ATTACHMENT A – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL - MOOREBANK PRECINCT WEST CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION 1

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Legislation			
Statutory Planning	The SRtS response notes that the proposed modifications result in “substantially the same development”. This is clearly not the case, with the proposed modifications including the importation of 1,600,000m3 of general clean fill. This is a significant change from the initial Concept Plan that detailed that a balanced cut to fill would be achieved for the site. In addition to this significant change, the associated heavy vehicle movements that are required to be undertaken to import this fill results in a substantial change to the development. The response notes that the development results in an intermodal terminal facility with the same IMT throughput limitations, warehousing GFA, freight village, truck parking and ancillary development as provided within the MPW Concept Plan. However, the scale of the environmental impacts that are associated with the construction and operation of the site are a magnitude different. Section 96 (2) of the EP&A Act is not the appropriate avenue for a change of this scale to the Concept Plan. Instead, a full revision of the MPW Concept Plan should be undertaken, with this conducted in conjunction with the overall master planning of the Moorebank Precinct site. A proper and thorough master planning approach would enable a vigorous and comprehensive assessment of the whole site to be undertaken, providing clarity on the overall cumulative impacts of the entire development on the surrounding area.	The importation of clean general fill as part of the Project is required to achieve the desired stormwater outcomes, meet geotechnical requirements and minimise offsite disposal of contaminated waste materials. The timing for the importation of this clean general fill, within Stage 2 of the MPW Project, more closely aligns with the maximum construction traffic vehicle movements presented within the MPW Concept Approval which is considered the key potential environmental impact posed by this modification. In particular, the Amended Modification Proposal would result in an additional 90 vehicle movements per day over a short duration (in the context of the overall development) which could be adequately managed through controls to be included within the CEMP for the MPW Project (refer to REMM 1B, identified within the MPW Concept Approval). The Amended Modification Proposal would not result in any substantial environmental impacts additional to those identified in the MPW Concept EIS, with these potential impacts being able to be adequately managed through the implementation of the MCoA and the REMMs provided within the MPW Concept Approval and additional mitigation measures identified in Section 8 of the MPW Concept Modification RtS, as amended in Section 6 of the MPW Concept Mod SRtS. Further, the Amended Modification Proposal proposes a development which is ‘substantially the same’ as that provided within the MPW Concept Approval in that it would facilitate for the development of an intermodal terminal facility with the same IMT throughput limitations, warehousing GFA, freight village, truck parking and other ancillary development as provided within the MPW Concept Approval. On this basis, the Amended Modification Proposal is considered substantially the same development and can be considered for approval under s96(2) of the EP&A Act.	MPW Concept Modification RtS Section 6 of the MPW Concept Mod SRtS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic			
Traffic model	As noted in previous submissions, copies of the traffic assessment modelling files are requested to enable full review of the model structure and associated assumptions to confirm adequacy of the traffic modelling work undertaken by the proponent, given the significance of traffic impacts of the proposed development on the local area and network	Section 7.1 of the Mod RtS details the key traffic modelling results. The information provides an appropriate level of detail for the assessment of construction traffic impacts of the Proposal. As such, the modelling files are not required to be issued. Further, the traffic modelling files for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal have been provided to Roads and Maritime for review as part of the response to submissions process.	N/A
Traffic impact assessment	Due to the number of submissions, subsequent modification requests and the large number of different traffic impact assessments associated with the proposed MPE and MPW facilities, it is not possible to assess and evaluate the total impact of traffic generated by the development as a whole. As the proponent has identified, it is not possible to make direct comparisons between the various assessment reports. Following completion of the Precinct Model that incorporates all elements of the proposed MPE and MPW developments, a revised and holistic CTIA and OTTIA should be undertaken to provide clarity and transparency on the total effects of the development.	The MPE Concept Plan Approval (MP 10_0193) (approved on 29 September 2014) included a detailed cumulative traffic impact assessment of the MPE Project and the MPW Project. At the time of the preparation of this cumulative traffic impact assessment an EIS had not been lodged for the MPW Project and, therefore, this impact assessment was based on publicly available information. Notwithstanding this, the traffic assessment was adequate and appropriate to both assess, and mitigate, the impacts of the MPE Project in consideration of the impacts identified for the MPW Project. Conversely, the MPW Concept Approval (SSD 5066) included a detailed cumulative traffic impact assessment of the MPW Project and the MPE Project. The MPW Concept Approval (approved on 3 June 2016) was granted subsequent to the MPE Concept Plan Approval and, therefore, additional information was available for the cumulative assessment of both Projects. In particular, Cumulative Scenario A within the MPW Concept RtS provides an assessment which is generally consistent with the current projects, namely 1.55 million TEU through put per annum for two intermodal terminals and 600,000sqm of warehousing for the precinct. The MPW Concept Approval, like the MPE Concept Plan Approval, included measures to mitigate the MPW Project both in isolation and in consideration of the previously approved MPE Project. As a result of the detailed cumulative assessments, and based on discussions with government agencies, the approach for each stage (i.e. SSD Application) for the development for Moorebank Precinct (both MPE and MPW Projects) has been to provide a detailed cumulative assessment for the stage of development for which approval has been sought and any other stages of development that are known to have the potential to be immediately operational (or under construction) at the	MPE Concept Plan MPW Concept Plan MPE Stage 1 EIS MPE Stage 2 EIS MPW Stage 2 EIS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
		time of opening (commencement of operations) of that project. This approach considers the proposed development and any neighbouring development (Moorebank Precinct or otherwise) that has suitable design and operational details to provide an informed cumulative impact assessment. To be consistent with the established approach, the MPE Stage 1 Project (approval granted on 12 December 2016) provided a cumulative traffic impact assessment for both the MPE Stage 1 Project full operations and MPW Stage 1 (Early Works) during construction. This assessment was consistent with and built on the MPE Concept Plan Approval cumulative traffic impact assessment, based on detailed design that had been undertaken for both projects subsequent to the approval of the Concept Plan/Concept. The MPE Stage 1 Project provided mitigation measures based on the Concept Plan/Concept to addresses and manage traffic impacts. To continue the above-mentioned approach, the MPE Stage 2 Proposal and the MPW Stage 2 Proposal have both provided individual cumulative traffic impact assessments based on further design and understanding of the operations (and construction timeframe) of the Moorebank Precinct. The MPW Stage 2 Proposal was prepared prior to the design or clarification of operational understanding of the MPE Stage 2 Proposal and, therefore, provides an operational cumulative assessment in consideration of the MPE Stage 1 Project at full operations. The MPE Stage 2 Proposal, progresses the cumulative scenario further and provides an operational cumulative assessment in consideration of both the MPE Stage 1 Project (full operations) and the MPW Stage 2 Proposal (full operations). The proposals separately include mitigation measures that consider the impact of the individual projects and other projects likely to operate reflective of the available information at the time of preparation. As a result, both the MPE Stage 2 and MPW Stage 2 Proposals have provided adequate and suitable cumulative traffic impact assessments with associated mitigation measures (including upgrades and road network improvements), which would facilitate the traffic to be generated by these proposals. The cumulative traffic assessments prepared throughout the staged development of both the MPW Stage 2 and MPE Stage 2 SSD applications under the respective Concept Approvals is robust and considered to be appropriate to the stage of assessment. As such,	

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
		further consideration of any Precinct models is therefore not considered necessary.	
	The same should also be undertaken with regards to noise and vibration.	Based on discussions with government agencies, the approach for each stage (i.e. SSD Application) for the development for Moorebank Precinct (both MPE and MPW Projects) has been to provide a detailed cumulative assessment for the stage of development for which approval has been sought and any other stages of development that are known to have the potential to be immediately operational (or under construction) at the time of opening (commencement of operations) of that project. A detailed cumulative noise and vibration impact assessment and associated mitigation measures have been previously provided for the purposes of the MPE and MPW Concept Plan Approvals and periodically for the staged applications, the recommendation is not considered to be appropriate in order to support the progression of the MPW Stage 2 and MPE Stage 2 Proposal.	MPE Concept Plan MPW Concept Plan
Local employment	The proponent has assumed that the MPW staff traffic would be non-local, despite Objective 4 of Commonwealth (2010) objectives for the project in the original MPW Concept Plan EIS being listed as “Attract employment and investment to west and south-western Sydney”. Clarification is sought as to the assumed locations that staff will be travelling from. Furthermore, clarification is also sought on how the proponent intends to achieve project Objective 4 of the original concept plan for MPW with regards to delivering long term employment benefits for the local area.	The distribution of external trips for staff from the Moorebank Precinct was based on the STM. Where reasonable and feasible, SIMTA remains committed to filling employment positions locally. The traffic and transport assessment undertaken considers trips from a broad range of origins and is considered to be appropriate for this type of assessment. Given that there is a reduction in the level of impact to traffic performance the further away trips occur from the Project (due to the increased options for travel routes (including public transport), along with the high number of existing background trips), the key intersections which would be impacted by traffic movements for the Proposal are expected to be the Moorebank Avenue/ M5 interchange and the Moorebank Avenue/ Anzac Road intersection. Changes to the origin of staff trips; whether they be local employees or employees from greater distances is unlikely to alter the outcomes of the traffic impact assessment for the project.	

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures provided in Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS (Revised CTIA) are generic in description, and do not provide Council with a clear view of the actual measures to be employed and their associated efficacy and impact on existing road users. Of particular concern are: • the proposed speed restrictions and traffic management along Moorebank Avenue; • maintaining access to neighbouring properties; and • maintaining pedestrian and cycle routes and crossing points.	As noted in Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would be prepared, prior to construction detailing management controls to be implemented to avoid or minimise impacts to traffic, pedestrian and cyclist access, and the amenity of the surrounding environment, including along Moorebank Avenue. The CTMP would provide detailed management controls to be employed. The CTMP would be approved by the DP&E prior to commencement of construction.	Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS
Pedestrian movements and impacts	Clarification is sought as to whether consideration has been given to the pedestrian traffic volumes between MPW and MPE in the construction and operations traffic impact assessments (CTIA and OTTIA). If this has been considered, can the proponent please outline what pedestrian cross traffic provisions have been modelled.	Given the preliminary nature of the design during assessment of the MPW and MPE concept plans, detailed assessment of potential pedestrian links was not provided. Assessment of pedestrian attractors alongside internal pedestrian links and walkways has been provided in the MPW and MPE Stage 2 assessments. Additionally a number of measures have been include in the SRtS relating to pedestrian traffic, including: • REMM 4D - Consider the provision of pedestrian and cyclist connections from Moorebank Avenue into the Project site during the detailed design, construction and operation of each stage of development. • REMM 4Q - Provision of alternate suitable pedestrian and cycle and facilities during the construction of Moorebank Avenue modifications retaining well defined and well signed routes and paths during construction of the modification to Moorebank Avenue. Impacts to pedestrians during construction and operation of each stage of develop would be further considered as part of the environmental document / approvals for that stage.	Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic signal phasing	While the optimization of signal phase and cycle times to provide optimal intersection performance is desirable, how does the proponent propose to achieve this in practice? If such control/mitigation measures are required to achieve the modelled traffic performance, then they should be included as a mandatory mitigation measure for the project. Alternatively, if this cannot be practically achieved, than standardised traffic signal phase and cycle times should be consistently applied across the models.	The optimisation modelling method utilised as part of the assessment of the Proposal replicates the operation of the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS) which has the ability to adaptively and dynamically adjust the signal phase time and cycle time according to instant traffic flows at intersections. As a result, it optimises traffic operation and performance at the intersection.	N/A
Noise			
Sound power levels for plant and equipment	Whilst Table 3-4 of Appendix E of the MPW Concept Plan Modification NVIA outlines the typical sound power levels for construction plant expected on site during construction, it does not list the assumed quantities of each type of equipment. Further detail on the assumed quantities of equipment on site during construction is required to confirm if due consideration has been given to the quantity of equipment that will be operating on site.	The noise and vibration impact assessment undertaken modelled all plant and equipment operating simultaneously at the site boundary, thereby representing a worst case construction noise assessment. The estimated quantity of each type of plant and equipment would not impact on the total sound power level (SWL) of each construction works period.	N/A
Construction assessment methodology	Clarification is sought regarding the formal process undertaken to assess the proposed construction activities and noise profile of associated equipment against the requirements of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009), that supports the proponents statement that “it is considered unlikely that any particularly annoying noise characteristics would be identified at sensitive receiver locations”.	Modifying factors (such as for particularly annoying sources), as defined in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy, have been considered for the Amended Modification Proposal and deemed unlikely to be applicable at any nearby sensitive receivers. Considering the closest nearby residential receivers are located at a minimum 330m from the MPW site (Casula), 1,000m from the Rail link connection (Wattle Grove) and 290m from the Rail link (Casula),, operational noise levels at residential receivers are considered unlikely to exhibit characteristics that would warrant the application of modifying factors under the INP. Notwithstanding, it is anticipated that the consent for future stages of development of the Concept Approval would include requirements for compliance monitoring of operational noise levels, and that the consideration and application of relevant modifying factors would be a basic requirement of such compliance monitoring.	N/A

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Temperature inversions	As noise enhancing temperature inversions are known to occur on site, and have previously been considered in the assessment of noise from the development, it is reasonable to request that they are also considered in the assessment of the noise associated with the proposed construction activities. This is particularly the case as temperature inversions typically occur during early morning periods when full construction activities are underway.	The construction noise assessment for the Amended Modification Proposal was conducted in accordance with the ICNG. The ICNG provides no guidance on the consideration of meteorological effects. Accordingly, reference is made to the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (INP), which provides guidance on assessing the influence of meteorological effects on noise. The INP does not recommend that temperature inversion effects are considered for the evening (6:00pm – 10:00pm) period. Accordingly, it is considered unlikely that temperature inversions would significantly affect construction noise impacts associated with the Amended Modification Proposal.	MPW Mod 1 SRtS
Construction noise monitoring	Given that Section 3.6 and Table 3-10 of Appendix E, MPW Concept Plan Modification NVIA has also identified that the cumulative construction noise levels exceed the specified limits at the most affected receivers at Casula, noise monitoring, it is requested that the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) include a requirement to monitor noise at these sensitive receivers throughout construction to ensure the efficacy of proposed control and mitigation measures.	Noise and vibration monitoring would be undertaken at nearby noise-sensitive receivers during construction as part of the CNVMP.	N/A

ATTACHMENT A – RESPONSE TO ISSUES RAISED BY LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL - MOOREBANK PRECINCT WEST CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION 1

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Legislation			
Statutory Planning	The SRtS response notes that the proposed modifications result in “substantially the same development”. This is clearly not the case, with the proposed modifications including the importation of 1,600,000m3 of general clean fill. This is a significant change from the initial Concept Plan that detailed that a balanced cut to fill would be achieved for the site. In addition to this significant change, the associated heavy vehicle movements that are required to be undertaken to import this fill results in a substantial change to the development. The response notes that the development results in an intermodal terminal facility with the same IMT throughput limitations, warehousing GFA, freight village, truck parking and ancillary development as provided within the MPW Concept Plan. However, the scale of the environmental impacts that are associated with the construction and operation of the site are a magnitude different. Section 96 (2) of the EP&A Act is not the appropriate avenue for a change of this scale to the Concept Plan. Instead, a full revision of the MPW Concept Plan should be undertaken, with this conducted in conjunction with the overall master planning of the Moorebank Precinct site. A proper and thorough master planning approach would enable a vigorous and comprehensive assessment of the whole site to be undertaken, providing clarity on the overall cumulative impacts of the entire development on the surrounding area.	The importation of clean general fill as part of the Project is required to achieve the desired stormwater outcomes, meet geotechnical requirements and minimise offsite disposal of contaminated waste materials. The timing for the importation of this clean general fill, within Stage 2 of the MPW Project, more closely aligns with the maximum construction traffic vehicle movements presented within the MPW Concept Approval which is considered the key potential environmental impact posed by this modification. In particular, the Amended Modification Proposal would result in an additional 90 vehicle movements per day over a short duration (in the context of the overall development) which could be adequately managed through controls to be included within the CEMP for the MPW Project (refer to REMM 1B, identified within the MPW Concept Approval). The Amended Modification Proposal would not result in any substantial environmental impacts additional to those identified in the MPW Concept EIS, with these potential impacts being able to be adequately managed through the implementation of the MCoA and the REMMs provided within the MPW Concept Approval and additional mitigation measures identified in Section 8 of the MPW Concept Modification RtS, as amended in Section 6 of the MPW Concept Mod SRtS. Further, the Amended Modification Proposal proposes a development which is ‘substantially the same’ as that provided within the MPW Concept Approval in that it would facilitate for the development of an intermodal terminal facility with the same IMT throughput limitations, warehousing GFA, freight village, truck parking and other ancillary development as provided within the MPW Concept Approval. On this basis, the Amended Modification Proposal is considered substantially the same development and can be considered for approval under s96(2) of the EP&A Act.	MPW Concept Modification RtS Section 6 of the MPW Concept Mod SRtS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic			
Traffic model	As noted in previous submissions, copies of the traffic assessment modelling files are requested to enable full review of the model structure and associated assumptions to confirm adequacy of the traffic modelling work undertaken by the proponent, given the significance of traffic impacts of the proposed development on the local area and network	Section 7.1 of the Mod RtS details the key traffic modelling results. The information provides an appropriate level of detail for the assessment of construction traffic impacts of the Proposal. As such, the modelling files are not required to be issued. Further, the traffic modelling files for the MPW Stage 2 Proposal have been provided to Roads and Maritime for review as part of the response to submissions process.	N/A
Traffic impact assessment	Due to the number of submissions, subsequent modification requests and the large number of different traffic impact assessments associated with the proposed MPE and MPW facilities, it is not possible to assess and evaluate the total impact of traffic generated by the development as a whole. As the proponent has identified, it is not possible to make direct comparisons between the various assessment reports. Following completion of the Precinct Model that incorporates all elements of the proposed MPE and MPW developments, a revised and holistic CTIA and OTTIA should be undertaken to provide clarity and transparency on the total effects of the development.	The MPE Concept Plan Approval (MP 10_0193) (approved on 29 September 2014) included a detailed cumulative traffic impact assessment of the MPE Project and the MPW Project. At the time of the preparation of this cumulative traffic impact assessment an EIS had not been lodged for the MPW Project and, therefore, this impact assessment was based on publicly available information. Notwithstanding this, the traffic assessment was adequate and appropriate to both assess, and mitigate, the impacts of the MPE Project in consideration of the impacts identified for the MPW Project. Conversely, the MPW Concept Approval (SSD 5066) included a detailed cumulative traffic impact assessment of the MPW Project and the MPE Project. The MPW Concept Approval (approved on 3 June 2016) was granted subsequent to the MPE Concept Plan Approval and, therefore, additional information was available for the cumulative assessment of both Projects. In particular, Cumulative Scenario A within the MPW Concept RtS provides an assessment which is generally consistent with the current projects, namely 1.55 million TEU through put per annum for two intermodal terminals and 600,000sqm of warehousing for the precinct. The MPW Concept Approval, like the MPE Concept Plan Approval, included measures to mitigate the MPW Project both in isolation and in consideration of the previously approved MPE Project. As a result of the detailed cumulative assessments, and based on discussions with government agencies, the approach for each stage (i.e. SSD Application) for the development for Moorebank Precinct (both MPE and MPW Projects) has been to provide a detailed cumulative assessment for the stage of development for which approval has been sought and any other stages of development that are known to have the potential to be immediately operational (or under construction) at the	MPE Concept Plan MPW Concept Plan MPE Stage 1 EIS MPE Stage 2 EIS MPW Stage 2 EIS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
		time of opening (commencement of operations) of that project. This approach considers the proposed development and any neighbouring development (Moorebank Precinct or otherwise) that has suitable design and operational details to provide an informed cumulative impact assessment. To be consistent with the established approach, the MPE Stage 1 Project (approval granted on 12 December 2016) provided a cumulative traffic impact assessment for both the MPE Stage 1 Project full operations and MPW Stage 1 (Early Works) during construction. This assessment was consistent with and built on the MPE Concept Plan Approval cumulative traffic impact assessment, based on detailed design that had been undertaken for both projects subsequent to the approval of the Concept Plan/Concept. The MPE Stage 1 Project provided mitigation measures based on the Concept Plan/Concept to addresses and manage traffic impacts. To continue the above-mentioned approach, the MPE Stage 2 Proposal and the MPW Stage 2 Proposal have both provided individual cumulative traffic impact assessments based on further design and understanding of the operations (and construction timeframe) of the Moorebank Precinct. The MPW Stage 2 Proposal was prepared prior to the design or clarification of operational understanding of the MPE Stage 2 Proposal and, therefore, provides an operational cumulative assessment in consideration of the MPE Stage 1 Project at full operations. The MPE Stage 2 Proposal, progresses the cumulative scenario further and provides an operational cumulative assessment in consideration of both the MPE Stage 1 Project (full operations) and the MPW Stage 2 Proposal (full operations). The proposals separately include mitigation measures that consider the impact of the individual projects and other projects likely to operate reflective of the available information at the time of preparation. As a result, both the MPE Stage 2 and MPW Stage 2 Proposals have provided adequate and suitable cumulative traffic impact assessments with associated mitigation measures (including upgrades and road network improvements), which would facilitate the traffic to be generated by these proposals. The cumulative traffic assessments prepared throughout the staged development of both the MPW Stage 2 and MPE Stage 2 SSD applications under the respective Concept Approvals is robust and considered to be appropriate to the stage of assessment. As such,	

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
		further consideration of any Precinct models is therefore not considered necessary.	
	The same should also be undertaken with regards to noise and vibration.	Based on discussions with government agencies, the approach for each stage (i.e. SSD Application) for the development for Moorebank Precinct (both MPE and MPW Projects) has been to provide a detailed cumulative assessment for the stage of development for which approval has been sought and any other stages of development that are known to have the potential to be immediately operational (or under construction) at the time of opening (commencement of operations) of that project. A detailed cumulative noise and vibration impact assessment and associated mitigation measures have been previously provided for the purposes of the MPE and MPW Concept Plan Approvals and periodically for the staged applications, the recommendation is not considered to be appropriate in order to support the progression of the MPW Stage 2 and MPE Stage 2 Proposal.	MPE Concept Plan MPW Concept Plan
Local employment	The proponent has assumed that the MPW staff traffic would be non-local, despite Objective 4 of Commonwealth (2010) objectives for the project in the original MPW Concept Plan EIS being listed as “Attract employment and investment to west and south-western Sydney”. Clarification is sought as to the assumed locations that staff will be travelling from. Furthermore, clarification is also sought on how the proponent intends to achieve project Objective 4 of the original concept plan for MPW with regards to delivering long term employment benefits for the local area.	The distribution of external trips for staff from the Moorebank Precinct was based on the STM. Where reasonable and feasible, SIMTA remains committed to filling employment positions locally. The traffic and transport assessment undertaken considers trips from a broad range of origins and is considered to be appropriate for this type of assessment. Given that there is a reduction in the level of impact to traffic performance the further away trips occur from the Project (due to the increased options for travel routes (including public transport), along with the high number of existing background trips), the key intersections which would be impacted by traffic movements for the Proposal are expected to be the Moorebank Avenue/ M5 interchange and the Moorebank Avenue/ Anzac Road intersection. Changes to the origin of staff trips; whether they be local employees or employees from greater distances is unlikely to alter the outcomes of the traffic impact assessment for the project.	

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures provided in Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS (Revised CTIA) are generic in description, and do not provide Council with a clear view of the actual measures to be employed and their associated efficacy and impact on existing road users. Of particular concern are: • the proposed speed restrictions and traffic management along Moorebank Avenue; • maintaining access to neighbouring properties; and • maintaining pedestrian and cycle routes and crossing points.	As noted in Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) would be prepared, prior to construction detailing management controls to be implemented to avoid or minimise impacts to traffic, pedestrian and cyclist access, and the amenity of the surrounding environment, including along Moorebank Avenue. The CTMP would provide detailed management controls to be employed. The CTMP would be approved by the DP&E prior to commencement of construction.	Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS
Pedestrian movements and impacts	Clarification is sought as to whether consideration has been given to the pedestrian traffic volumes between MPW and MPE in the construction and operations traffic impact assessments (CTIA and OTTIA). If this has been considered, can the proponent please outline what pedestrian cross traffic provisions have been modelled.	Given the preliminary nature of the design during assessment of the MPW and MPE concept plans, detailed assessment of potential pedestrian links was not provided. Assessment of pedestrian attractors alongside internal pedestrian links and walkways has been provided in the MPW and MPE Stage 2 assessments. Additionally a number of measures have been include in the SRtS relating to pedestrian traffic, including: • REMM 4D - Consider the provision of pedestrian and cyclist connections from Moorebank Avenue into the Project site during the detailed design, construction and operation of each stage of development. • REMM 4Q - Provision of alternate suitable pedestrian and cycle and facilities during the construction of Moorebank Avenue modifications retaining well defined and well signed routes and paths during construction of the modification to Moorebank Avenue. Impacts to pedestrians during construction and operation of each stage of develop would be further considered as part of the environmental document / approvals for that stage.	Section 7 of Appendix C of the MPW Stage 2 RtS

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Traffic signal phasing	While the optimization of signal phase and cycle times to provide optimal intersection performance is desirable, how does the proponent propose to achieve this in practice? If such control/mitigation measures are required to achieve the modelled traffic performance, then they should be included as a mandatory mitigation measure for the project. Alternatively, if this cannot be practically achieved, than standardised traffic signal phase and cycle times should be consistently applied across the models.	The optimisation modelling method utilised as part of the assessment of the Proposal replicates the operation of the Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS) which has the ability to adaptively and dynamically adjust the signal phase time and cycle time according to instant traffic flows at intersections. As a result, it optimises traffic operation and performance at the intersection.	N/A
Noise			
Sound power levels for plant and equipment	Whilst Table 3-4 of Appendix E of the MPW Concept Plan Modification NVIA outlines the typical sound power levels for construction plant expected on site during construction, it does not list the assumed quantities of each type of equipment. Further detail on the assumed quantities of equipment on site during construction is required to confirm if due consideration has been given to the quantity of equipment that will be operating on site.	The noise and vibration impact assessment undertaken modelled all plant and equipment operating simultaneously at the site boundary, thereby representing a worst case construction noise assessment. The estimated quantity of each type of plant and equipment would not impact on the total sound power level (SWL) of each construction works period.	N/A
Construction assessment methodology	Clarification is sought regarding the formal process undertaken to assess the proposed construction activities and noise profile of associated equipment against the requirements of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009), that supports the proponents statement that “it is considered unlikely that any particularly annoying noise characteristics would be identified at sensitive receiver locations”.	Modifying factors (such as for particularly annoying sources), as defined in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy, have been considered for the Amended Modification Proposal and deemed unlikely to be applicable at any nearby sensitive receivers. Considering the closest nearby residential receivers are located at a minimum 330m from the MPW site (Casula), 1,000m from the Rail link connection (Wattle Grove) and 290m from the Rail link (Casula),, operational noise levels at residential receivers are considered unlikely to exhibit characteristics that would warrant the application of modifying factors under the INP. Notwithstanding, it is anticipated that the consent for future stages of development of the Concept Approval would include requirements for compliance monitoring of operational noise levels, and that the consideration and application of relevant modifying factors would be a basic requirement of such compliance monitoring.	N/A

Aspect	Issue	Response	Reference
Temperature inversions	As noise enhancing temperature inversions are known to occur on site, and have previously been considered in the assessment of noise from the development, it is reasonable to request that they are also considered in the assessment of the noise associated with the proposed construction activities. This is particularly the case as temperature inversions typically occur during early morning periods when full construction activities are underway.	The construction noise assessment for the Amended Modification Proposal was conducted in accordance with the ICNG. The ICNG provides no guidance on the consideration of meteorological effects. Accordingly, reference is made to the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (INP), which provides guidance on assessing the influence of meteorological effects on noise. The INP does not recommend that temperature inversion effects are considered for the evening (6:00pm – 10:00pm) period. Accordingly, it is considered unlikely that temperature inversions would significantly affect construction noise impacts associated with the Amended Modification Proposal.	MPW Mod 1 SRtS
Construction noise monitoring	Given that Section 3.6 and Table 3-10 of Appendix E, MPW Concept Plan Modification NVIA has also identified that the cumulative construction noise levels exceed the specified limits at the most affected receivers at Casula, noise monitoring, it is requested that the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) include a requirement to monitor noise at these sensitive receivers throughout construction to ensure the efficacy of proposed control and mitigation measures.	Noise and vibration monitoring would be undertaken at nearby noise-sensitive receivers during construction as part of the CNVMP.	N/A