

# OBJECTIONS TO MOD 7 INFRASTRUCTURE CONSOLIDATION AND REMEDIATION AT KURNELL NSW

I have been a resident of Kurnell for 30 years. I am now a retiree, I have previously run a business located in Kurnell. I have witnessed all types of threats of intrusive infrastructure and constant negative progress made to Kurnell during my residency. To this day I still find it an incredibly beautiful suburb with an amazingly loyal community in which to live but can't help but wonder how it would be if we didn't have to endure a constant barrage of threats thrown, for us to contend with.

My Focus is on Ampol's Kurnell operations, including spills, PFAS issues, and a proposed BESS linked to post-refinery plans. Points adapt to MOD 7's infrastructure consolidation and partial remediation, arguing for full restoration to community land over perpetuating industrial use.

There are many reasons to object to MOD 7 Infrastructure consolidation and partial remediate, please find a selection of them listed below..

## POLITICAL REASONS:

Some standing via government leniency perceptions, no direct MOD 7 scandals.

- Favouritism and weak enforcement. Approval priorities Ampol over public interest given breach history. Details available.
- Clash with energy goals. Locks in fossil fuels despite decarbonation framing; contradicts net-zero via incomplete remediation. Details available.
- Council/community exclusion. Bypasses input, council pushes regeneration but MOD 7 may ignore. Residents trusted by lack of transparency and health risks.

## LEGAL REASONS

Strong standing from breaches and risks.

- Legislation violations • Lease covenants • Court precedent • Legacy remediation failure

## ZONING REASONS

Moderate; site zoned industrial, but redoing arguments exist post-closure

- \* Incompatibility - mains heavy zoning near parks/residential, closing with e2 zones
- \* Post-closure expectations - zoning tied to refining, pressure to shift to community use ignored by MOD 7
- \* No direct violation standing: modification to existing approval; challengeable if expands use.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REASONS

Very strong; pollution history key:

- PFAS Migration
- Spill History
- Biodiversity impact
- Asbestos/waste
- Fire/explosion risks

## COMMONSENSE REASONS

Strong, practical logic.

- \* High-risk site: Peninsula flood/storm-prone. Or so our insurance policies reflect.
- \* Proximity dangers
- \* Partial inefficiency

## COMMUNITY RESONS

Very strong, resident opposition evident.

- Health/quality impacts: health issues
- Consultation lacks: Ampol downplays risks
- Amenity disruption: Pollutes parks/tourism.

## WHS REASONS

- Fire/spill hazards
- Safety lapses
- No specific violations

## HISTORIAL/INDIGENOUS REASONS

Moderate: cultural notes.

- <sup>a</sup> Dharawal heritage.
- Cook site harm

Tuesday, 22 July 2025

- OTHER ISSUES -

- Economic - Favours Ampol profits over eco-tourism job; public bears costs
- Climate - Delays renewables; site better for reforestation/carbon sequestration
- Precedent risks - encourages incomplete remediation, ignores accountability.

THIS TIME PLEASE PUT PEOPLE OVER PROFIT.

[REDACTED]