

Submission regarding EIS for Hunter Central Logistics Estate (HCLE) - State Significant Development Application (SSD-64738258) – Industrial Development Proposal (Stages 1, 1A and 1B) at 1134 John Renshaw Drive, Black Hill (PPIP Pty Ltd, c/o Broaden Management)

My name is Tony Lewis, have been a resident of Black Hill for over 46years, and have lost count of the number of submissions that I have lodged over many years regarding this proposed development.

This morning I read the already lodged Black Hill Environment Protection Group and The Buttai Community Development Group (Local Community Groups Submission), dated March 5, and realised that every point I had drafted to date is covered more comprehensively, and articulated more clearly in the Community Groups Submission. Therefore, to save you unnecessary reading, I confirm that I fully endorse the points and suggestions made in the Community Group Submission (CGS) document, and instead only emphasise selected items which have particular additional significance for me and my family.

Community Consultation, The CGS notes that “Table 23 of the EIS has an entry suggesting that ‘*No response was received*’ from Residents (to the April 2024 Letterbox drop)”. The CGS goes on to explain that this is ‘inconsistent’ (*hmm, how polite!*) with the specific SIA findings. I will be less polite. That ‘inconsistent’ statement in the EIS is a lie. I take exception to proponents telling lies in documents as significant as this EIS, where consideration of the proposal must rely on the veracity of the information the proponent submits.

I particularly take exception to this lie, as I was one resident who DID RESPOND. Apparently approximately 44% of those residents specifically targeted to respond did respond, contrary to the false statement made in Table 23. It is all the more concerning that the proponent specifically excluded so many other local residents who were entitled to have their say, but were deliberately excluded by the proponent (as explained in the CGS)

Vegetation Buffer

Whilst at p125, the need for retention of bushland around the perimeter of the site is acknowledged in the EIS, I can’t stress how strongly this needs to occur. In my April 2024 submission (yes, one of the submissions which the proponent falsely claimed did not occur), I stated:

“The above point (regarding potential un-necessary clearing) is particularly relevant because Black Hill, particularly on the western side of the M1 Motorway, is historically a quiet, rural community. It will be imperative for there to be substantial vegetation buffers

on all sides of this industrial estate to make a genuine attempt to improve visual amenity, and promote connectivity conservation.

The containment of noise pollution and nighttime light pollution is of particular concern to my family as our property is significantly elevated relative to the proposed development, and without a significant vegetation buffer between the development and my property, we will be unnecessarily subjected to negative visual and noise impacts. (For context, from parts of my property I can see The John Hunter Hospital, The Alto building at Charlestown, the Stockton Bridge, Houses in Beresfield and Thornton, Admin / other buildings on the Donaldson Mine site, to name a few.)”

Throughout iterations of various proposal documents it has been stated that there will be insignificant noise & nighttime light pollution in the direction of my home. That statement is untrue. Apparently when the visual impact study was first performed the consultant ‘accidentally’ stopped low down on my access road (which runs beside the Black Hill Uniting Church), and lo and behold the photos taken showed no possibility of seeing the proposed development! Had they proceeded further up the hill towards my home, their photos would have clearly shown how visible the development will be from my home. But let’s not let facts and truth get in the way of convenient false statements...

Black Hill Road / John Renshaw Drive intersection

Finally, I note that the CGS discusses at length the need for the intersection of Black Hill Road (BHR) and John Renshaw Drive (JRD) to be upgraded to make it SAFE for residents & visitors to enter and exit, since the intersection is poorly designed, not fit for purpose, and poses ongoing safety risk. The SIDRA modelling noted in the CGS document is most concerning. With the anticipated increase in traffic which will be generated by this proposed (and adjacent) developments, the risk of serious injury or death resulting from the inadequacy of the intersection will only increase. While I agree that the upgrade of this intersection cannot fall on only one development on JRD, the proponent should be required to make a significant contribution to the intersection’s upgrade.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to lodge this submission.

Yours Sincerely,

Tony Lewis