

Delivered by Planning Portal

28 February 2022

Department of Planning, Industry & Environment

4 Parramatta Square,  
12 Darcy Street, Parramatta,  
NSW 2150, Australia

**Attention: Chris Ritchie – Director Industry Assessments**

Dear Mr Ritchie,

**Reference: Terminals Bulk Liquids Storage Expansion-4 (DA246/96-Mod-4) Response to Submissions – Lynda Newnam**

With reference to the Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (DPIE) request for response to submissions and submission made by Lynda Newnam.

This response pertains to the Lynda Newnam submission dated 12/12/21 and not the “attachment to submission August 2021” as this is dated before the DA246/96 – Mod -4 submission by Quantem. We note that the Lynda Newnam attachment addressed a different application altogether.

Quantem have prepared a table of responses addressing those items raised by Lynda Newnam that are appropriate for Quantem to respond to noting that some queries are directed to DPIE.

Lynda Newnam Query	Quantem Response
<p>I live at La Perouse south of the Elaroo-Grose Street Traffic pinch point. This is the only entry and exit to the La Perouse Headland. On busy days traffic grinds to a standstill and it is difficult to get in and out as a resident or visitor. On a recent occasion a helicopter was brought in for an emergency as vehicles couldn't access in a timely fashion. Visitors outnumber residents on such days at least 50:1. Visitors in particular are generally unaware of the significance of the DP Terminal and that the waters between La Perouse and the DP Terminal act as a buffer for the Major Hazard Facilities.</p>	<p>This proposal does not create extra vehicle movements to the area instead will result in a reduction in truck movements in the operations phase of the new combustor to and from the Port Botany terminal. This reduction is seen as a benefit to vehicle movements in the area. Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has conducted a review of the application and stated TfNSW has no comment on the application.</p>
<p>There has been no briefing of residents of the cumulative risk posed and how this incremental change will impact. According to the EPA license for both premises the current environment risk is rated as Level 3 and I note there is only one other Level 3 facility in the area (Qenos on the BIP). The DPIE 'instruction' to consult with community has not been addressed. (See page 16 <a href="https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=DA246/96-MOD-4%212021118T232559.807%20GMT">https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=DA246/96-MOD-4%212021118T232559.807%20GMT</a> Nonetheless, it the DPIE and EPA that need to consult with community not the developer and that consultation needs to be ongoing because of the extent of the industry in this area – 25</p>	<p>Quantem have followed the consultation process requested by DPIE and EPA including publishing the details on the planning website, notification of affected parties and engagement with the Port Botany Community Consultative Committee. EPA's submission remains available for viewing via the DPIE planning portal.</p>

<p>licensed premises 9 of which are Major Hazard Facilities. I note that the EPA did raise questions about this Modification but I can't find correspondence on the Planning page.</p>	
<p>I also note that Planning is currently processing an SSI Development affecting the buffer area between La Perouse and DP World Terminal  <a href="https://mpweb.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/majorprojects/project/34291">https://mpweb.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/majorprojects/project/34291</a> and there is no recognition of the significance of the buffer zone and why it is not suitable for major commercial tourism development. This is a project pushed by the MPs from Sutherland Shire Mark Speakman and Scott Morrison. Further details in my submission at this link -  <a href="https://laperousemuseum.files.wordpress.com/2021/09/lynda-newnam-submissionferry-wharves-compressed-2.pdf">https://laperousemuseum.files.wordpress.com/2021/09/lynda-newnam-submissionferry-wharves-compressed-2.pdf</a>3 NSW Ports have recently released this video on the importance of the port and industrial activities <a href="https://youtu.be/8BwrLAN2ln4">https://youtu.be/8BwrLAN2ln4</a> It appears to be response to a developer driven review of Industrial Lands, firstly through the Productivity Commission and now the GSC. The Local Government Association have rightly supported the status quo. The buffer zone between La Perouse and DP is used for low impact recreation. Randwick City Council in its Frenchman's Bay Plan of Management 2002 recognised this. Recreation includes snorkelling, scuba, windsurfing, paddleboarding, kayaking, kite surfing, wingsurfing, sailing, and fishing. If major development is approved around the La Perouse coastline it will push other activities closer to the Banks Revetment Wall. Low impact recreation along with low residential development is compatible with Port and allied activities at DP World Terminal. Residents tolerate the impacts of these activities as a trade-off. Encroachment is bad for both industry and existing residents. However, what is being proposed by Transport and in the case of the Kamay wharves also National Parks is totally incompatible. Transport have even amended the 2056 Transport Plan, without community consultation, to include a Metro Station at La Perouse. Container shipping was moved from Sydney Harbor and concentrated at Port Botany and Banksmeadow along with an intensification of bulk liquids to allow major commercial tourism and residential on Sydney Harbour. To then intensify the buffer area around the Port in Botany Bay is irresponsible and potentially dangerous. I alert you to this because the Terminals modification is within the current planning context where one Government Agency prompted by others – Industry (Tourism) and NPWS – is ignoring the long-standing planning priorities for this region. The NSW Auditor-General recently highlighted the poor planning performance of Transport in the review of Port Botany Freight – see <a href="https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/tp/files/80563/Auditor-General%20-%20Rail%20freight%20and%20Greater%20Sydney.pdf">https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/tp/files/80563/Auditor-General%20-%20Rail%20freight%20and%20Greater%20Sydney.pdf</a>  This is a growing problem borne of wilful stupidity and going under the radar because of general ignorance. The ignorance will continue unless Planning in partnership with the EPA, SafeWork Bayside and Randwick Councils and Emergency Services educate communities of the risk profile and its management. There should be an accessible dedicated site.</p>	<p>Quantem already own and operate the approved and licenced Terminal facilities which are an important component of NSW's bulk liquid import and export infrastructure through the Port for essential products for NSW businesses. The amendment to current approvals is being requested and consistent with the gazetted Land Use Zones for Port Botany. The content of this element of the response by Lynda Newnam does not appear relevant to DA246/96-Mod-4</p>

Yours Sincerely



Andrew Skeet

Quantem Major Projects Manager