

Mr Guy Smith  
Planning Manager

GOODMAN PROPERTY SERVICES (AUST) PTY LIMITED  
Level 17 / 60 Castlereagh Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

10/02/2020

Dear Mr Smith

Oakdale West Industrial Estate-Mod-2 (SSD-7348-Mod-2)  
**Request for Response to Submissions**

The exhibition of the modification application, including the Environmental Assessment Report for the above proposal, ended on 31 January 2020. All submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/25911>.

Please note, the Department is still awaiting comment from TransGrid. These comments will be forwarded to you upon receipt by the Department.

The Department notes that in its submission on the application, Council has raised a number of issues. These issues will need to be resolved in consultation with Council.

The Department requires that you provide a response to the issues raised in all submissions, in accordance with clause 85A(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (EP&A Regulation). In addition, the Department has provided comments on the modification application (**Attachment A**). Please provide a response to the issues raised in these submissions by Thursday 20 February 2020.

Note that under clause 113(7) of the EP&A Regulation, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your response to submissions is received by the Planning Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

If you have any questions, please contact Olivia Hirst on (02) 9274 583 or at [olivia.hirst@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:olivia.hirst@planning.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely



Chris Ritchie  
Director  
Industry Assessments

**as delegate for the Planning Secretary**

Enclosed/Attached:  
Attachment A: Request for further information

## **Attachment A: Request for further information**

### **1. Construction timeline**

Please provide details of the expected construction timeline for the proposed modification as well as all other modification applications associated with SSD 7348.

### **2. Other modifications**

Please include details of the likely interactions between the modification and existing, approved and proposed construction works and operations in the vicinity of the site. This should include details of how the subject modification relates to all other relevant modifications currently with the Department for consideration (including MOD 3).

Additionally, provide a summary of each modification, the expected staging and details of how each modification may impact upon any of the changes sought under the subject modification. All supporting documentation will need to be updated to ensure consistency with other modifications.

### **3. Acoustic Assessment**

The acoustic impacts of the modification should be considered both independently and sequentially i.e. MOD 3 will ultimately change the noise impacts and the noise wall proposed under MOD 2, given we understand MOD 3 is likely to be constructed before MOD 2. As such, this potential acoustic scenario should be addressed within the MOD 2 application. As noted in Council's submission, there is a need to adopt consistent modelling assumptions to inform the predicted noise levels and the assessment should include consideration of the cumulative impacts of preceding development.

### **4. Visual Impact Assessment**

Similar to the matters raised in Point 3 above about the acoustic assessment, the visual impacts of the modification should be considered both independently and sequentially i.e. MOD 3 will ultimately change visual impacts from some receivers and is likely to be constructed before MOD 2, therefore this scenario should be addressed within the MOD 2 application. The visual impact assessment should be updated to include indicative views along the Southern Link Road.

## **5. GFA and GLA**

It is noted that the total GFA is proposed to increase, however the total GLA is proposed to decrease. The modification application notes that the decrease in GLA is a result of the utilisation of vertical automation within the building and construction of additional mezzanine levels which consolidate the building area from that originally approved. Please provide clarification on how the GLA has been calculated.

## **6. Signage**

Please provide details of any proposed lighting/illumination and the dimensions for the proposed signage 'S7 Goodman Signage' and 'S8 Goodman Signage Wall'.

## **7. Tenants**

The modification application notes the purpose of the proposed modification is to facilitate changes to Warehouses 1A-1C to meet the operational needs of the future tenant. Please confirm whether there are tenants in mind for buildings 1B, 1B2 and 1C.

## **8. Setbacks**

The Department notes Council has raised concerns regarding the setbacks provided for lot 1B/1C. In addressing Council's submission, please provide justification for the proposed setbacks in the context of the increased building height sought under the modification.

## **9. Hazards**

Please provide the following additional information relating to the Preliminary Hazard Analysis:

- Provide details on the layout of the DG storage area, including the location of LPG cylinder locations and the storage arrangement for various DG classes.

- Please explain the purposes of the LPG tank and LPG cylinder? What is the anticipated refilling frequency for the LPG tank and the LPG tanker size? What is the LPG cylinder size and the anticipated number of LPG cylinders? Would the LPG cylinder be refilled on site?
- It is noted on Figure 3-2 of PHA that the DG store and the main warehouse are sharing a common wall, and the DG store and the Energy Complex 2 are sharing another common wall. Please clarify whether these walls are fire rated.
- What is stored within Energy Complex 2? Are there transformers or other electrical items?
- It is noted in the Fire Safety Strategy that the bonding construction from the warehouse to the DG store is going to achieve an FRL of 4 hours. Please confirm whether this is equivalent to a fire rated wall of 4 hours?
- Please provide details on the tenancy arrangement for the office premises. Are the offices ancillary to the warehouse?
- It is noted that the risk analysis provided two cases, namely Base Case and Sensitive Case. The sensitive case assumes the spread of fire is controlled by the second row of sprinklers which is further away from the fire source. Is the sprinkler system in the first row independent to the 2nd row? Please clarify whether such arrangement is a standard design requirement and will be installed for the entire DG store.
- The failure frequency established for Jet fire appears to be too low and the fault tree logic is incorrect. However, assuming the LPG tank is 7.5kL, as provided in Table 3.1 of the PHA, and it will comply with current AS 1596, the risk associated with the LPG tanks and its filling operation could likely be managed. Please confirm these assumptions.
- Please clarify whether there is an LPG filling operation for forklifts. The risk associated with LPG release from the forklift filling operation, if it is part of the proposed operation, is not considered in the current analysis, and should be included.