



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

**MOSS VALE PLASTICS RECYCLING FACILITY (SSD-9409987)**

### **DEPARTMENT MEETING**

**PANEL:** ANDREW MILLS (CHAIR)  
CLARE SYKES  
JANETT MILLIGAN

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** KENDALL CLYDSDALE  
TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

**DEPARTMENT OF  
PLANNING,  
HOUSING AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE:** CHRIS RITCHIE  
JOANNA BAKOPANOS  
SHEELAGH LAGUNA  
EMMA BARNET

**LOCATION:** ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

**DATE:** 9:00AM – 10:00AM  
WEDNESDAY, 23<sup>RD</sup> OCTOBER 2024

## <THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR ANDREW MILLS:** Well good morning everyone and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of all the country from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility case currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Plasrefine Recycling Pty Ltd, 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. Recovered plastic would be converted into clean plastic pellets and flakes which would then  
15 be reprocessed into a range of plastic products.

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

25 This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information on which the Commission will base its determination. It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on  
30 notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we can then put up on the website.

35 I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy in the transcript. We will now begin. Thank you. Some of us have met some of you. Chris I've met a couple of times. I've certainly not met all of you. I'm not sure about Janett and Clare. But maybe Chris, if you don't mind, on your side, do a couple of quick introductions, that would be great.  
40 Thanks.

45 **MR CHRIS RITCHIE:** Certainly. Thank you very much. So as an introduction, so I'm Chris Ritchie, so I'm acting as the executive director of energy, resources and industry assessments. So, with me today are three staff members. I've got Joanna Bakopanos, who's acting as the Director for Industry Assessments.

**MS JOANNA BAKOPANOS:** Hello.

**MR RITCHIE:** Sheelagh Laguna, who's the Principal Planner and Emma Barnett

5 who's a Senior Planner and both Emma and Sheelagh have been the primary officers who have assessed the proposal. What I thought I would do is give a quick introduction to the Department's assessment and some of the key matters that we're going to talk about. Then what I'll do is I'm going to hand to Sheelagh, who will run through a more detailed presentation along the lines of some of the matters that are on the agenda for us to go through. Throughout the process, feel free to ask any questions and some of the other members of the team might also jump in and sort of answer some of those questions that do come up.

10 But just as a quick introduction, I mean first we want to thank the opportunity for the Commission to give us a chance to run through our assessment of the Moss Vale Plastics project. I think it's important to probably firstly recognise that we appreciate and understand there's been a lot of community issues and concerns with the proposal and it has been a long process and we do acknowledge that. Sheelagh, Emma and myself have visited the site. We did visit a number of nearby sensitive receivers to hear firsthand some of the issues and concerns that the community had. We also visited the Australian BioResearch facility, which is also located next door and that's some matters that we'll talk about in a bit more detail in our presentation.

20 Noting the concerns in the community, we have throughout the course of the assessment process endeavoured to make as much information available to the community as we could, including, which we'll touch on again in the presentation, there was an amendment to the proposal, which we did exhibit to provide the community full and transparent opportunity to comment on that proposal and the changes that that sought to achieve.

30 Equally throughout the process we have engaged consistently with the Council from the onset of issuing SEARs and throughout the assessment process. We will touch on this in the presentation but the Department's also sought to achieve some key changes to the proposal and one of those key proposed changes is the proposed access to the facility. Now, that's been a long process in itself and I know that has raised some issues in the community, but we feel that the access that we've now achieved, which is more what we call a north-south arrangement, does minimise impacts on the community and does represent a better outcome in terms of potential impacts.

40 We'll also touch on the proposed location of the site. Being within a zoned industrial and employment area which has been the case for some time and the proposal in itself is permissible with consent in that zone. So again, we're going to touch on that in a bit more detail. But also importantly it's important to also reflect that the proposal in itself in terms of recycling plastic and trying to achieve a usable product out of a waste product does align with key government policies around recycling and reduction of waste plastics.

45 Now, some of those key initiatives around government incentives is around reducing the generation of plastic but also looking to triple recycling by the end of 2030 and also around the principle of what we hear around circular economy,

which is trying to keep those materials within the economy so they're not disposed of as a waste product. It's trying to get value and usage out of that.

5 In terms of when we do an assessment process, obviously what we do is engage with key agencies and some of those key agencies such as the EPA have a key function or approval role in terms of granting licences. Now, those agencies have become satisfied with those issues that are relevant to their responsibilities and the likes of the EPA have actually granted permission to be satisfied that a licence can be granted for the facility. So obviously their key remit is around amenity issues  
10 such as noise and odour, so the EPA has been satisfied that they've got the requisite information to issue a licence for the facility.

15 So what I'll do now is I'll hand over to Sheelagh to run through our presentation in a bit more detail and through the course of that presentation, we're happy to take questions as we sort of go through each topic.

**MS SHEELAGH LAGUNA:** Thanks, Chris. I understand that the IPC will share the presentation, is that correct? The Commission?

20 **MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** Look, we can if you wish, yes.

**MS LAGUNA:** Okay. Sorry, that was my understanding.

25 **MR CLYDSDALE:** It's no problems. We can dial it up.

**MS LAGUNA:** Thank you very much.

**MR CLYDSDALE:** You just let us know, Sheelagh, when you'd like to –

30 **MS LAGUNA:** Yes, sure. Thanks, just move on to the next slide. And the next slide, please. I just want to start off, thanks, Chris, for the introduction. As we've mentioned, we're going to run through some of the items that the IPC requested in the agenda to discuss just to give a bit of structure to that. And yes, I'll just start with a quick overview of the development. You will have all read our report. It's a  
35 plastics recycling facility to accept 120,000 tonnes of mixed plastics. Once that's been sorted and cleaned, it will be reprocessed into new products, new plastic products. Next slide, please.

40 Here is an example of some of the products that will be produced. Some plastic furniture, plastic, yes, small items. On the right we can see the recycling process. In total, it's quite a good graphic to sort of describe what's happening. The reprocessing and distribution of the plastic is the last phase. Next slide, please.

45 The site is located in Moss Vale. As we know, it's to the northwest of the village itself but is set in the edge of the sort of Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor, which we'll touch on shortly. As Chris mentioned, we did visit the site back in May 2022, we talked to the neighbours and the Australian BioResources facility next door. In the area there are a few other industrial developments for recycling, some

for manufacture. Most of the immediate area is as yet undeveloped. Next slide, please.

5 This is just a brief overview of the site, sort of an artist's impression of what it would look like. You can note that there is landscaping surrounding it proposed and access is from Braddon Road to the site. Next slide, please.

10 In terms of what Chris touched on earlier, the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor, that's been zoned general industrial in that area since 2010 and the site is located on the edge and indicated by the yellow star on the figure. As we mentioned in our report, there is a DCP that applies to the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor but DCPs actually don't apply to SSD development but of course the Department did have regard to it and we note that the site is located in what was described as an enterprise precinct, which is envisioned for light and general industrial  
15 development and there are development controls in the DCP regarding – which is applicable to the whole area about height of buildings, setback and landscaping. Next slide, please.

20 Over time, the Moss Vale Enterprise Corridor has been renamed into the Southern Highlands Innovation Park and currently there is some work being undertaken by Council to develop that masterplan for the SHIP, as it's known. It is still under development. I believe it was on exhibition, the draft masterplan was on exhibition in July of this year.

25 We have to note that our application or the application that's the subject of this discussion was lodged in early 2022 and as such this SHIP masterplan does not apply because it predated that. The SHIP masterplan, there's a depiction of that on the slide. The site is shown there. There's a lot of landscaping proposed in the SHIP masterplan and you will have noted that a lot of landscaping is proposed for  
30 this development to sort of keep the green in between, as they describe it, to keep the area sort of as green as possible, I suppose you could say.

35 Of note, the SHIP masterplan going forward does retain the same zoning as the currently – the general industrial zoning and Moss Vale – the Plasrefine facility is permissible with consent in that zone, both now and in the future. There are also a number of precincts defined in the SHIP masterplan. Our site would be in area three, which is designated for research, training and advanced manufacturing. That covers a lot of the north part of the site, where there are already industrial sites there, recycling and some manufacturing facilities in that zone or in that precinct,  
40 sorry, not zone.

**MR MILLS:** Sheelagh, can I just jump in there, if you don't mind.

45 **MS LAGUNA:** Of course, yes.

**MR MILLS:** Did you have a view on what constituted advanced manufacturing and whether or not this fitted into that? Take it on notice if you like.

5 **MS LAGUNA:** Well, that's certainly – it's not really defined in this masterplan what that would be, what is advanced manufacturing. I mean, we could provide more detail on it later but it's something that certainly this facility manufactures products but we could probably get back to you about what constitutes advanced manufacturing. But it wasn't really fully fleshed out in the masterplan what that would envisage and as I noted, there already are manufacturing companies in that precinct.

10 **MR MILLS:** Thank you.

**MS LAGUNA:** Can we get back to you later, Mr Mills?

**MR MILLS:** That's absolutely great, thank you.

15 **MS LAGUNA:** Yes. Okay, thank you. No problem. Next slide, please. One thing the Commission noted they would like a bit of deeper discussion is the genesis of the amended development and how that came about. It is a little bit of I suppose a long story but I'll try to keep it as short as possible and noting you've all read the report.

20 Originally, the EIS had proposed access to the site from the east on the east-west access road, as it was called. However, when the RTS was submitted in March 2023, the applicant proposed to change the access route to come from the north from Collins Road and to reach that from the eastern side, they proposed to travel through a number of streets of Moss Vale and that route would pass some residences and schools.

25 And the reason they needed to approach from the west was because of the existing level crossing at the Berrima branch line and the location of the north-west access road were I suppose not really compatible. They would require heavy vehicles to make a hook turn to access to get over the Berrima branch line and reach the access road, which was not ideal and they wanted to avoid that, so they were proposing to come from the east.

30 However, because of the potential additional impacts on residences and schools, the Department recommended the applicant formally amend the development to introduce this new access road. Next slide, please. This graphic gives a bit of a – I suppose maybe a simplification of how the amendment development came across. There were a number of access options floated in the EIS originally and then in the RTS they came back with option 3A. You can see that in the light blue which comes up Lackey Road and Collins Road, approaches the north-west access road from the east.

35 However, when the applicant submitted the amended development, they changed that access to option 3B, which was a new option and that was to I suppose simplify everything and avoid going through the streets of Moss Vale. To do that, they needed to move the level crossing and in the next slide we can see a depiction of the hook turn that's to be avoided.

5 If you can see on the left on the light blue lines, that shows traffic, heavy vehicles coming from the west and going over the new level crossing and heading on down to the north-south access road. If they were coming from the east, they would have to do a – sorry, if they were coming from the west and then going through the existing level crossing, they’d essentially have to do a hairpin bend to come back to the west to go down the north-south access road. So really so after about six months of considering the access, the applicant came back in October 2023 with this new option, which involved moving the level crossing, which we feel does provide a superior outcome.

10  
15 It obviously comes – you know, a lot of works need to be done up on the intersection, they’re going to be extending Collins Road and closing the existing level crossing. And there were a few other key changes, most of which had been proposed in the RTS but were incorporated into the amended development regarding reducing of water usage, some building height reduction and improved stormwater.

20 **MR MILLS:** Sheelagh, just if you wouldn’t mind going back to the previous slide.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes.

25 **MR MILLS:** There has been some concern expressed about the new Braddon Road and trucks accessing that. Was there ever consideration given to entering the site on that north-south road at the back?

30 **MS LAGUNA:** That was something that was not proposed by the applicant and our understanding is that because of the design of the development, that wasn’t an option.

35 **MR MILLS:** Yes, the applicant explained to us that they had some feedback from – I don’t know whether it’s the EPA or another agency, maybe New South Wales Water, that the riparian creek on that western side of the site, they were trying to avoid crossing it, effectively, in any way so that – but just there’s a trade-off there, obviously, between entering –

40 **MS LAGUNA:** Yes, and that I imagine might’ve been the reason that was never proposed.

**MR MILLS:** Okay.

**MS LAGUNA:** It was always [unintelligible 00:19:50] Braddon Road.

45 **MR MILLS:** Yes, which has to be upgraded, of course.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes.

**MR RITCHIE:** I'd say the other issue would've been the design of the building runs in a north-south direction. So apart from the water course, as you've correctly touched on, it would actually mean the facility would probably have to move then closer to the research facility and also the residence that would be to the southeast.  
5 So again, there's that compromise of if you were to make that work, then obviously you've got a water issue you would have to be cognisant of but also you actually pulling the facility closer to some of those sensitive receivers.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, yes.  
10

**MR MILLS:** Okay.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, and then there are two creeks on either side of the building.

**MS CLARE SYKES:** Sheelagh, could I just ask one question, so just confirming from this slide that all early options, so 1, 2, 3 and 3A have all been removed and option 3B is the only –  
15

**MS LAGUNA:** That's correct, yes.  
20

**MS SYKES:** – access, proposed access for construction and operation?

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, that's right.

**MS SYKES:** For heavy vehicles only?  
25

**MS LAGUNA:** Well, all vehicles will come down the –

**MR RITCHIE:** Be all vehicles.  
30

**MS LAGUNA:** – north-south access road, that's the only way to get to the site and then on to Braddon Road and into the site. Heavy vehicles all must come from the west. Light vehicles can come from the east and that's essentially staff who, if they live in that direction, would come from that direction. The traffic assessment did do some work, I believe, looking at the likely light vehicle routes and there was a split between the two of them in the traffic assessment.  
35

**MS SYKES:** Between one and two?

**MS LAGUNA:** Well, no, no, sorry, I mean for light vehicles, which direction –  
40

**MS SYKES:** Yes, for light vehicles.

**MS LAGUNA:** – they would come from, whether they would come from the east and the west. I believe it was –  
45

**MS SYKES:** Yes, okay.



**MS LAGUNA:** Actually I can't remember the exact numbers but there were some coming from the east and some coming from the west and they did a traffic assessment accordingly. So that's really just staff going to [unintelligible 00:21:54] work.

5

**MS SYKES:** Yes. Okay.

**MS LAGUNA:** But all heavy vehicles will come down Douglas Road from the west and turn right into the north-south access road.

10

**MS SYKES:** Yes.

**MS JANETT MILLIGAN:** So there will be a condition preventing staff using Beaconsfield Road, for example, access to the site?

15

**MS LAGUNA:** At this stage there is no condition for that.

**MS MILLIGAN:** So I'm just wondering why you're saying that all light vehicles will come either from easterly or westerly direction and down the north-south road?

20

**MS LAGUNA:** Well, that's what was proposed by the applicant.

**MR RITCHIE:** So given that's how they've described it in their application, that then forms part of the approval. Now, you can specify a condition but given that that's now forming the amended proposal, that actually gets attached as a requirement to satisfy in the consent.

25

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, it does specify no use of Beaconsfield Road.

30

**MR MILLS:** Yes. So a condition would be superfluous is what you're saying, Chris.

**MR RITCHIE:** Well, yes, you could do one but it's already envisaged that that is required because that forms your proposal.

35

**MS MILLIGAN:** Residents of course are worried that the streets will be used because people will live in the town and will be able to access it through Beaconsfield Road. That's not really a question, it's just a comment.

40

**MS LAGUNA:** Of course.

**MR RITCHIE:** I mean, this is probably the matter that we have pushed quite significantly from the start. So originally, I think construction traffic was using Beaconsfield Road, Sheelagh. Then it was going to use the route 2, as you can see. There were some residents to the south of that and obviously the research facility was worried about trucks running past the site or the construction of the road itself, the actual access of number 2 to the road was actually not in – provided in a

45

lot of detail and it wasn't the greatest access. So, we've pushed probably from almost the start that you need to come from a north-south direction to head away from the community and head away from those residents.

5 **MS MILLIGAN:** Yes.

**MS LAGUNA:** Next slide, please. So that leads us on to the closer examination of the assessment issues. Just briefly looking at the figure on the right we can see where the closets residences are located in terms of the site. Next slide, please.  
10 Social impact, that was something that the Department spent a lot of time examining and really wanted to ensure that that was very robustly assessed.

We engaged two different experts to help us with this assessment. In the first place, WSP was engaged to review the documents submitted by the application for the SIA. There were I think three or four iterations of the social impact assessment that were submitted to us over time. WSP reviewed those and provided comments and it resulted in the applicant, for instance, going away and doing additional targeted consultation to inform the SIA documents.  
15

That occurred in June 2023 and once we were happy that the documents were robust and then aligned with the guidelines for the SIA, we then engaged Dr Roberta Ryan to independently assess the outcomes to I suppose look at the documents and give us her professional opinion on whether the social impact was acceptable. Dr Ryan's advice was clear that all the mitigation measures and amendments on balance had been identified and that any residual impacts could be managed via conditions of consent to carefully manage social impact on the community. Next slide, please.  
20  
25

Those conditions were quite far reaching. They included preparation of a social impact management plan, a community consultation plan to keep everybody informed of what was happening at all steps and importantly a community consultative committee would be formed. This was something that actually the applicant themselves proposed right from the very beginning of this application. It would be independently chaired and would engage the community throughout construction and operation of the facility.  
30  
35

In addition, the Department has also recommended appointment of an environmental representative as an additional layer of control to independently review all the management plans, just review all the conditions were being met and as sort of a point of contact for any I suppose environmental issues that may arise. Next slide, please.  
40

Another concern of the community we know is the visual impact of the facility, given its location, the things that the Department considered carefully were the bulk and scale of the development and the building's appearance. Yes, given the location, that was something that was extremely important. We wanted to ensure that the facility would look as good as it could. We got the applicant to update the façade and the appearance of the development, have a look at the colours and the  
45

articulation, the height of the buildings were reduced. There was one of the buildings was slightly higher than the others and it was reduced down to 15 and a half metres. That was originally proposed at 18 metres. But the main win, I suppose you could say, was the significant increase in the landscaping around the facility. If we can go to the next slide, please.

Here we've depicted the landscaping that's proposed. Some mounding is proposed to I suppose give a head start to the landscaping, so to make sure that trees that are planted on top of it are as high as they can be. There will be a lot of mature trees planted around the site and there'll be trees in the riparian zone, which is the creeks on either side of the building and strategically placed mounds, so that the vegetation on top of that will shield the appearance of the building as much as possible from the residences.

The applicant coincidentally owns the block of land across Braddon Road from the facility and they've committed to providing landscaping on that block of land, which would also help to screen the development and to ensure that that landscaping remains into the future we've recommended that a covenant be placed on that landscaping so that it cannot be removed in the future by future owners, for instance, of the land. We've also recommended that the applicant be required to offer landscaping to residents themselves at their own properties. So, if they wish, then they can request it, the applicant at its own cost will plant additional screening in the gardens of residents who are affected. Next slide, please.

**MR MILLS:** Sheelagh.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes.

**MR MILLS:** Sorry, just with that planting, I noticed that – I hadn't thought about it too much before but the height that's referred to in that diagram there, 3.5, would be lower than the buildings potentially. But is that the point – I'm assuming they're not planting 3.5 metre high plants to start with but that's the expected height that they will grow to?

**MS LAGUNA:** No, that is the planted height.

**MR MILLS:** That's the planted height?

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, so they're –

**MR MILLS:** Okay, so [cross-talk 00:30:34] –

**MS LAGUNA:** – proposing to buy very mature trees. I think, yes, 600 millilitre pots or something like that, very large trees and they're being planted at 3.5 metres on top of a mound that's already – well, they vary in height slightly but a metre or a couple of metres high.

**MR MILLS:** I saw the 600 millimetre pots, I didn't realise that that [unintelligible]

00:30:55] that height.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, so that's the circumference of the pot, which means that the trees are already –

5

**MR RITCHIE:** So it is deliberate to try and get that height very early.

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes.

10

**MR RITCHIE:** To try and sort of minimise – because often in landscaping if you do plant it of a small size, it can take time to sort of take and grow, but here it's been a deliberate attempt to mound and then put quite a mature tree to get that effect as quickly as possible.

15

**MS LAGUNA:** That's correct, yes. And obviously from there, they will grow and mature and the canopy will increase over time.

**MR MILLS:** Yes. Okay, thank you.

20

**MS LAGUNA:** Next slide, please. Another aspect that we've considered deeply in our assessment is the presence of the Australian BioResources facility next door. As Chris mentioned, we went on a site visit that would give us a good appreciation of how that site works and the requirements there.

25

We met with the management of the ABR when we were on the site visit and also we met with them I think it was three times, at least two times but potentially three times separately throughout the assessment to get a really good idea of what their greatest concerns were regarding the facility, just to understand that, and they made it clear that vibration during construction was something that they were concerned about during the construction of Braddon Road by – it was approved under a Council DA and it has been constructed recently, not by Plasrefine, by somebody else.

30

There were some construction vibration issues which caused problems for the ABR, so we put in conditions regarding a vibration management plan and that the applicant needs to discuss with the ABR and plan construction along with them and the applicant talked to the ABR people and they were confident that that could be organised and that wouldn't be a problem. In terms of any fire risk, there's an emergency plan in the conditions that requires notification of the ABR if there's any incident on the site, so that they are aware and can take relevant action at their own site to minimise impacts.

35

40

**MR RITCHIE:** So a lot of the conditioning is around engaging between the applicant and the research facility so that they're aware of – each side is aware of when the research facility might have a delicate stage of what they're doing, such as – I think it's embryo implantation. Equally if there's construction works are about to occur, that way they can make sure that they consult and it's undertaken at an appropriate time that's not going to necessarily cause potential issues with

45

the research facility.

5 That is also one of the intents of the environmental rep, which is something we've been using a little bit more in a lot of our infrastructure projects or where there's a lot of construction activity, such as in the employment precincts in the Mamre Road area where we have about five environmental reps that really look at that construction impact because that's often when you can have some of those issues around vibration and noise.

10 **MS LAGUNA:** Yes, thanks for that further explanation, Chris. Next slide, please. Operational traffic, we have touched on that briefly when we talked about the amendments, so just to recap, this is a bit of a zoom out, just showing the approach route coming from the Hume Highway from the west, northwest down to the site and as we mentioned before, the final heavy vehicle approach route will avoid  
15 Beaconsfield Road, it will avoid going through the centre of Moss Vale. So that removes those potential impacts.

20 In terms of the heavy vehicle numbers, the numbers of heavy vehicles are quite low. It's only five vehicles in and five vehicles out per hour, which is in terms of any facility is relatively low, is rather low. And those heavy vehicle movements importantly will only happen during the daytime. The hours of operation I believe for heavy vehicles and it said at the beginning of the – it's up to 5 or 6 pm, it's not 24 hours. There will be 24-hour processing but the vehicles themselves will not be running during the night time, the heavy vehicles. And the applicant's assessment  
25 assessed that there was no impacts on the road network due to the low number of heavy vehicles using the roads around the site. Next slide.

30 Of course we have conditions regarding traffic. One of those is regarding the level crossing and how that will be managed and designed. There has been a lot of design work done for the level crossing, but as always, the final design will take place later on and that has to happen to the satisfaction of both Council and Boral. Boral in terms of the rail corridor itself and Council for the road.

35 All the roadworks need to be finished before they operate the site, everything – the intersections need to be operating and open and all the roads need to be fully operational. To manage the operational traffic, we've recommended an operational traffic management plan which will once again document the heavy vehicle approach route, so that's very clear to everybody. And there will also be a monitoring plan for heavy vehicles so that all the movements are tracked in a night  
40 and it's very transparent, so that the applicant and anybody else is aware.

45 In terms of microplastics, we looked at that. It's the main thing to note is that all the recycling and reprocessing will happen within enclosed buildings. No water that falls outside of the site will come in contact with plastic and that the microplastics, which may be in any of the process water used on the site, will be captured in the water treatment plant that's on site and it will capture most of the microplastics, up to around 90% in the filter cake, which is sort of like the sludge that comes off any water that's cleaned and will be removed from the site and will

enter the water system.

5 And once the operational water has been used and needs to be discharged, it will be discharged to the sewer under a trade waste agreement with Council and there are defined levels of how clean the water needs to be to be allowed to be discharged to trade waste and the applicant will be required to adhere to those levels. Any microplastics that may be present in the air will be captured as particulate matter by the air quality systems. Important to note that neither Water  
10 New South Wales nor the EPA raised concerns about microplastics from this facility and the Department is satisfied that that issue could be managed. However, we did recommend some conditions.

15 Of note is as technology progresses, as time goes past, that the applicant review the water treatment technology they're using on the site and as new opportunities arise, they would be required to update the water treatment plant with any new technology that comes along. And whenever they're doing the final detailed design of the water treatment plant, they did that in consultation with the EPA to make sure that that is indeed as robust as it can be. Next slide, please.

20 This continues on with discussion of water. As I mentioned before, no stormwater falling on the site will come in contact with plastic. It will be diverted to water tanks and then to bioretention basins. The site is located in the Sydney drinking water catchment, as I'm sure we're all aware. The applicant undertook a NorBE assessment and the requirements for that were met. Operational water, as I  
25 mentioned before, will be cleaned in a water treatment plant and excess water from that will be discharged to the Moss Vale Sewage Treatment Plant, which is going to be upgraded in the next couple of years and until the upgrade has occurred, any discharge to sewer would occur at night when demand is low and Council was supportive of that arrangement.

30 In terms of flooding on the site, the site has been – the buildings have been designed that the pads for those are above any flood levels and a flooding assessment indicated that there would be minimal offsite impacts if the development is built as designed. And just we put in recommended conditions  
35 regarding that, that the floor levels have to be above the flood level and there will be management plans detailing how water would be monitored and contingency plans. Next slide, please.

40 In terms of air quality, everything, as I mentioned, will be in an enclosed building. There will be hoods above machinery, collecting any emissions and it will be put through air pollution control devices to clean those. The applicant's assessment demonstrated that particulate matter and VOCs would comply with the criteria of the approved methods and it's important to note that emission limits for air quality  
45 will be incorporated into the site's environmental protection licence, which is regulated by the EPA. So those will be strictly adhered to.

The EPA was satisfied with the information provided. New South Wales Health didn't have any comments either on that, on the air quality information. However,

just noting the concerns of the public in particular, we did recommend conditions whereby air quality, the outcomes are reviewed once the development is operational. They're to be reviewed three times at different time periods after commissioning just to sort of see if any development over time to ensure that the levels are as predicted and that there were no impacts. There will also be an operational air quality management plan detailing all the controls and what would occur if there any exceedances, how that would be rectified immediately, et cetera. Next slide, please.

5  
10 **MS MILLIGAN:** Can I just ask a question, Sheelagh?

**MS LAGUNA:** Of course.

15 **MS MILLIGAN:** Can you just clarify, New South Wales Health, you said there they were satisfied. So what exactly was their position on air quality?

**MS LAGUNA:** They informed us that they had no concerns and no comments.

20 **MS MILLIGAN:** No concerns or just that is the comment?

**MS LAGUNA:** They didn't comment. I can go and check exactly the wording of that but whenever we provided them with the information, they said they had no comments.

25 **MS MILLIGAN:** Right. I was just trying to ascertain if in fact they actively investigated the information and said they were satisfied that there were no health risks or in fact if they didn't comment or didn't engage beyond that.

30 **MS LAGUNA:** Well, they just sent us one message saying that they didn't have any comments or concerns. We can certainly look into that and get the exact wording of that.

**MS MILLIGAN:** Thank you.

35 **MS LAGUNA:** In terms of consultation with Council, I understand the Commission wanted some more details on that. We did consult with Council throughout the entire assessment process. We kept them informed as we were going along. Unfortunately, there were some staff changes at Council during the period 2022–2024 and it was – the responses from Council were fragmented. We proactively followed up but sometimes we didn't receive a response. For instance, they didn't provide any input to our SEARs and they didn't respond to the RTS, our request to review that from the original development before it was amended.

40  
45 Once the development was amended and then there was the amendment, the RTS process, we did receive responses from Council, however there were multiple responses that were sort of at various times. They maintained the formal objection on basis of sort of the strategic issues but we were able to get advice from them on operational matters, so on the level crossing and the roads, on the sewage

treatment plant and things like that. And just to make sure Council's involved at every step of the way, they do have a key role in a number of conditions and the applicant's required to consult them, for instance, on the finalisation design for the level crossing and the roads and various other conditions. Next slide. Thank you.

5

So in conclusion, the Department's assessment has concluded that we're satisfied the development is suitable in its location. We have recommended a range of strict conditions in consultation with agencies and Council. We've had feedback from them, from agencies. Council and agencies will have a role in many of the conditions. I just want to reiterate that the site will operate under an environmental protection licence and noting that there were a number of changes throughout the assessment process, which did contribute to addressing the community's concerns on traffic and site approach, the height of the building and the viewpoints and the increased landscaping, which contributes to the improvements there.

10

15

And just finalising, Chris touched on this earlier, the benefits of the development. 140 ongoing permanent jobs at the site, the infrastructure improvements with the level crossing and there's upgrade to Collins and Douglas Roads, those are all paid for by the applicant. The recycling benefits, a diversion of a considerable amount of plastic, 120,000 tonnes, which is a large amount. Getting that out of landfill and getting it back into the economy. The SHIP, this facility will benefit the SHIP and sort of make things happen so that development can continue there and as Chris touched on, the government policy to increase recycling and add to the plastic recycling infrastructure that New South Wales requires going forward. Thank you.

20

25

**MR MILLS:** Sheelagh, can I ask a follow up question in relation to Council? Have they expressed any concern to you in relation to the operational traffic management plan and the conditions around that?

30

**MS LAGUNA:** No. We haven't had any communication with Council regarding the traffic management plan in particular. No.

35

**MR MILLS:** Okay. They made mention of it, seemed to be expressing some concern about their role in relation to that, which I'm not quite sure I can properly articulate, so I'll leave it there for the minute and –

**MS LAGUNA:** Yes, we haven't had any communication with Council.

40

**MR RITCHIE:** I think it's fair to say that the consultation back from Council has been a little bit inconsistent through the course of the process. As I said at the start, each time we've tried to engage with Council and include Council, but sometimes we haven't always heard back. But in terms of the current issue, I'm not aware of them raising anything, Sheelagh, around that.

45

**MS LAGUNA:** No, we certainly haven't had any discussion with them about the operational traffic management plan and their role in that.

**MR MILLS:** Okay. That's great. Thank you.



5 **MS SYKES:** Sheelagh, I just had a – thanks very much for that – a quick question on the verification or the predicted modelling for air and noise. Could you pop back to the previous slide – so review three times. Was it air quality validation and review three times. Could you just confirm is that three times per annum or over – like how –

10 **MS LAGUNA:** That would be three times – I’m just scrolling up quickly to confirm the timing. That’s three times in total.

**MS SYKES:** Okay.

15 **MS LAGUNA:** Once the development is operational, just bear with me for one second, so we’ve proposed that after six months of operation, so once they’re up and running and that can be validated after six months and then again two years after commencement of operation and the third time would be at full operation. I suppose I should preface that with the applicant has indicated that when they first start operating, they’re anticipating that they won’t be at 120,000 tonnes, it would build up slowly.

20 So they start with 60,000 tonnes, then after six months there would be validation of that and you would imagine that after two years, maybe it’s 80,000 tonnes and there would be validation there. And then once they reach 120,000 tonnes, there would be a third lot of validation. So it’s just really, I suppose, following – and if there were any problems say at the lower levels, that would be already fixed, so to speak, if they need to do anything to improve.

25 **MS SYKES:** Yes.

30 **MR RITCHIE:** So rather than waiting until they’re at full capacity, as Sheelagh’s explained, they’re not going to be there for a little while, you kind of get a test of how the system’s running, is it already identifying that there are some things that need to be tweaked and it provides that chance as a check in to see whether those systems are working or whether more needs to be done from a practice point of view or a control point of view to sort of manage that as they progress.

35 **MS SYKES:** Okay. And that’s specifically related to air quality and noise. Vibration? Any monitoring or verification related to vibratory impact?

40 **MS LAGUNA:** Vibration, not in particular. It was identified that operational vibration would be low. The vibration that, for instance, we were considering regarding the ABR facility was construction vibration and there are limits on that to what they can do and they do have to – there are some limits too for human exposure and structural damage on vibration in condition B52.

45 **MS SYKES:** Okay, thank you.

**MS LAGUNA:** But no specific monitoring or validation for that.

**MR RITCHIE:** Because there's not anticipated to be vibration during operation.

**MS LAGUNA:** No, yes.

5

**MR RITCHIE:** I think it's the roadworks or when they're doing construction of foundations, it's more that vibration.

**MS SYKES:** Okay.

10

**MS MILLIGAN:** Sheelagh, I'd be interested just to hear you talk a little bit more. We note your advice that the location is appropriate and given that the zoning across the road from the proposed facility is residential and it's a 24-hour operation, can you just sort of talk us through how you considered all that and how that was taken – I suppose how that's reflected in the advice that the location is in fact suitable.

15

**MS LAGUNA:** Chris, would you like to take that one?

20

**MR RITCHIE:** Sure, I can start. So, I mean the couple of things to factor in, the zoning at the moment does allow for employment and industrial uses. I think equally further to the east is actually more of a heavy zone identified as well as the residents to the south. The thing that obviously we look at in terms of the proximity are a lot of it is aimed at amenity issues and one of the key things with the proposal is it is fully enclosed. So, in terms of managing air, in terms of managing noise and in terms of managing water, I mean the site will be a nil discharge. These are some of the aspects that you look at when you're in those sort of interface locations.

25

30

In terms of those emission issues, we've consulted closely with the EPA, we've consulted closely with Water New South Wales, there has been some changes, there are some conditions. So, we're satisfied that from a location point of view, it can be operated and mitigated to the point that's not going to cause an impact on that research facility and in terms of some of those amenity impacts, we're quite comfortable that those issues will be complied with.

35

Now, we have, we touched on in the presentation, added additional elements around building design. It has been reduced slightly in terms of its original height. But then in terms of that landscaping, we've made sure that that is quite advanced to try again manage that interface area. The challenge for this generally is that land has been identified and zoned. So, it is permissible with consent and that's the key thing that we have to consider in terms of the planning process.

40

45

**MS MILLIGAN:** Understand. I guess I was particularly interested in the 24-hour operational aspect of the project. Certainly, sort of absorb the information you've given us about visual impact, about air quality, et cetera, but I'm just wondering about the 24 hour operation and the location.

5 **MR RITCHIE:** I mean – Sheelagh can jump in too, the assessments as presented in the EIS do look at it from a perspective of operating 24 hours a day. So particularly in things like noise, you do have to do that assessment on the basis of what is your existing background noise level, such as of a night time where it often is a lot quieter because there’s not a lot of activity. So, from a government policy point of view around noise, for instance, that assessment has shown that it can be managed.

10 In terms of other night time aspects such as night lighting, we have looked at that quite carefully as well in terms of how do you minimise glare or impacts from sort of light spill and that sort of thing, so we have looked at that again from a night time point of view. But maybe handing to Sheelagh about any particular details of what happens of a night time, maybe Sheelagh, I’ll hand to you.

15 **MS LAGUNA:** Yes, sorry, thanks, Chris. As I noted earlier, there will be no traffic coming in and out of the site, no heavy vehicles apart from a shift changeover because obviously staff coming in and out at the start of a shift. The operations are inside. So once all the waste has arrived, the doors close, everything occurs inside and the noise assessment has shown that at night time there won’t be impacts on the surrounding residents. We looked at that carefully.

**MS MILLIGAN:** That’s right.

25 **MS LAGUNA:** And as Chris said, the only other I suppose aspect would be any lighting, which has been in accordance with all the requirements.

**MS MILLIGAN:** Okay, thank you.

30 **MR MILLS:** Okay. Is there anything that you wanted to add in relation to the conditions of consent? I’m just conscious of time as well. Or are you happy that we’ve covered them all?

35 **MS LAGUNA:** I don’t think there’s anything particularly we want to add or we’re happy to answer any questions if there was anything that was unclear or if you want an explanation why something was worded the way it was or any requirement for a particular condition.

40 **MR MILLS:** Janett, Clare? Nothing in particular? No. And there’s quite a lot of good detail in there.

45 **MR RITCHIE:** I’d probably say it’s probably a quite rigorous conservative conditions that we’ve recommended. I mean, in terms of Sheelagh mentioned the meetings that we’ve had with the research facility, it was multiple times and particularly towards the end, it was around what are your principal key concerns and there was a lot of discussion around how we can sort of fashion some conditions around making them feel comfortable, that they would be engaged, that they would be consulted in terms of certain activities. And that they could observe in terms of when those works might occur and it would be not just our

consideration of those conditions but also some independent oversight through the environmental rep to make sure that from the point of view their concern that those issues would be addressed as part of those management plans.

5 Now, typically as we go through these management plan processes, a lot of those plans are actually considered by the staff that have assessed the project, so that's important because they understand the context of what the condition was trying to achieve.

10 Equally, the Department has a strong compliance function and if there are particular issues raised in the community or concerns that we have, then there is a latter part of the condition, you'll notice a lot of reflection around compliance requirements and reporting. So the conditions have been probably established in that regard for some time and they are quite robust in terms of how we manage  
15 those conditions and those sites moving forward.

**MR MILLS:** Terrific. Thank you. If there are no other questions from commissioners, I might just close out with one observation or consideration. When at the public meeting at the end of submissions and so on, whether it's on next  
20 Monday or Friday and we'll keep you posted as to how we're managing that because there's already over 50 registrants who would like to speak. Yes, it will be quite a long meeting, I think, as well.

25 So we're not certain whether we'll actually end up asking the Department to wait until the Friday when we do an online version, depending on how we try and squeeze in everyone. So just if you – obviously you'll be listening in at a minimum but keep that in mind. I would encourage you to attend, in any event, if you can on the Monday or at least have one person. The only other thing is there are inevitably, as you're aware, questions that we ask of the Department to get  
30 clarity around certain things.

It's never meant to be something that will catch you out. If you're unsure, then obviously please just simply say, "Yes, I think that's covered but I can't point to it right at the moment. I'll come back to you and confirm" or "Yes, look, I'll need to  
35 take that on notice." Whatever wording you're comfortable with, please do use the opportunity to do that. We don't want people – we don't want you to feel uncomfortable and we don't want people to get the wrong end of the stick either. So it's meant to be a cooperative process in that sense.

40 So please do think about it in that light and don't be too concerned that you won't be – we're not there to catch you out on anything basically. We're there to try to inform ourselves as much as possible, so simple as that. Do you have any questions on that aspect at all? No. Okay, thank you very much, Chris, Sheelagh and the team. Kendall, is there anything from the office's end that you wanted to  
45 add?

**MR CLYDSDALE:** No, nothing from our end. We've obviously got a copy of your presentation and that will be published on our website once the transcription

for this meeting is also completed. So, thank you for sending that through.

**MR MILLS:** Thank you everyone. Thank you for your time this morning.

5 **MR RITCHIE:** Thanks for your time. Thank you so much.

**MR MILLS:** Very much appreciated.

10 **MS MILLIGAN:** Thank you. Bye bye.

**MS LAGUNA:** Thank you. Goodbye.

**MR MILLS:** Bye.

15 **>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**