New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

MOSS VALE PLASTICS RECYCLING FACILITY (SSD-9409987)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR) CLARE SYKES JANETT MILLIGAN
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	KENDALL CLYDSDALE TAHLIA HUTCHINSON
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	SOFIE MASON-JONES DAVID GAMBLE ROMINA CAVALLO NANCY ZHENG
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	1:15PM – 2:30PM TUESDAY, 22ND OCTOBER 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR ANDREW MILLS: Thank you, everyone. Before we begin, first of all I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land and all of the countries from which we're virtually meeting today and pay my respects to elders past and present.

So welcome today to the meeting to discuss the Moss Vales Plastics Recycling Facility case currently before the Commission. That's SSD 8409987. The applicants, Plasrefine Recycling, proposes to construct and operate a plastics recycling and reprocessing facility in Moss Vale within the Wingecarribee local government area. The proposed development would recycle up to 120,000 tonnes of mixed plastic waste such as bottles and containers per annum. And covered plastic would be converted into clean plastic pellets and flakes which would then be reprocessed into a range of plastic products.

I have met most of you previously. My name is Andrew Mills. I'm the chair of the Independent Planning Commission and of this panel and I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Clare Sykes and Janett Milligan. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale, Tahlia Hutchinson from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure that we fully capture the information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's considerations of the matter and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its determination. It's important for commissioners to ask questions and to clarify issues that are considered appropriate. As I have mentioned previously, if you are asked a question and 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 up on our website.

Perhaps for the record and recording, if everyone could introduce themselves today before speaking for the first time and all members ensure that they don't speak over the top of each other. So we can now begin and perhaps David or Sophie, if you would like to lead off by introducing everyone on your side.

MR DAVID GAMBLE: Okay. I'm David Gamble. I'm the project director, I'm the senior technical director at GHD in the waste management area. I'd like to introduce Sofie Mason-Jones, who's our planning lead on the project. She's a planner with more than 20 years' experience. And Romina Cavallo, who is our social engagement and community engagement lead. Romina has a similar level of experience and she lectures at the university in those topics. Thank you.

MR MILLS: Thank you. And Nancy of course from Plasrefine Recycling itself. Welcome, thank you. Over to you as applicants to give us an overview of the application and the amendments that have made and we've allocated 15 minutes

for this time but happy to go longer if you get peppered with questions in particular.

MR GAMBLE: Andrew, Sofie will lead the presentation at this stage.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: Sofie, we can't hear you.

MS SOFIE MASON-JONES: Can you hear me now?

MR GAMBLE: Yes, all good.

MS MASON-JONES: Yes, terrific. Thanks, Rom. Just through to the next page, please. The Plasrefine and GHD team would also like to acknowledge the Gandangara and Tharawal First Nations people on the land in which the project's proposed and pay our respects as well to First Nations persons and learn from First Nations people as we develop projects and live harmoniously on the land.

The application that we're going to do a brief description on, we'd like to run through the proposed land use, how we came about selecting this particular site and answer any questions in terms of the layout or operations proposed. The EIS, chapter 3 of the EIS outlines the strategic need for the project.

There is a crisis in New South Wales and east coast of Australia more broadly in relation to mixed plastics and the lack of facilities that are around to separate plastics. 99% of plastics are currently made from fossil feedstocks and when we recycle 1 tonne of mixed plastics, it leads to an avoidance of 320 tonnes of CO2 equivalence of greenhouse gas emissions. The Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment's Waste and Sustainable Materials Strategy indicates that around 800,000 tonnes of plastic currently enters the waste management system in New South Wales and of that only 19% is recycled into plastic products and the rest, a large majority of it, 450,000 ends up in landfills.

So the project was born out of a very strong need and a desire by Plasrefine, and Nancy will speak to this as well, to develop additional plastic recycling and reprocessing to divert plastic from landfill and to improve our impacts on the natural environment.

We met with the Council in 2020 following a site selection study that we had done on helping to find a suitable site for a plastics recycling facility. The team originally looked for land in 2020 in the greater metropolitan Sydney area around Kemps Creek and within the emerging Aerotropolis. No land was available and for sale which was large enough or suitably zoned to permit the proposal.

But what we found was a very large area, 1,000 hectares of industrial zoned land known as the then Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor, which had been set aside since 1979 in the Council's interim development order, but more recently in the

Wingecarribee Shire local environmental plan from 2010, so about 15 years ago, for a significant employment industrial generating land use. And it promoted the site's accessibility for road and rail and close connections to Sydney, Wollongong and Canberra and importantly for this particular project, the site was of a suitable size and scale. A large floorplate is needed for the project and this particular site had site characteristics that were not prohibitive, a roughly 7.7 hectare site, roughly square in sheep.

There were some small farm dams and a drainage channel along the eastern alignment and a first order stream on the western alignment, but no significant constraints in terms of developing the site. And importantly from a heritage and biodiversity site compatibility and site constraints, these were not significant aspects for the project. We did also come in time to do a flood impact assessment study that confirmed flooding was not a concern.

So in terms of the facility, we met with Council in December 2020 to discuss the project. Initially at the time we were talking about 120,000 tonnes per annum with 60 trucks, which would be 120 movements a day. Truck movements between 7 am and 7 pm and the facility operating 24/7. Now, over time those numbers have come down a little bit, the trucks have dropped to 50 trucks a day, so a hundred movements, and the truck delivery and export timeframes have reduced one hour so that they are now completely in the daytime period of 7 am to 6 pm and not in the evening or night time period.

Building one is the plastic receival, the sorting, cleaning, crushing and extrusion, where the pellets will be made. It is a Colorbond clad building. We talked yesterday about the fast-closing doors that are access to the site and it is a 14 and a half metre high building. Building two will be where the reprocessing of recovered plastics into new plastic process would take place. It is also a Colorbond clad building with the same height of 14 and a half metres.

And then there is a multi-use building that is attached to building two which has the workshop, the office, laboratory and the amenities and seating area for staff and visitors to the site. There's also a site office building which has the research and development and the ability for school aged children and interested members of the public to come and have a look and understand the plastics recycling process and what is happening on site. And there's also a water treatment building.

So just in terms of the heights, the current controls for the site, there are no statutory planning controls in relation to height limits. There is, however, the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor DCP which stipulates a maximum height limit for this precinct of 20 metres. So we've got some slides that we'll talk through that show we initially had heights between 12, 16 and a half and 18 and a half metres. So within the guidance for the precinct. But following community feedback and consultation with council, we have sought to reduce the height elements of the facility.

There's also ancillary works insofar as the weighbridges, emergency fire water

tanks, the truck and vehicle parking and the rainwater tanks for water reuse, security fencing and CCTV.

We'll just point out in terms of the access to the site, the project did initially propose an east-west road and we've got a diagram to talk through what that road entailed. It would be an extension of the Braddon Road to the south of the building footprint there in an east west direction connecting with Lackey. That is in the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor DCP as a proposed future collector road. That was initially what was proposed to be the operational access.

The construction access was to use the existing access along Beaconsfield Road. That did get amended over time and the final access that the proposal seeks approval for is known as the north south public road and it runs along the western boundary. It connects up to Collins Douglas Road in the north and forms a small section of the new enterprise corridor on the southern side of the railway and seeks to relocate the existing level crossing slightly west of its current location.

The design of the roads and the level crossing have been prepared in consultation with Council to ensure that the design met their requirements for how the SHIP, the Southern Highlands Innovation Precinct would be released. Thanks, Rom.

So we felt it was important to share the landscaping for the project mainly because where the site is, it's on the southern boundary of the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor and notwithstanding the site's zoning for general industrial and the range of industrial uses that could be considered on the site and they include asphalt plants, concrete plants, water treatment plants, other types of waste facilities, open stockpiling of materials.

The proponent and project team felt that it was very important to acknowledge where this site sat in the landscape, the sensitive receivers that had vistas into and appreciated the current views and to provide a level of landscaping that enabled the realisation of the SHIP for industrial employment generating use but a harmonious treatment of the interface between its neighbours and the views into this facility.

So you'll see there on the western side, the first order stream has a significant amount of vegetation that's proposed in the riparian zone. There are currently no impacts proposed within – no building within the riparian zone. So it's a complete restoration and rehabilitation of that currently poor drainage line. And likewise, with the drainage channel on the eastern side of the site, it's proposed to have a significant amount of revegetation.

On the left there I've got since submission of the EIS, the landscape plan has been further updated. One of the things we heard from the community was around the timing for the landscaping and a request for it to be brought forward quite early in the project and not to be left to the final stages once the site had been benched and the slab had been poured, the buildings built, testing and commissioning and then landscaping brought in. So the landscape is now proposed as part of early works

once the levels for the sites have been confirmed and a significant amount of mature trees on the right-hand side between 2 metres and three and a half metres are proposed to be planted from the very early stages of construction.

Just to wrap up, Rom, if you don't mind pointing to the bund, please, on the southern part of the site. A little bit up a bit, please, just on the northern side of Braddon Road. There is a bund there. It starts off at 1 metre, raises to 4 metres and that was a request of the Department of Planning to put some additional height actually on the site for the landscape on that southern boundary to be situated on and that has been accommodated.

And then the project has always had as part of its proposal landscaping on the southern side of Braddon Road and that's a 14 metre wide corridor with an entrance break for access to the site as well as retention of the on site farm dams and that's why you don't see any planting in that particular area. Were there any questions on the landscaping or layout of the facility?

MS JANETT MILLIGAN: I had one question, please. Can I ask you perhaps on the previous slide, when material's being exported, I understand clearly what the path is where you have waste being delivered, where material's being exported, presumably that's from the front building and I'm just wondering how that happens and where trucks will load, et cetera. Thanks.

MR GAMBLE: Sofie, do you want me to try and answer that one? Yes, so most of the recycling type activity, sorting, washing, flaking, pelletising, would occur in building number 1, which is the rear building. Building number 2 is designated for dispatch of material, so material would move from building number 1 to building number 2 and be stored in there and then the road that runs in between the two buildings, there's actually a couple of entrances there so the trucks can go into the building to be loaded up and then leave the building and they'll actually do a clockwise loop then around the whole site to exit on the eastern entrance or exit.

So it's really like a one way traffic around the site. In number 2 building as well, there would be some provision to make some products and Sofie's about to talk about those kind of products in a minute. But essentially it's a multi-use building and we mentioned before about the multi-use building on the eastern side as well, the workshop, office, laboratory, et cetera. So hopefully that gives you a bit of an idea.

MS MILLIGAN: Yes, thank you.

MR MILLS: Clare.

MS CLARE SYKES: Thank you, Andrew. I had just one question around the height of the building, noting that the 14 and a half metres, is there any ventilation stacks that would exceed that height in that building area?

MR GAMBLE: Yes, on the roof there would be some ventilation systems and air

conditioning, roughly 1 to 2 metres high but they're set back quite far from the edge of the building, so they're not actually likely to be seen by anyone who's relatively close to the site. They're shown on the architectural plans.

MS SYKES: Thank you.

MR MILLS: And sorry, if I can ask a follow up to that, how high are those ventilation shafts and air condition –

MR GAMBLE: Yes, no more than 2 metres.

MR MILLS: Thank you. Could I ask a follow up in terms of the movement of trucks and so on, just into building 1, the trucks that are delivering the plastic to be recycled coming into those large doors, are they unloading – is there space for them to turn around to come out again? How does that work within the building?

MR GAMBLE: Okay. Yes, I'm not controlling the cursor but what would happen – I don't know if you can do this through Zoom but –

MR MILLS: I understand that there's a number of roller doors on the –

MR GAMBLE: Yes, so what happens is the vehicles will drive in – yes, where Rom's showing, yes. They'll drive in there and then they'll go and they'll basically do like a left kind of tur and then they'll reverse into the building. There's two roller doors there. So they'll reverse into the building and park in there, there's some parking bays in there. And then the roller doors will shut and they'll be unloaded and the bail plastic will be then – there's a number of storage areas along the western wall of the building, storage pens.

So they're basically – because of fire regulations, it's important to have a limited amount of materials stored in one place. So they'd basically be giant concrete pens with walls that extend above the height of the bailed plastic and then the material's going to be stored in there until it's required. So they're shown in some of the drawings and we can provide some follow up information on that. But basically then the trucks drive out in a forward direction past the waste water treatment building and around and basically do a loop around there and then exit on the eastern entrance or exit. And then they'll turn – whether they'll turn right and go along the north-south road.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MS MASON-JONES: So in terms of the types of plastics that would be received at the facility, there's a number of plastics that are currently circulating throughout the state. They have markers of one to seven on those products. There is the desire to phase out a number of these products by the EPA over time. Single use plastic in terms of cups and straws and forks and cutlery we will have seen has all been phased out now and single use plastic bags. However, there still remains a high level of plastic that is necessary in terms of how products are stored, mobilised

and transported, safety and to maintain shelf life. It's also a much cheaper product than glass and other alternatives.

So in terms of the life of plastic and its future, at the moment there does not appear to be a real – what can I say – ability for plastic to just disappear and we need facilities like this to manage the consistent and constant amount of plastic that is consumed by people every week. Numbers one to five is what will be received at the facility and so these are everyday items, as you can see, from cleaning products to meat trays, fruit trays, shampoos, conditioners and frozen and refrigerated products. David, I'll let you talk to the process.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, thanks, Sofie. So on the right-hand side there is the typical bails of plastic that are received and we think we said on the site yesterday that the plastic doesn't come directly from your bin or whatever, it goes to a recycling centre or MRF recovery facility where they sort – because often paper and glass is mixed with plastic, so you have like a comingled system.

So what they do, they take out all the plastics at the MRF, they might recover some of those plastics but a lot of plastics there that they don't recover and those are the kind of plastics that were exported to China previously, stuff that was just too hard to remove here because the technology was not available. So this plant would be one of the most advanced facilities in Australia, probably the most advanced and probably one of the most advanced in the world.

So what the process will do is the material will be received here, stacked up awaiting the right time – some of the plastic will be multi types and some of it will be single use, single type of plastic that might come from an industrial facility, for example, where they have waste plastic they want to get rid of, et cetera. So then it goes into a – they unbail it, it goes into different locations depending on what kind of plastic it is.

So you can see quite an advanced looking automated system on the right-hand side there, that three dimensional infographic. That's just I guess a typical one. The actual detailed design hasn't been done at this stage but it'll be sourced from a supplier who builds these things all the time, they build them in Europe, they build them in Asia, they build them in all sorts of places. So the contract is still to be [unintelligible 00:23:13] for that.

But basically they take the material, they use different types of sensors to determine what kind of plastic it is and then robotic arms move the plastic into different places and it gets basically moved by air and so on. And they also remove any sort of material that shouldn't be there that has somehow got through the process, so metals or pieces of cloth or whatever, pieces of paper. So that all gets removed and that material then ends up going to landfill and there shouldn't be too much of that material.

So then once it's been through that process of sorting, it then goes through a shredding process, flaking process, which is basically grinding it up into small

flakes using sort of rotating knives, et cetera. This part of the process is fully enclosed, so there's no I guess potential for microplastics to leak into the surrounding air or to go on to the floor, et cetera. And then after that, these pieces of plastic which I mentioned yesterday are about the size of a 5-cent piece, would then go into a washing process and the washing process is shown down the bottom there.

That's the typical washing process, material goes up in a kind of conveyor system, it floats around, it gets mixed with cleaning agents, which a natural cleaning agent is proposed to be used on the site, a tea tree oil-based process ingredient. So once it goes – there's hot water involved, there's heating, the tanks will be covered, where possible, to minimise evaporation and that's something, one of the means to try and reduce water usage on the site is to actually cover tanks.

So after the washing process, you've basically got a finished product. It needs to be dried first and then it can be sold basically as flakes, it gets put into these giant bags, or it can be pelletised. If a customer wants it in pellets, it can be turned into pellets by gentle heating in a machine and then it just pops out at the other end as small pellets. And then potentially on the site and we talked about this occurring at building number 2 is the ability to make various products. So garden benches, as shown there, there's a number of products which we'll show you on the next slide, I think.

But if material is made, PET can be made into bottles, so bottles would not be made on the site, it would be sent off to someone who actually makes PET and then they would mix it with virgin material in various quantities, depending on the right mix, et cetera, for the product. So it's a relatively simple process. Here are some of the products that could be made on the site. We've got sort of garden furniture over on the left-hand side there or school furniture. We've got like you can add wood to it, so basically sawdust and make different wood type products. You can make film. You can make decking, garden beds, garden edging, fence posts, wheel stops.

So I think I mentioned that yesterday in the car parks. Wheelie bins and other small bins can be made and also the material can be sent to other people who would make things like shoes and bags and yoga mats. It's not proposed to make those particular things on the site. So the products that would be made here would be highly dependent on the market. It was mentioned of what additives there would be. Obviously if you want to make something with a different colour, you have to add colour and there may be other kind of additives to improve plasticity, et cetera but they'd be all proprietary products, regulated in either EPA and the other authorities in Australia.

So I'll talk quickly through this. Sofie's already mentioned about the fact that we've changed from an east-west road to north-south road. That was as a result of community feedback and also the inability to obtain landowners' consent from the Garvan or the ABR, Australian BioResources next door. The new site access has required to cross the rail line and so a new rail crossing has been designed. It's

being discussed with Boral, who are supportive of that proposal, partly for safety reasons. It's been discussed with Council. Council have had the ability to look at the design drawings. We've got design drawings that we can show you later in the presentation, if required.

But basically the existing crossings that are diagonal, the new crossing would be a 90 degree crossing, so in effect safer than the existing crossing. There'll be signage, et cetera, and the final design needs to be discussed with Council and agreed with Council, that's one of the conditions. The heights of the buildings have been reduced where possible. We have a graphic that can show you the height comparison between the buildings and the ABR site next door. We had something prepared this morning specifically for that purpose.

One of the issues that was raised early by the ABR was what would be the impact on the shared pond that is on the boundary. So after discussions with them, a new sort of solution was arrived at which was to put a bypass channel past the shared pond. So the shared pond will not receive any water from the facility but the water will be diverted to a filtration device on the northern side of the site. That's been relocated. It was going to be where the shared pond was. The electricity connection has changed.

In the EIS it was going to be going to Douglas Road and we put in a request to Endeavour Energy and they said no problem, it needs to just go east along Braddon Road and there's an existing pole there that it can join on to. Waste water discharge we reduce the potential volumes there by having a closer look at the uses of the water and reducing some of the – I guess changing some of the assumptions around how much would be used for showers and that kind of thing.

With regard to the water consumption, there were concerns expressed about what would happen in dry periods, et cetera. The water consumption has been potentially reduced by covering tanks, et cetera. So reducing the evaporation that might occur and also again looking at the assumptions around showers et cetera and the number of workers. So we've arrived at much lower volumes for those things.

This is an infographic that we prepared. Initially it was done for – we've been doing consultation and as part of our consultation we've been to one of the schools in the area, the Gib Gate School in Mittagong and in fact the Gib Gate School reached out to us and asked us whether we could come and talk to them about the project. So Sofie and I have been there three times now and we're just about to do a presentation next week to the Gib Gate because they're interested in how the project's progressing and the presentation is made to the Year 5 students.

So they kind of do a project on it and then we come and talk to them about what their sort of findings are because they're kind of doing like a mini EIS themselves. So this graphic here is really kind of all the impacts on one page. So on the left-hand side there it shows maximum of five trucks per hour delivering the material between 7 am and 6 pm. It talks about the quantity, 120,000 tonnes of

plastic that would otherwise be disposed of at landfill. It talks about advanced optical sorting equipment to identify the different plastic types.

And one of the other features on the site is the recycling research and product development. So the mixed use building that we talked about before on the eastern side, that's the workshop, laboratory and we'll also have an education centre there so that schools and the general public will be able to come in and learn about plastic recycling and the plant will be set up so people can safely go out and have a look at the different processes.

In terms of biodiversity impacts, there's approximately 0.32 hectares of native vegetation, which is in currently poor condition that would need to be replaced. There's a lot of exotic species, et cetera, there. There'd be a replanting of about 1.4 hectares, which is more than five times the original area and it would be with trees which are native, endemic to the area. So there's been a very careful selection of the trees and shrubs and native grasses that would be used.

So one of the key impacts of the project and positive impacts is we'll avoid huge amounts of greenhouse gas impacts associated with using virgin plastics. The New South Wales EPA has assessed the area noise emissions and they're well below the New South Wales guidelines for those particular impacts. The buildings have been designed by GHD's industrial architects and they're sympathetic to the existing rural residential surroundings and they're screened with planted native trees, which Sofie's already talked about.

The capital expenditure is more than 80 million, with 200 construction jobs and 140 full-time operation jobs in the longer term. And we mentioned before about the water consumption, it's been reduced to about 10 kilolitres per day per average. That's equivalent to one large household rainwater tank. So it's really a low impact on the environment and the local community. Thank you.

MS MASON-JONES: This figure was initially prepared for community consultation. We have used it in our visits to Gib Gate School for the Year 5 STEM class but it was prepared for the workshops that we did with the community once the EIS went on exhibition. We got quite a few comments through the project website and the email address around is this project burning plastic, how much water and please make it a figure that we understand what that's relative to.

So the idea was to make it an easy to understand infographic that had some relative points in the landscape of okay, it's equivalent to a large household rainwater tank and this is the process line of sorting and processing the plastic feedstock and there was some concern initially that this was an incinerator, that it was a burning plastic project and just actually what were the impacts on the environment from a biodiversity, water perspective. So yes, it was originally a consultation infographic that then has moved into sharing at the Gib Gate School.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, so I got that slightly wrong. Appreciate that.

MS SYKES: Can I ask a question just on water? Could you explain a little bit more – to me that's the water consumption of 10 kilolitres per day on average, could you explain I guess the loop in terms of discharge per day and –

MR GAMBLE: So I mean what happens with the water is it's going to be recirculated throughout the plant. So there's the continuous cycle recirculating the water that's used for washing, cleaning the water – because there's an on site waste water treatment plant and that's for the dissolved air flotation system, which is like one of the most advanced technologies around for taking particles and so on out of water.

So that will basically enable the water to be reused again and again but we were expecting – occasionally there may be a need to discharge the water, so on average that would be 10 kilolitres per day but generally it would be a closed cycle. And there would be some addition of water to the system because there would be unavoidable evaporation of water here and there when during warm days and all that. So that's basically the water cycle.

There would be – you know, because there's 140 workers already as well, there's going to be toilets, there's going to be some showers, there's going to be other things. So some of the water, that would just be potable water which would be used for that. None of the recycled water would be used for that. But there is also the ability to harvest water from the roofs, so there's going to be I think it's over 150 kilolitres of water storage on the site. So that's actually going to reduce the water consumption of the project as well quite significantly.

MS SYKES: So what was the system for waste water treatment?

MR GAMBLE: It's a dissolved air flotation system called —

MS SYKES: Dissolved air – yes.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, so it basically puts air bubbles into it and you pressurise the water and then the air bubbles basically – like a fizzy drink and everything ends up floating and then it gets scraped off the top and then that is one of the means for removing any sort of small particles of plastic as well, so it's highly effective in that regard.

MS SYKES: And is there any reason it can't be a fully zero discharge site?

MR GAMBLE: Well, in fact it would be – yes, if you didn't have to – like, occasionally there might be a need to discharge water. We've been conservative because we didn't think anyone would believe that it was a full zero discharge and in fact Nancy has told us many times it's zero discharge but we've said, look, we really need to allow for the possibility that you might have to discharge water occasionally and then we've sort of collectively arrived at this quantity. But really it's a zero discharge type project.

MS SYKES: Yes, okay. Thanks, David.

MR GAMBLE: No worries. And I mean when I say zero discharge, that's process water. Obviously when you've got waste water, human sewage and all that, that has to go to the sewer, we're not proposing to treat that on the site.

MS SYKES: Yes. Yes, of course.

MR GAMBLE: Okay. Thank you.

MS MASON-JONES: Sorry, Janett's got a question but I was also going to talk about the Sydney Water. So Janett, maybe you go first.

MS MILLIGAN: Can I just ask a quick question. You talked about the waste that sort of has got through the sorting system but is not suitable and it will leave the site and go to landfill. Is that local landfill?

MR GAMBLE: Well, there's no real local landfill, so it'll probably have to go – because there's going to be a lot of trucks coming into the site, there's the ability to backload that material and take it to Lucas Heights or somewhere like that or there's a couple of other like – there's regional landfills but it's just general solid waste and there's not going to be too much of that. It's roughly – I think it's like less than 5% probably of what comes in to the facility and it should actually be – in theory it should be 0% because it should come from a material recovery facility or the other facilities without any contamination but again we're being conservative and allow for some quantity of material to leave the site.

MS MILLIGAN: So it will be stored on site until there's enough for a backfill?

MR GAMBLE: Yes, it will just go into a skip bin, it's basically like in any factory, there'd be a skip bin there and it will just – once the skip bin's full, it'll just be hauled off the site. We're not expecting very large quantities. I think it was like 12,000 tonnes a year or something like that. And one other waste material that would leave the site is from the waste water treatment plant I mentioned, it removes particles, so that goes into a filter press and then that would be sort of dewatered and that material would also need to leave the site. But that's I think within the 12,000 tonnes a year that we're talking about.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: No worries.

MR MILLS: Could I ask, David, you mentioned the building design earlier, can you just expand a little bit on the building design for me? You referred to it as being clad, is it cladding something else – just a little bit more about the construction, the design and construction of the buildings?

MR GAMBLE: Yes. I mean, normally these type of buildings – the standard sort

of construction is tilt-up concrete for the first 3 or 4 metres and then above that it's like a steel structure which is then cladded with Colorbonded material and there has been like some discussion about different colours, et cetera, for the sheeting but it would be done in, well, an architecturally pleasing manner, you could say.

Within GHD we've got an architecture business and we design the buildings, the architects design the buildings, et cetera, with the maximum amount of articulation possible, given the need for large internal areas, et cetera. But there's a whole set of architectural drawings in the response to submissions report and the amendment report, et cetera and also we've done three dimensional visualisations of the buildings to show what they might look like. I think that was in the pack that we distributed yesterday as well.

So in comparison, many buildings in the surrounding area, some of those compliant ones have no architectural merit, there's been no – they're just basically sheds and we drove past some yesterday which were basically just tilt-up concrete right up to like about 5 metres or 6 metres and so with no windows, no other features. So we feel that this amount of effort should be I guess recognised, the fact that the applicant has gone through the process of trying to make the facility fit in with the surrounding area, colour wise as well as using the same sort of Colorbond type material, et cetera, and with all the sort of landscaping, et cetera, to help sort of make less of an impact for the neighbours, et cetera.

MR MILLS: So just in –

MS MASON-JONES: Sorry, Andrew, there's also a review from the government architect on the industrial design by the Department of Planning.

MR MILLS: So I was thinking in terms of insulation, other things above the tilt-up concrete.

MR GAMBLE: Sure, yes, no the building will need to meet – like, will need to have insulation because otherwise there'll be a huge sort of requirement to cool the building and heat the building. So there'll be insulation on the walls and ceiling, et cetera. That's another means of ensuring that there's no sort of significant noise transmission outside the building. So that will be part of the detailed design.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: Within the noise modelling there's been an assumption of like a loss of noise through the means of insulation on all the surfaces.

MR MILLS: Yes, thank you.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, so I'm not sure what we've got next on our –

MS MASON-JONES: So I think at this stage we have finished the 15 minutes –

well, I think we've gone over actually, apologies, allocated to us to describe the project. We did prepare some slides to talk about the key issues that follow if we thought that would be beneficial to have as a prompt for discussion. Otherwise, we can just answer questions if you like to take that approach.

MR MILLS: Happy for you to put up the key issues. I think that you're right, we'll probably cover them off or we have covered some of them off anyway. But I'm keen to move to some of those issues in particular but ask about I guess your engagement. There you go. Thank you. That answers my question about the local engagement.

MS ROMINA CAVALLO: Hi, everyone. I'm Romina Cavallo. I'm heading up the engagement for this project. In I think it's the amendment report, there's some stats on the sheer amount of engagement and touchpoints we had with community. So since that it's gone up, so we've had close to 3,000 interactions with community and that's anything from an email or a phone call incoming or outgoing. We had 15 in person sessions throughout the project lifecycle to date and we also had online sessions before and after COVID at DPHI's request.

We've put out 13 community updates, the website is updated as the project is updated. As Sofie and David said, there's numerous visits to local schools and also doorknocks and letterbox drops, et cetera. We've got a good mailing list that we also mail all changes or proposed changes to the project out and invitations for engagement. So as you can see, on the top of this graphic is all of the engagement sessions that we held and then at the bottom you'll see these are the real touchpoints in the project.

So in keeping with the requirements for drafting an EIS, it was really important that we heard from the community about what their issues were and how they have been addressed and how they were addressed in the EIS and then in the subsequent responding to submissions report and then in the subsequent amendment report as well. As you can see, we had multiple engagement sessions. We were hit by COVID in kind of the first up engagement opportunity, so that was in 2020 and 2021. We were able to head out and do some in person engagement in mid-2021 and later in 2022 as well.

What we can see here though is there were also community briefings once project parameters had changed such as traffic haulage routes, changes to water and waste water usage, changes to the building heights and the architectural features, et cetera. So what had been heard from community, we really reported back on what had been changed. There was ongoing engagement with the Department, Council, the ABR or the old Garvan next door and the community.

What we did, we did have ongoing engagement with Council, so I don't know if this is going to be a question but let me preempt it. It first commenced at the end of 2020, as David said, and there were some parameters that Council laid down in those first meetings that really have been met by the project now which is no use of Beaconsfield Road, so which is why the east-west road was explored, initial

truck movements were higher, these were reduced, truck movements were for longer periods during the day, that was reduced, and then there were discussions around water supply and sewer and treatment of waste water.

Council was relatively supportive slash neutral at the first instance and then we felt growing opposition and encountered growing opposition post the EIS submission. There is information in the EIS, RTS and amendment report around the east-west road and the VPA through Council and Council have said they weren't prepared to support that at that time. And then also there's been further DA approvals for construction of Braddon Road, as we know, as you saw yesterday, to the south of the site.

One of the things that we have been dealing with here and you will see on Monday at the in person sessions is we've had a lot of community angst and outrage. I'm not going to deny that. You can see that by the amount of people that will probably register and what they will be talking about.

Now, we've tried at length to be as transparent as possible because that is what we have to do as technical experts, you have to stay transparent and neutral. We've tried extremely hard to get the information out to community members when we had any changes and when there was something to report. We've had a lot of community come to sessions, we've had a lot of community who come to us after the session to say it was interesting but I'm nervous about speaking out publicly, especially as these are my neighbours. We get emails of support, et cetera, but we just don't see much of it at the actual sessions.

So we do try our best to engage and engage as we can with outrage. It's very hard and we know that but we do still go out there and do our best to ensure that we are reporting back the information to those that are willing to participate and listen. Everything is always open to everyone, people from all over the local area have attended our sessions.

MR GAMBLE: And we've also responded to many, many emails from community members where they've asked for specific technical details. So we've never ignored anyone. As soon as that's been passed on to us or come through the community line, email line, we've actually responded to those people.

MS CAVALLO: Yes. So we've been as responsive as possible and as you can see, there's lots of community members and they're still meeting ongoing, it's just that we seem to have been removed from the conversation and there's meetings with Council, et cetera. So from a community point of view, you'll see on Monday how they're – how do I put this – how they're feeling about the project and we've tried extremely hard to ensure that all the information is available for community to be able to understand it.

EIS and all those documents are extremely technical, we try very hard to ensure that there are layers of information for the community to look at so that it's not just technical babble, there's also other opportunities in summaries and

infographics, et cetera. PowerPoint presentations where we drill things down and then also workshops where we ask for feedback on what has been proposed. And some of the changes to the project, a lot of the changes to the project have arisen from community feedback. Janett.

MS MILLIGAN: Yes, I was just interested to ask you to reflect on given the level of engagement you've just talked about and the number of people you've engaged with, why do you think the level of anger is as it is?

MR GAMBLE: Rom, it might be good to go to that social impact slide, you know, where we went through that.

MS CAVALLO: Yes.

MR GAMBLE: It's the one where we talked about the actual outcome for the social impact assessment.

MS CAVALLO: Not this one, the other one.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, the next one, yes.

MS CAVALLO: Yes. So from a community point of view, there's a lot of sensitivity around their local area and I have to say that we have been talking to an extremely vocal crowd but it's not the majority. We haven't heard from that silent majority a lot either. The outrage, it really started when it was proposed because – I'm going to talk very freely here – in a community perception, it was in somewhere that was zoned correctly but they didn't understand that that could've been part of what was allowed on that site.

A lot of the first interactions with community were really explaining that this is actually permissible on the site. The Council had – even though it had been earmarked for a long time, it had been zoned as such, something like I think it was 13 years before when we had these first conversations and community really felt that they had been sideswiped because they weren't really across, okay, well this was proposed. And Council at that time was in – there was a lot of issues behind the scenes around –

MS MASON-JONES: Administration.

MS CAVALLO: Administration, thank you very much. I had forgotten that word. So when we first started talking to community, the angst was "We had no idea this could even happen here now." And that was where community really felt let down but also sideswiped as well.

MS MILLIGAN: I can understand if that's where you started but I guess I'm interested if – and you may not have a comment on this, that was the starting point, given the level of engagement you've just spoken to us about, I was just interested in your views of why the community – and I understand you're saying

it's not everybody, but why the feeling of the community is still so strong?

MS MASON-JONES: I might answer this one, Janett. We initially engaged with the closest sensitive receivers, [Redacted] came up to the boundary yesterday, very interested in what was happening, and it's fair to say that even their position on the project has changed over four years from neighbours interested, "What are the impacts? What will it look like? Oh, that's a shame the landscape character's going to change, we really enjoy the view. What are you doing? Can you tell us about?" to – and I'm going to put it out here, social media is toxic.

There are people who live 40 km away who are rallying the troops. It's a waste project, there was concern about who the proponent was and the connection with [Redacted]. I'm going to say that here because that came out in the town hall. There was some clear very spiteful and vindictive comments made. So it's a waste project, it's divisive to start with, who the proponent is and then a fearmongering.

And it's been very tricky because even going slowly with the [Redacted] with [Redacted], we've gone and spoken within our consultation teams and social impact teams have spoken with the nearest receivers who started at a point of wanting to know information to now a Facebook frenzy and a Moss Vale Matters Group of many people who don't live within 10 km of the site, don't want it, don't want the change, don't want the Southern Highlands to be an industrial dumping ground.

So there is misinformation circling, there are people who won't have any interaction with this site at all who are fuelling fire with comments around PFAS and microplastics and there is now a storm that we are not invited to share the actual content into. And so I think that that's just – it's grown and it's grown and it goes down when there's no change to the project and it's flared back up again because the project has now been referred to IPC.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR MILLS: Can I ask a little bit of a follow up to that in terms of you've mentioned the SHIP in particular and Council have expressed a view as to what they expect in the SHIP and their view is it doesn't include this kind of development and rather that this kind of development would be better suited to a different place in the broader I guess enterprise corridor. Yes, thank you. How would you classify this vis-à-vis other kinds of industrial use?

MS MASON-JONES: Yes, I'll take this one. So there's two things at play here, we've got a statutory zoning, an IN general industrial zone – sorry, it's now changed to E4 general industrial zone. So that zoning sets out the statutory development controls and permissibility of projects and that general industrial zone is very flexible in terms of the uses that can be in there. You've got general industry, high tech industry, industrial training facilities and depots. So the land use which is a waste management reprocessing facility is a type of industry. So from a permissibility perspective, it meets the requirements of general industry in

the general industrial zone. Some members of –

MR MILLS: Can I jump in there?

MS MILLIGAN: Yes.

MR MILLS: That's not quite my question. I do appreciate that it actually meets the general industrial zone aspect but my question is slightly different, does it meet what the SHIP would [cross-talk 00:59:30].

MR GAMBLE: We'll need the next slide – Rom, the next slide.

MS CAVALLO: You want the next slide, yes.

MR GAMBLE: Yes.

MS MASON-JONES: The MVEC – the current DCP, Andrew, or the draft masterplan?

MR MILLS: The draft.

MS MASON-JONES: The draft masterplan, yes. So the draft masterplan and we've just done a little inset of where it is there. So it puts the particular site within the research, training and advanced manufacturing precinct. And so plastics recycling, reprocessing is a type of advanced manufacturing development. So from a land use perspective, yes, it meets the intended uses in the draft masterplan. The draft masterplan also proposes a much larger floorplate that takes up a larger footprint of the site than the two buildings that we have sought to separate and additional landscaping within it.

And there are the height controls, floorspace ratio, landscape requirements, the project meets the requirements of that. So we did a review when the draft masterplan came out a couple of weeks ago or maybe six weeks ago for the Department to confirm that notwithstanding this project was four years down the pathway, the draft masterplan from a land use, building footprint, connectivity, roads, landscaping and floorspace ratio was not inconsistent with the masterplan.

MR MILLS: And can I ask a follow up question and this is more a case of the why at this site, given that you're seeking to I guess collect plastic waste in the first instance from Sydney, Canberra and Wollongong, would a site closer to the highway have made more sense?

MS MASON-JONES: Yes, I guess it comes back to what we mentioned at the beginning around the suitability of zoned land that was of the appropriate size that was available to put forward a proposal at the time. Whilst this particular masterplan proposes a number of layouts and building footprints on it, I will note just where you see the symbol "3" there to the north of the line and there's quite a big floorplate there, there's two – Rom, if you can point up. Yes, just there.

There's two drainage lines that go through there, so I would be very surprised if that particular site which we looked at in the early stages because people were talking about, "Why don't you go on the north side?" it's very constrained by a creek that runs north-south and then heads in an east-west direction. So this particular site that we had, whilst it has a drainage line, it runs neatly north-south down the boundary and didn't compromise an area that was required for a large floorplate. Yes, it does require the need for a road to connect it to the highway but it's about a kilometre, so it wasn't considered an unreasonable cost for the feasibility of the project.

MR GAMBLE: One of the things that we did, when we were trying to – Nancy was actually negotiating with the Garvan on the price for the land to acquire. So we went and looked at all the industrial properties that had sold in the last two or three years and just to try and work out a dollar per square metre value to put in the agreement and we found there was very few, if any, sites which would've been equivalent to this one in terms of where it's located, how flat it is, the fact it doesn't impact on water courses, et cetera.

So we could not actually find anything that Nancy could've bought – acquired at the same time period and then since that time we've maintained a key interested in that and there's still virtually no sites available. One of the reasons for that is the Council never built any of the supporting road infrastructure.

So the area that we're talking about here has been largely inaccessible and the proposed north-south road which potentially open it up slightly and Braddon Road that's been built now by the neighbour will actually potentially allow industrial development further west of the proponent's site. And I know that's not intended but now it does provide an access into the site and that would be – other trucks from other facilities would be able to use Beaconsfield Road. There's no limitations on that.

So we're proposing to go in from a brand new road north-south, industrial standard, but basically anyone that comes along and buys a piece of land near where we are would have no restrictions whatsoever.

MR MILLS: Okay, thank you.

MS MASON-JONES: [unintelligible 01:04:15] I think shows the Southern Highlands Innovation Precinct strategy that we initially saw in 2020 that promoted the region for its large floorplates. Rom, if you can just tap on to the next one, it talked about the unique opportunity for large scale industrial and its connectedness to the regions. Council did mention to us once they formed a position of opposition that they felt the site was out of sequence and you might hear that from the Council or see that in some of their comments.

We wanted to understand what that meant because from our sort of review of it, you had the Australian Biomedical Resources and the Dux site and the development happening on the north. So we saw this as the next site, the next cab

off the rank. It would need to build a road, whether it was east-west or north-south was really what the point of discussion was up for and when we spoke to Council about what is referenced to out of sequencing, they just said, "Oh, it's just not yet. Not yet."

So the project went through looking at water, sewer, road access and environmental impacts, including social, landscape, visual, heritage, biodiversity and we can't see any constraint to development of the site and feel that it is appropriate sequencing, having regard to the development that has taken place around it.

MR MILLS: Thank you. I'm conscious we've gone a little longer than was originally intended. Are there other things that you would like to ensure that you covered off?

MS MASON-JONES: Just if you had any questions on the traffic because I know it is a long EIS and RTS and amendment report to read and get your head around and we've been in the project for four years and I appreciate your window to review and assess and get your head around it isn't as long. Did you have any questions on what we proposed, when and why and why it changed and how we consulted on the access, because it is a key component of the project.

MR MILLS: I don't think in terms of the when, why and why it changed. I think I do understand – I asked the question yesterday in why not [unintelligible 01:06:24] on the northern end of the site, off the north-south road and the response you gave, I'll just put it on the record here, the response you gave was the concern in relation to the riparian and crossing a riparian area, which I understand the logic there. Of course the concern is that Braddon Road, as I understand it, is not of industrial standard, is that –

MS MASON-JONES: Correct, it's not currently. Yes, it's an identified industrial collector road for the SHIP to use but it has not currently been constructed to industrial standard. It was approved as part of the three lot subdivision by the Harcourts and so it's been built for residential subdivision standard. But it is intended to be a future industrial collector road in the MVEC DCP and the draft SHIP masterplan.

MR MILLS: Is the Council asking you to do any upgrades to that road?

MS MASON-JONES: We proposed to upgrade it for the bit that we connect coming from the north-south if the project was approved, the north-south road and the full length of the frontage of Plasrefine's site would be upgraded to be industrial standard.

MR MILLS: In terms of noise, the trucks, because of the way trucks will enter and leave the site, it strikes me there'll need to be some form of braking going down the site as they enter and then certainly powering order to go up out of the site. Consideration been given in relation to that noise as well? I understand there

was some analysis of the vehicle noise.

MS MASON-JONES: Yes. And look, a noise and vibration study has been undertaken both with the road traffic noise policy criteria as well as the on site criteria and that is all met for operational noise impacts.

MR MILLS: Yes.

MS MASON-JONES: Both on site and vehicles accessing the site via the new road and the road was assessed as a public road in terms of the noise criteria and not a private road for the north-south road as it would be constructed and owned by the Council once completed.

MR MILLS: Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: You did ask a question yesterday about the relative height of buildings. So I just thought we'd just quickly answer that. So this is a photo montage that we did that you wouldn't have seen, it wasn't in the pack. This is from the Garvan site, so the photograph on the top of is currently as is and then this is the building that would go on that part there and that's the relative sort of heights there. And then there's no landscaping showing here, just for illustrative purposes, but there's obviously proposed to be landscaping.

So if we go to the next slide now, this is with all the landscaping but on the bottom there, we got our architects to do this this morning, this is basically if you were looking at the site from Braddon Road. So these are the relative levels. So the site currently would – the front part of the site would actually be RL 678 roughly, which is around about the same level as the Garvan site or the ABR site. But the roof height's obviously different. The top roof height of the Garvan is about RL 685 and then we're looking at about 693. So a small amount of difference, about 7 metres different but quite a distance between the two, obviously. And so that's hopefully the answer to the question that you posed yesterday.

MS SYKES: David, could you just clarify, so where is this looking from?

MR GAMBLE: So this is as though you were standing on Braddon Road and looking north.

MS SYKES: Okay.

MR GAMBLE: So on the left-hand side is the office building, the far left and then building number 2 would be sitting in front of us there in the middle and then the mixed use building on the right-hand side. So that's the proposed proposal site on the left and then the Garvan or ABR site is on the right. So in between –

MS SYKES: Yes. But the cross-section doesn't match the image though if that –

MR GAMBLE: No, it doesn't. No, we don't have an image that's equivalent to

that. But yes, sorry, it's probably a bit confusing but this is the perspective of what the Garvan would see from their site.

MS SYKES: What the Garvan will see. Okay, thank you.

MR MILLS: Sorry, but –

MS MASON-JONES: The Garvan's view is looking west and the cross-section was looking north.

MS SYKES: Yes. But the image is looking west.

MS MASON-JONES: Correct.

MS SYKES: Yes, okay.

MR MILLS: Yes, okay. Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: Sorry –

MR MILLS: I thought I understood it until you said that last bit and now – yes, [unintelligible 01:11:26] what I did understand, so that's fine.

MR GAMBLE: Yes, hard to visualise but –

MR MILLS: Thank you. Got it.

MR GAMBLE: What's this? This is some of that compliant development nearby. We've noticed across the road there, this is something interesting, this is night time lighting. I was actually down there, we had to do some night time shots for the visual assessment, so took a shot during the day, bit of a gloomy day, but then at night time, it lights up like a Christmas tree. So what we're proposing in this project or what Nancy's proposing is lighting that meets the required standard.

So this is what currently exists, there's no standards being met on the existing industrial facilities that are being built around the area but the lighting proposed for the project would be downward facing, it would be minimal, it would be at night just sort of basically security lighting, et cetera. So the facility probably won't be seen at night because of all the lighting from every other facility around it. I don't know what else we can show you really. Is there anything else you want to discuss?

MR MILLS: Sorry, yes?

MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: Sorry, Andrew. Sorry to interject. I was just going to mention we're probably at the maximum extent of our time. I just thought I would flag that with you.

MR MILLS: Yes.

MR GAMBLE: Very good. Well thank you very much for your invitation for us to speak to you today.

MR MILLS: No, thank you. Thank you for the information that you've provided. It may not be the end of it, we may end up with further questions and may come back to you at some point. But thank you for your time today. Appreciate it.

MS MASON-JONES: Thank you.

MR GAMBLE: Thank you.

MR MILLS: Thanks, everyone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED