

Brett Wilson

[REDACTED]

Fairy Meadow, NSW 2519

[REDACTED]

Date: 23 July 2025

To:

NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Subject: Strong Objection to Ampol's Proposal - Modification 7 (Mod 7) - Kurnell Terminal

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally register my strong objection to Ampol's proposed Modification 7 (Mod 7) at its Kurnell Fuel Terminal.

Although I am not a resident of Kurnell, I care deeply about the environment, the safety of local wildlife, and the wellbeing of the Kurnell community. Decisions like these affect not only local residents, but the broader ecological and coastal health of the region-and by extension, all of us. As a concerned member of the public, I feel compelled to oppose this proposal.

#### 1. Environmental Risk and Legacy Pollution

Kurnell has long borne the cost of industrial activity. Ampol's Mod 7 seeks to expand operations at a site already impacted by legacy pollution. Despite known contamination, Mod 7 lacks clarity, transparency, and accountability in environmental safeguards. The proposed increase in hazardous material handling and fuel storage heightens the risk to the Botany Bay ecosystem, protected

wetlands, and marine biodiversity.

## 2. Public Health and Safety

Kurnell is a high-risk bushfire and flood-prone zone. Increasing the presence and movement of flammable and toxic materials in such an area magnifies the potential for disaster. Ampol's application does not provide the community or regulatory authorities with adequate assurance of safety, preparedness, or response capability.

## 3. Lack of Meaningful Community Consultation

The scale and nature of Mod 7 demand extensive and meaningful community engagement, which has been notably lacking. Public consultation has been poorly advertised, inaccessible to many, and appears to be a procedural formality rather than a genuine opportunity for dialogue.

## 4. Incompatible with Climate and Planning Goals

The expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure directly contradicts NSW's commitments to carbon reduction, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land use. Kurnell should be moving toward environmental rehabilitation and resilience-not entrenching outdated, high-risk industrial uses.

## 5. Cumulative Impact and the Precautionary Principle

Given the existing environmental burdens and safety risks in the area, this proposal's cumulative impact is unacceptable. The precautionary principle, established under Australian environmental law, must guide decision-making: where serious or irreversible harm is possible, lack of full scientific certainty cannot justify proceeding.

**Conclusion: Reject Modification 7**

For the reasons above, I respectfully but firmly urge the Department to reject Ampol's Mod 7

proposal. Instead, Ampol should be required to:

- Conduct a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- Initiate a long-term site remediation and rehabilitation strategy
- Collaborate with the community to plan a transition to cleaner, safer land uses

Thank you for considering this submission. I trust the Department will uphold its responsibility to protect both the public interest and the natural heritage of the Kurnell peninsula.

Yours sincerely,

Brett Wilson