

Moorebank Precinct East Stage 2 Proposal Response to Submissions

Appendix A: Community response table



SIMTA

SYDNEY INTERMODAL TERMINAL ALLIANCE

Part 4, Division 4.1, State Significant
Development

Table 1 Community Response Table

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
Traffic and transport	Congestion / capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned that Moorebank and Moorebank Avenue in particular is inadequate for large container trucks and is already congested Concern that the Proposal would add to existing traffic congestion on roads in the vicinity of the project. Specifically, M5, M7, Newbridge Road, Heathcote Road and the Hume Highway, especially heavy vehicles. Concerned also by fill increasing the impact of previously mentioned issues Concerns that support vehicles and trucks from the Proposal would create congestion on the surrounding road network Concerns that the Proposal would result in congestion in nearby suburbs including Moorebank, Chipping Norton, Casula, Liverpool and the Prestons. Extra traffic congestion will cause strain on local recourses including shops and travel times The Local community cannot handle the increased number of trucks and congestion New suburbs have been established nearby and already the traffic is horrendous The road system cannot cope with the extra 2,500 trucks per day and 104 per hour on Moorebank Avenue plus current local congestion Proposal would add to increasing road congestion created by upcoming 	<p>17,20,60\192697,65\184211,102,108,1,5,34\184193,35,37,38,53,68,79,80,83,88,91\184189,94,95\191392,116,126,127,128,130,134,139\189907,145,153,162\185383,178794,18\191474,40,46,67,136,141,77,106,173,155\180143,23,43\184201,51,61,131\189865,39,103,19\189835</p>	50

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>apartment developments and from general population growth in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion from the movement of fill to site, which would potentially put children in schools at risk due to increased traffic • What impact will stormwater and road works have on traffic in the local area • No adequate attempt has been made to deal with the 10,000 trucks per day the site will generate • Road reconfiguration will not remove the problems associated with increased traffic 		
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 450,000 additional truck movements for fill has not been studied nor "considered for mitigation" and will worsen traffic congestion • The DP&E should start again with the precinct plan and EIS in light of these new applications • Up to date traffic modelling needs to be completed before application should progress 	39,53,60\192697,55,155\180143	5
	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any traffic increase in this area will "overwhelm" residents and normal users of the road • Concerns around the safety of vehicles merging on to the M5 Motorway (M5 weave) 	195757,41,65\184211,180141	4
	Road Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Damage to roads from increases in heavy vehicle numbers • Existing road infrastructure is not adequate to support the project 	43\184201,36\191340,153,129\189649,189649,20,68,128,73,31,155\180143,180141,178940	13

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widening of Moorebank Avenue and Anzac Parade will cause significant disruption to the community Construction of a temporary diversion road to allow diversion along Moorebank Avenue will cause traffic chaos Moorebank avenue would need to be widened to at least 3 lanes each way for project to be feasible Transport links are already struggling with current numbers Public road upgrades should be completed before the internal road connection is complete. Constant staged development was agreed such that it does not exceed the capacity of the current transport network Plans do not consider Cambridge Avenue not its redevelopment, it is a major arterial road. The plan is therefore flawed for not considering it. 		
	Use of local roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commuter vehicles utilising back roads to avoid congestion Increase in traffic on surrounding local roads 	41,17	2
Noise	Operational Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned warehouses built will be insufficient to block operational noise from the community Insufficient mitigation is provided for noise generation and receivers Additional noise walls should be constructed around the perimeter of the site to better mitigate noise emissions. 	132,71,155\180143,197385,68,128,180141	7

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise from the construction and operation of 300,000 m2 of warehousing and distribution facilities of the proposal will negatively affect residents The continuous transfer of containers between the MPE stage 1 IMT and the proposal's warehousing and distribution facilities will require heavy vehicles capable of being loaded with containers and used on MPE stage 2 site will cause 24/7 noise. Location of where trucks will load and unload is too close to residents 		
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General comment around noise generated by plant and operational machinery including trucks, container terminal, loading docks etc. The proposal will increase noise pollution, specifically 24 hour operations, impacting the health of residents Concerned importation of fill will negatively impact community and will cause dust and noise pollution The increase in site level from greater quantities of fill will result in greater impacts from generation, transmissions and reception of construction and operational noise Objects to the noise that will be generated by the extra traffic on Moorebank avenue The redirection of Moorebank Avenue will further increase noise impacts on Wattle Grove 	37,38,85\184217,180141,17,57\184240,195757,23,51,71,112\192757,155\180143,46,97\192748,68,128,15	17

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned for the noise impacts on residential homes 		
	Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The estimated noise levels noted in the assessment as being acceptable are contradicted by Transport for NSW and Sydney trains noise logging reports of 2015 Sydney trains conducted noise levelling tests in 2010 and 2015 and the report are different to those supplied in the submissions 	144,146,152	3
Air	Air Quality / Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in pollution generated by increased congestion and heavy vehicle movements Concerns that additional heavy vehicles and trains from the Proposal will result in increasing air pollution (in particular diesel emissions) impacting on nearby residents and the environment The increase in diesel trucks will worsen air quality in an area close to schools, nursing homes, retail and a large residential population in an area that is already over polluted and over populated Decrease in the local and regional air quality from dust, diesel and air pollution The area and community cannot handle the pollution Please explain in further detail the "very low impacts on the surrounding environment from air pollutants", Table 5 & 6 of the PB EIS dated 20/04/2016 has an annualised emissions quantification 	23,37,38,88,97\192748,112\192757,77,106,118\181043,17,180141,41,78,52,67,136,141	17

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>and qualification which does not appear to be "very low"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the point source diesel emissions impact the health of populations residing adjacent to the Proposal? • Diesel Fumes will be increased as a result of the proposal • Children and schools nearby will be impacted by increased pollution 		
	Particulate matter	Carcinogenic Diesel particulate emissions pose a grave threat to the health of the local community	55	1
Health	Pollution / air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased pollution will affect people's health particularly young children • Impacts to air quality from the project would result in health impacts to nearby schools, childcare centres and homes • Concerns around air pollution and particulates (including diesel particulate matter) from the project resulting in various impacts to health including: Shortened life expectancy, increases outbreaks of asthma, cancer in newborns, lung cancer in children, autoimmune diseases, bronchitis, coronary disease, cardiovascular disease • Increased impacts to those suffering asthma and other respiratory conditions • Concerned the proposal will increase pollution in the local area and affect the community • Area cannot handle increase in pollution 	2,10,195757,75,3\184213,12\184187,81,109,116,46,173,51,62,118\181043	14

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns to residents from increased pollution 		
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General impacts to health and wellbeing of nearby residents not considered in this proposal Concerned about the detrimental health effects of the project on a community predominantly made up of young families This project is causing stress for their family worrying about their home and the area they live in Please consider the health of our children in an already polluted environment Fire incidents on the site could result in toxic emissions impacting nearby residences 	62,81,122,30\184197,36\191340,73,75,86	8
Natural environment	General Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal would significantly impact the environment and cause environmental destruction The environmental impact from the removal of vegetation, remediation works, earthworks and levelling of the site, drainage and utilities installation, construction of the hardstand. Adverse impacts to local wildlife Damage to the environment would be irreparable Environmental efforts are the legislative minimum and no effort is being made to strive for higher or even world class standards 	8\189921,63,134,186310,68,89,128,95\191392,131\189865,31	10

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
	Impacts on local river systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned the project will negatively impact South-West river systems Concerned the project will cause major degradation/damage to the Georges river Objects to use of prime public riverfront for an industrial project and its alienation from public use Project should not be situated so close to an environmentally sensitive area such as the Georges River Area should be used to beautify Georges River rather than for industrial uses Concerned the proposal will cause pollution to the local river systems Redirection of waterways will cause Anzac and Harris creeks to dry up Aerosol pesticides will be used to fumigate containers; this will pose a threat to aquatic life downstream when it enters the river as run off. 	5,6,122,126,127,18\191474,47,35,100,64,89,144,146,152,55	15
	Aboriginal/European Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive noise from the spur-line will ruin Glenfield Farm, and blight important historical views with heavy industry 	55	1
	Bushfire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The southern aspect of the site will present a bushfire threat as it has sloped indexed land which under the right temperature and wind direction could pose problems to residents who have to evacuate through one main entry/exit point on Wattle Grove Road 	105	1

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
	Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in site level from the fill will result in great distribution of lighting impacts to local residents • Increase in building heights will increase noise and light pollution to local residents 	116,139\189907	2
	Flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncaptured flows from the eastern side of the site will negatively impact Anzac Creek • Increasing site level will increase flooding impacts to surrounding areas • New concrete yards and large shed and general increase in sealed areas will displace rainwater and increase flood danger for surrounding residents and areas • Proposal will change the whole nature of the flood zone and Georges river catchment, resulting in more flooding and spreading pollution further • If the site were flooded, contamination would run off and potentially harm and kill previous thought extinct Hibbertia fumana • Importation of 2 million tons of fill will change the entire water flow and flood diversion profile of the flood plain area • No plans to create a site for the backed up flood waters to retreat to • The proposal area is a designated flood area, raising the site by 2m will impact the surrounding area ability to deal with the impacts of excessive rain 	71,49\191488,50\191464,80,89,144,146,152,14,98,139\189907	11

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
	Fill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill is only being added in an effort to avoid site remediation, due to contamination and dangerous materials left behind • 2.2 million cubic meters of landfill is untested, land should be remediated instead • The fill will likely cover rare botanical specimens, aboriginal sites and cause un-remediated contamination • If 600,000 tonnes of fill is required then the site is not suitable and the original application is invalid • Objects to the modification of 600,000 cubic metres of fill • Proposed dirt may contain bio hazards and foreign matter 	60\192697,139\189907,48,58,77,106,80,96\19142 2,116	9
	Visual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned there will be a reduction in visual amenity for elevated receivers in Casula • Freight village will be an eyesore 	71,143	2
Planning process	Approvals/applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approvals process has not been undertaken correctly and is not transparent, lodging 3 proposal applications 3 days prior to Christmas is underhanded. • Objects to all aspects of the proposal being approved • This proposal and the entire project should be stopped completely • 3 new modification applications invalidates any previous EIS findings 	96\191422,180141,42\192717,45,48,58,122,57\18 4240,60\192697,144,146,152,139\189907,9,55	15

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>and results, a new EIS needs to be produced to include these modifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is a major modification to the concept and should be rejected • The greens proposal to place intermodal terminals on the periphery of the cities and use both port Kembla and Newcastle ports along with port botany to distribute freight fairly and with less environmental destruction • The planning department should reject all applications and a new fully costed precinct master plan should be developed, one that includes late additions and factors in the RMS traffic impact study, PAC etc. due to the new modifications • Opposed to operational movements between MPE and MPW • An independent investigation needs to be completed to confirm the findings of the Submissions • The proposal is being rushed through at a rate that residents can't handle • Proposal should be thrown out until a responsible master plan has been produced • The distance of Wattle Grove to the MPE Project site as stated in the Project Application, is incorrect. It should be 370 metres and not 640 metres 		
	Combined project / Modifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that if this large a modification is required then the original proposal is flawed and should be thrown out 	155\180143,180141,77,106,60\192697,84,113\184215,9,139\189907,19\189835	10

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not a modification but a whole new development This modification proposal now makes all previous studies and proposals irrelevant as the plans have changed, planning and testing should be done again and the new data presented to the public for consultation Reading and understanding 81 documents at the same time to understand and make considered objections to the proposal is unfair and constitutes inadequate consultation Opposed to the change of function of the intermodal terminal to allow interstate, intrastate and port shuttle freight rail Residents have not been consulted in this three in one exhibition 3 applications at once have been made to try and sneak them through the approvals process 		
	Environmental Management Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The original EIS did not allow for the amount of fill required for retail, commercial or light industrial uses and therefore should be reassessed Amendments introduce significant environmental impacts and should be addressed separately in their own EIS not included as an amendment Who will police the implementation of the OEMP? 	35,79,84,90	4
	Tech studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual Impact Assessment and Light spill studies show that significant landscaping, screening and architectural 	68,128,89	3

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>elements will be needed in order to shield site operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Impact of light spill to residential properties will affect residents 24/7. The light spill study show this. Thorough research needs to be done to substantiate the project to the local people 		
	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since project was conceived the surrounding areas have been rezoned to medium and high density, greatly increasing strain on traffic, resources etc. Proposed raising of vertical alignment of Moorebank Avenue for 1.5kms by 2m from the northern boundary of MPE to 120 meters south of the MPE site will require more space for the proposed site Raising of Moorebank Avenue needs to be investigated 	35,77,79,106,68,128	6
	MPE Stage 2 Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SIMTA shouldn't be able to apply for Stage 2 when they haven't finished modifying their concept plan Stage 2 should not be approved when concept plan and layout is not finalised Where is the detailed study showing how/what 'minor indirect visual impacts' there will be on Glenfield Farm Section 5.1 pg.22 of the Non-Indigenous heritage assessment in the section historical background - early settlement at Liverpool. The proponents do not mention Glenfield farm at all, they do not mention that the intermodal spur-line site is part of Charles Throsby's land 	71,9,22,55,15,155\180143,180141,31,162\185383,178794	10

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<p>grant of 1810 and an important visual curtilage of Glenfield Farm which was to be returned to the public as recreational use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept plan clearly stated that warehousing would be located on the eastern side of MPE site to act as noise mitigation for Wattle Grove residents, the new site plan layout shows a large percentage of warehousing facing the western side of Wattle Grove. • Subdivision is an alarming term. Does this mean there is the potential further sale of subdivided plots for alternative uses which may not be bound by this application or time frame. Will subdivided plot be bound by the same regulation? • Could subdivided plot apply for various usage? E.g. heavy industrial, commercial. Which could then bypass requirements for PAC development approval? • The residents have never had a vote on the proposal or the approval 		
Economics	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the use of public funds for this privately owned project • This will benefit multinational companies who will not pay their fair share of taxes • Forwarding freight on from its original port destination in Port Botany will increase freight and shipping costs while unnecessarily clogging roads 	43\184201,89,63,70,117,118\181043,155\180143	7
	Reduction in property prices and compensation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project would cause a decrease in property and land value 	3\184213,31,97\192748,108,112\192757,117,136,141	8

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts to nearby residents economic wellbeing Request for reimbursement of property capital loss The intermodal project will drive new residents and investment away from the region 		
	Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispute employment numbers stated in the EIS. The use of automated machinery would reduce these numbers significantly Inconsistent employment numbers have been provided, first it was 7000 jobs and now it's only 1600 jobs 	184921	1
	Cost of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raising the ground works by 2m is a waste of tax payers money Waste of tax payers funds Government has not allocated the required funds for the required infrastructure to establish the site 	53,63,145,136,141,186476	6
Community	Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation to date has been insufficient/non existent Huge swathes of the broader community, who will also be affected, have been left out of the consultation process such as Bayside council area, Sutherland shire, Georges river, Canterbury, and Bankstown Multistorey high-rise apartment buildings are being constructed within 1km of the proposed site, these new owners have not been consulted with and their views will be obstructed with the proposal 	106,144,146,152,77,79,126,127	8

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
	Impacts to community lifestyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposal would impact on community, families and lifestyle. Impacting general health, traffic and environment through noise and pollution for years to come • The proposal would change the character of the area • The proposal would impact young families who have settled in the area • The Proposal will decrease the quality of life for the community • Extensive construction works and operation will impact the surrounding community in regards to noise, emissions, dust, breaking, lighting and shunting • It is unrealistic to assume that this development in such a small community will have no impact • Facility will stifle growth in an important business growth centre • Adverse impacts on the standard of living for local residents • Industrial area not appropriate in the middle of a residential community • Densely populated family-orientated residential area not suitable for such a development • The proposal will risk destroying the unique, young family orientated community, specifically one that is surrounded by the bush • The proposal is located too close to residential areas 	<p>5,11\184207,21,30\184197,36\191340,68,92\189961,120\184191,110,124,128,96\191422,50\191464,47,109,186310,16,34\184193,35,117,118\181043,133\192738,162\185383,155\180143,70,79,95\191392,97\192748,100,112\192757,60\192697,104,107\184185,57\184240,180141</p>	35

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raising site 2m will put the terminal in full view of surrounding residents making their life unbearable Diesel particle pollution and traffic will have a negative impact on residents and has not been looked at properly Many residents have illnesses and the current peaceful and green environment minimise symptoms and aid recovery 		
	Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's morally wrong to do this to residents in the area 	44,162\185383	2
	Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erecting noise barriers in close proximity to noise sources is unsafe and impractical, especially when sources are not static Traffic caused by the proposal will be dangerous and compromise the safety of residents Concerned that SIMTA's official report states at this point that there is a 20-fold higher crash rate than the RMS threshold for blackspots on Moorebank and Cambridge avenue, 2 fatalities over 5 years and MICL's EIS which states a 40 fold higher crash rate than the RMS threshold on the M5 between Heathcoat Road and the Hume highway, while the report states that between 75-85% of intermodal trucks will use these blackspots and 100% will use Moorebank Avenue. With 25% using Sydney's worst blackspot. Concerned that this will result in more deaths 	71,92\189961,94,127	4

Aspect	Issue	Summary	Respondent Reference number	Total
Flora and Fauna	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned project would impact endangered flora and fauna thought to be extinct, specifically Hibbertia Fumana Concerned project is reducing vegetation in the riparian corridor, how is this going to be offset Concerned general Flora and Fauna will be negatively impacted This modification shows that key information was withheld until after the approvals process relating to previous thought extinct species 	27\184209,71,67,9,122	5
	Vegetation management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the conservation and management plan for Hibbertia fumana, which department will be delegated authority to ensure the plan is produced by the applicant 	71	1
	Impacts to native species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non reporting of extinct flora until 4 days after the report points to dishonesty and shows no community consultation No clearing whatsoever must be done to protect the recently discovered Hibbertia Fumana and an OEH section 91 licence should be applied for. 	144,146,152,31	4

