

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [PAC Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Public meeting Dec 12th
Date: Sunday, 3 December 2017 1:52:56 PM
Attachments: [PAC_2018.pdf](#)

I would like to request that the public meeting be held next year so that i have sufficient time to prepare a written submission on this monster you are planning to bring to my backyard.

Regards

Emmanuel Nikoloudakis



PAC MEETING DECEMBER 12th

25.11.2017

Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 & Concept Plan Modification 2 - D495/17

Dear Commission Chair Lynelle Briggs and Delegation Chair Annabelle Pegrum AM

We write to ask that you postpone the December 12th Public Meeting to a more appropriate time, in early 2018, and or when the delegation for the cumulative adjacent project is made. In support of this request we ask that you each consider this briefly itemised list of macro and micro factors.

- **Planning and Assessment Commission does not have any statutory requirement on timeframe** for undertaking public meeting[s] and or assessment. Advised by PAC staff.
- **Land & Environment Court – Merits Appeal of PAC Determination for Stage 1 SSD 6766.** Court Proceedings took place 25th – 27^h October and a judgement is not expected from Commissioner Dixon before Christmas. Whatever the outcome it will have direct impact on this referral. Therefore proceeding now would be premature.
- **The Department of Planning and Environment has only referred 2 of the 4 “precinct” applications**, while it waits on “more information required” for assessing the cumulative adjacent project across the road. This runs counter to PAC’s 2014 report which states: *“The Commission is disappointed that the recommended master plan for the site was never undertaken, particularly as there are now two competing proposals causing both uncertainty and alarm in the community about the cumulative impacts should both proceed.”* Therefore proceeding now without the capacity to assess cumulative impacts lacks necessary diligent best practice and contradicts PAC’s own perspective.
- **The \$3.4 Million Dollar Traffic Network Study conducted by the RMS has not been supplied or made public.** This study was confirmed as existing in Sept 2016 and confirmed as complete in Oct 2017 Not providing it to the Community, the DPE’s Independent Consultant or to PAC contradicts Aurecon’s recommendation in 2015 *“It is considered that this modeling must be completed as a matter of urgency and with maximum transparency, so that the Planning approvals process can progress effectively”.* Proceeding now without access to this study – for all stakeholders – would fundamentally undermine this PAC process and any future determinations.



- **Allowing only three weeks to review a further [approx.] 2000 pages across almost 40 documents is not realistic.** To read and compare this new information to one's own previous submissions and the 3500+ previous pages of technical reports, associated with these modifications, and then formulate a speech or submission is near impossible. To proceed now without providing sufficient time for the public to review the required reading, is to confirm that genuine engagement and comment is not sought.
- **During the two previous processes "Response to Submissions" were publically available on the DPE Major Project website for months prior to referral and setting a public meeting.** This allowed the public to comment further on RtS, while this time round only Government Agencies were asked to comment [concurrent with L&E Merits Appeal].
- **Conducting just one meeting or in other words soliciting a single 5-10 minute speech to cover 4 applications relating to "Australia's Largest Intermodal Facility is also problematic.** While this would be preferable to splitting the applications into two separate processes, it is still not a responsible course of action. Four connected / consecutive meetings would be the better solution, and or an extended deadline for written submissions for those whom cannot take time off work.
- **Expecting the general public to take time off work or study at this crucial period of the year, with only three weeks notice is also unrealistic.** The short turnaround is further complicated by the 'silly season' as many rush to meet deadlines and targets before the holidays hit. Thereby restricting numbers and attendance due to scheduling not interest level.
- **9:30am on a Tuesday.** As an aside the location in Liverpool is much better than Bankstown for the last PAC, but worse than holding it in Wattle Grove for the first PAC. It has previously been suggested that the PAC considers undertaking a series of meetings from 2pm to 8pm to consider the community stakeholders and audience. Of course such action would be based on the number of registered parties, but as already stated the time and location can have a retarding effect on registration numbers. This final point is offered as a suggestion for how it might conduct the hopefully postponed meeting.