

Attachment A

ISSUES	RESPONSE
NSW Department of Planning	
<p>The Proponent is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide information on the arrangements for containing contaminated fire fighting water in the case of a fire involving inks; update the base leak frequency information based on the size of valves to which the information applies, and provide clarification on if the frequency used was total frequency or specific for a certain size; and undertake a revised risk assessment of fire in the toluene storage bund in the event of a leak or rupture of a storage tank. 	<p>Section 2.1 of the Response to Submissions and the letter prepared by Sherpa Consulting (see Attachment B) demonstrates that the potential hazards identified in the Department's letter can be adequately addressed.</p>
<p>The Department has requested the Proponent to quantify the proposed reduction in greenhouse gas emissions that would be achieved by the proposed energy efficiency measures.</p>	<p>See Section 2.2 of the Response to Submissions.</p>
NSW Ministry of Transport (MoT)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent's justification for the variance to the Liverpool DCP Car Parking Provision rate is fully supported. A further reduction is encouraged. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent should provide appropriate secure bike storage and cyclist amenities. 	<p>The proposed development includes these facilities as detailed in Section 4.4.4 of the EAR and in Figure 17.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent's intention to adjust the boundary of the Southern Sydney Freight Line and intention to develop a Travel Demand Strategy (TDS) was supported. MoT recommended the strategy include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the use of car share schemes for employees; potential assistance for employees to access work by public transport through salary package options and other incentives; preparation of a Travel Access Guide (TAG); and the provision of adequate and secure bicycle storage and cyclist amenities. 	<p>IPMG had previously committed to incorporate most of the recommended MoT initiatives in its TDS and will consider other initiatives when preparing the final TDS.</p> <p>IPMG will also aim to achieve the 25% journey to work mode share goal.</p>

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Sydney Water	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is located within the 400m Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) buffer zone which will result in people being exposed to odour, and therefore recommends that dining areas shall be fully enclosed with appropriate ventilation systems incorporated and consideration given to any other outdoor staff amenity areas. 	<p>It should be clarified that any reference to a 'Café' on the plans refers to an 'outdoor eating area' where no food is produced or sold. While the proposed outdoor eating area is approximately 320m from the STP boundary the recommendation to enclose the area is not considered appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed staff outdoor eating area will not function as a commercial café or staff canteen. No food will be produced or sold from the café and it will only be used intermittently by staff during breaks. It is located on the northern side of building which is orientated away from the STP and buffered by the significant building mass of the IPMG facility. It achieves the Liverpool Development Control Plan 2008 Section 7.7(b) objective to provide outdoor amenity areas for staff on industrial sites. It provides a desirable recreation area for the staff of the printing facility.
RailCorp	
<p>RailCorp recommended the following conditions of consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Risk Assessment/Management Plan and detailed Safe Work Method Statements (SWMS) for the proposed works are to be submitted to RailCorp for review and comment prior to any road works (sic) commencing. 	<p>Noted. No road works were proposed as part of the Project Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No metal ladders, tapes, scaffolding and plant/machinery, or conductive material are to be used within 6 horizontal metres of any live electrical equipment. This applies to the train pantographs and 1500V catenary, contract and pull-off wires of the adjacent tracks, and to any high voltage aerial supplies within or adjacent to the rail corridor. Not metal ladders are to be used within the rail corridor. 	<p>Noted. The western wall of the development is approximately 10 metres from the site boundary and considerably further to the train line (see Figure 7 of the EAR). Therefore there is no risk of any metal ladders, tapes, scaffolding and plant/machinery, or conductive material being used within 6 metres of any live electrical equipment.</p>

ISSUES	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Applicant is to procure a report on the Electrolysis Risk to the development from stray currents, and the measures that will be taken to control that risk. The Applicant is advised to consult an Electrolysis expert. The expert's report must be submitted to RailCorp for review by the Senior Electrolysis Engineer or nominated Electrolysis Section personnel. 	<p>As detailed in Section 6.1 of the EAR, electrolysis was not considered an issue as the building closest to the railway is an existing structure and the new development is sufficiently distant from the corridor to not be affected by electrolysis.</p> <p>Despite this the proponent will consider the potential effects of stray electrical currents and electrolysis in the design of the development and will provide an Electrolysis Risk Report, prepared by a specialist consultant, to RailCorp prior to commencement of construction.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No crane or other aerial equipment is to be operated with the potential to reach over the rail corridor. The applicant is required to submit to RailCorp a plan showing all craneage and other aerial operations for the development. 	<p>Noted. As detailed in Section 4.2 and Figure 15 of the EAR, no crane or other aerial equipment with the potential to reach over the corridor is proposed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to the commencement of any works along Bellevue Street (sic) the Applicant is required to obtain Rail Corp's requirements in relation to fencing along the common boundary with the Rail Corridor. 	<p>Not applicable. The proposal retains the existing fencing along the corridor. Bellevue Street does not apply to this site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proponent must submit any proposals to RailCorp for the use of lights, signs and reflective materials. 	<p>Noted. No lights, signs or reflective materials are proposed near the rail corridor or along the western facade of the building facing the railway line.</p>
Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee (SRDAC)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed initiatives to encourage employee use of public transport are commended. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The plans submitted with the application do not provide details of the car parking and loading areas and therefore a detailed assessment of the internal arrangements could not be undertaken. 	<p>Noted. Plans detailing the car parking and loading areas were submitted with the application and are appended to Appendix M of the EAR.</p>

ISSUES	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking provision should be to Council's satisfaction. 	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Off-street parking associated with the development should be designed in accordance with AS2890.1 – 2004 and AS 2890.2 – 2002. 	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The swept path of the longest vehicle entering and existing the subject site, as well as manoeuvrability through the site, shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS. 	Noted. A swept path analysis demonstrating the proposals compliance with AUSTROADS was undertaken by Transport and Traffic Planning Associates and was appended to the Traffic Report (see Appendix M of the EAR)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Demolition Construction Traffic Management Plan should be submitted to Council prior to issue of construction certificate. 	Noted. The proponent has committed to preparing a Demolition Construction Management Plan as detailed in Section 8.5 of the EAR.
NSW Health	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is advisable to do a risk assessment of the catchment and likely quality of rainwater to ascertain what further treatment is required. 	Noted. The proponent will seek specialist advice to ensure that harvested rainwater meets required standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future redevelopment of Liverpool Hospital Campus will result in increased traffic flows on Scrivener Street. 	Noted. The proposal will result in an overall reduction in the amount of traffic compared to the existing operations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The early detection/warning systems and evacuation procedures should be fully assessed as part of the hazardous risk assessment and that sensitive receptors are fully considered as part of the assessment. 	<p>Early leak detection, fire detection and fire suppression systems will be incorporated into the design of the facility.</p> <p>An emergency plan is to be developed, that will account for 'notification of authorities and adjacent companies' (in accordance with section 2.10.2 of HIPAP 1 (DoP, 1993)). This will include mutually agreed contact arrangements.</p> <p>Sensitive receptors have been fully considered in the risk assessment and it was found that 'there were no events with the potential to affect... sensitive land uses', see Page 9 of the Preliminary Hazard Assessment report (Appendix Q).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise levels need to be within acceptable limits to sensitive receptor sites. 	Section 7.7 of the EAR assessed the impact of noise on sensitive noise receptors in the locality and found that the development will be within acceptable limits.

ISSUES	RESPONSE
<p>Resident 1</p> <p>R1 was concerned about the potential for increased noise levels in particular on their horses, as a result of the movement of heavy vehicles and the proposed 24 hour operation of the facility. R1 suggested a range of measures to minimise noise levels on residents.</p> <p>R1 was also concerned by dangerous chemical emissions.</p>	<p>R1's concerns regarding truck noise are addressed in Section 2.3 of the Response to Submissions.</p> <p>The chemical emissions produced by the facility are well under the EPA regulatory limits as detailed in Air Quality Assessment prepared by Stephenson Environmental Management Australia (see Appendix N and Section 7.10 of the EAR).</p>
<p>Resident 2</p> <p>R2 was concerned about the potential for increased noise levels in particular on their horses, as a result of the movement of heavy vehicles and the proposed 24 hour operation of the facility.</p> <p>R2 requested that a curfew be adopted to restrict any loud activity after hours and that truck drivers be made aware of the impact that noise has on the surrounding residents.</p>	<p>R2's concerns regarding truck noise and suggested curfew are addressed in Section 2.3 of the Response to Submissions.</p>
<p>Resident 3</p> <p>R3 was concerned about the potential for increased noise levels and traffic, as a result of the movement of heavy vehicles and requested clear statements regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ truck movements ▪ testing of emergency systems ▪ forklift operations at night ▪ gate repairs and maintenance ▪ staff change over's at night <p>R3 also requested that the car park and Manning Street gates should not operate between 9pm and 6am and the 11pm traffic shift change should be via the Scrivener Street entrance.</p>	<p>R3's concerns regarding truck noise, traffic and suggested curfew are addressed in Section 2.3 and 2.4 of the Response to Submissions.</p>

ISSUES	RESPONSE
Resident 4	
<p>R4 was concerned that the facility will increase traffic flows which will make it harder for horses and staff to cross Manning Street safely.</p> <p>R4 requested that flashing lights or a designated horse crossing be installed.</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 7.8 of the EAR and 2.4 of the Response to Submission, the proposed development will result in a reduction in the amount of traffic when compared to the previous facility and therefore reduce the potential for a horse related incident.</p> <p>IPMG will incorporate a set of protocols into site induction, contractor (including driver) induction and the construction tender to deal with potential noise, speeding, and potential 'hoon-like' behaviour on the roads surrounding the site.</p> <p>IPMG would support safety measures implemented by Liverpool Council in the area.</p>