Submission on 12 Mars Road Data Centre (application number: SSD-82052708)

To: NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Re: Proposed Data Centre, 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West application number: SSD-82052708
Submission Type: Objection
Applicant: Goodman Property
Date of submission: 4 May 2026

1 Executive Summary

I object to the proposed data centre at 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West.

My family and I have lived in Lane Cove and Lane Cove West for nearly 10 years and have come to love what has been identified as *Australia's Most Liveable Community in 2025* following the results of the 2025 Australian Liveability Census.

The data centre proposal at 12 Mars Road represents a substantial industrial infrastructure development in close proximity to residential receivers, Lane Cove West Public School, community uses including Blackman Park, skatepark, tennis courts, scout hall, outdoor playing fields, Lane Cove Community Nursery, conservation zone and other sensitive land uses.

Although data centres may be permissible within the applicable zone, zoning permissibility is not, of itself sufficient justification for approval. It is understood that the consent authority is still required under section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to consider the likely impacts of the development, the suitability of the site, submissions made, and whether approval would be in the public interest.

This proposal will have significant and material impacts on me, my family, the locality and the broader community that will impact us for decades.

Further, the EIS is materially deficient because it relies on favourable assumptions, incomplete modelling, deferred mitigation, unresolved design inputs and inconsistent technical conclusions. It does not adequately assess credible worst-case scenarios, cumulative impacts, full generator operation, night-time outage conditions, sleep disturbance, diesel emissions, infrastructure capacity, visual impacts, construction impacts or the lived social impacts on nearby residents and community users.

The EIS contains significant internal inconsistencies, including conflicting information about building height, residential separation distances, employment numbers, power demand, diesel storage arrangements, tree canopy, sensitive receivers and the treatment of emergency generator operation. These are not minor drafting issues. They go directly to the reliability of the EIS and the ability of NSW Planning and the community to understand what is actually being proposed.

Furthermore, the EIS must seek to meet the *Environment and Planning Act 1979 (NSW*), specifically Section 4.15 Evaluation, including (1) (b) *the significant likely impacts of that development*; s4.15 (1) (c*) the suitability of the site for the development*, and also the Planning

Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) specific requirements. This EIS fails to meet these criteria.

I refer to Appendix A – SEARs Compliance Table. This appendix is concerning because it appears to present the EIS as having satisfied the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements, when a review of the supporting appendices relied upon in Appendix A suggests otherwise.

In several instances, Appendix A appears to direct the reader to other sections or technical appendices as evidence of compliance. However, when those referenced documents are reviewed, they do not adequately respond to the relevant SEARs requirements.

In effect, Appendix A, like much of the EIS documentation appears to create an impression of compliance, rather than demonstrating substantive compliance.

These contradictions, omissions and selective presentations are not isolated. They appear to form a recurring pattern throughout the EIS, creating a risk that the reader, the community and the consent authority may be misled as to the true nature, scale and likely impacts of the proposal.

For this reason and many other reasons set out in this submission, the application should be refused.

And to the contrary, this EIS lends itself to the opposite conclusion that the site is fundamentally unsuitable for a large-scale, 24-hour data centre involving substantial mechanical plant, diesel backup generation, continuous operational impacts and proximity to sensitive residential receivers and the wider community.

I have taken considerable care in preparing this submission. It is based on a detailed review of the EIS and raises a series of specific questions for both NSW Planning and the Applicant.

Put simply, the EIS documentation does not adequately answer or resolve the matters raised in this Submission. **It is therefore unacceptable for the Applicant to respond with generic statements such as "refer to Appendix XX", or "this has already been addressed in the EIS", or similar type responses.**

Each question raised in this submission requires a clear and specific response. Where the Applicant relies on an appendix, technical report or section of the EIS, it should identify the precise reference, explain how the issue has been substantively addressed, and demonstrate why the response is adequate.

I encourage NSW Planning to also reject the proposed development based from its own assessment, but also those of the community including this submission.

2 Goodman Property and Urbis

The developer, Goodman Property, and its planning consultant, Urbis, are experienced participants in the development and delivery of built-environment and infrastructure projects, including data centres. Given that experience, both parties should be well aware of the standards expected in the

preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, including the need for accuracy, transparency, consistency, and a fair representation of the proposed development and its likely impacts.

However, this EIS contains significant flaws, inconsistencies, omissions, and selective presentation of information. In several areas, the EIS understates impacts, rely on favourable assumptions, and presents conclusions in a manner that may mislead readers, the community, and potentially NSW Planning as the consent authority.

Accordingly, the first question for NSW Planning is how it will treat these issues. Will NSW Planning require an immediate pause or cessation of all Goodman and Urbis related proposals, applications, and active projects currently before or being overseen by NSW Planning, until such time as the Department has properly investigated the extent of these apparent misrepresentations, omissions, and inconsistencies, and determined whether any action is required under applicable planning legislation, compliance powers, penalties, or other relevant legal mechanisms?

3 Statutory and Planning Context

This submission is made having regard to the matters that must be considered by the consent authority under section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW) (EP&A Act), including the likely impacts of the development, the suitability of the site, submissions received and the public interest; and also the requirements contained in the SEARs. NSW legislation identifies these matters as relevant considerations for development assessment.

The EIS must also satisfy the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021 and applicable environmental assessment requirements. The Regulation contains requirements relevant to environmental assessment and EIS content.

For a State Significant Development or major development of this nature, the EIS must do more than describe the project in general terms. It must allow the consent authority and the community to understand the real impacts of the proposal before approval is granted. NSW Planning's EIS guidelines state that the guidelines explain the form and content requirements for environmental impact statements.

The relevant issue is not whether a data centre is theoretically permissible in the zone. The relevant issue is whether the actual proposal satisfies the statutory tests, including impact acceptability, site suitability, adequacy of information and the public interest.

4 Overall Submission Position

The application should not be approved due to the EIS being materially deficient in the following respects:

1. it does not adequately assess credible worst-case scenarios
2. it does not adequately assess cumulative impacts
3. it does not demonstrate land use compatibility

4. it understates the significance of the proposal's 24/7 industrial operating profile
5. it does not adequately assess operational noise
6. it does not adequately assess sleep disturbance
7. it does not adequately assess diesel generator noise
8. it does not adequately assess air quality and diesel emissions
9. it does not adequately assess human health and sensitive receivers
10. it does not adequately assess visual bulk, scale and height impacts
11. it does not adequately assess construction impacts
12. it does not adequately assess infrastructure capacity, including electricity and water
13. it does not provide confirmed utility servicing commitments
14. it does not adequately assess bushfire, emergency, resilience and outage scenarios
15. it does not adequately assess tree loss, landscaping and urban heat impacts
16. it does not adequately assess social impacts on nearby residents, schools and the community
17. it relies excessively on deferred management plans and future mitigation
18. it fails to provide clear, enforceable and auditable approval conditions
19. it does not demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed scale and intensity of development.
20. The EIS contains multiple inconsistencies and discrepancies rendering the document unfit for evaluation.

The combined effect of these deficiencies is that the EIS cannot be relied upon for determination. Once the inconsistencies, omissions and discrepancies are properly interrogated, the EIS does not establish the suitability of the site. **To the contrary, the EIS does not establish site suitability. Rather, the disclosed impacts, unresolved assumptions and internal inconsistencies point to the opposite conclusion in that the site is fundamentally unsuitable for a large-scale, 24-hour data centre of this intensity in such close proximity to residential homes, and the community including sensitive receivers.**

5 The EIS Fails to Assess Credible Worst-Case Scenarios

The EIS relies on constrained and favourable operational assumptions. It assesses the development under selected, limited and controlled operating scenarios, rather than testing the full credible operating envelope of the proposal.

The EIS does not transparently demonstrate how the development would perform under credible worst-case or upper-bound conditions. Instead, it appears to rely on assumptions that reduce the assessed impact profile, including:

- **limited generator operation**, rather than modelling full or partial emergency generator operation under credible outage scenarios
- **controlled generator testing assumptions**, rather than assessing the full practical impact of testing frequency, duration, start-up, shutdown, load banks and cumulative testing hours
- **assumed mechanical plant loading**, rather than clearly demonstrating that all relevant cooling, ventilation, electrical and ancillary plant has been modelled at peak design load
- **limited concurrency assumptions**, rather than modelling simultaneous operation of mechanical plant, generator systems, electrical infrastructure and other material noise and emission sources
- **favourable night-time assumptions**, rather than assessing worst-case night-time operation during low background noise periods when residents are most sensitive
- **limited emergency operation assumptions**, rather than assessing extended grid outage events, full generator operation, emergency fuel use, noise, emissions and community impacts
- **selected meteorological assumptions**, rather than clearly demonstrating impacts under adverse noise propagation and air dispersion conditions
- **assumed plant performance**, rather than allowing for plant degradation, equipment ageing, acoustic treatment deterioration, maintenance variability or future replacement plant
- **indicative or unresolved plant selections**, rather than modelling final confirmed plant, equipment, louvres, silencers, screens, generators and tenant-specific requirements
- **receiver selection assumptions**, rather than clearly demonstrating that the most affected residential façades, upper-floor receivers, bedrooms, outdoor living areas, Blackman Park, Lane Cove Community Nursery and school receivers have been assessed
- **limited cumulative impact assumptions**, rather than assessing cumulative noise, air quality, traffic, construction, infrastructure, water, heat and social impacts with other existing, approved and reasonably foreseeable data centre or industrial developments
- **limited diesel emissions assumptions**, rather than assessing multiple-generator operation, extended outage operation, short-term pollutant peaks, NO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10}, odour and sensitive receiver exposure
- **assumed mitigation effectiveness**, rather than demonstrating that mitigation is fully designed, certain, enforceable, independently verifiable and effective under worst-case conditions

- **future management plan assumptions**, rather than resolving key impacts before determination
- **operational compliance assumptions**, rather than demonstrating that all operating limits relied upon in the EIS can be converted into enforceable, auditable and practical consent conditions.

NSW Planning should not accept an EIS that demonstrates apparent compliance by avoiding or under stating the scenarios most likely to generate the highest impacts. The assessment must test the development as it may realistically operate over its full life, including adverse, abnormal but credible, emergency and cumulative conditions. It should not assess the proposal merely as it may operate under ideal, managed or average conditions.

The constrained assumptions appear most clearly in the technical modelling adopted in **Appendix U – Noise Impact Assessment** and **Appendix T – Air Quality Impact Assessment**, as well as in the operational description and mitigation commitments in the EIS main body. These assumptions relate to generator operation, mechanical plant loading, night-time operation, operational concurrency, diesel emissions, cumulative impacts, receiver selection, plant degradation, design uncertainty and reliance on future mitigation.

Unless the Applicant can demonstrate that these assumptions are conservative, transparent, enforceable and representative of credible worst-case conditions, NSW Planning should place little or no reliance on the EIS conclusions.

Put simply, the EIS appears to assess the proposal under conditions selected to support approval, rather than under conditions required to properly test whether the site and development are acceptable.

A data centre's impacts are not limited to ordinary day-to-day operation. The real-world impact profile includes:

1. peak summer cooling demand
2. full or partial grid outage
3. emergency generator operation
4. generator testing
5. commissioning
6. plant failure or redundancy testing
7. maintenance
8. prolonged outage scenarios
9. simultaneous operation of cooling plant and generators
10. cumulative operational impacts with nearby industrial uses.

If these scenarios are not assessed, the EIS cannot properly disclose the likely impacts of the development.

5.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has the EIS assessed the maximum credible operational scenario for the entire data centre?
2. Has the EIS modelled all mechanical plant operating simultaneously at maximum design load giving consideration to the likely tenant requirements and demands?
3. Has the EIS modelled all diesel generators operating simultaneously during a full grid outage?
4. Has the EIS modelled simultaneous generator operation and full cooling plant operation, including over the full design life of relevant plant and associated cooling loads in relation to climate changes over that period?
5. Has the EIS modelled a night-time grid outage scenario?
6. Has the EIS modelled extended outage scenarios lasting several hours or longer, noting that such scenarios are credible for a facility that relies on backup diesel generation for resilience?
7. Has the EIS modelled commissioning scenarios?
8. Has the EIS modelled abnormal but credible operating events, including plant failure, redundancy testing and emergency operation?
9. Has the EIS modelled peak summer conditions, including those conditions to take into account climate change?
10. Has the EIS modelled the development at full IT/electrical load?
11. If these scenarios have not been modelled, why not?
12. What physical or operational mechanism would require the development from operating in a more intensive manner than assessed? And has this been included in the impact assessment?
13. Will the Applicant accept planning consent conditions limiting the development to the operating assumptions used in the EIS? And can the Applicant provide evidence that it has fully complied with conditions of consent in the past?
14. What assurance can the Applicant provide to ensure that it will fully limit the potential impacts (including conditions of consent) should any proposal get approved by the consent authority?
15. Will the Applicant accept consent conditions requiring revised modelling if plant, equipment, generator numbers or operating modes change?

5.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that the EIS assesses credible worst-case scenarios, including all requirements under the Environment and Planning Act and relevant SEARs?
2. Has NSW Planning independently tested whether the assumed operating scenarios are conservative?
3. Will NSW Planning require full worst-case modelling before determination?
4. Will NSW Planning refuse to rely on modelling that excludes full generator operation?
5. Will NSW Planning require all operational assumptions to be converted into enforceable consent conditions?
6. Will NSW Planning require public re-exhibition if revised worst-case modelling shows materially different impacts? And if so, give the community sufficient time (i.e. 60 days) to review any re-exhibition?

6 The EIS Fails to Properly Assess Cumulative Impacts

The EIS assesses key impacts in isolation rather than as part of a cumulative environmental and social impact context.

Cumulative impacts are central to the assessment of this proposal because the surrounding locality is already affected by industrial activity and may be subject to further data centre intensification, given the data centre clustering in Lane Cove West. The EIS must assess not only the direct impact of this individual proposal, but the cumulative effect of approving this type of 24/7 industrial infrastructure in close proximity to residential and sensitive uses.

6.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has the EIS undertaken a quantitative cumulative impact assessment and can it demonstrate that 12 Mars road still meets planning approval requirements?
2. Which existing industrial operations have been included?
3. Which existing or proposed data centres have been included?
4. Which approved but not yet operational developments have been included?
5. Has cumulative noise been quantitatively modelled?
6. Has cumulative air quality impact been quantitatively modelled?
7. Has cumulative traffic impact been quantitatively modelled?
8. Has cumulative construction impact been assessed?
9. Has cumulative diesel generator testing been assessed?
10. Has cumulative night-time industrial noise been assessed?

11. Has cumulative low-frequency noise been assessed?
12. Has cumulative visual bulk and urban character impact been assessed?
13. Has cumulative infrastructure demand been assessed?
14. Has cumulative water demand been assessed?
15. Has cumulative electricity demand been assessed?
16. Has cumulative greenhouse gas impact been assessed?
17. Has cumulative social impact on residents and the school community been assessed?
18. Has the EIS assessed whether the locality is reaching or exceeding its environmental capacity for data centre development?

6.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that cumulative impacts have been properly assessed?
2. Will NSW Planning require a precinct-level cumulative assessment of data centre impacts?
3. Will NSW Planning consider whether repeated approval of data centres in this locality creates unacceptable cumulative impacts?
4. Will NSW Planning require cumulative assessment of noise, air quality, traffic, infrastructure, energy, water and social impacts?
5. Will NSW Planning refuse the application if cumulative impacts cannot be demonstrated to be acceptable?

7 Land Use Compatibility Has Not Been Demonstrated

The Applicant may argue that the use is permissible within the zone. However, permissibility does not establish site suitability or impact acceptability.

The proposed development is not a standard industrial building. It is a major 24/7 infrastructure operation with substantial mechanical plant, diesel generators, electrical infrastructure and continuous operational impacts.

The EIS does not demonstrate that the proposed scale, intensity and operational profile are compatible with nearby residential and sensitive uses, as this is a requirement of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW), including s4.15 Evaluation.

The fact that the zoning may permit data centres does not mean any data centre, of any scale, with any generator fleet, any height, any mechanical plant intensity and any proximity to homes, should be approved.

7.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. How has the EIS demonstrated land use compatibility with nearby residential receivers?
2. How has the EIS demonstrated compatibility with nearby school or community uses?
3. Has the EIS assessed whether the development is more akin to critical infrastructure or heavy industrial infrastructure than ordinary light industrial development?
4. Has the EIS assessed the continuous 24/7 operational nature of the use as a land use compatibility issue?
5. Has the EIS assessed whether the site has sufficient separation distance from sensitive receivers?
6. Has the EIS assessed alternative sites with greater separation from residential uses?
7. Has the EIS assessed whether the proposed scale is appropriate for this particular location?
8. Has the EIS assessed whether the generator fleet is compatible with nearby sensitive uses?
9. Has the EIS assessed whether the mechanical plant intensity is compatible with nearby sensitive uses?
10. Has the EIS assessed whether the proposal creates an unacceptable land use conflict?

7.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that land use compatibility has been demonstrated?
2. Does NSW Planning accept that permissibility in the zone is not the same as site suitability?
3. Will NSW Planning require an independent land use compatibility assessment?
4. Will NSW Planning assess whether the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site?
5. Will NSW Planning consider refusal on the basis of land use conflict?

8 Site Suitability Has Not Been Demonstrated

The EIS does not adequately demonstrate that 12 Mars Road is suitable for a data centre of this scale and intensity.

Site suitability must consider:

1. proximity to homes
2. proximity to sensitive community uses
3. road network suitability
4. construction impacts

5. operational noise
6. diesel emissions
7. visual bulk
8. electricity and water servicing
9. emergency access
10. cumulative industrial impact
11. the availability of more suitable alternative sites.

The proposed development is located close to residential receivers and community uses. That proximity creates an obvious land-use compatibility problem.

The EIS has not adequately demonstrated that such an intensive industrial operation is compatible with nearby residential amenity.

The core problem is that the EIS appears to seek to **manage** land-use conflict through modelling assumptions and future mitigation, rather than demonstrating that the conflict has been properly avoided or resolved.

The proposal's height, bulk and visual scale raise significant site suitability concerns. A building envelope of this magnitude, particularly where it exceeds local planning controls, cannot be treated as a minor variation or routine industrial built form issue.

The question is not only whether the building can physically fit on the site. The question is whether the proposed scale is appropriate having regard to adjoining and nearby land uses, visual impacts, streetscape character, residential outlook, overshadowing, perceived enclosure, and cumulative built form change in the locality.

The EIS does not appear to adequately justify why a development of this size and massing is suitable so close to sensitive receivers.

Separation distances appear inadequate for the intensity of the use

The proposal appears to rely on relatively limited separation from residential properties, despite involving continuous industrial plant and backup diesel generation.

For a development of this operational intensity, proximity matters. The closer the site is to residents, the greater the risk that noise, vibration, air quality, visual and amenity impacts will be experienced directly and persistently.

The proposal relies too heavily on future mitigation

The EIS appears to rely on future design development, management plans, acoustic treatments, operational controls, and mitigation measures to make the site appear acceptable.

That is not the same as demonstrating inherent site suitability.

If the development requires extensive mitigation simply to approach compliance, that may indicate that the site is poorly suited to the proposed use. Suitability should be demonstrated before approval, not deferred to later design phases or operational management plans.

The public interest case has not been adequately established

Site suitability is also connected to public interest. The EIS appears to focus heavily on the Applicant's development objectives and broader economic need for data centre infrastructure, but it does not appear to adequately balance those claimed benefits against localised impacts borne by the surrounding community. This includes the cumulative job losses. The existing operations of the site employ a far greater number of people as opposed to the 26 people (as per EIS) of the data centre once in operations.

8.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. What alternative sites were considered?
2. Why was this site selected over sites with greater separation from residential uses?
3. Has the EIS undertaken a genuine site suitability assessment?
4. Has the EIS assessed whether the site is large enough for the proposed operational intensity?
5. Has the EIS assessed whether the site can accommodate all required mitigation within its boundaries?
6. Has the EIS assessed whether the setbacks are sufficient?
7. Has the EIS assessed whether the road network is suitable?
8. Has the EIS assessed whether utility infrastructure is confirmed and adequate?
9. Has the EIS assessed whether the site is appropriate having regard to cumulative data centre clustering?
10. Has the EIS assessed whether the site is suitable in the interest of the locality being Lane Cove community?

8.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that the site is suitable?
2. Will NSW Planning require a comparative alternatives assessment?
3. Will NSW Planning require independent review of site suitability?
4. Will NSW Planning consider whether the development should be located in an area with greater separation from sensitive receivers, noting that false and misleading statements are contained in the EIS and cannot be relied upon to make a determination?

5. Will NSW Planning refuse the application if site suitability is not positively demonstrated?

9 Built Form, Height, Bulk and Scale Are Excessive

The proposed built form appears to exceed local planning expectations and would introduce a large, visually dominant industrial building into a locality affected by nearby residential and community uses.

The project has previously been described as involving a building envelope of approximately 28.3 metres, exceeding an 18 metre local control. It is also noted that Appendix H states that the height will be a “maximum height of 33 metres” and therefore even further beyond allowable height. This height, together with the likely bulk, massing and plant infrastructure, raises serious visual, amenity and character impacts.

A height exceedance is not merely a numerical variation. It affects:

1. visual dominance
2. overshadowing
3. acoustic shielding/reflection
4. urban character
5. views from residences
6. compatibility with surrounding built form
7. long-term precedent for industrial intensification.

9.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. What is the proposed maximum building height as the EIS contains conflicting information?
2. What is the applicable height control and exact percentage exceedance?
3. Has the Applicant demonstrated that the development cannot be redesigned to comply with the height control?
4. Has the Applicant assessed a lower built form option?
5. Has the Applicant assessed alternative site layouts, one that minimises all impacts? It should be noted that the so called “impacts” contained in the EIS are false and misleading as identified in this document.
6. Has the visual impact assessment considered views from all affected residential areas? It should be noted that the photomontages misrepresent visual impacts and do not represent views from the most affected residential and community locations.
7. Has the visual impact assessment included night-time lighting impacts?

8. Has the visual impact assessment included rooftop plant, screens, exhaust stacks and ancillary infrastructure?
9. Has the Applicant assessed whether the building bulk contributes to acoustic reflection?
10. Has the Applicant assessed whether the proposed height creates an unacceptable planning precedent?
11. What design changes have been made to reduce height, bulk and visual dominance?

9.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that the height exceedance is justified?
2. Will NSW Planning require a compliant height design option?
3. Will NSW Planning require independent urban design review?
4. Will NSW Planning require independent visual impact review given the falsehoods in the EIS?
5. Will NSW Planning consider refusal on the basis of excessive height, bulk and scale, as this would materially alter the area and locality?

10 Setbacks and Separation Distances Are Inadequate

The proposal appears to be located in close proximity to residential receivers (16.5m boundary to boundary from development site to residential property at 10 Banksia Close, measured via Google Maps) and other sensitive uses. The adequacy of setbacks and separation distances is a key issue because physical distance is one of the most effective controls for noise, visual, air quality and amenity impacts.

Where a development relies on narrow setbacks and technical mitigation to manage impacts, the risk of residual impact increases. Once a building and plant are installed, later mitigation may be difficult, expensive or ineffective.

10.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. What are the minimum setbacks to each site boundary? This EIS contains numerous errors and/or inconsistencies throughout the document an it is unclear what the proposal is suggesting.
2. What are the distances to the nearest residential dwellings?
3. How were setbacks determined?
4. Are the setbacks driven by planning merit or by site yield?
5. Has the EIS assessed increased setbacks as an alternative mitigation measure?

6. Has the Applicant assessed relocating plant away from sensitive receivers? See section in this submission that identifies material concerns with the findings in EIS Appendix U Noise Impact Assessment, and therefore physical separate (including mechanical) should be considered.
7. Has the Applicant assessed relocating generators further from sensitive receivers? See section in this submission that raises material concerns regarding the findings in EIS Appendix U Noise Impact Assessment, and therefore physical separate (including mechanical) should be considered.
8. Has the Applicant assessed a lower-intensity development with greater setbacks?
9. Has the Applicant demonstrated that all impacts can be contained within the site?

10.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that the setbacks are appropriate?
2. Will NSW Planning require a greater setback from sensitive receivers?
3. Will NSW Planning require plant and generators to be located as far as practicable from residential boundaries?
4. Will NSW Planning refuse the application if adequate separation cannot be achieved?

11 Operational and Construction Noise Assessment Is Inadequate

Noise is one of the most significant issues for this proposal. The development involves continuous mechanical plant and diesel backup generators. It has a materially different acoustic profile from ordinary warehouse or industrial development.

The NSW Noise Policy for Industry is directed at managing industrial noise and balancing industrial activity with the community's desire to minimise intrusive sound. The EPA's guide (NSW EPA, Noise Policy for Industry, 2017) explains that the policy provides a framework and criteria for assessing and controlling noise from industrial developments, including large industrial developments requiring planning approval.

The Noise Impact Assessment:

- Targets RBL +5 dB (maximum allowable intrusiveness limit, without buffer or allowance for modelling uncertainty)
- Relies on assumed plant performance
- Uses optimistic modelling assumptions (e.g. acoustic louvres treated as solid barriers, ref: Appendix U "*The acoustic louvre screen is represented as a solid noise wall*".)
- Does not adequately assess:
    - Low-frequency noise

    - Sleep disturbance
    - Intermittent noise events

The proposal is engineered at the threshold of compliance, with:

- No margin for variability
- No resilience to real-world conditions
- No demonstration of acceptable outcomes under:
    - Equipment degradation
    - Weather variation
    - Operational anomalies

There are various critical technical deficiencies including:

- Reliance on LAeq rather than LAmax for sleep disturbance
- Lack of low-frequency spectral analysis
- Incorrect use of screening thresholds (e.g. 52 dBA, as stated in Appendix U) as compliance metrics
- No assessment of tonality penalties under NPfI

The EIS is deficient if it does not adequately assess:

1. all mechanical plant
2. peak cooling demand
3. tonal noise
4. low-frequency noise
5. modulation and fan cycling
6. generator start-up and shutdown
7. routine generator testing
8. emergency generator operation
9. sleep disturbance
10. cumulative noise
11. construction noise
12. long-term plant degradation.

The SEAR states that the EIS must include, "*demonstrating worst-case modelling of plant and equipment for each assessment period, including testing of any back-up power system and a critical power failure scenario".*

The proposal is a 24-hour, 7-day-per-week industrial use with substantial mechanical plant, substations, load banks and a large number of diesel backup generators. In that context, the assessment should not rely only on constrained or favourable operating assumptions. It needs to test the upper-bound acoustic risk associated with the development.

NCA02, as per the Impact Assessment in the EIS appears to be one of the most affected receiver areas. If the RBL adopted for NCA02 is elevated due to existing site operations, traffic, industrial noise, or the location of the logger, then the derived project noise trigger levels may be artificially high. That would materially affect the assessment outcome.

In addition please note the following statement as documented in a Submission via NSW Planning Portal by local resident includes the following:

> *"The Noise and Vibration report identifies in Section 2.1 that unattended noise monitoring was completed in the study area in February, March, April, November and December 2025. It should be noted that throughout this period continuous and extensive infrastructure work was being undertaken by Interflow Pty Ltd. These works were to install additional mains water infrastructure to another data centre in the Mars Road business park and were a significant source of noise with construction activity occurring on a daily basis between October 2024 to the present (April 2026). The noise included road cutting, heavy vehicle movements, digging, construction and paving which were undertaken during both the day and night along Banksia Close, Cullen St and Hallam Ave during the periods identified by SLR when unattended noise monitoring was undertaken. There is no mention in the EIS of this construction activity and how it contributed to the baseline noise results in the EIS"*

If the background noise monitoring periods were materially affected by unrelated infrastructure works, and if those works were not identified, filtered or otherwise accounted for, then the adopted background noise levels would be unrepresentative. This would materially undermine the reliability of Appendix U and warrants independent review.

While the use of NCAs can be an acceptable method for summarising results across a broader assessment area, it should not replace assessment of the most affected individual receiver locations. Given the proximity of residential receivers to the proposed development, and the variation in local acoustic conditions between Banksia Close, Mars Road, Wood Street and rear-yard receiver locations, Appendix U should identify and assess the most affected individual residential receivers, including receiver height, façade orientation and location on the property. Reliance on one monitoring location per NCA may not be sufficient to establish representative criteria for the most affected dwellings.

Given NCA02 extends south along Wood Street, including dwellings with different exposure, elevation and shielding characteristics, the backyard of 64, 66 or 68 Wood Street would likely

provide a more conservative and representative location for noise logging for the eastern residential receivers.

I cannot agree that the Power Outage scenario should be treated as information only. While grid outage events may be infrequent, they are a foreseeable and integral operating condition for a data centre reliant on emergency standby generation, especially to maintain 24/7 operations. If all or a substantial number of generators operate concurrently, including during the night-time period, the resulting acoustic impact may be significant and may result in sleep disturbance or unacceptable amenity impacts. Accordingly, the Power Outage scenario should be modelled and assessed as a credible operational scenario, including night-time operation, LAmax events, start-up noise, full-load operation and the potential duration of outage events

The operational noise modelling is based on a number of assumptions and indicative design inputs. These include assumed plant selections, assumed sound power levels, assumed acoustic louvre and screening performance, assumed generator enclosure performance, assumed operating scenarios and incomplete information regarding internal plant and data hall breakout noise. Changes to any of these inputs may alter the predicted noise levels and compliance outcome. Accordingly, the assessment should be treated as indicative only unless supported by fixed design commitments and verified acoustic performance data.

Appendix U also contains inconsistent assessment namely where OP.02, which includes additional generator testing sources, is predicted to be lower than OP.01 at NCA02. Adding noise sources should not logically result in a lower predicted cumulative noise level unless there is a specific modelling, source-selection, or receiver-selection explanation. Again, this issue would invalidate the assessment, or as a minimum raises concerns regarding the whole of Appendix U and whether it has been undertaken appropriately and accurately.

The construction noise assessment must be based on realistic demolition and construction methodology, including realistic plant size, realistic plant numbers, realistic daily utilisation and realistic duration of high-noise activities such as rock-breaking, concrete breaking and bulk excavation. Figure 14 in Appendix U implies that rock-breaking would occur during a window from 11:30am to 1:30pm, and this may be impractical given the size and scale of demolition needed for this site. This short window may extend the demolition period significantly, unless a detailed demolition plan can advise otherwise. Generic mitigation measures, such as use of the “minimum sized equipment”, do not resolve the need for the assessment to reflect how the works will actually be undertaken. If the adopted construction assumptions materially understate the duration, intensity or concurrency of high-noise activities, the predicted construction noise impacts will not be reliable.

11.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Why has the development been designed to operate at the maximum allowable noise limits, rather than incorporating a compliance buffer?
2. Provide sensitivity analysis demonstrating the impact of:

+1 dB

+2 dB

Do these result in exceedances?

3. Why have acoustic louvres been modelled as solid barriers?
4. What is the expected degraded plant or acoustic treatment performance over time and what impact does this have on the noise impact assessment?
5. Provide low-frequency noise assessment (full frequency spectrum analysis)
6. Provide LAmax modelling for:

   - Generator start-up

   - Emergency operation

   - Night-time conditions
7. How many night-time noise events are predicted annually?
8. How will sleep disturbance impacts be avoided during outage scenarios?
9. Has the Noise Impact Assessment modelled all mechanical plant at maximum load?
10. Has the Noise Impact Assessment modelled peak summer night-time cooling demand?
11. Has the assessment modelled all generators operating simultaneously, and if not, then why not?
12. Has the assessment modelled generator start-up and shutdown, and if not, then why not?
13. Has the assessment modelled emergency generator operation at night, and if not, then why not?
14. Has the assessment modelled generator testing scenarios?
15. Has the assessment modelled simultaneous cooling plant and generator operation?
16. Has the assessment assessed tonality?
17. Has the assessment assessed low-frequency noise?
18. Has the assessment applied modifying factors where required?
19. Has the assessment assessed sleep disturbance using LAmax events?
20. Has the assessment assessed internal bedroom impacts?
21. Has the assessment considered plant degradation over time?
22. Has the assessment assessed cumulative noise from other industrial and data centre sources?
23. Has the assessment modelled upper-floor receivers?

24. Has the assessment modelled the most exposed façades?
25. Will the Applicant accept conditions limiting generator testing to weekday daytime hours only?
26. Will the Applicant accept annual, monthly, weekly and daily caps on generator testing?
27. Will the Applicant accept real-time noise monitoring?
28. Will the Applicant accept independent post-commissioning noise validation?
29. Will the Applicant accept a condition requiring rectification if tonal, low-frequency or sleep-disturbing noise is identified?

11.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Does designing to the exact limit without buffer at a large number of instances (i.e. Day, Evening, Night) of RBL +5 dB satisfy the intent of the Noise Policy for Industry, or merely its upper limit?
2. Is reliance on LAeq sufficient to assess sleep disturbance impacts?
3. How has WHO guidance on sleep disturbance been considered?
4. Is it appropriate to approve a development where:
5. Noise modelling relies on assumptions, and
6. Key inputs are not fixed at determination stage?
7. Is NSW Planning satisfied that operational noise has been conservatively assessed?
8. Will NSW Planning require full-load mechanical plant modelling?
9. Will NSW Planning require full generator operation modelling?
10. Will NSW Planning require night-time outage modelling?
11. Will NSW Planning require sleep disturbance modelling?
12. Will NSW Planning require low-frequency and tonal noise assessment?
13. Will NSW Planning require independent acoustic peer review?
14. Will NSW Planning impose enforceable generator testing restrictions?
15. Will NSW Planning require post-commissioning monitoring?
16. Will NSW Planning require public reporting of noise compliance results?
17. Will the NSW government enforce conditions that require rectification if tonal, low-frequency or sleep-disturbing noise or any impacts as measured are beyond those stated in the EIS is identified?

12 Sleep Disturbance Has Not Been Adequately Addressed

The EIS has not adequately addressed sleep disturbance. It appears to rely primarily on conventional operational noise assessment and average noise criteria, rather than providing a separate, robust and conservative assessment of maximum night-time noise events and sleep arousal risk.

This is a material deficiency. The proposed data centre is a 24-hour industrial operation involving continuous mechanical plant, electrical infrastructure, cooling systems and backup diesel generators. Sleep disturbance may arise not only from average operational noise levels, but from maximum noise events, low-frequency noise, tonal characteristics, plant cycling, generator start-up, generator testing, emergency generator operation, and cumulative night-time industrial noise.

The EIS should be required to demonstrate that it has assessed credible worst-case night-time scenarios, including peak mechanical plant operation, emergency generator operation, multiple generator operation, adverse meteorological conditions, low background noise periods, and the most affected residential bedroom receivers. If these scenarios have not been assessed, NSW Planning cannot be satisfied that sleep disturbance impacts have been properly understood or mitigated.

A claim of technical compliance with average night-time noise criteria is not sufficient. Sleep disturbance must be assessed as a discrete issue, having regard to maximum noise levels, intermittency, tonality, low-frequency noise, frequency of events and the sensitivity of nearby residential receivers during the night-time period.

Accordingly, the EIS should be regarded as deficient unless and until the Applicant provides a revised sleep disturbance assessment based on conservative, transparent and independently verifiable night-time operating scenarios.

This area of Lane Cove in my experience is very quiet during the late evening and night time. I have taken indicative personal sound readings which recorded an average of approximately 33 dB over a one-hour period on 3 May 2026. While I acknowledge these readings are not a substitute for formal unattended monitoring, they indicate a materially quieter night-time environment than appears to be reflected in parts of the EIS..

12.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has a dedicated sleep disturbance assessment been undertaken?
2. Has LAmax been assessed for generator start-up?
3. Has LAmax been assessed for generator shutdown?
4. Has LAmax been assessed for generator testing?
5. Has LAmax been assessed for emergency operation?
6. Has the assessment considered internal bedroom noise?

7. Has the assessment considered open-window sleeping conditions?
8. Has the assessment considered low-frequency noise impacts on sleep?
9. Has the assessment considered continuous mechanical hum?
10. Has the assessment considered repeated night-time events?
11. Will routine generator testing be prohibited at night?
12. Will routine generator testing be prohibited on Sundays and public holidays?
13. Will independent night-time monitoring be undertaken after commissioning?

12.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that sleep disturbance has been properly assessed?
2. Will NSW Planning require revised LAmax modelling?
3. Will NSW Planning require internal bedroom assessment?
4. Will NSW Planning impose night-time generator testing prohibitions?
5. Will NSW Planning require investigation of sleep disturbance complaints?
6. Will the NSW government enforce conditions that require rectification sleep-disturbing noise or any impacts as measured are beyond those stated in the EIS is identified?

13 Air Quality and Diesel Generator Emissions Are Inadequately Assessed

The proposal involves diesel backup generators. Diesel generator operation may generate emissions including nitrogen oxides, particulate matter and other pollutants. The air quality assessment must assess not only routine testing, but also emergency operation and cumulative exposure.

The EIS is deficient if it does not assess:

1. all generators operating during outage scenarios
2. extended grid outage operation
3. generator testing
4. cumulative emissions
5. short-term pollutant peaks
6. sensitive receivers
7. school community exposure
8. worst-case meteorology

9. stack height and plume dispersion
10. start-up and shutdown emissions.

13.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. What emissions standards apply to each generator?
2. Were emission factors based on manufacturer data or generic assumptions?
3. Has the assessment modelled all generators operating simultaneously?
4. Has the assessment modelled extended grid outage operation?
5. Has the assessment modelled night-time generator operation?
6. Has the assessment modelled routine testing emissions?
7. Has the assessment modelled commissioning emissions?
8. Has the assessment modelled cumulative emissions with other industrial sources?
9. Has the assessment modelled cumulative emissions with other data centres?
10. Has the assessment modelled PM2.5, PM10, NO2, CO and relevant air toxics?
11. Has the assessment assessed short-term concentration peaks?
12. Has the assessment assessed impacts at residential receivers?
13. Has the assessment assessed impacts at school or childcare receivers?
14. Has the assessment assessed impacts under worst-case meteorology?
15. Has the assessment assessed stack height sensitivity?
16. Has the assessment considered diesel odour?
17. Has the assessment considered health risk from repeated generator testing?
18. Will the Applicant accept conditions of consent limiting generator testing hours?
19. Will the Applicant accept conditions of consent requiring emissions monitoring?
20. Will the Applicant accept conditions requiring use of lower-emission fuels or technologies?
21. Will the Applicant accept conditions requiring reporting of all generator runtime?
22. Can the Applicant demonstrate that it is a not breached conditions of consent for other developments in its portfolio?

13.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Is NSW Planning satisfied that the air quality assessment is conservative?

2. Will NSW Planning require modelling of all generators operating simultaneously?
3. Will NSW Planning require extended outage modelling?
4. Will NSW Planning require cumulative air quality modelling?
5. Will NSW Planning require health risk assessment for sensitive receivers?
6. Will NSW Planning require independent air quality peer review?
7. Will NSW Planning require enforceable generator runtime and testing limits?
8. Will NSW Planning require emissions reporting?

14 Human Health and Sensitive Receiver Impacts Are Inadequately Assessed

The proposal is located near people who live, sleep, work, study and gather in the area. The EIS must assess impacts on sensitive receivers, including residents, children, elderly persons, shift workers, people with pre-existing health conditions and school communities.

The EIS treats impacts as technical exceedance/non-exceedance issues rather than lived human impacts.

14.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has a human health risk assessment been undertaken?
2. Has the assessment considered children as sensitive receptors?
3. Has the assessment considered elderly residents?
4. Has the assessment considered people with asthma or respiratory conditions?
5. Has the assessment considered people with sleep disturbance?
6. Has the assessment considered shift workers?
7. Has the assessment considered school students and staff?
8. Has the assessment considered cumulative stress from construction and operation?
9. Has the assessment considered anxiety and perceived risk from diesel generators and industrial intensification?
10. Has the assessment considered health impacts from noise and air quality together?
11. Has the assessment considered long-term exposure, not just short-term compliance?
12. Has the assessment considered vulnerable groups specifically?

15 Construction Impacts Are Inadequately Assessed

The development would involve a substantial construction period (EIS states 3 years) with demolition, excavation, piling, civil works, structural works, services installation, road movements and commissioning.

Construction impacts are not minor if they extend over a prolonged period and occur near homes and sensitive uses.

15.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has construction traffic through residential streets been assessed? Noting that it is understood that Lane Cove Council has already objected to any construction traffic whatsoever on the residential streets of Lane Cove West.
2. Has construction noise been assessed at the closest homes, being all homes within a 250 metre distance from the site?
3. Has construction vibration been assessed and its impact to residents?
4. Has dust from construction been assessed and its impact to residents?
5. Has cumulative construction impact with other projects been assessed?
6. Has construction impact on school operations been assessed?
7. Will high-noise works be subject to respite periods?
8. Will residents receive advance notification?
9. Will real-time noise and dust monitoring be used?
10. Will the Applicant accept independent auditing of construction impacts?

15.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning require a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan before approval, not after?
2. Will NSW Planning prohibit out-of-hours works?
3. Will NSW Planning require construction noise and vibration monitoring?
4. Will NSW Planning require dust monitoring?
5. Will NSW Planning require construction traffic restrictions?
6. Will NSW Planning require community notification and complaints handling procedures?
7. Will NSW Planning require respite periods for high-noise works?

16 Infrastructure Capacity Has Not Been Confirmed

A data centre requires significant electricity, water, telecommunications, stormwater and potentially sewer capacity. The EIS must demonstrate that required infrastructure is available, feasible and acceptable without unacceptable external impacts.

The EIS identified the lack of confirmed support or capacity from utilities such as Sydney Water and Ausgrid. This is a major issue and therefore the data centre cannot be properly assessed if its utility demands and network impacts are unresolved.

16.1 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning require formal confirmation from Ausgrid before determination?
2. Will NSW Planning require formal confirmation from Sydney Water before determination?
3. Will NSW Planning require assessment of off-site utility works?
4. Will NSW Planning require cumulative utility capacity assessment?
5. Will NSW Planning refuse or defer the application if servicing is not confirmed?

17 Visual Impact, Lighting and Urban Character Are Inadequately Assessed

The proposed development would introduce a large-scale industrial building and associated infrastructure into the locality. It includes bulk, height, night lighting, rooftop plant, exhaust stacks, walls, screening and the psychological effect of industrialisation near homes.

17.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Which viewpoints were selected for the visual impact assessment?
2. Why were those viewpoints selected as they are not representative of the actual impacts of this proposal?
3. Were all affected residential viewpoints included, as this is a material impact to those residents?
4. Were night-time lighting impacts assessed?
5. Were rooftop plant and screens shown accurately?
6. Were exhaust stacks shown accurately?
7. Were security fences shown accurately?
8. Has visual impact from elevated residential viewpoints been assessed, especially those across the tennis courts on Wood Street?

17.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning require independent visual impact review?
2. Will NSW Planning require additional photomontages given that the ones in the EIS do not represent that actual impacts of the proposed development?
3. Will NSW Planning require night-time lighting assessment?
4. Will NSW Planning consider refusal or redesign due to visual bulk and scale?

---

18 Social Impact and Community Wellbeing Have Been Understated

Appendix JJ – Social Impact Assessment, raises serious concerns regarding the accuracy, completeness and reliability of the Applicant's reported community consultation and Social Impact Assessment. It presents the engagement process as broader, more transparent and more informative than it actually was, while also characterising several social impacts as **Negligible**, **Low**, **Low Positive** or otherwise acceptable. Those conclusions are not credible when assessed against the actual nature, scale, location and operational characteristics of the proposed development.

The concern is not merely that consultation was inadequate. The more serious issue is that Appendix JJ may have created a misleading impression for NSW Planning that the surrounding community had been properly notified, meaningfully engaged, and given a fair opportunity to understand the true nature, scale and impacts of the proposed development. Based on my own engagement and speaking with many of local residents, that impression is incorrect.

The proposal is not a minor commercial or light-industrial development. It is a large-scale, 24-hour data centre involving substantial built form, continuous mechanical plant, backup diesel generation, electrical infrastructure, prolonged construction activity, operational noise, potential sleep disturbance, air quality concerns, visual impacts, traffic disruption, infrastructure demand and cumulative impacts. Any social impact assessment that reduces these impacts to "Negligible" or "Low" after mitigation is unsupported and misleading.

Apparent Misrepresentation of Community Notification

Appendix JJ suggests that nearby residents and affected community members were notified or consulted about the proposal. However, this is inconsistent with the experience of many residents, who advise that they did not receive any direct communication, notification letter, flyer, briefing material, or meaningful engagement from the Applicant or its consultants.

This raises a fundamental question for NSW Planning: **how can the Applicant claim that meaningful community engagement occurred if a substantial number of directly affected residents were never contacted, never received consultation material, and only became aware of the proposal through other residents or after the EIS was placed on exhibition?**

It is not sufficient for the Applicant to rely on generic notification, a website, limited mailouts, or broad statements that consultation occurred. For a proposal of this scale and sensitivity, direct engagement should have occurred with immediately affected residents, nearby schools, community groups and other sensitive receivers.

At minimum, Goodman and Urbis should be required to provide:

1. the full notification distribution list
2. the exact addresses notified
3. the method of delivery
4. the date each communication was issued
5. evidence of actual delivery
6. copies of all materials issued
7. records of all resident enquiries, objections and responses; and
8. records of all community meetings, briefings and attempted engagement.

Without this information, Appendix JJ should not be accepted as reliable.

Face-to-Face Sessions Did Not Constitute Meaningful Engagement

The so-called community face-to-face sessions also failed to provide residents (including myself) with a meaningful understanding of the proposed development or its likely impacts.

The representatives attending on behalf of Goodman, understood to be from Urbis, were unable to answer basic and material questions about the proposal. I asked questions regarding potential noise impacts, the size and scale of the development, anticipated construction duration, the type of plant and equipment proposed, and whether diesel generators formed part of the development. The representatives were unable to provide clear or substantive responses and appeared unfamiliar with key aspects of the project.

This is highly concerning. Community consultation for a development of this scale should involve informed representatives capable of explaining the proposal, its operational characteristics and its likely impacts. Instead, the sessions provided little meaningful information and did not assist myself and other residents to understand or respond to the development.

On that basis, the face-to-face sessions appear to have been largely procedural in nature and may have functioned primarily as a “tick-box” exercise for the purposes of supporting the EIS, rather than as genuine community engagement.

Community Feedback Has Not Been Accurately Captured

I also completed an online community engagement form, through which I identified a number of concerns and potential impacts from my perspective as an affected resident. These included, among other matters, the potential loss of property value to homeowners.

However, these concerns have not been adequately captured or reported in Appendix JJ. Community engagement material should accurately record and disclose the issues raised by residents, even where those issues are adverse to the Applicant's position.

This also raises a broader concern that other resident concerns may have been selectively excluded, downplayed, or withheld from the EIS documentation. Accordingly, Goodman and Urbis should be required to provide the full unredacted record of all community engagement feedback received, including online forms, emails, meeting notes, consultation logs, and any internal summaries used to prepare Appendix JJ.

In addition, Appendix JJ states that, "*30 respondents (or 76.9%) stated there would be **no positive impact** resulting from the proposed development*", but the EIS main body on page 8 states the opposite in that, "*The proposal is in the public interest for the following reasons:*

- *No adverse environmental, social or economic impacts will result from the proposal*."

Consultation Material Understates the Development

The consultation material reportedly issued to the community, as included in Appendix JJ, appears to have materially understated the true nature of the proposed development and its associated impacts. The proposal is not a minor commercial building, warehouse, or ordinary industrial facility. It is a large, complex, high-intensity data centre involving substantial built form, major mechanical plant, diesel backup generators, electrical infrastructure, 24/7 operation, and potentially significant noise, air quality, visual, traffic and infrastructure impacts.

The community should have been clearly informed that the proposal may involve:

- continuous 24-hour, 7-day operation
- substantial rooftop or external mechanical plant
- diesel generator testing
- potential emergency generator operation
- industrial noise sources operating during night-time periods
- construction impacts over an extended period
- visual bulk and scale impacts
- cumulative impacts with other industrial and data centre developments
- potential air quality impacts from diesel combustion
- increased pressure on electricity, water, traffic and local infrastructure.

If the consultation material did not clearly and prominently identify these matters, then residents were not in a position to make an informed response. The key issue for NSW Planning is whether the community was given a fair, accurate and complete description of what was actually proposed. If the material downplayed the height, massing, operational intensity, generator reliance,

mechanical plant, night-time operations, emissions risk, construction duration or cumulative impacts, then the engagement process was fundamentally flawed.

The "Mitigated Assessment" Ratings Are Not Credible

I strongly reject the "mitigated assessment" ratings in Appendix JJ, particularly where impacts are characterised as **Negligible**, **Low**, **Low Positive** or otherwise acceptable.

Appendix JJ appears to rely on mitigation to reduce impacts to low or negligible levels. However, mitigation should not be used as a device to minimise impacts unless it is clearly demonstrated to be:

- fully designed
- certain to be delivered
- technically effective
- enforceable
- independently verifiable
- capable of performing under worst-case operating conditions
- responsive to the actual concerns raised by affected residents.

That has not been demonstrated.

A clear misrepresentation in Appendix JJ is where "Health and wellbeing" has been granted a "Medium positive" score for "Enhanced access to working amenities and services for future workers". The existing site is understood to support a workforce of more than 100 staff, whereas the EIS claims that only 26 full time staff would operate the Data Centre once in operations. That is a negative impact, not "medium positive", and should be re-graded as a negative impact. This is just one example of many misrepresentations throughout Appendix JJ.

Also a social impact cannot be treated as "negligible" merely because the Applicant says it will be managed. The proper question is whether the impact has been avoided, properly assessed, reduced to an acceptable level, and demonstrated as acceptable through evidence. Appendix JJ does not appear to do that.

The broader EIS is already affected by deficiencies including incomplete impact assessment, reliance on constrained and favourable operational assumptions, over-reliance on unverified mitigation, and failure to assess cumulative and worst-case scenarios. In that context, Appendix JJ cannot credibly rely on those same uncertain assumptions and mitigation measures to downgrade social impacts to negligible or low.

The Assessment Understates the Lived Experience of Affected Residents

Appendix JJ appears to assess social impacts from a desktop or consultant-led perspective, rather than from the lived experience of residents who will actually experience the impacts.

For nearby residents, this proposal is likely to affect daily life in practical and tangible ways, including through:

- anxiety and stress associated with a major industrial facility being located close to homes
- uncertainty about health, amenity and property impacts
- fear of night-time operational noise and sleep disturbance
- concern about diesel generator emissions
- concern about loss of residential amenity
- concern about visual dominance and industrialisation of the local area
- concern about construction disruption over an extended period
- concern about cumulative data centre clustering
- concern about loss of trees and local environmental character
- concern about infrastructure capacity, including electricity and water
- concern about property value impacts.

These are not negligible impacts. They are real social impacts arising from the nature of the proposal and the way it has been assessed and communicated.

Appendix JJ Relies on Incomplete Technical Conclusions

Appendix JJ appears to rely heavily on the conclusions of other EIS technical appendices. That is a fundamental problem because those appendices are themselves contested and appear incomplete.

The broader objection framework identifies significant deficiencies, including:

- failure to assess full generator fleet operation
- failure to assess extended outage scenarios
- failure to assess night-time emergency generator operation
- inadequate assessment of cumulative impacts
- reliance on average noise metrics without adequate characterisation of tonality, low-frequency noise and intermittency
- inadequate sleep disturbance assessment
- unrealistic operational assumptions
- limited assessment of diesel generator emissions
- inadequate assessment of peak PM2.5 exposure and short-term concentration spikes
- insufficient justification of site suitability

- over-reliance on conceptual mitigation.

If the technical assessments are incomplete, constrained or based on favourable assumptions, then Appendix JJ cannot validly rely on them to conclude that social impacts are negligible, low or otherwise acceptable.

Sleep Disturbance and Night-Time Amenity Have Been Understated

Appendix JJ downplays sleep disturbance and night-time amenity impacts by suggesting that noisy events would be limited, infrequent, or would not occur on a regular basis.

The fact that a noise event may be described as “limited” or “infrequent” does not mean it is socially or environmentally insignificant. Sleep disturbance is not assessed only by reference to frequency. It is affected by the timing, character, intensity, suddenness, duration and maximum level of noise events.

This is particularly important for a 24-hour data centre located near residential receivers. The proposal includes continuous mechanical plant, cooling infrastructure, electrical equipment and diesel backup generators. These are not incidental or passive features. They are integral operational components of the development and may affect the night-time acoustic environment.

The NSW EPA’s **Noise Policy for Industry** expressly recognises that the potential for sleep disturbance from **maximum noise level events** during the night-time period needs to be considered, and that sleep disturbance includes both awakenings and disturbance to sleep stages. The NSW EPA’s guidance also explains that sleep disturbance screening involves both a night-time LAeq,15min level and a maximum LAFmax level, and that exceedance of either trigger may require detailed assessment of maximum noise level events.

Accordingly, Appendix JJ cannot credibly dismiss sleep disturbance merely by asserting that noisy events are limited or not regular. The proper assessment question is whether maximum noise events, intermittent events and night-time operational scenarios have been assessed at the most affected residential receivers.

For a data centre, the relevant sleep disturbance risks include:

- generator start-up, ramp-up, operation and shutdown
- generator testing
- emergency generator operation during grid outage events
- simultaneous or sequential operation of multiple generators
- low-frequency diesel generator noise
- tonal or low-frequency noise from chillers, fans, pumps, transformers and ventilation systems
- plant cycling or changes in cooling load during hot weather
- night-time operation during periods of low background noise

- adverse meteorological conditions that may enhance noise propagation
- cumulative night-time noise from surrounding industrial sources and other data centre-related infrastructure.

A key factual point is that night-time noise is treated differently because sleep is a sensitive human activity. The World Health Organization recognises environmental noise as a health issue associated with sleep disturbance. NSW EPA policy similarly incorporates sleep disturbance assessment levels informed by World Health Organization guidance.

It is therefore not sufficient for Appendix JJ to characterise the impact as low on the basis that noisy events may not occur often. Residents may be affected not only by actual awakening, but also by changes to sleep quality.

This is especially relevant where the EIS appears to rely on constrained and favourable operating assumptions. If the noise assessment does not model credible worst-case night-time conditions, including emergency generator operation, maximum noise events, low-frequency noise and cumulative industrial noise, then Appendix JJ has no reliable basis to conclude that sleep disturbance and night-time amenity impacts are negligible or low.

The Social Impact Assessment should therefore have treated sleep disturbance and night-time amenity as material adverse impacts requiring detailed assessment, not as minor or unlikely matters capable of being dismissed through general statements about limited frequency.

Noise Impacts Have Been Understated

The proposal involves continuous mechanical plant, cooling systems, electrical infrastructure and backup diesel generators. These sources are materially relevant to residential amenity.

The concern is not only whether the proposal can comply with a numerical noise criterion under selected assumptions. The concern is whether the community will experience a persistent change in acoustic character, including industrial hum, low-frequency noise, intermittent generator-related events and night-time noise.

The EIS appears to rely on constrained operational assumptions and does not appear to test the full operation setting of the development. In those circumstances, Appendix JJ has no reliable basis to downgrade social impacts from noise to negligible or low.

Air Quality and Diesel Generator Concerns Have Been Understated

The presence of a large number of diesel backup generators is a material social impact issue, not merely a technical air quality issue.

Residents are entitled to be concerned about diesel emissions, short-term exposure events, generator testing, emergency outage operation and cumulative emissions from other industrial or data centre uses. If the air quality assessment is based on limited generator operating assumptions and does not adequately assess extended outages, multiple generator operation, peak PM2.5 exposure or short-term pollutant spikes, then social concern about air quality cannot be dismissed as negligible.

The fact that a technical appendix may conclude compliance under selected assumptions does not mean that the lived social impact on residents is negligible.

Visual, Built Form and Character Impacts Have Been Understated

The proposed development involves a substantial built form and a significant change in the character of the area. The development's height, bulk, massing, industrial appearance, rooftop plant and associated infrastructure are likely to affect the visual environment experienced by nearby residents.

These impacts are not simply aesthetic. They affect sense of place, residential outlook, neighbourhood character, perceived enclosure, and the community's relationship with its local environment.

Appendix JJ's mitigated assessment does not appear to properly reflect the psychological and amenity impact of placing a large-scale industrial data centre close to homes and community uses.

Construction Impacts Have Been Understated

Construction impacts should not be treated as low or negligible simply because they are temporary. The construction period for a development of this scale may be prolonged, disruptive and highly intrusive.

Potential construction-related social impacts include:

- noise
- vibration
- dust
- truck movements
- traffic disruption
- loss of amenity
- safety concerns
- construction fatigue
- disruption to families and school communities
- reduced enjoyment of homes and outdoor areas
- cumulative impacts with other nearby works.

For myself and local residents, a multi-year construction period is not a minor inconvenience. It is a material disruption to daily life.

Property Value Impacts Have Been Ignored or Inadequately Captured

Residents including myself have raised concern that the proposal may affect property values. This is a legitimate social impact concern.

Whether or not the Applicant accepts the impact, Appendix JJ should have recorded and assessed it. A perceived or actual reduction in property value affects household wealth, financial security, future saleability and residents' sense of fairness. It may also result in a wealth transfer from affected homeowners, who bear the amenity and value impacts, to the developer, who captures the commercial uplift from the project.

The downplaying of property value concerns further undermines the reliability of Appendix JJ. Also refer to my comment above where Appendix JJ has not included the fact that I had informed Goodman/Urbis on property value impacts.

Cumulative Social Impacts Have Not Been Properly Considered

Appendix JJ appears to assess the proposal too narrowly. The social impact of this data centre cannot be understood in isolation from the broader pattern of industrial intensification and data centre clustering in the area.

The relevant cumulative social impacts include:

- cumulative operational noise
- cumulative diesel generator emissions
- cumulative construction fatigue
- cumulative traffic impacts
- cumulative visual industrialisation
- cumulative pressure on infrastructure
- cumulative loss of residential amenity
- cumulative anxiety about future data centre expansion
- cumulative perception that the community is being asked to absorb impacts for broader commercial or infrastructure benefit.

A social impact assessment that does not properly grapple with cumulative impact cannot credibly conclude that mitigated impacts are negligible or low.

Claimed Positive Social Impacts Are Overstated

Appendix JJ also appears to attribute positive social impact to the development. Any such claimed positive impacts should be treated with caution.

While the proposal may deliver economic or infrastructure benefits to the Applicant, its customers or broader digital infrastructure markets, that does not mean it delivers positive social outcomes for the immediately affected community.

For nearby residents, the direct local impacts are likely to be adverse: noise, visual impact, amenity loss, construction disruption, perceived health risk, uncertainty, stress, loss of confidence in the planning process, and potential property value impacts.

Appendix JJ should not characterise broad commercial or economic benefits as positive social impacts for residents who are likely to bear the localised burden. The Environment and Planning Act, including s4.15 (1) (b) (c) and (d) mandates the criteria that an EIS needs to meet.

The Assessment Fails to Apply a Precautionary Approach

Where there is uncertainty about noise, sleep disturbance, air quality, generator operation, cumulative impacts, infrastructure capacity or health-related concerns, Appendix JJ should adopt a precautionary approach.

Instead, the mitigated assessment appears to assume that impacts will be managed down to negligible or low levels. That approach is not appropriate where:

- the final design may not be complete
- mitigation is not fully validated
- worst-case scenarios have not been assessed
- affected residents have not been properly engaged
- community feedback appears incomplete
- sensitive receivers are nearby
- the development will operate continuously.

A precautionary social impact assessment would identify these uncertainties as material adverse impacts, not minimise them.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I reject the “mitigated assessment” ratings in Appendix JJ and the subsequent contents of the document. The conclusions that impacts are negligible, low, low positive or otherwise acceptable are not supported by the actual nature of the proposed development, the concerns raised by residents, or the deficiencies in the broader EIS.

Appendix JJ appears to rely on incomplete engagement, favourable technical assumptions, unverified mitigation and selective characterisation of impacts. It does not adequately reflect the lived experience of affected residents or the reasonable social concerns arising from a large-scale, 24-hour data centre located close to homes and community uses.

NSW Planning should therefore give little or no weight to Appendix JJ’s mitigated impact ratings. **Further, Appendix JJ must be treated as materially deficient and unreliable**.

18.1 Questions for Goodman, Urbis and NSW Planning

The following questions should be put directly to the Applicant and NSW Planning:

1. Which specific residential addresses were notified about the proposal before the EIS was placed on exhibition?

2. What evidence can Goodman and Urbis provide that notification material was actually delivered to those addresses?
3. Why did numerous nearby residents receive no direct communication about the proposal?
4. What community engagement was undertaken with residents closest to the proposed data centre?
5. What engagement was undertaken with Lane Cove West Public School, parents, carers and other sensitive community stakeholders?
6. Did the consultation material clearly disclose the full size, height, scale and industrial character of the proposed development?
7. Did the consultation material clearly identify the number of diesel generators, the role of backup power, generator testing, and potential outage operation?
8. Did the consultation material clearly explain that the facility would operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and include those associated impacts?
9. Did the consultation material clearly identify potential night-time noise, sleep disturbance, air quality and cumulative impacts?
10. Did the consultation material explain the proposed building height exceedance and the proximity of the development to residential receivers?
11. Did the consultation material include visual material that accurately represented the bulk, height, massing and proximity of the proposed development?
12. Did Appendix JJ disclose the number of residents who were not contacted, did not respond, or were unaware of the proposal?
13. Has NSW Planning independently verified the accuracy of Appendix JJ, or has it simply accepted the Applicant's account of consultation?
14. Will NSW Planning require Goodman and Urbis to provide a statutory declaration or formal certification confirming the accuracy of all consultation claims made in Appendix JJ?
15. Appendix JJ contains materially inaccurate or misleading statements, and therefore what compliance, enforcement or procedural action will NSW Planning take?

18.2 Additional Questions to the Applicant

1. Why does the EIS Social Impact Assessment contain misleading information?
2. Why didn't the Applicant consult directly with nearby residents?
3. Has the Applicant consulted with vulnerable groups?
4. Has the Applicant assessed community anxiety and perceived risk?
5. Has the Applicant assessed impacts on children and families?

6. Has the Applicant assessed impacts on shift workers?
7. Has the Applicant assessed impacts on people working from home?
8. Has the Applicant assessed impacts on outdoor amenity?
9. Has the Applicant assessed potential property value impacts?
10. Has the Applicant assessed cumulative social impact from data centre clustering?
11. Has the Applicant provided meaningful alternatives or design changes in response to community concern?

18.3 Additional Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning require a revised Social Impact Assessment that accurately reflects community feedback, lived experience, cumulative impacts, uncertainty, perceived risk and impacts on nearby residents and social infrastructure??
2. Will NSW Planning give weight to genuine lived experience and community concern?
3. Will NSW Planning require further consultation before determination?
4. Will NSW Planning assess whether the proposal is in the public interest given the scale of community opposition?

19 Property Value and Wealth Transfer Impacts Have Not Been Addressed

The proposal may result in perceived or actual impacts on residential property values due to visual bulk, industrialisation, noise, generator risk, diesel emissions and loss of amenity. This may operate as a wealth transfer from existing homeowners, who bear the amenity and value risk, to the developer, who captures development value.

19.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Has the EIS assessed potential property value impacts?
2. Has the EIS assessed whether residential desirability may be affected?
3. Has the EIS assessed whether proximity to a 24/7 data centre affects market perception?
4. Has the EIS assessed whether noise, visual and air quality impacts may affect property values?
5. Has the EIS assessed whether the proposal creates a private benefit at public and community cost?
6. Has the Applicant proposed any benefit to nearby homeowners (i.e. locality benefit) or compensation mechanism?

19.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning consider economic impacts on nearby homeowners?
2. Will NSW Planning consider whether the proposal creates an inequitable transfer of value?
3. Will NSW Planning consider property impacts as part of social and economic impacts in the locality?

20 Emergency, Outage and Resilience Scenarios Are Inadequately Assessed

The EIS must assess how the development operates during emergency and abnormal scenarios, not only routine operation.

20.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. What happens during full grid outage?
2. How many generators operate during full outage?
3. How long can the facility operate on diesel?
4. What happens during extended outages?
5. What happens during heatwave conditions?
6. What happens during water supply constraints?
7. What happens during equipment failure?
8. What happens during fire or emergency incidents?
9. Have emergency noise impacts been assessed?
10. Have emergency air quality impacts been assessed?
11. Have emergency traffic impacts been assessed?
12. Have emergency community notification procedures been proposed?
13. Has cumulative emergency operation with other data centres been assessed?

20.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning require full emergency scenario assessment?
2. Will NSW Planning require assessment of extended diesel operation?
3. Will NSW Planning require emergency generator operation to be disclosed and reported?
4. Will NSW Planning require emergency management plans to be reviewed before determination?

21 The EIS Does Not Provide Adequate Conditions for Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement

The EIS must lead to conditions that are clear, measurable, enforceable and auditable.

21.1 Questions to the Applicant

1. Will the Applicant accept enforceable noise limits?
2. Will the Applicant accept enforceable air quality limits?
3. Will the Applicant accept generator runtime limits?
4. Will the Applicant accept generator testing restrictions?
5. Will the Applicant accept traffic restrictions?
6. Will the Applicant accept construction hour restrictions?
7. Will the Applicant accept monitoring obligations?
8. Will the Applicant accept independent auditing?
9. Will the Applicant accept public reporting?
10. Will the Applicant accept mandatory rectification obligations?
11. Will the Applicant accept operational restrictions if exceedances occur?
12. Will the Applicant accept penalties, stop work order, stop operation order and/or consequences for non-compliance?

21.2 Questions to NSW Planning

1. Will NSW Planning impose measurable conditions?
2. Will NSW Planning impose monitoring conditions?
3. Will NSW Planning require independent auditing?
4. Will NSW Planning require public reporting?
5. Will NSW Planning impose mandatory rectification obligations?
6. Will NSW Planning ensure non-compliant operations and/or breaches to conditions of consent result enforcement action, including but not limited to stop work orders, prevention notices, orders, penalties, operating restrictions, or other compliance mechanisms available under relevant legislation?

22 Discrepancies contained within the EIS

Internal Discrepancies, Conflicting Assumptions and Unresolved Gaps Across the EIS Pack

The EIS package contains numerous internal discrepancies, conflicting assumptions and unresolved gaps across the main EIS and supporting technical appendices. These are not minor editorial issues. They go directly to the reliability of the assessment, the accuracy of the proposal description, the credibility of the claimed impacts, and the ability of NSW Planning and the community to understand what is actually being proposed.

The combined effect of these discrepancies is that the EIS cannot be safely relied upon for determination. In several instances, different appendices appear to assess different versions of the project, rely on different assumptions, or present materially different conclusions regarding height, scale, residential proximity, employment, noise, generator operation, diesel storage, air quality, vegetation, visual impact, social impact, water, infrastructure and cumulative impacts.

These inconsistencies must be reconciled before the application is determined.

22.1 Core Project Description Discrepancies

Height: 18 metres vs 28.3 metres vs 33 metres

There are material inconsistencies in how the height of the proposed development is described across the EIS package.

The Social Impact Assessment describes the proposal as an approximately **18-metre-tall building** operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. However, the main EIS states that the data hall buildings rise to a maximum height of **28.3 metres**, while the Engagement Report told community members that the proposed building height would range from approximately **13 metres to 33 metres**.

This is a significant discrepancy. It suggests that the Social Impact Assessment may have assessed community and social impacts on the basis of a materially lower building height than the actual design envelope or the material provided to the community.

The applicant must reconcile whether the true maximum height is 18 metres, 28.3 metres or 33 metres, and whether the 33-metre figure includes rooftop plant, screens, generators, roof structures or other elements.

Height variation assessment may be based on an incomplete height envelope

The main EIS project summary identifies a maximum height of 28.3 metres. However, other project material issued to the community refers to a maximum height of 33 metres.

This raises a serious concern that the Clause 4.6 / height variation assessment may have been framed around 28.3 metres, while the community was told that the proposal may reach 33 metres. If the true maximum built form envelope is 33 metres, then the height exceedance, visual impact, urban design assessment, social impact assessment and community engagement material must all be reassessed on that basis.

“Three-storey data centre” description understates the actual vertical mass

Multiple reports describe the proposal as a “three-storey data centre building”. However, the main EIS refers to five segmented data halls across several levels, while architectural sections appear to show lower ground, ground, Level 01, Level 02, roof level, and top-of-screen / plant zones.

The simplified “three-storey” description appears to understate the perceived scale, plant levels, vertical mass and visual dominance of the development. The applicant must provide a single, clear and consistent description of the building form, including all levels, plant zones, screens and rooftop elements.

Power demand: 81 MW vs 90 MVA vs 60 MVA references

The main EIS states that Goodman intends to redevelop the site for an **81MW** data centre and also refers to an 81MW total estimated power supply. However, other technical material refers to a **90MVA** substation / transformer arrangement (which may be acceptable due to redundancy requirements). Appendix T Air Quality Impact Assessment states that Power Consumption is “***60 MVA***”. This suggests that the Appendix T is based on an understated or inconsistent input.

This must be reconciled. The EIS should clearly distinguish between IT load, total power supply, transformer capacity, substation capacity and any allowance for redundancy or future expansion. These figures are not merely technical details. They drive the assessment of noise, heat rejection, water demand, generator requirements, diesel storage, dangerous goods, fire safety, infrastructure augmentation and cumulative impacts.

Off-site power infrastructure is not fully assessed

The Infrastructure Report states that augmentation of the high-voltage network is expected and that Ausgrid will advise final supply capacity and feeder routes. It also states that feeder supply routes are outside the subject site boundary and will be approved under utility permitted development rights.

This is a material gap. Off-site electricity infrastructure is necessary for the development to operate, yet it does not appear to be fully assessed as part of the EIS. The environmental, traffic, construction, visual, community and cumulative impacts of that off-site infrastructure should not be deferred or excluded from assessment.

22.2 Residential Proximity and Sensitive Receiver Discrepancies

Residential distance: 200m / 250m vs 50m vs near-boundary assessment points

Different technical reports use materially different assumptions regarding the proximity of residential receivers.

The Landscape Report states that the closest residential uses are approximately **200 metres east on Wood Street** and **250 metres north on Banksia Close**. By contrast, the Air Quality Assessment states that the closest residential properties are approximately **50 metres east on Wood Street** and **50 metres north on Banksia Close**. The Noise Assessment also includes monitoring locations at the end of Mars Road / Banksia Close, behind 64 Wood Street near the Community Nursery, and in front of 8 Banksia Close.

This is a critical inconsistency. Reports relying on a 200m / 250m separation may materially understate impacts compared with reports recognising receivers at approximately 50 metres or closer in acoustic terms.

The applicant must provide a single sensitive-receiver register identifying the closest residential, recreational, community, school and ecological receivers, with verified distances from the development boundary, built form, plant areas, generators, exhaust points and construction work fronts.

Sensitive interface is downplayed

The Clause 4.6 Variation Request describes residential properties as being located “further east”, while also acknowledging public recreation land to the south and the Lane Cove Community Nursery directly adjoining the north-eastern corner of the site.

That language downplays the sensitivity of the surrounding interface. The site is not isolated from sensitive receivers. It sits near residential areas, public recreation land, community infrastructure and environmental land. The EIS should assess the development on that basis.

Sensitive receiver hierarchy is inconsistent across disciplines

The Noise Assessment treats locations around Banksia Close, Wood Street and the Community Nursery as relevant acoustic environments. However, the Landscape Report frames residential uses as being 200m / 250m away.

This inconsistency means the same project alternates between recognising close sensitive receivers when required for acoustic assessment, while relying on more distant residential context when assessing visual and landscape impacts. That approach is not acceptable. Sensitive receiver assumptions must be consistent across all technical disciplines.

22.3 Employment and Public Benefit Discrepancies

Construction jobs: 200 vs 350

The main EIS states that the proposal will create approximately **200 full-time equivalent construction jobs**. However, the Engagement Report states that Goodman told the community the project would generate **350 full-time jobs** through construction over a 34-month period.

This is a material inconsistency in the claimed public benefit. The applicant must reconcile whether the proposal creates 200 or 350 construction jobs, whether these are full-time equivalent positions, peak workforce numbers, direct jobs, indirect jobs, or total job-years.

Operational jobs: 26 vs up to 45

The main EIS states that the operational data centre will provide **26 ongoing operational jobs**. The Engagement Report states that Goodman anticipated up to **45 full-time operational jobs**.

This inconsistency materially affects the claimed employment benefit of the proposal. It also affects transport, parking, social impact and public interest assumptions.

Employment, parking and staffing assumptions do not align

The main EIS identifies only **24 at-grade parking spaces** and **26 operational jobs**, while the Engagement Report refers to up to **45 full-time operational jobs**.

The applicant must reconcile the operational workforce, staff shift patterns, visitor demand, parking provision, transport assessment and public benefit claims. The proposal cannot rely on one staffing assumption for employment benefit and another for parking or traffic impact.

Public interest claim is inconsistent with the technical appendices

The main EIS states that **"No adverse environmental, social or economic impacts will result from the proposal."** That conclusion is not supported by the technical appendices.

The Social Impact Assessment identifies medium negative mitigated construction noise and vibration impacts, while the Noise Assessment predicts construction noise exceedances at residential and active recreation receivers.

The main EIS therefore overstates the acceptability of the proposal and is inconsistent with its own supporting material.

22.4 Noise, Generator Testing and Acoustic Assessment Discrepancies

Construction noise impacts are softened despite predicted exceedances

The Noise Assessment predicts construction noise levels of up to **85 dBA** at NCA02 residential receivers during hard-rock excavation, and up to **85 dBA** at active recreation receivers, exceeding the relevant noise management levels.

Despite this, the Social Impact Assessment appears to reduce construction air and noise impacts through management-plan style mitigation.

This is not adequate. Significant predicted exceedances should not be softened through generic mitigation language. The EIS must identify the actual magnitude, duration, frequency and lived impact of those exceedances on residents, park users, schools and community facilities.

Generator testing impacts on Blackman Park are not properly carried into the Social Impact Assessment

The Noise Assessment explicitly models generator maintenance and testing involving **49 generators**, quarterly and annual testing, one generator plus two load banks at a time, and **155.2 cumulative hours** of testing between 7:00am and 5:00pm Monday to Friday.

Despite this, the Social Impact Assessment rates Blackman Park amenity as negligible after mitigation.

This is inconsistent. Blackman Park is a major community recreation facility. The lived impact of generator testing, including noise character, frequency, duration and cumulative amenity impact, should have been properly assessed in the Social Impact Assessment.

Emergency all-generator operation is treated as “for information only”

The Noise Assessment states that it is not considered reasonable for the development to meet operational noise criteria during infrequent emergency all-generator operation, and that predicted levels are provided for information only.

That is a significant gap. Emergency generator operation is not hypothetical. Backup generation is integral to the operation of a data centre. If all-generator operation is outside normal operational noise criteria, then that scenario must be carried through to the Social Impact Assessment, public interest assessment and consent risk assessment.

The main EIS and Social Impact Assessment should not present operational noise as negligible or acceptable while treating emergency generator operation as outside the assessment framework.

Low-frequency and tonal noise remain unresolved because plant is indicative

The Noise Assessment includes mechanical plant data, octave-band information and indicative noise sources, including cooling tower sound power data and warnings that frequency inverters can increase sound levels.

This indicates that final plant, louvres, silencers and tenant-specific requirements may not be fixed. If so, firm conclusions about operational noise, low-frequency noise, tonality and sleep disturbance are premature.

The EIS should not rely on final design mitigation that has not yet been fully specified, modelled, validated and exhibited.

Noise monitoring confirms nearby sensitivity, while other reports treat residents as distant

The Noise Assessment records attended monitoring near Mars Road / Banksia Close, behind 64 Wood Street adjacent to the Community Nursery, and in front of 8 Banksia Close. By contrast, the Landscape Report states that the closest residences are 200m / 250m away.

This is another example of inconsistent sensitive receiver assumptions. The EIS must adopt a single, conservative receiver baseline across all disciplines.

22.5 Diesel, Dangerous Goods and Fire Safety Discrepancies

Diesel storage arrangement is unclear

The Infrastructure Report says the backup power system comprises **49 low-voltage diesel generators** served by approximately **eight in-ground bulk fuel storage tanks**. However, the Engagement Report told residents that diesel would be stored in steel tanks enclosed within a four-hour fire-rated, bunded room with leak detection.

These descriptions appear materially different. The applicant must clarify the actual diesel storage arrangement, including whether storage is in-ground, above-ground, internal, external, in a bunded room, in bulk tanks, day tanks, or a combination of systems.

Diesel reliance conflicts with sustainability framing

The Infrastructure Report states that solar with battery storage, wind with battery storage, hydrogen fuel cells, green hydrogen and HVO are not suitable or not suitable in the near term, while diesel generators are identified as suitable.

This practical reliance on diesel backup power must be reconciled with any sustainability, low-impact or public-interest framing in the EIS. The proposal should not be presented as environmentally progressive while materially relying on diesel backup generation.

Dangerous goods risk documentation is incomplete

The Dangerous Goods Report identifies the need for a Dangerous Goods Risk Assessment and Emergency Response Plan.

This is a material gap. Dangerous goods risks are treated as manageable, but key operational safety documents are future requirements rather than final exhibited documents. NSW Planning and the community should not be asked to accept material dangerous goods risks on the basis of future documentation.

Fire strategy is conceptual, not final

The Fire Safety Concept Strategy states that a fully prescriptive NCC deemed-to-satisfy approach is unlikely to satisfy the desired design, that multiple Performance Solutions are proposed, and that the complete fire engineering analysis will be included in a future Fire Engineering Report.

This is significant. The EIS relies on fire safety being capable of future resolution, but the final fire-engineered solution has not been exhibited. For a data centre involving diesel, batteries, electrical infrastructure and complex plant, this is not a minor issue.

Lithium-ion battery fire behaviour is acknowledged but not reflected in social impact conclusions

The Dangerous Goods Report notes that lithium-ion thermal runaway may continue even with water and that sprinkler systems are intended to attenuate radiant heat and cool modules rather than extinguish the reaction.

Despite this, the Social Impact Assessment rates operational health, wellbeing and cumulative social impacts in low or negligible terms.

That conclusion does not reflect the technical hazard complexity identified in the supporting material.

22.6 Air Quality Discrepancies

Emergency NO_2 exceedance risk is not reflected in the Social Impact Assessment

The Air Quality Assessment states that emergency-condition modelling predicts a low risk of exceedance of the one-hour NO_2 criterion at four of the nearest receptors. However, the Social Impact Assessment rates operational air quality as negligible after mitigation.

This is inconsistent. Even a low risk of exceedance at nearby receptors is materially relevant to health, wellbeing, community perception and social impact. It should not be reduced to negligible without transparent explanation.

Emergency generator impacts are not fully integrated across disciplines

The Air Quality Assessment treats emergency generator operation as unlikely or low risk, while the Noise Assessment states that all-generator operation is outside normal operational noise criteria and provided for information only.

The combined emergency scenario , noise, air quality, community notification, health concern and amenity impact has not been properly integrated into the Social Impact Assessment or main EIS conclusions.

Worst affected receptors are not clearly explained to the community

The Air Quality Assessment refers to modelling of 57 sensitive receptor locations. However, the EIS and community material do not appear to clearly identify which homes, parks, nursery, school or community locations are the worst affected receptors.

Residents should not be required to infer this from technical modelling tables. The EIS should plainly identify the most affected receptors and explain the predicted impacts at those locations.

22.7 Trees, Canopy, Vegetation and Visual Screening Discrepancies

Tree and canopy figures are inconsistent

The main EIS states that **90 trees** will be removed, **132 trees** retained and **104 replacement trees** planted. It also lists tree canopy cover as **9,290m² / 24.7%**. The Urban Heat Island Advice lists tree canopy cover as **29.6%**.

These inconsistent canopy figures must be reconciled. Canopy cover is relevant to visual screening, urban heat, biodiversity, amenity and landscape mitigation.

Canopy target compliance is unclear

The main EIS lists canopy cover as 24.7%, while the Urban Heat Island Advice lists canopy cover as 29.6%.

The community should be told which figure is correct, whether it relates to existing or proposed canopy, whether it includes retained or replacement planting, and whether it meets the relevant Council target.

Visual assessment relies on vegetation while vegetation is being removed

The Architectural Design Report says mature trees have been retained extensively toward the south and that new plantings will create a green edge. It also suggests the building is embedded in the topography to conceal much of its height and bulk.

However, the main EIS confirms that 90 trees will be removed.

The visual assessment therefore appears to rely on vegetation as mitigation while also materially reducing existing vegetation. Replacement planting will take time to mature and cannot be treated as equivalent to existing mature screening at year zero.

Screening appears focused on Mars Road rather than the most sensitive interfaces

The Landscape Report's street-frontage section appears to focus on screening the built form and substation from Mars Road. However, the most sensitive receivers are to the east and south, including residential properties, Blackman Park and the Community Nursery.

The EIS must explain how visual, acoustic and amenity impacts are mitigated at the most sensitive residential, park and nursery interfaces, not merely at the public street frontage.

Vegetation value should not be reduced to lay descriptions

The Social Impact Assessment / engagement material records user perceptions of vegetation, while the BDAR identifies biodiversity and habitat context, and the Arborist Report assesses tree retention values.

Social and amenity conclusions should not rely on simplified or lay descriptions of vegetation if technical reports identify biodiversity, habitat, canopy, screening and amenity functions.

22.8 Visual Impact Assessment Discrepancies

Private residential views are acknowledged but not adequately modelled

The Visual Impact Assessment acknowledges potential views from 10 Banksia Close, approximately five Wood Street dwellings and other Wood Street dwellings, but concludes impacts are low.

This conclusion is not adequately supported unless property-specific photomontages or equivalent visual analysis from the closest and most affected homes are provided. A low impact conclusion should not be accepted where private residential views are acknowledged but not properly modelled.

Blackman Park is under-represented as a visual and social receiver

The Visual Impact Assessment recognises Blackman Park directly south of the site, including sporting fields, dog park, tennis club and skate park.

However, the assessment from Blackman Park appears limited relative to the number, diversity and intensity of park use areas. Blackman Park is not a single generic viewpoint. It contains multiple active and passive recreation areas with different viewing angles, exposure durations and sensitivities.

Physical absorption capacity may be overstated

The Visual Impact Assessment appears to place weight on mature trees and topography limiting views. However, the EIS confirms that 90 trees will be removed and replacement planting is proposed.

The assessment must clearly distinguish between retained trees, removed trees, replacement planting, year-zero post-construction conditions and mature landscape conditions. Otherwise, the physical absorption capacity may be overstated.

22.9 Social Impact Assessment Discrepancies

Broad methodology is not reflected in narrow conclusions

The Social Impact Assessment states that it considers physical and intangible, direct and indirect, and short- and long-term impacts. However, it then rates Blackman Park amenity as negligible, operational noise as negligible, operational air quality as negligible, and visual impact as negligible to low positive.

The conclusions do not appear to reflect the stated methodology. A proper social impact assessment should capture lived experience, uncertainty, perception of risk, loss of amenity, community anxiety, construction fatigue, cumulative impacts and impacts on nearby social infrastructure.

Survey sample is not representative of later community objection

The Social Impact Assessment survey recorded 92 responses, including 57 completed responses. Council later recorded a petition with hundreds of responses and a formal objection.

This suggests that the early survey sample may not be representative of the scale or intensity of later community concern.

Blackman Park's social role is recognised but its impact is rated negligible

The Social Impact Assessment baseline identifies Blackman Park as containing synthetic fields, turf fields, multiple sports uses, lights for night games and training, Scouts, Girl Guides and Imagination Dance.

Despite recognising this diverse community infrastructure, the Social Impact Assessment rates Blackman Park amenity impacts as negligible after mitigation.

That conclusion is inconsistent with the park's acknowledged social role and should be revisited.

Community Nursery is not adequately assessed as standalone social infrastructure

The Social Impact Assessment includes a photo of the Lane Cove Community Nursery and Eco Garden adjoining the site. The Noise Assessment includes monitoring adjacent to the Community Nursery.

However, the Social Impact Assessment does not appear to assess the nursery as a standalone sensitive social infrastructure asset. Given its location, community function and likely sensitivity to construction, noise, dust, access and amenity impacts, this is a material omission.

School engagement appears weak and unreliable

The Engagement Report records that Lane Cove West Public School stated the relieving principal and deputy first became aware of the proposal when a family brought it to their attention, despite previous correspondence.

This is a serious engagement gap. The fact that correspondence may have been sent does not mean effective engagement occurred. If the school itself was unaware of the proposal until informed by a family, the EIS should not present school engagement as adequate.

22.10 Water, Stormwater and Urban Heat Discrepancies

Stormwater assessment does not resolve loss of beneficial stormwater reuse

The Stormwater Report focuses on on-site detention, water quality and discharge management. However, Council has separately raised the issue of existing stormwater reuse supporting Blackman Park irrigation.

“No increased runoff risk” is not the same as assessing the loss or alteration of beneficial stormwater reuse. The EIS should assess the existing beneficial reuse function and explain whether the proposal affects that system.

Urban heat advice appears qualitative rather than properly modelled

The Urban Heat Island Advice acknowledges the requirement to evaluate heat rejection impacts on habitable rooms and communal open spaces, including neighbouring properties. However, it appears to rely on qualitative mitigation measures and broad canopy / solar reflectance index statements.

The SEARs require evaluation of heat rejection impacts. That should involve property-, park-, nursery- and receiver-specific analysis, not merely general mitigation commentary.

Canopy figures used for heat mitigation are inconsistent

The EIS canopy cover figure of 24.7% and the Urban Heat Island Advice figure of 29.6% must be reconciled, particularly where canopy is relied upon as heat mitigation.

Water management scope is too narrow

The Stormwater / Integrated Water report focuses on stormwater drainage and refers potable water and wastewater to hydraulic documentation.

That approach does not provide an integrated assessment of broader water-related issues, including total water demand, recycled water, cooling demand, irrigation impacts, drought resilience and cumulative data-centre water use.

22.11 Infrastructure and Staging Discrepancies

Off-site telecommunications and fibre routes are deferred

The Infrastructure Report states that Goodman will negotiate with preferred telecommunications carriers during design finalisation and that required routes or asset changes will be identified at that point.

This defers potentially material off-site works and public-domain impacts until after assessment.

Electricity augmentation is not finalised

The Infrastructure Report states that Ausgrid will advise final supply capacity and route options, and that high-voltage network augmentation is expected.

A major infrastructure dependency is therefore unresolved. The proposal should not be determined before the scale, route, timing and impacts of required electricity augmentation are assessed.

Construction staging relies on later sign-offs

The Infrastructure Report states that sign-off from relevant infrastructure authorities will be obtained as relevant, and that commissioning will occur before business-as-usual operation.

This does not provide certainty about when and how infrastructure dependencies will be delivered, assessed, coordinated or managed.

22.12 Construction Management Discrepancies

Construction traffic and worker parking are deferred to future plans

The Mitigation Measures Table states that a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared prior to construction and will include construction traffic generation and worker parking.

This is a deferral of assessment. Construction traffic generation, haulage routes, worker parking, local road impacts, school-related impacts and cumulative construction traffic should be substantially assessed before determination, not left to a future management plan.

Construction noise exceedances are met with generic mitigation

Predicted construction noise exceeds noise management levels at residential, school and active recreation receivers. However, the Social Impact Assessment appears to mitigate this through a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan and communications strategy.

A predicted high-impact construction environment requires site-specific, enforceable mitigation, not standard management-plan language.

Construction fatigue is not quantified

The Social Impact Assessment identifies cumulative and construction impacts, but does not provide a robust standalone assessment of construction fatigue.

For nearby residents, park users, schools and community facilities, a prolonged construction period can create sustained disruption. The EIS should quantify duration, intensity, overlap with other projects and likely cumulative burden.

22.13 Cumulative Impact Discrepancies

Cumulative impacts are identified but not quantified

The Social Impact Assessment lists cumulative impacts including construction, on-site fuel / lithium battery storage, safety and security, contribution to the digital economy, and urban heat.

However, these cumulative impacts do not appear to be meaningfully quantified across multiple existing and proposed Lane Cove West data centres or other relevant industrial developments.

Data-centre clustering is used as a benefit but not assessed as a burden

The Engagement Report states that proximity to other data centres supports hybrid solutions, backup systems and disaster recovery.

This uses data-centre clustering as a project benefit. However, the cumulative burdens of clustering including power demand, water demand, heat rejection, diesel generator testing, emergency generator operation, construction impacts and reduced employment density are not fully assessed.

The applicant should not be permitted to rely on clustering as a benefit while avoiding assessment of clustering as a cumulative impact.

Site-selection rationale does not reflect the sensitive interface

The Engagement Report states that the site was selected due to zoning and to minimise impacts on residential areas. However, other documents acknowledge nearby residential dwellings, the Community Nursery, Blackman Park and the C2 environmental conservation corridor.

The location rationale is therefore inconsistent with the actual sensitive interface around the site.

23 Required Action Before Determination

Given the number and significance of the unresolved inconsistencies and cross-report gaps identified above, the applicant should be required to provide a single reconciled design-basis register before any determination.

That register should identify, for each EIS appendix and technical report, the exact assumptions used for:

- maximum building height, including rooftop plant, screens, generators and other roof structures
- total power demand, IT load, transformer capacity and substation capacity
- generator number, location, operating assumptions and testing regime
- total diesel volume and tank arrangement
- lithium-ion battery quantity, chemistry and location
- transformer oil volume, containment and fire-safety provision

- nearest sensitive receivers and measured distances
- construction workforce, vehicle movements and worker parking
- operational jobs, shift patterns and staffing levels
- tree removal, retention, replacement planting and canopy cover
- water demand, recycled water, stormwater reuse and impacts on existing beneficial reuse
- heat-rejection assumptions and receiver-specific heat impacts
- off-site electricity and telecommunications infrastructure works
- cumulative data-centre impacts
- mitigation measures relied upon by each technical discipline.

The applicant should then identify which reports require updating because they relied on a different, incomplete or outdated assumption.

Until this reconciliation is completed and publicly exhibited, NSW Planning should not accept the EIS as a reliable basis for determination. The inconsistencies are too material to be resolved by post-approval conditions or future management plans.

24 Required Further Information Before Determination

The Applicant should be required to provide the following before any determination:

1. revised EIS
2. revised Noise Impact Assessment
3. revised Air Quality Assessment
4. revised Human Health Risk Assessment
5. revised Traffic Impact Assessment
6. revised Construction Environmental Management Plan
7. revised Visual Impact Assessment
8. revised Social Impact Assessment
9. revised cumulative impact assessment
10. formal Ausgrid servicing confirmation
11. formal Sydney Water servicing confirmation
12. full electricity demand disclosure
13. full water demand disclosure
14. greenhouse gas and energy assessment

15. alternatives assessment
16. site suitability assessment
17. land use compatibility assessment
18. emergency and outage scenario assessment
19. diesel storage and spill risk assessment
20. stormwater and flooding assessment
21. urban heat assessment
22. independent acoustic peer review
23. independent air quality peer review
24. independent traffic peer review
25. independent visual impact peer review
26. public re-exhibition of all revised material.

25 Requested Determination Outcome

Primary Position

The application must be refused.

The EIS does not adequately demonstrate that the proposed development is suitable for the site or acceptable in terms of its likely environmental, social, health, amenity, infrastructure and cumulative impacts.

Alternative Position

If NSW Planning is not willing to refuse the application immediately, the application should be paused and the Applicant required to submit revised technical material. That material should be independently peer reviewed and publicly re-exhibited with a sufficient duration for review (i.e. 60 days minimum).

The community should not be required to respond to a moving target after approval. The impacts must be properly assessed before determination.

Also given the concurrent NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into data centres, NSW Planning should consider whether determination should be deferred until the Inquiry's findings and recommendations are available, particularly where those recommendations may be relevant to the assessment of cumulative impacts, energy and water demand, land-use compatibility and community impacts to this proposed data centre at 12 Mars Road.

26 Final Submission Statement

For the reasons set out in this submission, I strongly object to the proposed data centre at 12 Mars Road, Lane Cove West.

This application must be refused.

The EIS is materially deficient, internally inconsistent and unreliable. It does not provide myself, NSW Planning, Council, affected residents or the broader community with a clear assessment of the proposed development and its likely impacts. It relies on constrained assumptions, unresolved design inputs, selective technical conclusions, inconsistent project descriptions, uncertain mitigation, and future management plans that cannot lawfully or practically substitute for proper assessment at the determination stage.

The proposal would expose myself, my family and the local community to significant material impacts associated with operational noise, sleep disturbance, diesel generator emissions, visual bulk, construction disruption, traffic impacts, infrastructure strain, urban heat, safety concerns, cumulative industrialisation and loss of residential amenity.

These impacts are not abstract, temporary or small in nature. They would be borne directly by the surrounding community, while the commercial benefit would accrue to the Applicant. That imbalance is central to the public interest assessment.

The EIS does not demonstrate that the site is suitable for a data centre of this scale, intensity and operational character. To the contrary, once the inconsistencies, omissions and discrepancies across the EIS are properly examined, the material before the community and NSW Planning points to the opposite conclusion in that the site is fundamentally unsuitable for this type of development.

The consent authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal is acceptable. It cannot rely on an EIS that understates impacts, defers critical matters, fails to resolve infrastructure dependencies, inadequately assesses worst-case and cumulative scenarios, and downplays the lived experience of nearby residents.

Accordingly, I reject this proposal and encourage NSW Planning to reject the application also.