

Robert Storey  
4 Anzac Mews  
Wattle Grove 2173  
26<sup>th</sup> May 2020

I am objecting to the Moorebank Intermodal Precinct West- Stage3 for the following reasons:  
Application20200424133928 Lodgement date24/4/2020 application number SSD-10431

I would like to point out some information that is incorrect when the lodgement application was submitted.

### **1. Critical Habitat and Threatened Species**

Is the land, or part of the land, critical habitat: The answer was **No**

The answer should be **YES** I have cited threatened fauna species in the biodiversity area of the Moorebank Intermodal when I was canoeing on the Georges River.

The threatened species that I saw was the Varied Sittella (*Daphoenositta chrysoptera*) and the Little Lorikeet (*Glossopsitta pusilla*). As I had my binoculars in my canoe I could clearly identify the species. Unfortunately I did not have my camera to give photographic evidence.

I have never been on the Intermodal land as the Army have it fenced off so obtaining critical evidence is impossible. I would not expect a developer to be truthful when the correct information could jeopardize the development.

2. Is the development likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitat?

The answer they gave was **NO**

The answer should have been **Yes** I carry out voluntary environmental work on the Georges River at Chauvel Park, Chipping Norton and have extensive experience in identifying Vegetative Communities and the classification that exists in stage 3 is a River Flat Eucalyptus Forest on Coastal Floodplains (RFEF) which is classified as an endangered community.

The dominant canopy species in the area would be Forest Red Gum (*Eucalyptus tereticornis*), Cabbage Gum (*Eucalyptus amplifolia*) and the Apple's (*Angophora floribunda*, and *subvelutina*) with small trees such as the Paperbarks, *Melaleuca stypheliodes* and *Melaleuca linarifolia*.

Understory species including several wattles (eg *Acacia parramattensis* and *Acacia floribunda*), Native Blackthorn (*Bursaria spinose*) and moist loving grasses, sedges, rushes and herbs in the ground layer. You will find that these species dominate the area therefore the classification is a River Flat Eucalyptus Forest on Coastal Floodplains (RFEF)

Opposite Chauvel Park which is about 3 km down the Georges River from the Intermodal site is Coopers Paddock. This land that fronts the Georges River has been classified as a River Flat Forest on Coastal Floodplains (RFEF) by Travers Bushfire and Ecology.

3. The development biodiversity compliant? (Referred to schedule one, part one, clause 1(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation)

The answer they gave was **Yes**

### **Concept plan**

Stage one of the concept plan allowed for 250,000 containers to be delivered by rail movement to and from the site. No trucks were allowed to transport containers from the site to new locations. For this reason the concept plan was approved and not having a masterplan this allowed the developer to then make modifications that would have been objected if they were stated at the original concept plan.

Stage 2 and 3 do not have restrictions on container movement so I would presume that trucks will be moving containers in and out of stage 2 and 3 and therefore the concept plan has been completely changed without a proper traffic study included the additional traffic caused by each modification.

### **Subdivision**

The subdivision of the site was never a part of the concept plan and does not meet the requirements of the Liverpool City Councils. By allowing the developer to subdivide the land would then put the whole complex into individual areas that can be sold off when the project becomes a white elephant. This project was never feasible from the start but as it was cheaper land the project kept marching on.

The 2 detention ponds will not hold the amount of water that comes off the site in heavy rain. Having the detention ponds in the riparian land and in the floodplain area is a poor decision and should not be approved. With the land now being subdivided a filter pond could be constructed at the base of each lot, it would only have to be about 1000 square metres and then could be slowly discharged into the Georges River. This would be a solution that should be fully investigated as it would result in no fill being required to raise the area for drainage.

### **Landfilling (Recycling Plant)**

The concept plan never allowed for 1.6 million cubic metres of fill and now this will allow the developer in Lot 10 to crush and recycle material and then use it as fill to raise a site by 3.5 metres. Why approve 2 stockpiles of material 20,000 cubic metres each when the clean fill is to be used to fill the site. This could give the developer in excess of \$200 million and make the site useless for future generations. There is no logic in raising the site by 3.5 metres except for revenue.

### **Biodiversity Area (Riparian Land) fronting the Georges River**

By raising the site by 3.5 metres will have a huge impact on the Biodiversity area (Lot 11) it will stop the natural water flow down to the Georges River. This may result in the killing of all of the vegetation fronting the Georges River, when this happens who will be responsible for the re-establishment of the plant material. Who will be maintaining the biodiversity land after the subdivision?

### **Landscaping**

With all development projects a landscaping plan must be provided. A landscaping plan is not included in this proposal, does that mean they are exempt from a landscaping proposal?

**Time Line**

This project has been classified as a State Significance Development (SSD) so a timeframe for the completion of the project would have been stated. If no completion date has been stated, then the recycling (crushing concrete) area could be there for the next 20 years making money under the pretence that this is a much needed project. This would be an unsatisfactory solution for such an urgent project.

Sincerely

Robert Storey