: So I – I'll just check the consent again.

10 MR WILSON: There – there is a condition in there - - -

MS SEDGMEN: There – there is, yes.

MR WILSON: There's a - - -

15 MS SEDGMEN: 82.

MR WILSON: There's a – there's a condition that says - - -

20 PROF FELL: A clever condition.

MR WILSON: - - - you can only store up to the threshold.

PROF FELL: Yes.

25 MR RITCHIE: Yes, there you go.

MR WILSON: Yes.

30 MR RITCHIE: There you go.

MR WILSON: Okay.

PROF FELL: I - - -

35 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

PROF FELL: - - - guess my other question is if you have, basically, a spill on site
- - -

40 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

PROF FELL: Right, which is not to do with storage, how well does the system handle it?

45 MR RITCHIE: I might take that on notice and come back and explain that to you
- - -

PROF FELL: Please.

MR RITCHIE: - - - and – have to go back through the EIS, because I know from a –
if there's a fuel storage, they'll have to have the appropriate bunding, but I'll see
5 what other requirements that they're proposing need mitigation measures, and I'll
come back and address that.

MR WILSON: So if they do at some stage in the future want to store quantities
above the threshold, they then have to come and seek a modification and – and
10 include a preliminary hazard analysis and - - -

MR RITCHIE: They would have to do a PHA and - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.
15

MR RITCHIE: And we'll look at it from there and look at fire safety controls and
- - -

MR WILSON: Thank you.
20

PROF FELL: Wendy?

MS LEWIN: I think – well, my – my considerations were very much focused on the
association of the building, the setbacks and the transmission line easements, and
25 also in relation to that, the perimeter movement of trucks and if they're – if – if they
are, in fact, stationary and start up again – as they do – and that is a – a long term
parking, the – the issues that you identified in relation to loading – the – the, you
know, noise and – and – is going to be present in a similar sort of way, and that's
very much adjacent to the residential areas. Did you cover that?
30

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So when – so from a – a noise assessment point of view,
there's two ways to look at the transport affects. So one is once the truck comes on
site and there's loading activities and reversing – so you're looking at that from an
overall site operational noise impact point of view. When the truck leaves a site and
35 gets onto a – a road or a public road, then you look at it from a – a noise – a traffic
noise point of view and there are set criteria and you've got to remain within, say, 2
dBA of what's existing. When trucks are reversing on here and – and manoeuvring
and leaving the site, then that becomes part of your industrial noise. So those issues,
that's what we did look at as part of our noise assessment. So given that there is
40 some separation – so from roughly here down to the residents – there is a – quite a
bit of separation. There's also an acoustic wall going in through here, but when you
see this road here - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes. Yes.
45

MR RITCHIE: - - - that's, from what I would understand, would be to allow fire
trucks to come around. So the trucks want to be - - -

MR WILSON: You've got – you've got to have full perimeter access.

MR RITCHIE: Yes. So you've got to have, for fire reasons – I'm not sure there's a better figure, Bruce – you've got to allow perimeter access for emergency vehicles,
5 particularly for fires, but the trucks aren't intending to go all the way around.

MS LEWIN: So the graphic is not quite correct in that sense? It's showing - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.
10

MS LEWIN: - - - the similar sort of graphic for the trucks at the loading area and on the perimeter road. So it's not intended to be a - - -

MR RITCHIE: I – I can come back. I don't think it's intended to be - - -
15

MS LEWIN: Side use?

MR RITCHIE: Yes. I'll - - -

MS LEWIN: Okay.
20

MR RITCHIE: I'll confirm that

MS LEWIN: Okay.
25

MR WILSON: Just in terms of the controls, Chris - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: The controls are established in the – in the SEPP?
30

MR RITCHIE: For?

MR WILSON: Well, for the site.
35

MS LEWIN: Site – relevant - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON:
40

MR RITCHIE: So there are – so there are controls – some controls in terms of compatibility and the Western Sydney Employment Area SEPP, but from a – a noise point of view, there are policies around how you would assess any of those.
45

MR WILSON: Oh, yes. No, I understand that, but the – I guess more broadly, though, beyond – beyond the controls in the SEPP, what other controls are applicable to this site? Are there any other controls?

5 MR RITCHIE: There would be. I'm trying to follow your question – line of questioning. Is it around, I mean, you're, in terms of what you want to do on site, then that forms part of your – your assessment, so your look at what you're doing on site, what impacts there are, in terms of policies that apply. There are certain guidelines and policies that we will look at, in considering those controls, or those
10 impacts on – in terms of the project. In terms of the flow of vehicles, yes – I'll confirm that and come back.

MS LEWIN: Issues like site cover, percentage of site for landscape - - -

15 MR WILSON: Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - and so on.

MR RITCHIE: So in terms of the Western Sydney Employment Area, one of the
20 things that applicants need to do, as required by the SEPP, is come up with your development controls. So if no existing development control applies, the applicants have to come up with their own that apply. In this instance, there are controls around setbacks, there are controls around design, landscaping and a lot of the sites we are consistent with what Council would otherwise require. A lot of proponents like
25 Goodman make their controls similar. That way, when you go out to the employment area, because they've got a number of sites, they're looking consistent in terms of their setbacks and their requirements. So in terms of here, you have to have a development control, which they do – which we're holding them to. And also, future applications have to assess against those requirements.

30 PROF FELL: Could you say a couple of words about parking onsite and you've recommended a distinct drop in the number of parking lots. And they've agreed to this. But is that really going to work? Will there be enough transport here to - - -

35 MR RITCHIE: I might have to take that on notice and come back. But, generally, there's - - -

PROF FELL: Well, you can put an argument - - -

40 MR RITCHIE: - - - in terms of parking there's - - -

PROF FELL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - there's two things you look at. One is a – there's usually a
45 Council requirement.

PROF FELL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: And there's an RMS requirement.

PROF FELL: Yes.

5 MR RITCHIE: So in our assessment, we would compare against the two. And generally, we would look at or side with the RMS requirement. It's usually a bit lower.

PROF FELL: Yes.

10

MR RITCHIE: Because often what we find is that, generally speaking, is that Councils' parking requirements don't factor in you have shift changes over time. So Councils often require the total amount. Say, there's 300 employees, 300 parking spots. But at any one time, you're not going to have the total employment numbers. So - - -

15

PROF FELL: My principal concern was it's 24 hours operation.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

20

PROF FELL: - - - which means you've got all the shift workers.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

25 PROF FELL: Shift workers are not well served by public transport, generally.

MR RITCHIE: Not out here, particularly out here.

PROF FELL: And, therefore, you need a facility - - -

30

MR RITCHIE: Yes. But I'll take - - -

MR WILSON: But there's, but my understanding is, there's more than ample parking - there's, there's an excess of parking requirements. Like - - -

35

PROF FELL: Well, they've, they've put up 2000. It was reduced to about 1500 - - -

MR WILSON: - - - 1500, but the requirement - - -

40

PROF FELL: Mmm.

MR WILSON: - - - the RMS requirement, I think, it's assumption - - -

PROF FELL: Sorry, it was just a question, really.

45

MR WILSON: - - - it's assumption is - less.

MR RITCHIE: Is usually lower, yes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

5 MR RITCHIE: But I'll take that and come back. Yes.

MR WILSON: So just – just on that DCP. So they've submitted a DCP with their application, yes.

10 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: That DCP they've prepared.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

15

MR WILSON: Consistent with what would normally be accepted within the – the Western Sydney Employment Area.

MR RITCHIE: A lot of people do that, yes – yes.

20

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

25 MR WILSON: And you're satisfied that - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

30 MR WILSON: - - - this DCP is generally consistent with what's – what's applicable elsewhere?

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

35

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes.

MR WILSON: And then that'll be applied to any future applications will need to have regard to that - - -

40

MR RITCHIE: Correct.

MR WILSON: - - - DCP, so - - -

45 MR RITCHIE: Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. We need to look closer into DCP.

MR RITCHIE: And in there will be setbacks - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

5 MR RITCHIE: - - - landscaping, colour schemes.

MS LEWIN: Good. Good. Okay.

MR RITCHIE:

10

PROF FELL: Noise is highly quantitative, like, I might say noise assessment. Visual, I think, is less so - - -

MR RITCHIE: It's - - -

15

PROF FELL: - - - in my judgement.

MR RITCHIE: Mmm.

20

PROF FELL: How would this site compare with other developments that were in the area? In other words, the amount of aggrievement if you like?

MR RITCHIE: I – it's not as, not as much as I've had on other sites.

25

PROF FELL: That's all.

MR RITCHIE: Here – I think, one of the issues here is that a lot of the properties don't face directly. Other sites I've had people that were quite elevated looking over an estate. Not looking at just one building, but the whole - - -

30

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - 180-degree. Here you've also got some existing mature vegetation, which will assist. A lot of those properties actually do face away or different – not directly at the – the actual estate. And the fact that there's – there is a large easement there and between the stage one and the residencies that currently exist, there is a large stanchion, as well. Which are quite – they're like a transmission tower. They're actually quite large. Further, there is the – the potential freight line. And as the site will develop to the east there is a lot of topographic relief that will utilise – that the applicant will be utilising to address that, sort of, the – the more visual issues as the – the estate develops over time.

40

PROF FELL: Yes.

45

MR RITCHIE: We – as I was saying before, we did look at how we can try and – and soften that. But there is some restrictions because of those transmission lines. But we have, where we can, facilitated mature trees where we could, barriers that

address both visual, but noise as well, and also lower stuff where we're able to. Because TransGrid have some strict requirements around what you can do on their lines.

5 PROF FELL: Which is the rail corridor. Sorry, there's going to be a fair bit of civil work going on in the site preparation. I realise there are quite strong requirements with respect to storm water during civil work. I'm also very conscious of Reedy Creek as an area that needs to be carefully looked after. Be reasonably confident that the current requirements on civil work are good enough to do that.

10 MR RITCHIE: Well, in terms of what we've presented, we are confident that it's enough assessment was done and there's enough strong conditions we need to ensure that's managed properly. The other thing, too, is we have a very strong compliance function within the Department. So once decisions are made on projects, we do let
15 Compliance know that decisions have been done. And once we sign off on conditions that allow people to construct, we also let them know so that they could keep an eye on – on projects as they developed. There has on some other sites, we've had some close involvement with compliance, to ensure that the sites were done - - -

20 PROF FELL: Sure.

MR RITCHIE: - - - properly to – to manage any impact.

25 PROF FELL: Very good.

MR WILSON: Chris, just in terms of development of the site, overall, have you been given any timeframes in terms of what that might? No? Okay.

30 MR RITCHIE: No. I – in saying that, though, I'm - - -

MR WILSON: And what – what's your experience in relation to other sites?

35 MR RITCHIE: I would say; that would develop quite rapidly. There's, a lot of applicants we meet do talk about the need for space within the zone part of the Western Sydney Employment Area. There is a lot of discussions around trying to develop on the fringe. My experience would be that will develop quite rapidly. If you see the Erskine Park Employment Area to the – which is the western part of the WSEDA, that's developed in the space of eight to 10 years, quite quickly.
40 Goodman, in that Oakdale South has probably developed nearly half of that site, already, that was approved in 2015, from memory. Some projects haven't developed much at all. But the ones that are, have – also have approvals are developing quite rapidly. So I would say on that site in the next five to seven years that would be almost four.

45

MR WILSON: Okay. Thanks. Just one other question. The private road, so – so the applicant’s now going to build their own access into the site, which you discussed first, that design – was that considered a part of the assessment? So - - -

5 MR RITCHIE: So going – where they, where the site will access, so what will happen – so here, there’ll be a set of traffic lights.

MR WILSON: Yes.

10 MR RITCHIE: They will build 350 metres - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - of that road. And then they’ll build the rest of it down here.
15 The RMS, given that the RMS are the only authority that can okay the traffic lights
- - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

20 MR RITCHIE: - - - will need to be okay with this part of the road is what I – what I understand. But they’ll build; they will be responsible for building this part of the road.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay. So the impacts in relation to the RMS responsibility
25 that – that, that’s been – that’s been considered as part of the assessment. You’re clear in all that sort of – those issues?

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes. And – and as part of that VPA.

30 MR WILSON: Okay. But – but yes, I understand it’s part of the VPA. But the impacts associated - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes.

35 MR WILSON: - - - because - - -

MR RITCHIE: Oh, yes, yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. Because they – it wasn’t initially part of the application was
40 it?

MR RITCHIE: No. It had to change within that – with the change to the project, that’s right. It was initially the middle part of the site. And it had to move to the northern part.
45

MR WILSON: Okay. But all the storm water and all those issues, drainage, clearance of potential native veg and so forth - - -

MR RITCHIE: It's part, yes.

MR WILSON: - - - have all been considered as part of that?

5 MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes.

MR WILSON: Okay.

10 PROF FELL: This may be totally off the wall, but you're putting in something that will be around for 30 to 50 years. Transport mechanisms could well change. We could go much more electric, even crazy things like hydrogen if you're listening to the Mr Chief Scientist. Do you feel reasonably confident they can handle these, you know, power re-site and all this sort of thing?

15 MR RITCHIE: Ah - - -

PROF FELL: Or is that futuristic for you to look at now? Or you - - -

20 MR RITCHIE: Nothing is too futuristic, is it? I mean, they'll – they'll have to adapt over time, themselves. If you mean hydrogen fuel for trucks, is that what you mean?

PROF FELL: Yes, sure.

25 MR RITCHIE: They'll have to, if they're looking to - - -

PROF FELL: Put a DA in to - - -

30 MR RITCHIE: - - - if that makes it, you know, viable for them and they want to do that, then they'll have to, you know, potentially, you know, modify the project to facilitate that. But if it's in their interests, really, an interest – an issue for applicants to look at what they need to do to either save money or cost or time.

35 MS LEWIN: Thanks.

MR RITCHIE: But, certainly, there's no – while the application - - -

MS LEWIN: Ta.

40 MR RITCHIE: - - - or assessment and decision is – is done, people change things overtime to adapt or improve or modernise.

45 PROF FELL: All right. I guess my other question, again, off the wall – are there any overseas developments in warehousing that would suggest this is not an ideal development? I mean, structurally, you know – methods of arranging the whole process.

MR RITCHIE: I mean, I'm not an international expert.

PROF FELL: Yes.

5 MR RITCHIE: But a lot of people I do deal with, people like Vos do a lot of things overseas and are bringing some of that ideas here, in terms of their projects. And one of the things they're doing is, like, if you think of a – a mine site that has the trucks going down, they're looking to have warehouses that do the same. So multi-level warehouses.

10

PROF FELL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: And as spacing issue and some of the things we see is more high bay now because - - -

15

PROF FELL: Yes.

MR RITCHIE: - - - land is quite expensive, land's at a premium. So rather than spreading themselves out, people are going vertical. So we've done a Snack Brands facility that has a high bay for chips. So that's a lot of chips, it's 36 metres. We've done some other high bays because it allows a lot more automation and a lot more efficiency in how they operate. So there's a lot of other people talking to us around high bays. But you do have to be particular about where you locate them because they're quite visually prominent. So there's probably more things that are happening overseas.

25

But there are, certainly, people that are also developing overseas that are coming back with things that they see and do and see that work overseas and applying them here.

30

PROF FELL: And, fundamentally, a structure with this layout, if you like – independent operators - - -

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

35

PROF FELL: - - - makes reasonable sense.

MR RITCHIE: Yes.

40

PROF FELL: For the future.

MR RITCHIE: Yes, yes. And being conceptual, there's, once they commence the works, the consent will be activated. And those other sites will, you know, be for – for the market or for users that might have particular ideas.

45

PROF FELL: Adapt appropriately - - -

MR RITCHIE: That's right. That's right.

PROF FELL: Yes, thanks.

5 MR WILSON: And quite often, they're subject to modifications, aren't they?

MR RITCHIE: That's right. I mean - - -

MR WILSON: Because people come back with their own needs and - - -

10 MR RITCHIE: A lot. That's why it's - - -

PROF FELL: Forgive me for that.

15 MR RITCHIE: No, that's fine. That's fine.

MR WILSON: Anything else?

MS LEWIN: No, I'm happy with that.

20 MR WILSON: Have you got anything else to add, Chris?

MR RITCHIE: No, I think we're done.

25 MR WILSON: Thank you very much for coming. We appreciate it. So there's a number of questions, I guess, we just need to confirm that.

MATTER ADJOURNED at 11.17 am ACCORDINGLY