

Please find the submission from **Ultimo Village Voice**, representing the Ultimo community, regarding the current proposal to expand the Digi Data Centre in Harris Street Ultimo.

The main objections are as follows:

1. Environmental impact

This impact includes loss of sunlight and sky, overshadowing, pollution from fumes, noise pollution,

A) Power. Why does this proposal not include solar panels? The NSW government is greatly increasing density across Sydney and particularly on the Pyrmont Ultimo peninsula. This building is already a massive user of electricity and when power is in great demand Ausgrid calls upon the generators to reduce strain on Sydney's power grid. It is totally unacceptable for a proposal using so much power not to include a solar panels. Equinix Data Centre in Melbourne has implemented rooftop solar power panels and they also have them in Canberra, Sydney and Brisbane. **Why is there nothing in this proposal that would help offset the massive energy usage. Why no renewable energy target?**

B i) Noise: The conclusions drawn by White Pulse Noise assessment re generator noise from the site suggest that the 198hrs per year that the generators will be operating for testing, will be below the 200hr per year threshold, and therefore Environment Protection Authority licence (POEO act 97) will be unnecessary. Yet they also identify the possibility that generators *could run* for an up to 30 hrs per year in certain circumstances. This would put it over the threshold so it should require an EPA licence.

This proposal must be required to have an EPA licence.

Noise from rapidly expanding data centres in NSW presents a significant threat to urban wildlife by fundamentally disrupting their critical ecological functions. This continuous anthropogenic noise, a direct consequence of data centre operations, severely impairs communication pathways essential for species survival. It masks vital calls for mating, territorial defence, and predator warnings, leading to reduced reproductive success, fragmented populations, and increased vulnerability. Beyond communication, chronic noise exposure induces physiological stress, weakens immune responses, and compels animals to alter their foraging and habitat use, effectively displacing them from otherwise suitable environments.

To protect urban biodiversity, the NSW Government must urgently integrate data centre noise's ecological impacts into the Ultimo data centre and all NSW data centre planning, mandating wildlife-focused acoustic assessments and setting strict, ecologically sensitive emission standards.

B ii) Emissions: The same criteria apply to generator emissions - nitrogen dioxide and nitric oxide. As stated, if the plant runs less than 200 hrs per year it is exempt from an Environment Protection Licence.

The submission refers to a worst-case scenario which is incomplete as it does not include the emissions and noise from the 66 generators. These are the major issue. This worst case scenario was considered so unlikely that it was dismissed. It must not be dismissed. We know that in 2024 during a serious heatwave AUSGRID

directed Global Switch to run on their generator power to take strain off Sydney's power grid.

How will the operators guarantee to the community that these running times will not be exceeded? Why is a worst-case scenario dismissed?

C) Overshadowing and loss of amenity: The current building already overshadows much of the Ultimo Heritage Conservation Zone. The proposal shows some visual impacts in Bulwara Road, Fig St Park, but not, for example, Ada Place which is a street entirely of residential properties and a small park. These homes, as well as those on the western side of Bulwara Road, will be greatly overshadowed with loss of light, and sky. It may "ensure minimal solar impact to residential development" located to the south of the site" but it will certainly *not* ensure it to homes *west* of the site.

Please provide a more detailed shadow diagram indicating the effect of the building on the properties and park directly west of the building.

2. Inaccuracies in the Proposal

A) The proposal states that there was notification to community groups of consultation opportunities. The Ultimo community received letters from the State Government in our letterboxes, Ultimo Village Voice received notification from the government via email on 1st May 2025. **Yet we received no notification of the supposed 'community consultation' either via email or through our letterboxes.** No postcard was seen in Ultimo by our members.

B) The proposal misidentifies residential apartments as being commercial properties including:

- R12 is Goldsbrough Apartment block contains 538 apartments + some office spaces
- R13 is part residential
- R10 - whole block is residential
- Jones St between William Henry + Harbour Mill apartments is mainly residential.