



MR WILSON: Okay. Well, we'll get cracking. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today.

5

Welcome to the meeting today. Gazcorp Proprietary Limited, the applicant, has lodged a State Significant Development application seeking approval to establish an industrial warehouse estate known as the Gazcorp Industrial Estate at 813-913 Wallgrove Road, Horsley Park, within the Western Sydney employment area and the Fairfield Local Government area. My name is Chris Wilson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Professor Chris Fell. The other attendees of the meeting are Brad James and Callum Firth from the Commissioner Secretariat and Georgia Sedgmen from Mecone – Urban Planning & December, who are assisting the secretariat.

10  
15

In the interest of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

20

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So we will throw it over to you to quickly just go through your proposal, the assessment and where you think we're up to today.

25  
30

MR WARD: Okay. Look, thank you for having us, thank you for seeing us and, like I said, we're very excited to be at this juncture. Look, we don't have a long presentation or anything today. We think that the department has done a good job in their assessment report. We support the assessment report and the conclusions that the assessment report or the department has reached. We have only a couple of very small queries about a couple of the conditions. But apart from that, yes – no, we support the recommendations of the department.

35  
40

So I think, you know – I think we're sort of open to just taking questions if the Commission has any questions on the project. Obviously, the project has been going for a number of years now, and I think it's fair to say that it's been fairly intensively scrutinised by the department, by the agencies, and, like I said, the department has done a good job in summarising all of that.

45

MR WILSON: Look, we've asked the department a few questions. I guess some of them relate to their assessment; others are more general questions. In terms of the time frame for development, do you have an understanding? I know it's a bit crystal-gazing, but in terms of the development of the whole concept .....

5

MR WARD: I think Gazcorp is keen to get cracking straightaway. I mean, they were keen to start developing this years ago, so - - -

MR WILSON: Right.

10

MR WARD: I mean, Nabil, if you have - - -

MR GAZAL: Yes, no – do you mean how long do you think - - -

15

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GAZAL: - - - to take it up?

MR WILSON: I mean, there's 16 lots. The take-up, you expect to take - - -

20

MR GAZAL: We're forecasting five years to take it up, that it will be done - - -

MR WILSON: Okay. In full?

25

MR GAZAL: In full. I'm – you know, it depends on the market. It can be less, can be more.

MR WILSON: Sure.

30

MR GAZAL: But there's healthy demand out there.

MR WARD: Certainly the intention is for stage 1 to be built imminently.

MR GAZAL: Imminently, yes.

35

MR WARD: Immediately upon approval.

MR WILSON: So in other words, you have clients - - -

40

MR WARD: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - in mind? Just in terms of that, at this stage there's no proposal to store dangerous goods? It's not part of your application?

45

MR WARD: No.

MR GAZAL: No.

MR WILSON: Okay. So you're effectively looking at this stage for clients who don't – aren't storing dangerous goods.

5 MR GAZAL: No – yes, it's - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR GAZAL: - - - logistics warehouse.

10 MR WILSON: Logistics warehouse, yes.

MR WILSON: Sorry.

15 PROF FELL: Thank you. No, no, it's fine. A question I asked the department, this is a very conventional warehouse development. Can you – it's your overseas practice that would suggest it will be obsolete within a few years time?

MR WARD: Well, do you - - -

20 MR GAZAL: In terms of the building designs?

PROF FELL: Yes, the whole structure of this sort of warehouse park.

25 MR GAZAL: I – they're talking now about – do you mean, like, multistorey warehousing?

PROF FELL: Yes.

30 MR GAZAL: They're starting to look at it in South Sydney from what I've heard. I mean, in Hong Kong and more dense cities they have multistorey warehousing. At the moment it would be a cost factor that would stop that from happening. So at this stage and in this location, I don't think it would be viable. Not today. But I do know that they're starting to look at it in South Sydney. There's a couple of places.

35 MR WARD: I think there – you know, there's a number of planning reasons, I suppose, why the estate is designed in the way that it is, plus, you know, obviously, the market reasons that Nabil refers to. Look, this – this is a concept, so the stage 1 building will be built, you know – or is proposed to be built as it's – as it's – as it's designed in – in the stage 1 application. But the buildings in the subsequent stages,  
40 you know, there could be - - -

PROF FELL: Different.

45 MR WARD: - - - to those buildings as - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR GAZAL: Yes.

MR WARD: - - - the market evolves and, you know, that's, you know, maybe two  
years away, three years away, and if – if there is demand for different types of  
5 buildings, then we would need to come in and, you know, seek a modification to, you  
know, change the – the – the footprint of buildings or – or anything like that. So I  
think there's a – there's – it was always intended that there's a – an element of  
flexibility by using the – the concept proposal, and, you know, we'll – we'll sort of  
see where that – that ends up.

10 MR WILSON: So just in terms of the – the original stage 1 application, it includes  
preparatory works for the whole site, doesn't it?

MR WARD: No, it includes preparatory works for the – the lead-in infrastructure  
15 required to access the first site, which includes bulk earthworks on around about a  
third of the site.

MR GAZAL: Yes.

20 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: But there's – there's other – there's earthworks on the eastern part of  
the site that don't need to be done until future - - -

25 MR WILSON: Further stages.

MR WARD: Yes. So there will be future applications for – for earthworks, and  
that's one of the reasons why – I don't know if you noticed there's a biodiversity  
staging plan. So - - -

30 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WARD: - - - we're not necessarily proposing to undertake - - -

35 MR WILSON: So – so you'll seek – you'll – you'll deliver the offsets when you –  
when you clear the land.

MR WARD: That's right. So - - -

40 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: - - - the first stage – look – look, there's a flexibility which we worked  
with the department to achieve in the – in the drafting condition to say, well, if it's  
appropriate to clear all the – you know, all the vegetation right up front, then – then  
45 we'll do that and offset it all up front if we can get the offsets, or we can clear the  
first – you know, so we can come up with a staging plan once we know how we're

going to source the credits and then deliver the – the credits, you know, to that staging plan.

5 MR WILSON: Yes. That's - - -

MR WARD: So if we clear - - -

MR WILSON: Yes. Yes.

10 MR WARD: - - - all the vegetation up front – yes.

MR WILSON: That makes sense.

15 MR WARD: So that – that – that – that's linked to the earthworks.

MR WILSON: Yes. So it will be - - -

MR WARD: Yes.

20 MR WILSON: - - - commensurate with the clearing. So it will be - - -

MR WARD: That's right, yes. Yes.

25 MR WILSON: It will be linked to the clearing. That's great.

MR WARD: Yes, so then – so in the – yes, so there will be applications in the future for earthworks for the future buildings.

30 PROF FELL: Tim, the – the – the VPA, we've asked the department, is there – is there any reason why we can't view the VPA? It was exhibited, wasn't it? It was a public document?

MR WARD: Yes.

35 MR GAZAL: Yes.

MR WARD: It's on the website.

40 MR WILSON: As executed?

MR WARD: Yes.

MR WILSON: It's on the – it's on the department's website, is it?

45 MR WARD: Yes, it's on the website, I believe. Yes.

MR WILSON: Okay. All right. Just in terms of that – the road, that was all covered in the assessment, wasn't it? It had come with the interim solution orders, but it's an interim solution, I presume, in relation to access to the site.

5 MR WARD: Yes, look, the road was – was probably one of the biggest issues in the assessment.

MR WILSON: It might be worthwhile just giving us a bit of a run-through of the road.

10

MR WARD: I'll give you a bit of a summary of that. So if you look on page 8 of the department's assessment report, you can see one of the early designs. And originally, Gazcorp sought a connection to Wallgrove Road in the middle of the site

---

15

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WARD: --- as a more efficient ---

20 MR WILSON: Yes. No.

MR WARD: --- way of connecting to Wallgrove Road. And we knew the Southern Link Road was a future road that's gazetted under the – under the set.

25 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WARD: So we knew that that road was – was there. So we have two – we propose to have two access points. One to the Southern Link Road, one to Wallgrove Road.

30

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WARD: You know, there was discussions with the RMS. RMS preferred not to have the ---

35

MR WILSON: There was a warrants issue.

MR WARD: The second access on Wallgrove Road.

40 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR WARD: So we agreed to relocate just to the Southern Link Road. And, look, these negotiations went on over a long period of time about the best place to connect and what that would mean in terms of the Southern Link Road, the design of Southern Link Road and the design of the Southern Link Road intersection with Wallgrove Road. Those matters were, you know, resolved through negotiation and design.

45

A lot of design work was done in support of that, and we – we achieved, essentially, an agreed solution for the – for the road, and then that moved into – into a discussion with the – the VPA team and the department as to whether it was appropriate to obtain works in kind for aspects of that – of that – of that road, because if that’s the only – that’s the only access to the site, so part of that road had - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

MR WARD: - - - to be built for stage 1. The – as part of those discussions, we got to the point where it was easier. Because there’s no – council and the RMS couldn’t agree on who’s going to be the roads authority. So without a roads authority, there was no one to sign off on the design of the future Southern Link Road.

MR WILSON: Right.

MR WARD: Um, and that what we were proposing was consistent with the vision for the future Southern Link Road if there was no roads authority to – to verify that. So we agreed to, um, just construct a - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: - - - glorified driveway, um, which could then be acquired.

MR WILSON: It’s two lanes though, or it’s not two lanes, it’s just - - -

MR WARD: It was going to be two lanes. Yeah, it was - - -

MR WILSON: Two lanes: one in, one out.

MR WARD: But a – but a - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR WARD: You know, an internal access road that was, for all intents and purposes, a – a – a private driveway.

MR WILSON: Just in terms of the impacts associated with the realigned road, like the SLR – the SL – sorry.

MR WARD: Link road.

MR WILSON: The Southern Link Road has got content approval? Yes. Yes. So you’ve – you’ve looked at the impacts associated with the – the - - -

MR WARD: The Southern Link Road doesn’t have any approval.

MR WILSON: There’s no existing gazettal?

MR WARD: No. It's just been – because the – and it's not even – there's no design. There is a design that sits behind it. We've seen it. It's been, um, it's been exhibited by the department.

5 MR WILSON: Yes. All right.

MR WARD: But there's been no roads authority endorsed design.

10 MR WILSON: Okay. But you're confident the impacts associated with your component of what now runs along the alignment of the SLR has been – have been addressed.

MR WARD: Yeah, because the – the road that we're building in there, um, can be totally sacrificed; it's just a driveway. It's not been built to some link road standard.  
15

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: We – we could build it to the South Link Road standard – and there's a, I believe, the VPA has the flexibility to allow this if a roads authority is in place at the time - - -  
20

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR WARD: - - - that Gazcorp proposed to build it, to build that to the Southern Link Road standard and then claim works-in-kind - - -  
25

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: - - - for it. But without a roads authority, there's no one to sign off on it. So - - -  
30

MR WILSON: No. I appreciate that.

MR WARD: - - - it will just be built as a driveway and then it will just be demolished when the Southern Link Road – it gets built in 20 years time.  
35

MR WILSON: Yeah. No, I appreciate that. But the impacts associated with what you're proposing to access the site has been considered because it wasn't there in the original application.  
40

MR WARD: No. It was always there in the original application.

MR WILSON: Access via – via the top one? Via the SLR?

45 MR WARD: Um, yeah. So if you look, there was always a sec – there was always two access points.

MR WILSON: Ah. Okay.

MR WARD: There was always two access points.

5 MR WILSON: Ah. Okay.

MR WARD: One to the Southern Link Road and one to, um, to Wallgrove Road. But because, when you had two access points, you didn't necessarily need to bring the Southern Link Road access point on until the Southern Link Road was built,  
10 because you have an access on Wallgrove Road. When that became the only access point - - -

MR WILSON: I see.

15 MR WARD: - - - then you needed to build the Southern Link Road - - -

MR WILSON: So you had an alternative. There was two sites – there was two sites considered as part of the application.

20 MR WARD: Yeah. So – yeah, that's right.

MR WILSON: Two – two access points.

MR WARD: Yeah.

25

MR WILSON: Okay. I got it. Excellent.

PROF FELL: Well, just a question on the parking on the site.

30 MR WARD: Okay.

PROF FELL: You actually dropped that substantially in response to initial feedback. I'm conscious that this is going to be a 24 hour site, shift workers, very poor local transport.

35

MR WARD: Mmm.

PROF FELL: Have you done the right thing in dropping that parking?

40 MR WARD: The – I mean, the parking is guided by the rates in the relevant DCP rates.

PROF FELL: Yes.

45 MR WARD: There's – the RMS have – have rates for parking. We had applied an overly conservative approach to parking to ensure that there was enough. I think it was council came back and said it was - - -

MR WILSON: Excessive.

MR WARD: - - - a bit excessive.

5 PROF FELL: Too much.

MR WARD: Look, I think the – the amounts of parking will probably evolve a little bit as each individual building gets designed and will dependent on, then, what the use of that building is. So we have - - -

10

PROF FELL: So the new DAs will pick that up.

MR WARD: Yeah, future – and future design. You know, there may be nips and tucks where needed and bit more parking for one building, but less parking for another, but, overall, I think there's – you know, the evidence would suggest out there – out there in Eastern Creek that there's going to be plenty of parking available; um, there's enough under the proposed rates.

15

MR WILSON: Yes. Is there anything else? Wendy?

20

MS LEWIN: No, no. I think we covered it before.

PROF FELL: Wendy, surely - - -

MS LEWIN: No, no, I don't. I was – I think most of the concerns were – were related to setbacks and that – that we covered with the department in relation to the easement for the transmission lines, your boundary conditions. My question to them was related to the use of the perimeter road that you've got around this first stage development.

25

MR WARD: Around the first building.

MS LEWIN: Whether it be used for trucks or whether it is to be a service road for - - -

30

MR WILSON: Emergency vehicles. Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - emergency vehicles only. It – it bears on noise and, uh, issues that - - -

35

MR WARD: No. It's intended to be used for general access.

MS LEWIN: General access.

MR WARD: Yeah. As well as it's obviously - - -

40

MS LEWIN: As - - -

45

MR WILSON: Around the back of the building.

MR WARD: Yeah. It's obviously available for emergency vehicles if required - - -

5 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR WARD: - - - but is intended to be - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah. Okay.

10 MR WARD: - - - part of a - the general - - -

MS LEWIN: So it's - - -

15 MR WARD: So there's - there's a noise wall - - -

MS LEWIN: Yeah. It's only three metres high.

MR WARD: Yeah, that runs along - - -

20 MS LEWIN: Yeah, yeah.

MR WARD: - - - the side of it. Yeah.

25 MS LEWIN: So it's likely that, uh, it can be used as a - a hard stand area or a lay by area for trucks for some period of time during the 24 hour operation and then they - they stop and start up again.

30 MR WARD: I think the, um - I think a requirement under the TransGrid easement rules is that you can't park trucks underneath their easement. So it wouldn't have any lay by or parking.

MS LEWIN: Right.

35 MR WARD: Um - - -

MS LEWIN: But that may be up in that more open area at - at the back.

MR GAZAL: At the back. Yeah.

40 MR WARD: Yeah, there'd be more out the back. Yeah.

MS LEWIN: And then - then move through here and out during the 24 hour operation.

45 MR WARD: Yeah.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

MR WARD: That's right. Yeah.

5 MS LEWIN: All right.

MR WILSON: So do they – do they access – so they – -

MS LEWIN: They come around.

10

MR WILSON: Is it proposed that they actually circumvent the building or is it just  
- - -

MS LEWIN: Yeah, they do.

15

MR WILSON: - - - generally, they – I know they can, but is it proposed to be – or is  
it proposed they just come in and out in a forward manner in this, you know, on the  
- - -

20 MS LEWIN: In the forecourt.

MR GAZAL: In the docks, yeah.

MR WILSON: In the docks, yeah.

25

MR GAZAL: That would be the bulk of it. It depends on – on the tenant at the  
time.

MR WILSON: Okay.

30

MR WARD: It is the – there is the potential for them to - - -

MR GAZAL: To go around.

35 MR WILSON: Yeah. Okay.

MR WARD: Yeah. So it's been designed to accommodate different uses. And the  
noise modelling was done based on the trucks going all the way around.

40 MS LEWIN: Okay. And the numbers of movements of trucks in that noise  
analysis. Do we have that?

MR WARD: Ah, I'd need to – I'd need to check the - - -

45 MS LEWIN: Yeah.

MR WARD: - - - what the - - -

MR WILSON: Assumptions were.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

5 MR WARD: What the actual assumptions were.

MS LEWIN: Good. All right.

10 MR WILSON: Just in terms – it might be worthwhile having to briefly describe the DCP you prepared for the site and what you took into consideration in preparing that DCP? Just – well, just know that we asked the department, because I guess we're interested in the setbacks to heights and the design provisions that - - -

MR WARD: Yeah.

15

MR WILSON: - - - that apply.

MS LEWIN: Site coverage, landscape.

20 MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR WARD: Yeah. We – look, we really just looked at the site guidelines that had been prepared for other sites in the precinct, so in the Western Sydney Employment Area and then, particularly, the – the – the development site south of the pipeline. So there's the ..... the Oakdale sites. So we looked at those guidelines and – and just extrapolated that. I mean, we weren't trying to do anything to give Gazcorp a – a benefit or some sort of - - -

25

MR WILSON: No, no, look, we - - -

30

MR WARD: - - - some sort of different rules.

MR WILSON: We're just trying to understand - - -

35 MR WARD: Yeah. We were just – yeah, we were just trying to replicate as much of what was on the other site to create a sort of consistency.

MR WILSON: So they're fairly consistent. Yeah.

40 MR WARD: Yeah. That was the idea. Yeah. And – and, certainly, the – we didn't – you know, and there was some discussions around setbacks to the Southern Link Road. Obviously, Gazcorp has, you know, the largest frontage to the Southern Link Road and, obviously, being near the front door, you know, it was important to the department, so we tweaked that, um, but – yeah, the – the guidelines haven't been, um, ah, really queried.

45

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR WARD: Yeah – fully.

MR WILSON: Excellent.

5 MS LEWIN: Okay.

MR WILSON: I - - -

10 PROF FELL: I will just ask one small one. You've indicated you're not storing any hazardous materials. I would think the only risk on the site is a major petroleum leak from the vehicles or something like that. Are you reasonably satisfied that your stormwater system will capture that and stop it going to Reedy Creek, for example?

15 MR WARD: Um, yes. I hope so. Um, I don't – ah, look, I'm not – I'm not sure exactly what the – the mechanism that they have for that is, but they're certainly – the stormwater system was designed to include on-site detention and water treatment. I'd need to – I'd need to check the – the plans again to see exactly what the mechanism was. I mean, just – just – um, just as an excuse for not knowing the answer to that. You know, a lot of these plans were done several years ago and,  
20 really - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah. Sure.

25 MR WARD: - - - these issues were, um – were resolved with the department and – and the agencies and – and the council and everyone.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

30 MR WARD: - - - you know, three or four years ago and we – you know, they haven't been any further.

MR WILSON: Sure.

35 MR WARD: So – yeah, I think - - -

MR WILSON: I think this was a good question though, and I think what would be nice to hear from you also is what happens with fire ..... water. I mean - - -

40 MR WARD: Yeah.

MR WILSON: And we haven't gone into a lot of detail in terms - - -

MR WARD: Yeah.

45 MR WILSON: - - - of looking at the EIS, and so forth. So it would be useful to understand - - -

PROF FELL: Yes.

MR WILSON: - - - what the – what system is in place to accom – to ensure that Reedy Creek is protected from, you know, spilt - - -

5

PROF FELL: Any - - -

MR WILSON: Any spills, and so forth.

10 MR WARD: Yeah, yeah. There is – there is certainly a, uh, a large onsite detention system - - -

MR WILSON: Which accommodates fire – ah, they're usually separate, aren't they, or does it - - -

15

MR WARD: I'd need to check.

MR WILSON: - - - accommodate firefighting water as well?

20 MR GAZAL: We'd have to – yeah, I would need to check.

MR WILSON: Yeah. That's okay. Just take a note.

PROF FELL: But particularly as it's in the Sydney catchment.

25

MR WARD: Yeah, yeah. Look, indeed.

PROF FELL: Reedy Creeks drains into Sydney catchment.

30 MR WARD: And, look, and I – yeah, it's – it's a - - -

PROF FELL: So there's quite stringent rules.

MR WARD: Yeah. Yeah. Yep.

35

MR WILSON: Okay. I think that's it. Thank you very much.

PROF FELL: That's me done. Thanks.

40 MR WILSON: Yeah. Wendy, is there anything else?

MS LEWIN: No, that's all right.

MR WILSON: Yes. Okay.

45

MR WARD: So we'll provide you with, um, responses to – to - - -

MR JAMES: Yeah, those two. Could you – are you happy just to send that through once you get the transcript?

MR WARD: Yep.

5

MR JAMES: So we'll go from there.

MR WILSON: All good. Thank you very much for coming.

10 MR GAZAL: Thank you.

MR WARD: Thank you.

MS SEDGMEN: Thank you.

15

PROF FELL: Yes.

**MATTER ADJOURNED at 11.45 am INDEFINITELY**