



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

MOSS VALE PLASTICS RECYCLING FACILITY (SSD-9409987)

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL:	ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR) CLARE SYKES JANETT MILLIGAN
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	KENDALL CLYDSDALE TAHLIA HUTCHINSON STUART MORGAN
WINGECARRIBEE SHIRE COUNCIL:	CR JESSE FITZPATRICK LISA MISCAMBLE DENIZ KILIC SUSAN STANNARD MICHAEL MCCABE
LOCATION:	WINGECARRIBEE SHIRE COUNCIL CIVIC CENTRE 68 ELIZABETH STREET, MOSS VALE NSW 2577
DATE:	11:30AM – 12:30PM MONDAY, 21ST OCTOBER 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR ANDREW MILLS: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet, the the Gundungurra people, and pay my respects to their Elders: past and present. I would also like to thank Council for hosting this meeting at Council's Civic Centre.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility in Moss Vale within the Wingecarribee local government area The proposed development would recycle up to 120 tonnes of mixed plastic waste such as bottles and containers per annum. Recovered plastic would be converted into clean plastic pellets and flakes which then would be reprocessed into a range of plastic materials and I'm telling you everything you already know but for the record, because we are recording it as well. I think it was agreed beforehand you're – so we may double check on that too.

My name is Andrew Mills. I am the Chair of the Independent Planning Commission as well as 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 and Stuart Morgan from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. And so in the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, the meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's considerations of this matter. It will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. So it's important for Commissioners to ask questions of you all, to clarify any issues when it's considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and you don't have an immediate answer, that's fine. Please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing later. We're also put that up on the website.

If you could introduce yourself for the purposes of the recording the first time you speak, that would be very helpful and please all try to ensure we don't talk over the top of each other. Perhaps rather than asking you to introduce yourselves as we've done an introduction already, perhaps it might be worthwhile just in terms of positions of everyone if you don't mind –

MS LISA MISCAMBLE: And how do you prefer to be addressed, Andrew?

MR MILLS: Andrew is fine.

MS MISCAMBLE: Andrew's fine. I'm Lisa Miscamble. I'm the general manager of Wingecarribee Shire Council.

CR JESSE FITZPATRICK: Jesse Fitzpatrick, mayor of Wingecarribee Shire Council.

MR DENIZ KILIC: Deniz Kilic, executive manager of strategic outcomes at Council.

5 **MS SUSAN STANNARD:** Susan Stannard, coordinator strategic policy in the strategic outcomes team.

MR MICHAEL MCCABE: Michael McCabe, director, communities and place.

10 **MR MILLS:** Thank you very much. This meeting in particular, we need to try and capture as much as we can about Council's views. We've seen the submissions that Council has made in the past to the Department. Obviously we welcome a further submission if you would like to make one directly to the Commission. But we're really opening it up and as I said as part of the introduction, we're here to listen to what Council's views are in relation to this and I fully understand that part of that will be reflecting the community and their concerns. So I'll leave it up to you. Please.

20 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Sure. So today we're here, I've got a few people who are going to speak on the technical side of things. Obviously I'm closest to the community, so I'll give a bit of a high level of what I'm hearing on the ground and public sentiment and then we'll pass it over to the experts. "Disappointment" is being used a lot in the space, in the media and I would say that's an understatement, more along the lines of fury and upset and I don't think I've seen as much push back in this space since the Hume Coal. So I don't know if you're aware of how big of an issue that was, this would be second to that by far.

30 The biggest issues we're facing is probably, if I could preface on three of them and then they'll delve into some other ones, is contradiction to our strategic sort of vision. We have been given funding to create a strategic vision in what we call the SHIP, Southern Highlands Innovation Park, and this sort of flies in the face of that. We consider it a bit more heavier industry and not the right location, which brings us into the second part of being very close to a residential area.

35 So we have residents that are immediately affected by it, running 24 hours a day and the traffic movements and then we have residents who are affected by the traffic movements beyond that, not just the people that live near it. Noise, traffic movement, damage to roads, all of the above with large truck movements. Then we have the environmental impacts. So we understand that it is a plastics refinery attempting to reduce plastics but we believe that the outcome of that and the detriment to the environment far exceeds what they're pertaining to do with in the realm of water and microparticles in the air and the like.

40 We are not opposed to this project, this industry, but we would love it to be closer to – we have Boral up the road, a heavy industry, where it's really splitting our strategic planning in half, having two kind of what we believe is heavy industries on one end of a strategic plan with trucks driving through the middle of it when we're looking at medical research. It does about the medical research, as you would know, and we want more of that there. And those guys definitely don't want

downwind of plastics and heavy vehicles running near them.

5 So as I said, the community is vehemently upset, don't want it in any capacity. I'm about to go to a meeting tonight where there's going to be 500 people maybe there and as I said, I haven't seen that many people in a room since Hume Coal. So that's sort of the high level overarching views and I'll pass it on to these guys to sort of give you a more technical breakdown.

10 **MR KILIC:** I'll speak to the strategic implications. As we all know, the site is zoned general industrial, however, we can all appreciate under the New South Wales planning system, zoning is a blunt instrument and that is why over the past few years this Council has put considerable resources into creating the strategic framework and strategic vision for that area that we call the Southern Highlands Innovation Park, affectionately known as the SHIP, even though we're inland.

15 We've previously relied on the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor Development Control Plan, a structure plan since then and that interface because this is very much on that residential interface with C4 environmental living, where homes are within metres of this proposed facility. We always envisaged lower impact employment generating land uses.

20 So the sites were always open to employment generating land uses but something like the Garvan Institute, which is very low impact and very suitable for that residential interface. The fundamental – so it always starts with that opposition to the fundamental point which is the location, not the concept of responding to the state government's vision to meet the circular economy targets and of course plastics recycling, it's about the location rather than the facility output.

25 The innovation park masterplan is actually a state government funded masterplan. We received \$270,000 from the Department of Regional New South Wales to undertake this work and this proposal fundamentally undermines that masterplan as well as the trust that both the state and Council has built with the community. So there's a broader picture here around community trust and trust in institutions, including the state.

30 Looking at the masterplan, we envisage that that precinct as an emerging biotech sub-precinct, leveraging off the Garvan Institute. So we've already attracted attention from medical device manufacturers who want to locate around that Garvan Institute facility because of the nexus that it creates and those sorts of industries like to cluster.

35 Industries like plastics recycling, we have zoned land that we can accommodate facilities like this and that's closer to the Boral Cement Works, which is zoned heavy industrial and right next door is actually the Berrima Sewage Treatment Pant. So in terms of noxious industries, it's the perfect place to cluster high impact land uses like a plastics recycling facility which has high impact truck movements particularly as well as visual impacts from the building.

Those are our fundamental concerns and everything else probably stems from that. But fundamentally the locational question has to be answered before we move on to some of those impact assessments, which the Department has been going through over the past two years now.

5

I'll briefly touch on the interface issue on Braddon Road. So Braddon Road is very much that interface between industrial and residential or environmental living and the implications for us looking at the Department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent, there are some unworkable – in our view, unworkable and potentially irreconcilable issues with particularly condition B44 around truck movements and the realignment of a level crossing, which is owned by a rail line owned by Boral.

10

So we believe that some of the assessment conditions have not been fully resolved and again but that's a tertiary consideration. I've spoken to the fundamental concern about location but the whole point of an SSD process is that the state assesses the whole project and does not delegate issues to Council, which we objected to this, so it becomes unworkable to delegate the details of a level crossing, of an unformed road, as well as the long term compliance issues with truck movements on a residential road.

15

20

MR MCCABE: Commissioner, I'll just give a point of clarity. I think Deniz was referring to B22.

25

MR KILIC: B22, sorry.

MR MCCABE: Not B44. B44 is air quality. B22 is traffic.

MR MILLS: Can I ask a couple of questions then around some of that. So plastics, you described as – you used a couple of terms, a noxious industry or in that class of noxious industries. What are the features of the process I guess that you're concerned about in particular when you refer to it as noxious?

30

MR KILIC: It would be primarily the cumulative impact of the microplastics, both airborne and water. We've made representations to the Department around how our STPs may not be able to filter out those microplastics, which wouldn't be an issue if it was let's say down the highway in Goulburn where it's not part of the Sydney water catchment, Sydney drinking water catchment.

35

But Wingecarribee Shire is Sydney's drinking water catchment and that was actually one of the primary arguments as part of the Hume Coal SSD proposal, that if it was somewhere else, the impacts may have been acceptable but because it's part of the Sydney drinking water catchment, that's what made it irreconcilable.

40

45

The other would probably be the [unintelligible 00:12:10] we're looking at the truck movements being every seven minutes and the gates of the facility opening up, allowing for again those airborne microplastics to become airborne from the

facility immediately adjacent to a residential precinct. So my understanding is industries like this can be accommodated, it just needs to be – there needs to be a greater buffer from residential areas.

5 **MR MILLS:** And so apart from that, a lot of what you spoke about was the interface with the residential area and that medical device manufactures had expressed interest. In terms of the visual impact, would there be – do you believe there'd be a big difference between a facility – and I'm talking the buildings, not what's inside, a facility like this versus a medical facility, medical device
10 manufacturer? Because I've been to Cochlear in Sydney, for example, and it's a great big building, you know, and has some offices at the front but they're doing stuff behind, tiny little detailed work and so on. I just was interested whether you perceive it to be very, very different. Anyone jump in, please.

15 **MR KILIC:** In terms of the built form impact, as a designer, I think again it's come to that location question. If that building was closer to Boral –

MR MILLS: Yes, sorry, I'm just saying if you replaced what is being proposed with a medical manufacture facility, how different do you see the visual impact or
20 is there none? Is there not a notable difference?

CR FITZPATRICK: Is it three storey site proposed currently?

25 **MR MILLS:** Yes.

MR KILIC: And plus a vent on top.

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes, I mean depending on the scale of the medical facility, I imagine they'd be more ground floor than –
30

MR MILLS: No, the one at Ryde's three storeys high as well but that's what popped into my mind, I'm just trying to think how different does it look in terms of the visual things. You want to encourage – I hear what you're saying, you would prefer to encourage that kind of facility going in there but some of the
35 residents are complaining about visual, so I'm trying to get my head around if –

CR FITZPATRICK: Part of the SHIP plan, I believe we do have ideas of what we want the space to look like and what type of buildings we do want. So yes, there is a plan of what we would like it adhere to, which they haven't really even
40 attempted to fit into that –

MR KILIC: Yeah and I'll add to that the landscape buffers, so again as part of the masterplan, we proposed landscape buffers because fundamentally we don't want the innovation park to look like just any other industrial precinct in Western
45 Sydney or in another city. It responds to that Southern Highlands identity. So that fact of course I think visual impact is probably a tertiary argument because again I bring it back to that location question, which is fundamental.

5 I think from the community's perspective, the visual impact of a medical device manufacturer would be more acceptable. We often don't get a lot of engagement with industrial precinct masterplans but the Southern Highlands Innovation Park masterplan got considerable feedback from the community and we usually only hear about concerns when it's a residential project, a greenfield subdivision.

10 But with the innovation park, a lot of people said, "No, we want more job – employment generating land uses here." I think people are okay with the visual impact being mitigated by, for example, landscape buffers. And if I can give a quick example, there's no way of hiding, for example, the Boral Cement Works. It's one of the silhouettes in the landscape.

15 But even Boral a few decades ago Commissioned a Sorensen designed landscape plan to plant essentially a native forest around the cement works. Again, that creates a buffer. Maybe not a visual buffer but in terms of the amenity, even though New Berrima is very close by, it does create a bit of a buffer as much as you can, given the location. At this site, you don't have space for those sorts of buffers.

20 So again, I think it would be acceptable because speaking to those medical device manufacturers, they're talking about at most five truck movements a day. So the impact of that compared to this with the same built form outcome, it's night and day.

25 **MR MILLS:** Yes, no, no, I get that, that transport aspect, the movement of trucks and so on. I guess I'm trying to chunk it down and think about the different components and go okay, so what's the feeling about different things. So no, no that's absolutely fine. Sorry, Janett, you look like you're about to ask a question.

30 **MS JANETT MILLIGAN:** When you're ready, I have a question.

MR MILLS: Go for it.

35 **MS MILLIGAN:** Can I just come back, I need to clarify Council's position on location and we just heard you talk about your real concerns about microplastics into the water and you talked about the fact that it's in the water catchment area. Earlier you talked about potentially wrong location but there could be another place in the innovation park that would accommodate it but then I heard you say it's in the water catchment, that would rule it out.

40 So can you just clarify, are you saying this project, if it was lifted up and put somewhere else, if it's in the water catchment, Council would still retain its concerns about its location or could it be in another part of the park and you wouldn't be worried about microplastics in the water and the water catchment?
45 Just clarify that for me.

MR KILIC: That's a very good point. I think it's a matter of foundationally ideally we'd like it in another location outside of the water catchment area.

However, if the position is that the impact of microplastics is acceptable in a Sydney water catchment area, then the secondary argument would be that it's located next to a heavy or in a heavy industrial precinct like the Boral Cement Works. So it's a tiered argument there.

5

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you.

MR MILLS: Clare, anything –

10

MS CLARE SYKES: Yes, I just had for – well, I guess for my benefit, could we take a step back on the innovation park itself and perhaps the status of the masterplan and also just understanding the different sub-precincts within it?

15

MR KILIC: That's a fantastic question. We were actually printing the sub-precincts off for you but it should be here in minutes.

MS SYKES: Okay.

20

MR KILIC: I'll place a copy in front of you for the time being.

MS MISCAMBLE: Deniz, before we dive into [unintelligible 00:19:07] do you mind just going back say two or three years, with the history of the SHIP?

25

MR KILIC: Very much so. So the innovation park has been zoned for employment generating land uses since the 80s and we've had piecemeal development and it is a very large precinct. So we're talking about a thousand hectares of zoned land, about 750 hectares of which is available as undeveloped. And we have a chapter in our development control plan called the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor, that's its former name.

30

And of course under the New South Wales planning system, zoning is a blunt instrument and that is why that DCP work, that master planning work was Commissioned. More recently, we Commissioned a structure plan as a first step towards a masterplan and eventually we brought on a nationally recognised group of consultants to work on the masterplan being our business case.

35

MS MISCAMBLE: So I might just in between, so back in late 2021, we engaged Elton Consulting to have a look at the Moss Vale Area and because they hadn't been activated, there was a concern that there were bits and pieces of industry popping up but no really overarching masterplan for that area that would support the jobs and the economy we need in order to keep people living and working locally.

40

So Eltons were engaged to look at it, look is it something that is economically viable, attractive and if so, what would be the key industries that could be attracted to that area, knowing what our community is, knowing its strategic positioning between Sydney, Canberra and Port Kembla and just doing it as early market testing. Out of that came, yes, there is interest and at that point identified some key

45

industries or smart jobs, if you like, in terms of biomedical, health, education.

5 So from there, Council had discussions with regional New South Wales, which then led to funding for a more detailed masterplan and a governance strategy to be developed. So Council isn't a major landowner in that area, so we need the ability to have an appropriate governance structure to support the delivery of the vision. We own a little bit of land on the fringe but not in the centre. So we were successful in achieving the grant from regional New South Wales and then back to you, Deniz.

10 **MR KILIC:** Yes. Thank you, General Manager. A lot of that history again seems from the fact that industries were popping up without that [unintelligible 00:22:05] strategic framework. The other aspect here is infrastructure coordination. So in a rural shire, it's about the trunk infrastructure. It's the good old sewer, water, roads and because industries were popping up uncoordinated, servicing those industries is important and that's why the master planning work was Commissioned.

20 So the nationally recognised [unintelligible 00:22:32] being Architectus for the masterplan, SGS Economics for the strategic positioning paper as well as Astrolabe Consulting for our governance strategy. So we went for the top tier consultancies to advise us and fundamentally that strategic positioning paper said leverage off your regional advantages. Don't try to compete with the Aerotropolis or some of the special activation precincts that the state government has been coordinating. It's very much leveraging off the Southern Highlands brand and the industries that are already here, industries that we want to attract, given our liveability as well as what we're known for attracting.

30 And closer to the innovation park, so what you'll see, a big blue star there close to the town centre, that is the sort of the nexus we'd like with other town centre supporting land uses. So whether it be a university presence, a TAFE presence, incubation hubs as well as lower order employment generating land uses. And then further out, again away from residential land uses, so to the far west, you see the circular economy, heavy industry precinct cluster around Boral Cement Works.

35 **MS MISCAMBLE:** Can I just jump in there, Deniz? So with the little stars that you can see on the character precincts, they're existing industry that are strong and again, it wasn't starting with a blank sheet of paper, it was looking at what are the anchors that exist within the SHIP and then how do we leverage off those to create ecosystems that would then support jobs. So as Deniz has mentioned, the Garvan Institute in terms of medical, there's a significant data centre there on site that at first stage is being developed and there are a number of other stages coming through that is quite significant for the nation. And then you have the Boral –

45 **MR MILLS:** Is it mainly cloud technology support and that kind of thing, is it –

MS MISCAMBLE: Data storage of –

MR KILIC: Defence data potentially.

MS MISCAMBLE: Yes. Of government information is what I would say. So you also have Boral Cement Works and the Berrima Feedmill and saleyards as well in that precinct. So it wasn't a blank sheet, it was how do we – we've already got anchors, how do we leverage off that. So back to you, Deniz.

MR MILLS: Just in relation to that, the one that's described manufacturing, what's the nature of that?

MR KILIC: So leverage off there are landholders who would like to assemble the next generation of electric buses to service Sydney's bus network. So we do have significant landholdings there of investors who want to assemble the next generation of Sydney buses. The other one would be there's a crane manufacturer currently there as well as lower order employment uses like storage.

MR MILLS: So those two that you mentioned specifically though, do you classify those as heavy industrial, the bus manufacturer and crane manufacturer?

MR KILIC: I'm not sure. I would point out they're further away from residential [cross-talk 00:26:02].

MR MILLS: No, no. I was just trying to get a sense but no, it's not a trick question. It's not meant to do anything, but it's just trying to get a full understanding.

MR KILIC: No, it's a fair question.

CR FITZPATRICK: To get a tangible idea in my head, so for example, we're desperate for younger people down here and we would love the opportunity for a university. If we project forward and say this is approved and here it is and there is a detriment to environment, microplastics in the air, when you're sitting there, boots on the ground, I know we talk about a high level in our mind's view, someone's going to go to that site that might want to build a university and say, "Absolutely not next to that." And that's what we're facing.

If the Garvan Institute finds that they are getting microplastics or something into their filtration system, they may close. Like, there's not many industries that pump out microplastics. So it's not like we're against any sort of heavy industry or buses or things like – I can't see a bus company, for example, producing huge amounts of air pollutants.

So it's to put to the strategic part of it, yes, we are very worried about the future impacts of not only what may happen to existing but as soon as this is approved, how many people are we losing that are circling here that want an industry that are going, "No way, not near that." And there are lots of areas similar to this all around. So we are in competition for the best thing we can attract and putting the worst thing we can attract in day one completely undermines this.

5 **MS SYKES:** Is the principle of circular economy across the whole precinct or is there a particular zone that's focused on – I mean, I noticed the resource recovery centre, as an example. So just delineating between is it an operating principle across the masterplan?

10 **MR KILIC:** The principle – first off we started off from okay, which industries do we want to attract and then we established those sub-precincts, leveraging off what's already there. So that corridor, ideally clustered around the Boral Cement Works, there's a lot of land available there, but off Berrima Road would also be workable because there's that nexus with our waste centre, our resource recovery centre.

15 The other thing I'll add to what the mayor mentioned, it's also about again bringing it back to some of the impact assessment because that is what this SSD is primarily about. This will potentially take all the capacity that's available off Douglas Road with one development.

20 So we envisaged something like this being closer to that Boral cluster, closer to the highway, because the plastics are coming from that Sydney to Canberra corridor, being off the highway, so it's straight on and off, literally next to the off ramp, rather than dragging a hundred plus truck movements per day right into the eastern frontier of the SHIP, that residential interface and then back out because that is the movement of travel.

25 **CR FITZPATRICK:** And [unintelligible 00:29:07] equine.

MR KILIC: Yes, well we support equine –

30 **CR FITZPATRICK:** So we do have an equine area and I don't know how much but that's sort of what we represent down there and a hundred truck movements past equine is going to be a massive hindrance, not to mention them trying to pull their own trucks and floats and things out on to a road that has a truck nearly every seven minutes. It's quite substantial.

35 **MS MILLIGAN:** Can I ask just a question about the transport, so the trucks would be leaving the main road where you'd like to contain them I guess and the distance north-south to this site is approximately what? I have read it but –

40 **MR MILLS:** It's a kilometre, isn't it?

MS MILLIGAN: Is it less than a kilometre or is it a kilometre?

45 **MR KILIC:** I can't remember the figure.

MS MISCAMBLE: If I could just jump in, it's not so much the distance, it's the fact that it actually – it cuts right through the heart of the SHIP. So it's not necessarily the distance that the trucks would need to come. It would actually take

up the road and basically cut through the whole precinct to the far end. So the point around the traffic and trying to keep it up here is that it's close off and on, minimising the impact in terms of amenity but also truck movements and capacity of the road and it will impact – as this develops, impact on the ability and potentially the attractiveness if that capacity is taken up on the road.

MS MILLIGAN: And just one other question, where's the equine industry, just roughly?

MR KILIC: So the green area, again that responds to our regional advantages. We provide 850 jobs in the equine sector in Southern Highlands and again the SGS report, because it's a huge precinct, it can support various industries and equine is one of the industries that we can support.

MS MISCAMBLE: So the green on the plan is the agribusiness, agri-innovation equine.

MS MILLIGAN: Right. Sorry, I thought you were saying it was already there. So yes.

MS MISCAMBLE: There are parts of it in there, so we already have a saleyard. So again, leveraging off the existing, so there's the saleyard that's there. Just zooming a little bit out of this proposal itself, for our community too it's looking at how do we support the local producers, the agri and the equine industries to remain viable in the area and then how do we use the opportunity of the SHIP to leverage that. And in part, that's part of the overall strategy about maintaining the green in between so that agricultural land remains valuable enough to retain and reduce the pressure in terms of wanting to sell. So it links to a broader picture [unintelligible 00:32:01].

MR MILLS: Just coming in on that road and the opposite side to the Boral Cement Works itself, there's another – struck me there was another cement style manufacturer there.

MR KILIC: It's a chicken feed, Inghams.

MS MISCAMBLE: Inghams.

MR MILLS: No it wasn't Inghams.

MR KILIC: Brickworks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The brickworks [unintelligible 00:32:25].

MR MILLS: Yes, I've just forgotten the name of it but – and I noticed I was held up by a very large truck going in. But yes, I thought it was another cement name, cement manufacturer name. No, okay. I may have it wrong.

MR KILIC: On Berrima Road there's a –

MR MILLS: On the road coming up just opposite –

5 **MR KILIC:** – cement producing plant, yes.

CR FITZPATRICK: Concrete [unintelligible 00:32:51].

MR MILLS: Was it?

10

CR FITZPATRICK: [unintelligible 00:32:54].

MS STANNARD: [unintelligible 00:32:58].

15

CR FITZPATRICK: Opposite the hardware and the nursery, is –

MR MILLS: It may have been a bit before that but anyway.

20

CR FITZPATRICK: So that's a concrete manufacturer to site for slab pouring and things.

MR MILLS: So the question was where exactly could I have been seeing that, I guess.

25

MR KILIC: That would be opposite the livestock exchange. So where you see the star –

MR MILLS: Near the feedmill kind of area and so on, opposite it.

30

MR MILLIGAN: No, the stock exchange.

MR KILIC: No, the stock exchange further south.

35

MR MILLS: Yes, okay. I thought I came all the way down the upper road, not down that one. But anyway.

MR KILIC: We can go for a drive.

40

MR MILLS: Yes, we will. We will go for a drive this afternoon, get a better understanding and I'll go back out that way, also get more information. But yes, sorry, slight diversion. Thank you.

MR MCCABE: Commissioner, can I just talk to your point about built form and the comparison with medical?

45

MR MILLS: Yes.

MR MCCABE: In direct response to your question, I would compare something

like Lane Cove West as a medical manufacturing facility and in comparison to this proposal, we obviously have more of a logistics and hardstand arrangement with the processing. So if you ask me to compare what the visual difference is, I would be saying well the built form of Lane Cove West and the associated transport, which is mainly passenger vehicle often and some lighter trucks. Compared to something say in the southwest, the logistics orientated business like a supermarket, warehousing or [unintelligible 00:34:44] or something like that is probably more of a comparison.

MR MILLS: So which is partly a traffic thing but it's also what you're saying, it's what's needed there to support that traffic which is the hardstands.

MR MCCABE: That's right, yes. And obviously you have those curtains, yes, the servicing of the B-doubles in relation to the elevation platforms, the interface with the rear of your trucks that you normally see in those type of facilities compared to what you would see in a medical precinct is small loading docks that are generally hidden.

MR MILLS: Yes, yes. There's large, six large roller doors –

MR MCCABE: Yes.

MR MILLS: – of this proposed facility.

MR KILIC: The other comparison I'd make in terms of built form, when we look at Garvan Institute, Australian Bioresources, you drive past it on Lackey Road, you can't see it because of the topography and even on Beaconsfield Road, there's a landscape buffer and given the topography, the impact is minimal. So again, we might need to do a footprint analysis, the footprint of this SSD proposal is considerably larger than that Garvan Institute. So in terms of I think wanting to also make that comparison to footprint.

MS SYKES: Can I just ask a quick question on you mentioned earlier about the objective with the master planning work was also about leveraging or capturing and understanding the regional advantages and then you mentioned the Southern Highland brand and this aspect of liveability. Like, if you look at the different industries that have been identified within the innovation precinct, sort of categorised under sort of the four main areas, like what do you define as the regional advantages in terms of contribution to the economy, the jobs metrics, what is the Southern Highlands brand in terms of aspiration against those industries? I'm just keen to understand that a little bit more.

MR KILIC: Yes, that's a really good question. I think using an example is the best way to answer that question. The Southern Highlands is known, for example, for its wine, it's a wine producing region and yet we do not have a TAFE facility in the shire for students to go and study viticulture or winemaking. You actually have to go to Goulburn TAFE to get a qualification in viticulture or winemaking. So those are some of the existing industries that we'd like to leverage off by

supporting that existing established anchored industry that feeds off that regional brand by training the next generation of winemakers and viticultural workers here in the shire. So that's one example of getting that education industry nexus.

5 And even though some might say that Goulburn's just down the road, it doesn't work that way. We lose people to places like Goulburn, the coast if we can't retain them and accommodate them here in the shire. And it brings us to the liveability aspect. I think anecdotally most young people leave and come back in their sort of late 30s, early 40s and that is because we don't have the jobs currently to retain
10 that young population and it starts with education. If they're leaving at 18, they're going to university or further education.

So if we can retain some of that, we're not saying you can't leave, it's a rite of passage to be able to go and explore the world and come back. But if we can retain
15 some that do not want to leave but want to pursue further education here in the shire, I think that that is a valid opportunity. And winemaking, the viticultural sector is one, I'm just trying to think of another example.

CR FITZPATRICK: We have competing – obviously what we're creating exists
20 in other areas, other regions and we are in competition for the industry we want to attract. So we do need a unique – so we do have a bit of a barrier to transport costs and location, so we have to attract in another way and that is potentially in the attractive look of it. So we want people to say, "We want to come and build our industry here because it's the quote unquote Southern Highlands."

25 Like, we have a great brand of everyone wanting to live here and again that's the vision and there are some photos of what – I don't know if you've seen the plan of the idea of the concepts of what we wanted to see. It is very pretty, it's very aesthetically pleasing and it fits in with our sort of green space, our heritage sort of
30 site and that is what we're trying to leverage. Throwing in a massive industrial boiler room, as I said, completely undermines that and can potentially ruin our entire attraction point to this region.

MS MISCAMBLE: What might be of interest to is SGS Economics did a
35 positioning paper and as part of that, they looked at the unique opportunities for the Highlands, taking into account Port Kembla, Sydney, Aerotropolis and Canberra and really pulled out where the strengths – you know, and then that was part of a sort of iterative process but that was part of the informing data that went into the structure plan as well.

40 **MS SYKES:** Yes, okay.

MR MILLS: I think I've read that Council was also concerned about the 24 hour
45 operation of the plant in terms of noise, was that correct? Or I may be confused from the various submissions I've read.

CR FITZPATRICK: I have that from the public's point of view. So that was a big talking point on the press conferences, the 24 hours and close to residential

with never stopping and then obviously that aligns with trucks never stopping.

MR MILLS: Yes, well the trucks were limited to 7 am to 6 pm under the proposal.

5

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes, okay.

MR MILLS: But the operation – you’d have cars obviously, passenger vehicles I guess coming in.

10

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes. Because what was the meterage from a home to –

MS MISCAMBLE: 240.

15

MR KILIC: So the report speaks to 240 metres being the distance between the facility and the existing homes, but do have subdivision approvals for closer than that. So again, Braddon Road is that interface and there’s existing subdivision approvals and because it’s already zoned with appropriate minimum lot size, future homes will pop up there on Braddon Road.

20

MR MILLS: And are they large residential blocks at that point?

MR KILIC: [unintelligible 00:41:43].

25

MR MCCABE: I can just give you high level detail of these applications. So DA numbers as such. So we have DA22/0811 and that’s a three lot subdivision. Didn’t include any dwellings but the dwellings permissible in residential and that’s basically pretty much across the road from the subject site. So we believe that may be – and I’ll check the distance but we may be shorter distance than the 240 that’s quoted in the assessment report. There’s also a current DA in assessment and that’s DA25/0454 and that is for a new dwelling on one of the subject lots.

30

MS MILLIGAN: So is that a subdivision DA or just a dwelling?

35

MR MCCABE: No, a dwelling. That’s a dwelling.

MS MILLIGAN: A dwelling, okay. Sorry.

40

MR MCCABE: And that’s not determined. It’s been lodged, under assessment currently. And the other DA was a two lot subdivision, DA23/0359, which was a two lot subdivision as well in addition to some alts and adds of an existing dwelling. But I would like to just confirm the distance of those to better inform your assessment report.

45

MR MILLS: Yes, that’s great, thank you.

CR FITZPATRICK: Did we want to ask any questions or – in regards to – sorry, just did we want to touch on any questions we still had outstanding in terms of the

whole project that we're not even clear on?

MR KILIC: One question that has emerged is on 28 October during the public meeting, whether that five minute rule was applied or do people request –

5

MR MILLS: People can request longer but to schedule everyone, we need to know that in advance. So people just have to ask. It's on the website, they can ask longer. We are conscious – I don't know what the numbers are at the moment. Stu?

10

MR STUART MORGAN: I've got 24 registered speakers.

MR MILLS: Okay. And we often find the registrations –

15

MR MORGAN: Pick up very quickly towards the end. Normally the last day is when we get the most.

20

MR MILLS: Yes. So we'll just try and fit everyone in who wants to speak as well, so we've just got to be conscious of that too. But if people want – I think the easiest thing to do is to request – if people want to request longer and I note the Council's requested an hour at the beginning and that's fine. But if people want longer, ask us but we probably won't be able to confirm until the last minute as to whether we can get –

25

MR MORGAN: Yes. So we used to have 10 minutes that we found that a lot of people were finishing early because when they get up and they start speaking, they sort of finish and then the scheduling got thrown out because you just have these gaps. So five minutes tends to be fine. If there's a particular person who's speaking that wants to finish a point, Andrew will be like, "You can speak for an extra couple of minutes and wind it up."

30

MR MILLS: [cross-talk 00:44:50].

35

MR MORGAN: But if there's any particular people that are part of any agencies or action groups that want to have more time, that's totally fine. They can just send us an email and we can get back to them.

40

MR MILLS: And we find that even when we give five minutes, some people finish in three.

MR MORGAN: Yes.

45

MR MILLS: They just want to get up, they want to make their two or three points and that's fine and that's absolutely fine too and if everyone who wants to speak is there around about the time that they're scheduled to speak, then we can bring them on faster and then that does allow for those who go over as well. So we're pretty flexible basically is what I'm trying to say.

MR KILIC: And I think Stuart did say the weight of an in person representation and an online representation is the same?

MR MORGAN: Yes.

5

MR MILLS: Yes. And is a written submission. So all of them are the same. We try to take into account absolutely everything.

MR KILIC: And I realise the IPC has KPIs to meet as well, I think the idea was determination within 50 days, is the expectation that by late November the IPC would make a determination?

10

MR MILLS: That's what we're scheduling at the moment.

15

MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: That's the schedule. If we need further information, that can change things but that's the schedule, yes.

MR MILLS: Yes, sometimes we have to go back to the Applicant, the Department, another agency of some sort and get clarity around certain things.

20

CR FITZPATRICK: We have some – there's a few issues that we might need clarity on from their submissions we're still unclear on. Is it appropriate that we ask through you? Not to ask on our behalf but say we're still chasing up – we're still vague on these few things from their original submission that you can sort of ask on our behalf in some capacity?

25

MR MILLS: If you ask us and we're curious about that, then we will make that enquiry.

30

CR FITZPATRICK: Okay, that's a nice way of putting it.

MR CLYDSDALE: Yes, any submissions you make, raise those points. Yes.

CR FITZPATRICK: So ask some questions and –

35

MR CLYDSDALE: Yes.

CR FITZPATRICK: Okay, great.

40

MR MCCABE: Commissioners, just on B22, condition B22, there's concern there because it talks about an operational traffic management plan but yet conditions B17–21 sort of enshrine infrastructure needs but it's not informed by a TMP. It says that they then subsequently have to draft an operational TMP. So there's a concern that the actual infrastructure needed between B17–21 may not be appropriate because we don't know what B22 is going to say.

45

MR MILLS: Perhaps one of the things that you may want to do is suggest and I understand sort of the first argument that the Council wants to put is this is not the

site for it. So but if it were to be the site, the backup is what would you suggest be the changes to those conditions, if that makes sense. But yes, we welcome that, those kinds of submissions as well.

5 In fact, it's incredibly important and we tell this to the communities as well that it's one thing to say really we don't want it but yes, if we're otherwise struggling to go, well, it's zoned for that, it's – I'm not talking about this one in particular, but just sort of a particular proposal's zoned, it's in the right zoning area and it otherwise meets a whole lot of criteria, you go well, it's hard then to just go well
10 you refuse it outright but you might be able to put conditions on it that makes it a lot better.

So we welcome any of those kinds of suggestions as well. But trying to – couching language say we've made no decision. All right. So I want to make sure that that's
15 absolutely clear. We've made no decision. At this stage we're just trying to absorb as much information as we can. I'm just conscious of there's refusal, there's acceptance and there's acceptance with conditions or approval with conditions, suggest them.

20 **MR MORGAN:** With your Councillors who are speaking, are they speaking on behalf of themselves or are they speaking on behalf of the Council?

CR FITZPATRICK: Look, so we've earmarked it and we're still talking to them. We don't obviously want to keep bombarding you guys with the same thing over
25 and over and over, so we're just sort of going to – some may not speak, some may speak and we're just going to work out between us because the community obviously want to have a big say, we're going to try and keep it at a higher level, more technical level with the staff and us.

30 So yes, the idea is to individually do it on our behalf if we can and then the community. We are guiding them, I'm going to a meeting tonight where I'm just sort of saying this is what we're touching on, please don't overlap, if you can stick to topics. So we're trying to curate it best for you guys so you're not hearing the same thing a million times.

35 **MR MORGAN:** Yes, that's fine.

MS MILLIGAN: We'll come back to you.

40 **MR MORGAN:** It's just that we've had some previous cases where Councillors speak and then they get mixed between "I'm representing an organisation" and "I live in the community." So just making sure that they're aware that if they're talking on behalf of the Council – if they want to speak separate to Council, that's fine but if they're doing one presentation, it's not a misrepresent of your position.

45 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Yes, I'll make it clear, there are some people that are involved, some of the Councillors are involved in the community side of it and I think they may speak on behalf of that with that hat on and I'll make sure that's

clear before – I’ll clarify that today.

5 **MR MORGAN:** Yes. We’ve had Councillors speak on behalf of their specific wards, there’s like “I speak on behalf of Ward 2” or something like that, so something like that, whatever works for –

CR FITZPATRICK: [cross-talk 00:50:36] on behalf of Council or them, but I’ll nut that out today.

10 **MR MORGAN:** Okay. And if their presentations can be – obviously the [unintelligible 00:50:44] quite soon to the date, we just test all the presentations. So just make sure like we run it through all the equipment, so we’ve just got to make sure that we have it.

15 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Okay. Yes, gotcha.

MS MISCAMBLE: You’d probably be aware too we only inducted our brand new Council on 9 October, so yes.

20 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Yes, I’m flying a week in. Hope I’m doing well.

MS MISCAMBLE: Doing very well. Day two [unintelligible 00:51:11].

25 **MR MILLS:** And you called an extraordinary meeting of Council as well for Wednesday night, is that right? That’s next week?

30 **MS MISCAMBLE:** It was already – yes, it was already scheduled as an extraordinary meeting because we do need to present our end of financial statement. So that was already scheduled and then just so it happened that DPHI released their assessment, so we added that to the agenda, so just for clarity.

MR MILLS: Is there anything else that you would like to raise, make sure that we’re conscious of and thinking of?

35 **MS MISCAMBLE:** Is there anything you would like to know from us, any other questions?

MS MILLIGAN: Not from me.

40 **MS SYKES:** No, that was very helpful actually, especially the innovation.

MR MILLS: Yes, and we may come back to you with further questions as well at some point. But certainly there’s a lot to digest, a lot of people to talk to and listen to.

45 **MR KILIC:** And we’ll have a full package of the masterplan as part of our submission package.

CR FITZPATRICK: And there is lots of photos for that visual impact within to show what we are chasing.

5 **MR MILLS:** Yes, that's great. That'd be great. Thank you.

MR MORGAN: If your Councillors are interested in what a public meeting looks like, on our YouTube channel, because they're being livestreamed, so implying that we don't need to – if someone says their personal address or their phone number or something we'll have to redact that out for privacy reasons or if a child gets up and says, "I go to this primary school" or whatever, might need to just redact it, but it should be directly on YouTube as soon as the meeting finishes. So there are some videos up there, so you can go and look at what it looks like if they are concerned about what that would be.

15 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Yes, so I mean from our perspective I believe it was going to run as in I would open similar to this, followed by Councillors, maybe two, maybe six, probably closer to two. And then followed directly by staff on the technical side and then we were going to let the community open up to the sort of obviously community issues. And we are trying to get them to stay out of the technical side and do more of the community impact. That's part of the meeting
20 tonight, I've got to go sort of foster that because we do have people that want to scream for the rooftops on every individual topic, so I'm just going to try and temper that a little tonight and bring something well presented to you guys.

25 **MR MILLS:** That's helpful.

MR MORGAN: What Andrew said before I think is exactly what we say to community is that if you're just against it, saying, "I don't want it," that's one thing but then also like stressing that saying that "If it does go ahead, these are the things that are super important to me." Like haulage routes or bus timetables. Like mentioning that doesn't say to the community that you're pro the case. So making sure that they're saying both sides, otherwise they lose that ability to inform conditions. So that's a good opportunity. And if they have presentations, if they can try and get them probably by Saturday.

35 **CR FITZPATRICK:** So presentations –

MR MORGAN: Saturday night.

40 **MS MILLIGAN:** And can I just make one comment. I'm sure we really appreciate the fact that you're trying to curate and sort of the community but uncurated is also good. You know, like we're really keen just to hear –

CR FITZPATRICK: The emotional side, yes.

45 **MS MILLIGAN:** – from people. Not necessarily the emotional side but we're very happy for individuals to stand up and tell us what they think and we can sort of work our way through that, I guess.

MS SYKES: Because often there is technical expertise that is –

MS MILLIGAN: Yes.

5

MS SYKES: – really helpful.

MS MILLIGAN: That’s right. Or people have had a previous experience or life that they can apply to –

10

CR FITZPATRICK: Open slather.

MS MILLIGAN: [unintelligible 00:54:42].

15

CR FITZPATRICK: No, I get what you’re saying. Yes, we’ll just –

MR MILLS: I mean, we try to – one of the difficulties sometimes is ensuring people are respectful of each other, allow the person who’s talking to talk, that kind of stuff. So if you are talking to the community tonight, if you just stress keep the levels down, make sure those people who are talking have the opportunity to do so. Because if someone stands up to speak in support of it for some reason because they think it’s great, they’re going to get employment or whatever, then we don’t want them to be howled down just because you know, some people in the room don’t want it. So we need to be respectful of everyone who wants to speak.

20

25

CR FITZPATRICK: Okay. And sorry, this may be a silly question, there’s no representative from the other side at this meeting, is there?

MS MILLIGAN: You mean the Applicant?

30

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes.

MR CLYDSDALE: Yes, no, the Applicant will speak.

35

CR FITZPATRICK: The Applicant will speak. Okay. Sorry.

MR MILLS: But the Applicant will speak at the end.

MR CLYDSDALE: They will start but a brief overview upfront.

40

MR MILLS: Sorry, that’s right. We ask them – what we do is we ask them to focus in on what has changed since it first was put up, not – because the whole community would be aware of what the proposal is but rather focusing on “Well, this is how we’ve tried to – we’ve listened to the community and this is what we’ve changed.” So that some community members are still working off the first proposal as opposed to the most recent version of the proposal. Of course, all proposals change [cross-talk 00:56:05].

45

CR FITZPATRICK: And they'll speak at the beginning, did you say, or at the end or –

5 **MR MILLS:** Yes, they'll speak at the beginning. We will ask the Department to respond to any questions that we have at the end as well.

CR FITZPATRICK: Okay, so I'll just make sure that everybody [unintelligible 00:56:18].

10 **MR KILIC:** So the Department will be there as well?

MR MILLS: They probably will be listening in, I suspect. We've tried to encourage them to have someone there. We can't control that, unfortunately.

15 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Yes. And will the Applicant be in person, did you say, or via link?

MR CLYDSDALE: They'll be in person.

20 **CR FITZPATRICK:** In person, okay. Okay. So send through your tech stuff by Saturday. So if they've got a PowerPoint or something, they need to send – this is obviously through the –

25 **MR MORGAN:** Yes, just IPC ipcn@ipcn.

CR FITZPATRICK: Just an email, okay. And then look at YouTube if they have any ideas.

30 **MR MORGAN:** Yes. We just try and avoid people coming up to me with a USB because I'm very hesitant to plug anything into 50 grand worth of equipment.

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes, I agree.

35 **MR MORGAN:** So we try and separate it.

CR FITZPATRICK: And then both – and when they're speaking, attempt to look at both sides if they can and –

40 **MR MORGAN:** If they can, yes.

CR FITZPATRICK: – what conditions they would consider acceptable.

MR MORGAN: Yes, obviously can't force them to say anything but it helps.

45 **MR MILLS:** If they're particularly concerned about a particular aspect, then well what could change – not having it is one of the things but what else could change.

MR CLYDSDALE: I'll just add too, Andrew, if you don't mind, in terms of the

5 Applicant, so the Commission obviously will have questions that they gather throughout the day from listening to the community and the Councillors and if there's some further questions for the Applicant, the Applicant will get back up again for five minutes to take any questions from the panel as well. And because they'll be there to hear everything that's been said as well.

CR FITZPATRICK: And the whole meeting will go as long as as many speakers there are, I guess.

10 **MR MILLS:** As long as – yes.

MR CLYDSDALE: Yes, could be a late evening.

15 **MR MILLS:** It could be a late evening but if it's finished by 4 o'clock, it's finished by 4 o'clock. But as long as people have the chance to speak.

20 **MR MORGAN:** Twenty-four. We only have one person online, so the additional overflow day for Friday is probably – it might get reached but it's unlikely. And if we do, that one person has requested to call via the phone. We'll just say, "Are you able to speak on Monday?"

25 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Okay. Well, I can give you a rough idea from community of how many more people will be – of course they have to apply but if it's a large number, I can pre-empt it for you.

MR MILLS: Well, often we have three or four times the number of people who want to speak turning up and that's fine too.

30 **MR MORGAN:** Yes, yes.

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes.

MR MILLS: Some people just want to be there to listen in.

35 **MR MORGAN:** Because we've got – thanks for lining up that venue, that's really, really good. So we've got I think space for like 420 people and then if you let me know, because we work the venue to get in quite late, we're bumping in at like 10.30 at night, which is fine. And then we can get additional seats put out in the courtyard area and have the fire doors open so they can see in from the side if we need it.

40 **CR FITZPATRICK:** Okay. I'll get an idea tonight as how many people are there to how many the numbers are.

45 **MR MORGAN:** Awesome.

MR MILLS: That'd be great. Thank you.

MS MISCAMBLE: The acoustics are very good apparently.

MR MORGAN: It's one of the nicest venues I've ever been in in regional New South Wales.

5

MS MISCAMBLE: Could you quote that? No. We actually had a pianist play or test the piano there and then play at the opening and the acoustics are better than the opera house, he said.

10

MR MORGAN: The tech there is incredibly impressive. So yes.

MR CLYDSDALE: And speaking of venues, thank you for hosting us today too. It's much appreciated.

15

MS MISCAMBLE: You're welcome.

MR MCCABE: Can I just ask another question about condition A1 and with environmental compliance and whether Council plays a role in that environmental compliance or any other authority. How is that determined? I mean, I think it's setting Council up for a lot of representations from constituents and legal advice which is potentially a path that we don't want to continue to go down.

20

MR CLYDSDALE: I can probably answer that one, Andrew. I guess the short answer is the Department of Planning have a significantly large compliance team and they travel all across the state every day. They have offices up and down the coast as well. So if there is a compliance issue, the Department of Planning is the consent authority that would follow up with any compliance issues. Yes.

25

MR MCCABE: It's sort of a catch all in perpetuity condition and I understand why it's there but how you actually demonstrate that there's a trigger is subject to opinion, I'd say.

30

MR MILLS: Well, I guess the concept of what's reasonable and not has been tested in courts over the years as well. So that's sort of the standard I think to which this [unintelligible 01:01:01]. And that allows the Department to [unintelligible 01:01:05].

35

MR CLYDSDALE: And look, it also works the other way too, the Department can use that condition if they feel like they need to take action on a development. I think that's pretty much – Tahlia, correct me if I'm wrong, it's their stock standard they usually put on.

40

MR MCCABE: Okay.

45

MS MILLIGAN: Can I just come back and make one clarification, when we were talking earlier, you were talking about you're meeting tonight, maybe guiding the community.

CR FITZPATRICK: Yes.

5 **MS MILLIGAN:** And my comment about the curation was not so much about the way people present or behave but if you've got 10 people who want to tell us that they're concerned about the same issue, that's fine. In fact, it's kind of helpful to hear that there are 10 people who have jumped up and said, "We're really worried about the visual impact." I can see that you're trying to be helpful and say, "Well, if you've got 10 people doing that, why don't you talk about that?" I'm just saying if the community wants to do that, that's fabulous, but don't feel as though you
10 need to do that.

15 **MR MILLS:** Maybe I think we've found in other situations community members know each other and they've spoken about this often between each other and one will stand up and say, "Well, I support completely what X said before me but I'd like to add."

20 **CR FITZPATRICK:** They are a group, so the speakers are part of an organisation basically for the most part, they're pretty across it together. So yes, it should be fairly easy to do that, speak to them tonight. Great, thank you very much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

25 **MS MILLIGAN:** Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks, everyone.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED