

Presentation to NSW PAC

MPE Concept MOD 2

MPE Stage 1

December 2017

Firstly, I would like to have noted my annoyance that this meeting has been scheduled so close to Christmas and we have only been given three weeks to put together a presentation. Being so close to Christmas and during normal business hours has prevented me taking leave from my job to make that presentation. One couldn't be blamed for believing this timing was to prevent as many people as possible from being able to present. Two weeks out from Christmas everyone is incredibly busy. Many businesses that our residents work for are probably experiencing their busiest time of the year. Also school children have just started their school holidays so many parents won't be able to attend as their children can't be expected to sit quietly during the presentations. The fact that for at least the last three years in a row residents have had to write submissions either just before or after Christmas seems to be designed to prevent as many people as possible from responding.

I am concerned that the proponent's facts and figures seem to be little sketchy at best and feel that the entire project/s need to be stopped and fully scrutinised by a 100% independent company – an independent company not paid for by the proponent. The fact that the existence on the site of the previously thought extinct plant *hibbertia fumana* (along with other endangered species found) was only announced after NSW PAC's previous approval when it had been discovered prior to that approval being given.

Investigations show that an amount of 1,600,000 cubic metres of clean fill are now required for the site. How was this overlooked initially? Obviously mistakes were made in initial reports.

The modification to raise the site by 2 metres from original plans will increase noise disturbance to the surrounding areas and health effects resulting from this. The run off of rain water on such a large area will increase the risk of flooding to the surrounding suburbs of Wattle Grove, Hammondville and Moorebank at least. Why would you make this area more prone to floods than it already is? Any contamination of the soil will flow into the Georges River and do untold damage to our waterways.

Liverpool Council's Cardno reports show discrepancies between reports taken by the proponents and their own independent reports. Independent traffic modelling reports have been provided differing greatly from the proponents reports. Why are so many mistakes being made?

The SIMTA July 2016 newsletter states that more than 7,000 jobs will be created whereas both sites together will only create 2,648 jobs. Reports to the public are still stating that approximately 7,000 jobs will be created.

Statements like traffic will be taken off Sydney's roads when we know that the traffic will just be moved to Moorebank from Port Botany – an area already in traffic gridlock daily. Improvement in regional air quality – is all manipulation of language.

There have been so many changes: name changes, modifications, additions, extended hours of work, tonnes of extra fill, concrete crushing machines, etc to the proposed Moorebank Intermodals that I firmly believe it has all become an utter mess. The modification applications have not been substantially the same as the initial proposals. The impacts on the community and environment will be disastrous.

The constant applications increasing the size and significance of once a much smaller intermodal need to be stopped. Another request for an extra 12 hectares of land to be included was reported in the Liverpool Leader week commencing 11 December 2017.

Construction noise is expected to exceed acceptable levels in Casula of 9 dBA during construction of the rail siding. I am wondering why this can go ahead considering these exceedances. Surely if the noise exceeds the acceptable limits then the construction should not go ahead.

This just goes to prove that you can't trust the reports that the proponents have provided. Independent studies need to be conducted to find the true facts and figures and not blindly accept the reports the proponents arrange or there will be a white elephant on your hands.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [PAC Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Notice of Planning Assessment Commission Meeting - Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 and Concept Plan Modification 2.
Date: Monday, 4 December 2017 6:10:26 PM
Attachments: [Notification Public -Email.pdf](#)
[PAC_2018.pdf](#)

Attention: Robert Bisley

Dear Mr Bisley,

I would like to thank you for the notification regarding the Notice of Planning Assessment Commission Meeting - Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 and Concept Plan Modification 2.

I am at a loss to understand why every Christmas/New Year period for at least the last three years we have had to work on either submissions or presentations to NSW PAC regarding the Moorebank Intermodals. Also, I see once again, that the meeting is being held during work hours preventing the majority of our residents from being able to present. The lead up to the Christmas period is an extremely busy time for most people and to give us only three weeks to prepare our presentations for NSW PAC is beyond belief! I strongly urge you to consider giving the residents an extension on this time frame.

Due to my extremely busy work schedule just prior to Christmas I will be unable to attend the meeting but wish to make a written submission instead. I request that we are given more time so it is possible for us to have the time to do this properly.

I look forward to your response.

Regards,
Lorrae Lemond



Contact : Robert Bisley
Phone : 02 9383 2100
Fax : 02 9383 2133
Email : pac@pac.nsw.gov.au

20 November 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

Notice of Planning Assessment Commission Meeting
Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 and Concept Plan Modification 2

I am writing to you as you have provided comments, or a submission, to the Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) on the above proposals. The Department has completed its assessment of the applications and has now referred them to the Planning Assessment Commission for determination, under the terms of the Minister's delegation.

The Commission to determine the applications comprises Ms Annabelle Pegrum AM (chair), Mr Stephen O'Connor and Mr Peter Duncan AM.

Due to the level of public interest in the proposals, the Commission will be meeting to hear public views on the Department's Assessment Reports and recommendations, prior to determining the proposals. This is a final opportunity for you to comment on the Department's assessment and recommended conditions of approval, before a decision is made.

The Commission meeting is scheduled to commence at **9:30am on Tuesday, 12 December 2017 at the Club Liverpool, 185 George St, Liverpool NSW 2170**. The meeting is open to the public to observe the proceedings.

If you wish to comment on the DP&E's recommendation at the meeting, you must register to speak by contacting **Philippa Vale on (02) 9383 2115 before 1:00pm, Friday, 8 December 2017**. The Commission understands that public speaking can be a difficult experience and welcomes written comments on projects up to one week after the public meeting. Individual circumstances may also prevent a registered speaker from attending on the day. Written comments will be weighed equally by the Commission to verbal presentations.

The Assessment Reports (including recommendations) are now available on the Commission's website www.pac.nsw.gov.au (reference: ***Moorebank Intermodal Precinct East Stage 2 and Concept Plan Modification 2 D495-17***). Other documents associated with the applications are available on the DP&E's website via <http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au> (reference: MP 10_0193 MOD 2 and SSD 7628).

If you have any questions on the Commission process, please call me on 02 9383 2100 or email pac@pac.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

/
Robert Bisley
NSW Planning Assessment Commission

Please note that any information provided to the Commission may be published on the Commission's website, unless it contains a clear statement that you do not want it to be made public. For documents provided by individuals, personal contact details, other than names, will be removed from the document before it is published. However personal information is sometimes provided to relevant government departments. Before writing to the Commission, please read the Commission's Privacy Statement which is available at www.pac.nsw.gov.au or by calling 02 9383 2100.



**RESIDENTS
AGAINST
INTERMODAL
DEVELOPMENT
MOOREBANK**

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.