

Andrew Beattie

From: system@affinitylive.com on behalf of Allan Corben <allancorben@bigpond.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 24 June 2015 2:43 PM
To: Andrew Beattie
Subject: Submission Details for Allan Corben (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Allan Corben
Email: allancorben@bigpond.com

Address:
13 Woolmer's Court

13 WOOLMERS COURT, NSW
Sydney

Content:
A study has found that the Liverpool road network without the Intermodal, the traffic demand will exceed the network capacity by 21% by 2030.

With the Intermodal, the traffic demand will exceed the network capacity by 53% by 2030.

How can the proponents possibly claim that Moorebank is the ideal location for this development. What it will be is a parking station.

Question: (1) What has been put in place to ensure the road network is upgraded to cope with the traffic volume.

Question: 2 This now being basically a private development, the developer should be responsible for the cost of the upgrades, not the taxpayer.

IP Address: - 120.155.114.166
Submission: Online Submission from Allan Corben (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=118817

Submission for Job: #6766 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility Stage 1
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6766

Site: #3010 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=3010

Allan Corben

E : allancorben@bigpond.com

Andrew Beattie

From: system@affinitylive.com on behalf of Allan Corben <allancorben@bigpond.com>
Sent: Saturday, 13 June 2015 4:46 PM
To: Andrew Beattie
Subject: Submission Details for Allan Corben (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Allan Corben
Email: allancorben@bigpond.com

Address:
13 Woolmer's Court

Wattle Grove, NSW
2173

Content:

13th June 2015

Allan Corben 13 Woolmer's Court Wattle Grove NSW 2173 Contact: allancorben@bigpond.com.au Phone 0451 998 774

Please find below, my submission on the SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Terminal.

Reference: AC1612

I do question as to why I'm even bothering to lodge a submission again, as virtually no notice has been taken of previous submissions lodged by local residents by either the proponents or the Australian Government.

First and foremost, now that SIMTA and the Federal Government have agreed to jointly develop the Intermodal, the EIS process should commence again from the start, based on the full operation and cover all aspects and duration of construction. The fact that SIMTA are planning three stages for the development does not allow a clear prediction of what the overall impact of Noise, Air quality and Traffic will have on the residents of the numerous suburbs that surround the proposed sites when the development is at full operation. It's fine to have a PM2.5 outcome of 10 µg/m³ at the completion of stage 1, to then find that when the facility is in full operation that the particulate PM levels constantly exceeds the NSW EPA criteria. I like many others, don't need to know what impact stage 1 will have on my families health, but of what the impact will be at full operation. Staging of construction is a strategy to get the development under way as once it commences, there is little hope of stopping it should it negatively impact on the communities' health. Originally it was proposed that there would be 2600 trucks movements into the site daily, and now they are talking of 10,000 movements + it was previously proposed that there would be one rail line to the terminal and now they propose two. This has created an all new ball game.

Having an employment background of 47 years in the transport & Logistics industry, and having an extensive knowledge of the industry, I have been involved in the opposition to these proposals since day one as and I'm firmly of the opinion that professionally Moorebank is not the correct location and neither the proponents nor State & Federal Governments have any intention at all of addressing or accepting the concerns of the people who are facing massive negative health and wellbeing impacts. The reason for this opinion is that those involved have their minds firmly set on building this unacceptable transport industry operation at Moorebank based purely on (a) close to the M5 & M7, and (b) adjacent to the Southern freight line, ignoring the fact that the proposed site is surrounded by residential housing. Furthermore, in this day and age, operations of this nature, that operate 24/7, create dangerous air pollution and traffic congestion, should under no circumstances be sited amongst residential housing. "Haven't we yet learnt our lesson?"

The proponents ignore the fact that 39,000 + people live within a radius of two kilometres of the Moorebank site, some as close as 400 to 1000 metres, and that the Liverpool road network is already at its capacity.

Following are my comments by category on facts that both the Government and proponents are ignoring,
Site: The proponents claim that Moorebank is the ideal location for the Intermodal, yet ignore the fact that 45% of all containers landing at Port Botany are destined for Western Sydney not South Western Sydney. One function avoided by the transport industry is double handling of freight. In the case of Moorebank the freight will be unloaded from inbound shipping and placed in a holding area. It will then be reloaded on a Moorebank train and travel 26 kilometres to Moorebank, where it will again be unloaded into a holding area ready for delivery. The next action is to load the container on to a truck for the delivery involving a road trip in excess of 40 kilometres to the end customer. This will result in handling the container twice, not once and delaying the delivery of the container for an additional 24 hours. Definitely not what I would call efficient, nor will it have improved delivery time.

Infrastructure NSW is on record as recommending that no future investment be made in rail infrastructure till such time that short haul rail is proven viable. To load a train to travel 26 kilometres to unload is considered in my mind as being inefficient and not viable.

Traffic: It is well known that the Liverpool road network is near capacity. In an article published in the Daily Telegraph 4th June, the Federal Government is quoted as rebuffing critics who say it will clog Western Sydney roads with trucks, but in a speech on the Intermodal proposal made by NSW MP Ms Melanie Gibbons in the Legislative Assembly on the 4th June, she made the

following statement, quote "I have read through the information provided by the company for the next period of community consultation. It says that, should there be an accident on the M5 or Moorebank Avenue, the facility will need to close while the accident is being cleared". Would the most outrageous comment I have ever heard and totally disputes the Federal Governments rebuffing critics, not to mention the outcome when the facility is shut down for any period of time, and again questions the suitability of the site.

I'm sure that transport companies servicing the site, warehouse tenants and their customers would be less than impressed with this prediction. Although a traffic model, completed on behalf of our community, has shown that there are many roads and intersections that will require substantial upgrades, the proponent has only acknowledged only one upgrade being Moorebank Avenue, but not till 2029/2030. This is regardless of the fact they intend to bring upwards to an extra 10,000 truck and 5700 car movements on to the local road network daily and handling a throughput of upwards of 500,000 containers.

One of the main selling points, claimed by the proponents, has been that Moorebank will take thousands of trucks off the Sydney roads each day, which is absolute rubbish as all it will do is relocate the trucks to Moorebank, where they will enter the Sydney road network. The fact is that it will remove trucks in the interim from the M5 between Port Botany and Moorebank, but this will only be a short term reduction. The reason for this is due to the handling capacity of the Port Botany freight line. It has been suggested (government has refused to reveal capacity) that the line has a maximum capacity to handle 1.2 million containers per annum. If we consider that Port Botany currently receives 2 million containers per annum and is predicted to handle in excess of 4 million in future years, how will the additional 2.8 million containers be delivered, simple, on the back of a truck.

Noise: The intermodal site is located in the middle of a number of residential suburbs that are home to many thousands of people. It is a known fact that residents living within a radius of three kilometres of the Port Botany container terminal are currently suffering from sleep disturbance, yet the proponents and government are obviously of the opinion that residents who live within a radius of 400 to 1000 metres of the proposed site will not be impacted by sleep disturbance. The government claims that the warehousing on what is currently SIMTA's site will act as a buffer zone to the suburb of Wattle Grove, but anyone who has been exposed to the level of noise created by this type of operation knows; the warehousing will barely reduce the overall noise level. The people living in the elevated suburb of Casula (400 metres on the Western side of the site) look directly down into the proposed area, with no chance of avoiding the noise level whatsoever. When asked how the proponents would mitigate the noise level, MICL stated that it would be up to the successful company who was appointed to develop the site to address.

Air Quality: It is well known that the Liverpool area is one of the most polluted areas in Sydney. This is qualified in a statement made in the PAC SIMTA determination that has already shown that PM 2.5 levels in the local area are close to or above the advisory criteria, yet MICL state that, quote "Air quality monitoring has demonstrated that the concentration of different airborne pollutants in Liverpool is generally well below guidelines. Conflicting statements????

Regardless of the above, that substantiates the proposed area is already highly polluted, the proponents intend to bring 10,000 + diesel trucks, ancient diesel locomotives and thousands of car movements into the site area daily. It should be noted that the emissions created by diesel types of equipment are carcinogenic and in the same category as asbestos, which is a well-known cause of death.

Alternative site: Although the ideal site is Eastern Creek, with the announcement of the Badgerys Creek airport, it was suggested that the ideal site for the intermodal would be to amalgamate the two projects together at Badgerys. This would eliminate the need to spend many millions of dollars upgrading the eastern area of the Liverpool road network and reduce the truck travel distance by approximately 20 kilometers and increase the rail kilometre component by 20 kilometres, and totally eliminate noise and air quality issues that pertain to Moorebank. This suggestion has been completely dismissed by the Government and the proponents as not possible due to (a) not sufficient time due to the urgency of the predicted increase in import container arrivals, calling for additional handling facilities and (b) no rail line into the Badgerys' site. There have been two changes that suggest that the urgency to build Moorebank no longer exists. Firstly, the Chullora terminal has announced that it has increased its handling capacity from 300,000 to 600,000 and secondly, the predicted annual increase in import containers of 7%, as advised by the proponents, has not been achieved and, in fact, is only in the area of 4%. Where's the hurry? Furthermore, for some time, Anglo Ports have been very keen to operate a container in the Newcastle area which would remove pressure off Port Botany, but the Government continues to ignore the interest. It appears that the lease holders of Port Botany and Port Kembla have a contractual agreement with the NSW Government that involves a container cap restriction on Newcastle which restricts its viability. The Government continually refuses to confirm that the cap exists.

In closing I would like to note that, Government and their various departments need to be reminded that they have a duty of care to ensure that people aren't exposed to health threats, which this type of transport operation is well known to create. Should this development go ahead and impact on my family's health, I will not hesitate to seek legal action. This is the first time I have made this statement in 6 years of involvement, but I'm sick and tired of our community (the people) being ignored by those who are paid to represent us.

Yours Sincerely,

Allan Corben

IP Address: - 120.155.86.90

Submission: Online Submission from Allan Corben (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=118064

Submission for Job: #6766 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility Stage 1

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6766

Site: #3010 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=3010

Allan Corben

E : allancorben@bigpond.com

Andrew Beattie

From: system@affinitylive.com on behalf of Allan Corben <allancorben@bigpond.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 16 June 2015 5:48 PM
To: Andrew Beattie
Subject: Submission Details for Allan Corben (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Allan Corben
Email: allancorben@bigpond.com

Address:
13 Woolmer's Court

13 WOOLMERS COURT, NSW
Sydney

Content:

16th June 2015

Submission on Reference: SSD 14_6766 SIMTA Stage 1, Provided by Allan Corben 13 Woolmer's Court Wattle Grove NSW 2173 Phone: 0451 998 774 Email: allancorben@bigpond.com.

In the minutes of a PAC meeting held on the 30th July 2014, a statement is made under air quality that quote, "PM2.5 concentrations are close to or above the advisory criteria, this applies to the current background levels as well as the predicted impacts. This statement gives great concern that the current level is close to or above the criteria and at full capacity, when this terminal is planned to have an additional 10,000 diesel trucks, 42 ageing diesel locomotives and 5700 cars coming into the site each day.

In my opinion, the additional diesel powered equipment, will increase the PM2.5 level dramatically to well above any acceptable level.

It's a bit late to say, whoop's, the PM levels are too high, once this facility is in full operation.

As such, no further approvals should be given till such time that independent, qualified evidence is provided that shows what the predicted full capacity PM2.5 levels will be.

To ignore this issue, would be a total dereliction of duty.

IP Address: - 120.155.77.40

Submission: Online Submission from Allan Corben (object)

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_activity&id=118197

Submission for Job: #6766 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility Stage 1

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_job&id=6766

Site: #3010 SIMTA Moorebank Intermodal Facility

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com/?action=view_site&id=3010

Allan Corben

E : allancorben@bigpond.com

Andrew Beattie

From: Karen Jones
Sent: Friday, 19 June 2015 11:42 AM
To: Alix Carpenter
Cc: Andrew Beattie
Subject: FW: SIMTA Stage 1 EIS

Hi,

FYI and for appropriate action.

Karen

Karen Jones

Director Infrastructure Projects
Department of Planning and Environment
23-33 Bridge Street | Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39 | Sydney NSW 2001 | T 02 9228 6150 | karen.jones@planning.nsw.gov.au



From: Allan Corben [<mailto:allancorben@bigpond.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, 17 June 2015 4:35 PM
To: Karen Jones
Cc: Andrew McDonald; Brian Last; David Dawer; Erik Rakowski; John Anderson; Lorae Lemond; Narelle Van Den Bos; Paul Van Den Bos; Peter Harle; craig.kelly@nsw.liberal.org.au; Melanie `` Gibbons; alanjones@2gb.com; Ashleigh Milton; Ashley Gillon; Channel 9 News; charles@intermedia.com.au; cllrhadchiti@liverpool.nsw.gov.au; Dara Bonic; Editor The Australian; editor@liverpoolleader.com.au; NSWML Liverpool City Champion; foi@smh.com.au; Greg Cameron; NSWML The Sydney Morning Herald; Jega Kanagan; Jenny Wiggins; Lilian Saleh; mayor@liverpool.nsw.gov.au; News at 0; News at 10; NSWML The Daily Telegraph; pac; Phillip Ly; Rob Stokes; sbocking@2ue.com.au; Will Glasgow
Subject: SIMTA Stage 1 EIS

Hi Karen,

I write in reference to the recent announcement that the SIMTA & the Federal Government have agreed to jointly develop the Moorebank Intermodal.

Firstly and foremost, the **EIS process should commence again from the start**. For the last five years, members of the community have had to contend with the confusion of having to relate to two different proposals, both relating to their own predicted operations. Now that the development will be substantially larger than previously proposed, it will have a much larger impact on the infrastructure, Noise, Air quality and traffic. To put it simply, it's a new ball game.

One of my major concerns is air quality which as you would be aware, has the ability to devastate the local communities health. At the time that PAC approved the SIMTA Concept plan, the number of additional diesel truck movements coming into the site on daily basis was suggested to be in the vicinity of 2600. In mid 2015 we are now talking a figure more like 10,000. When you consider that the PAC determination released in September 2014 clearly stated that the **PM2.5 concentrations are close to or above the**

advisory criteria, would suggest that at full operation, the joint development will substantially exceed the advisory criteria.

As a result of above, no further approvals should be given till such time that **independent, qualified evidence is provided** that shows what the predicted **PM2.5 levels will be when the terminal is in full operation**. It is fine for the proponents to predict levels at various stages of development, as it gives a false impression of the facilities suitability sited in the midst of residential suburbs. I like many others, aren't particularly interested in knowing what the levels are at completion of stage 1 or 2, but what the level will be at the completion of the development when nothing can be done to mitigate this very harmful pollutant.

Secondly, the proponents have made little commitment in regards to the required road and intersection upgrades that will be required to cope with the massive increase in traffic, other than Moorebank Avenue (Site access point) which will not be carried out till 2029/2030. It should be noted, that Moorebank Avenue is the only suitable access to the site. One upgrade is outrageous, when you consider that the facility will be handling up to 500,000 TEU's annually before any upgrades to the already, near capacity road network are completed.

A comparison of the vehicle accidents noted in SIMTA Concept plan 2004 – 2009 (Appendix K_Transport and Traffic Assessment_Volume 1.pdf, page 16) and Stage 1 2009 – 2013 (Appendix L_SIMTA Stage 1_Traffic and Accessibility Impact Assessment.pdf, page 18) clearly shows there has been an increase of 20% in heavy vehicle accidents, which is of great concern. It should be noted that this information is only up to 2009. These people advocate to operate at 500,000 TEU's annually without virtually any roads upgrades, which questions as to what the % of heavy vehicles accidents will increase by during that period.

In a speech on the Intermodal proposal made by NSW MP Ms Melanie Gibbons in the Legislative Assembly on the 4th June, Ms Gibbons made the following statement, quote "I have read through the information provided by the company for the next period of community consultation. It says that, **should there be an accident on the M5 or Moorebank Avenue, the facility will need to close while the accident is being cleared**". I could imagine what the transport companies, warehouse tenants and their customers would think of this strategy. This clearly shows that the surrounding road network cannot handle any additional traffic as it stands.

A quick look at the SIMTA Stage 1 EIS suggest that the noise level created by the facility will be below requirements. This is regardless of the fact that residents living within 3 kilometres for the Port Botany container terminal are currently suffering from sleep disturbance, yet many people in the suburbs surrounding the proposed site live as close as 400 metres of the site in modern homes that were never designed for to deflect excessive noise.

There are many questionable issues pertaining to these developments, but the above require immediate action by your department and subsequently PAC.

Yours Sincerely,

Allan Corben
Member of Liverpool City No Intermodal Committee and
Community group, RAID Residents Against Intermodal Development

