

29 September 2014

MAJOR PROJECT APPLICATION – CONCEPT PLAN FOR SIMTA INTERMODAL TERMINAL FACILITY ON MOOREBANK AVENUE, MOOREBANK (MP10_0193)

1. INTRODUCTION

The proponent, Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance (SIMTA), has submitted a Part 3A application for a concept plan approval to develop an intermodal terminal facility with a rail link to the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) at Moorebank, in the Liverpool and Campbelltown Local Government Areas. Being a concept plan, subsequent development applications will need to be made, assessed and determined prior to any commencement of construction or operation of the facility.

The concept plan proposal is for the transport by rail of up to (ultimately) 1,000,000 TEUs or twenty foot equivalent units (containers) between Port Botany and the site. It also proposes a warehousing and road transport distribution facility to allow the delivery of the rail freight to the catchment area in south-west Sydney.

The proposal is a Major Project under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (the Act) because it is *development for the purpose of railway freight facilities or inter-modal terminals* under clause 23 of Schedule 1 of the (now repealed) *State Environmental Planning Policy (Major Development) 2005* (Major Development SEPP). The Director General's Environmental Requirements were issued prior to the repeal of Part 3A in October 2011, meaning the application is a transitional project under Schedule 6A of the Act.

The draft instrument of approval recommended by the Department does not permit the construction or operation of any part of the project until development consent is granted under a further more detailed assessment process carried out in accordance with Part 4 of the Act.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Freight Infrastructure Advisory Board Report 2005

The 2005 Freight Infrastructure Advisory Board (FIAB) recommended a staged development of new intermodal freight capacity within metropolitan Sydney. The report identified a precinct of surplus defence lands on both sides of Moorebank Avenue as a suitable site for a Moorebank Intermodal. The report noted that it *“is ideally placed in the South Western corridor with access to the Southern Sydney Freight Line, the M5 road corridor and Western Sydney through the M7 corridor”*.

The report recommended Moorebank as *“a key component in meeting Sydney's Intermodal needs with a capacity to handle at least 500,000 TEUs per annum of port freight”*.

The SIMTA proposal is within the precinct on land on the eastern side of Moorebank Avenue. There is a second competing proposal on adjacent land within the precinct, on the western side of Moorebank Avenue. This second proposal is on behalf of the Commonwealth Government and is referred to as the MIC proposal. The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Report notes that an environmental assessment of the MIC proposal is likely to be exhibited later this year.

The FIAB recommended a number of conditions that should guide development of the Moorebank terminal including:

- Open access of the facility;
- Proper master planning of the site;
- Timely development of the rail connections;
- Protection of the open space corridor along the Georges River; and
- Maintenance of the buffers between the site and the existing residential areas.

The Commission is disappointed that the recommended master plan for the site was never undertaken, particularly as there are now two competing proposals causing both uncertainty and alarm in the community about the cumulative impacts should both proceed.

The NSW Government's objective is that 28% of port container freight will be taken by rail by 2020. Freight volume is measured in container units. The standard measure is a Twenty – foot Equivalent Unit or TEU. Port throughput is measured by the addition of the number of units leaving Port Botany to the number of units returning to the Port.

According to SIMTA's *Freight Demand Modelling Report* which formed part of its Environmental Assessment, the South West catchment area has an import distribution share from the Port of 15 percent. In 2011/12 Port Botany throughput was some 2 million TEUs. Sydney Ports are forecasting growth of the imports from Port Botany annually at 6.7%.

This means that to meet the Government's objective of 28% of port container freight transported by rail, the throughput of containers at the precinct, transported by rail will be 111,500 in 2016, 143,200 in 2019 and 174,250 in 2022.

2.2 Project Description of the SIMTA and MIC proposals

2.2.1 SIMTA

The concept plan for the SIMTA proposal comprises an intermodal terminal facility, rail corridor including a link to the SSFL, warehouse and distribution facilities, and a freight village to be developed in three stages. The three stages of the development as proposed in the concept plan are:

- Stage 1 – construction of the intermodal terminal facility and rail link;
- Stage 2 – construction of warehouse and distribution facilities; and
- Stage 3 – extension of the intermodal terminal and completion of warehouse and distribution facilities.

The concept plan application does not propose any limits on TEU throughput. However, the Commission notes that the Environmental Assessment Report assumes a limit of one million TEU for the whole precinct when addressing the cumulative impact of the proposal.

The proponent's *Freight Demand Modelling Report* proposes that Stage 1 will provide an initial capacity of 250,000 TEU, that is, 125,000 TEU from Port Botany to the facility and 125,000 TEU returning to the Port. Stage 2 is proposed for completion in 2019 and it will increase the capacity to 750,000 TEU while the final stage is to be completed in 2022 and will increase the capacity to 1 million TEU.

Facilities proposed for the site include rail sidings (up to 1,200m in length); 90,000m² of container hardstand; 300,000m² of warehousing and ancillary offices and an 8,000m² freight village. The freight village is proposed to include support services such as convenience retail, meeting rooms and conference facilities.

2.2.2 MIC

The proposal by the MIC on behalf of the Commonwealth Government is not before the Commission for determination. It is proposed on land adjacent to the SIMTA site (on the western side of Moorebank Avenue) and is for an intermodal terminal with a throughput of 1.2 million TEUs plus capacity for interstate movements of 500,000 TEUs. The proposal also includes 300,000 m² of warehousing, and a rail link from the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) to the site. This proposal is yet to be placed on public exhibition. This information regarding the proposal was provided to the Commission by MIC.

2.2.3 SIMTA Assessment Process

The Environmental Assessment (EA) was publicly exhibited initially from 28 March to 28 May 2012. A total of 74 submissions were made during this exhibition period, including 13 submissions from public authorities and 61 submissions from the general public and special interest groups. The Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) did not consider that the proponent's Preferred Project Report (PPR) adequately addressed the issues that were raised in the submissions. The principle issues of concern requiring further attention included the project description and its delivery; cumulative impacts; road and rail network and related traffic impacts; noise and air quality impacts; hazards and risks; ecological; and flooding impacts.

The then Director General's designation of the concept plan as land with multiple owners on 22 February 2013 necessitated the re-exhibition of an updated EA. The updated EA also provided a response to issues raised during the first exhibition. The EA was re-exhibited from 4 September until 21 October 2013. A total of 44 submissions were made during this exhibition period including 11 submissions from public authorities and 33 submissions from the general public and special interest groups including a petition with 1,299 signatures.

3. DELEGATION TO THE COMMISSION

On 12 June 2014, the concept plan was referred to the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) for determination under Ministerial delegation dated 14 September 2011, as more than 25 objections were received and both Liverpool City Council and Campbelltown City Council object to the proposal.

Ms Gabrielle Kibble AO nominated Mr Garry West (chair), Mr David Johnson and Ms Donna Campbell to constitute the Commission to determine the project.

4. ASSESSMENT REPORT

The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) prepared by the Department has identified the following key issues with the application:

- Traffic;
- Air quality;
- Noise and vibration; and
- Historic heritage.

The Assessment report concluded that on balance, the proposal's benefits outweigh its potential impacts and is therefore in the public interest. The Concept Plan is recommended for approval subject to the recommended conditions and future assessment requirements.

5. MEETINGS AND SITE INSPECTION

Notes of all the meetings referred to below are included in Appendix 2

5.1 Site visit

On 30 July 2014, the Commission inspected the site and the surrounding area.

5.2 Meetings with the proponent

The Commission met with the proponent on 30 July 2014 for a briefing on the project. The proponent explained that the Department's report was generally acceptable, subject to a number of minor clarifications/comments regarding traffic, noise and vibration and historic heritage.

Subsequent meetings were held with the Proponent on 18 August 2014 and 2 September 2014. These meetings were to discuss the key issues raised at the public meeting and to discuss the cumulative impacts as a result of the competing MIC proposal.

A further meeting was held on the 8 September 2014 with both SIMTA and MIC together. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss whether the planning process for the two proposals could be combined, particularly given the absence of a single precinct master plan and agreement that both proposals could not proceed on the scale proposed. The Commission expressed its strong concern that to proceed separately would cause great uncertainty and alarm in the community.

The two parties advised the Commission that although they were currently in negotiations endeavouring to agree on a single proposal for the precinct, this would take time and there was no guarantee that agreement would be reached. Accordingly, they indicated that they would continue with the planning process separately.

5.3 Meeting with Liverpool City Council

On 31 July 2014, the Commission met with Liverpool City Council to discuss issues raised in its submission to the EA and the proposal in general. The key concerns raised by the Council at the meeting were:

- The consideration of traffic impacts is insufficient, and the traffic volumes are not supported by robust data;
- Air quality has not been adequately addressed in the concept plan, and Council have little confidence that these impacts can be mitigated as no health impact assessment has been carried out yet;
- Noise impacts to residents, particularly at night and from the rail link;
- The Department's proposed conditions in relation to traffic are uncertain and lack standards that future developments must meet;
- The heritage of the site and the connection that Liverpool has to the military; and
- Concerns that the intermodal will be not be a scheduled premise and therefore it will not require an environment protection licence.
- Provision for appropriate section 94 contributions to Council.

The Commission invited the Council to submit alternative concept plan conditions for consideration should approval be granted. Council did so in a letter dated 19 August 2014 outlining its concerns in more detail.

In particular, the Council expressed disappointment that a more co-ordinated approach to assessing the impact of the two intermodal proposals has not been undertaken. *"The ad hoc approach leaves gaps and inconsistencies in the information available resulting in a lack of transparency and reduced faith in government decision making"*.

The Council suggested that the highest and best use of the site is in fact a residential and mixed use precinct.

5.4 Meeting with Campbelltown City Council

The Commission met with Campbelltown City Council on 31 July 2014, to discuss issues raised in its submission to the EA and the proposal in general. The key concerns raised by the Council at the meeting were:

- That the rail connection is not a certainty, containers could be coming in by road rather than rail to begin with;
- SIMTA has not proposed any upgrade works on roads south of the intermodal facility; and
- Cambridge Avenue, the only road to the south of the intermodal facility, is expected by the proponent to take approximately 5% of traffic generated by SIMTA, including employee vehicles and rigid trucks. This figure may be too low and is not supported by any evidence. Even if it is correct Cambridge Avenue:
 - Has a narrow causeway that is load limited;
 - Leads straight into residential areas, so there will be noise and other impacts from heavy vehicles travelling along residential streets, which have not been addressed in the EA; and
 - Is controlled by the Commonwealth Government, who own part of the land.

5.5 Meeting with Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services

The Commission met with Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services on 18 August 2014 to seek further clarification of the proposed rail link from the SSFL. The Commission also sought clarification on the impact and timing of SIMTA's proposed road network upgrades.

5.6 Meetings with the Department of Planning and Environment

The Commission met with the Department on 30 July 2014, for a briefing on the project and the Department's assessment of the project. The Department confirmed that the SIMTA proposal had considered the cumulative impacts of the MIC proposal in their assessment of air quality.

5.7 Meetings with MIC

A series of meetings were held with the MIC, on the 14 August 2014 and 1 September 2014, to allow the Commission to gain an understanding of their proposal and the impacts of the development.

The Commission also met with MIC on the 8 September 2014 in the joint meeting held with SIMTA.

5.8 Public Meeting

A public meeting was held on 31 July 2014 at the Wattle Grove Community Centre, to hear the views of the public. A total of 27 speakers verbally presented their concerns and objections to the Commission. A list of speakers is presented in Appendix 1. All those seeking to be heard were heard. In addition a total of nine written comments were received. All who presented and provided the Commission with comments, were opposed to the development.

The key issues raised during the public meeting, are summarised below and included:

- Traffic and access
 - The proposal will move the congestion from Port Botany to Moorebank, which is already congested;
 - Modelling does not include the predicted growth of the region;
 - The intersections and road network are already congested, how is it possible for the proposal to decrease traffic delays?

- Trucks ‘weaving’ onto and off the M5 between the Moorebank and Hume Highway interchanges, this is going to cause accidents;
 - Trucks parking and taking short-cuts through the nearby streets;
- Noise
 - There is no noise wall along the rail corridor along the Georges River, so noise will carry particularly at night;
 - Noise from the unloading/loading and movement of containers within the terminal;
 - Wheel squeal from the trains exiting the SSFL, tight radius curves lead to wheel squeal;
- Air quality
 - Increased diesel fumes in the community generated from locomotives, heavy vehicles and other heavy equipment used on site;
 - Health impacts from the increased diesel fumes;
 - South-west Sydney is already heavily polluted due to the topography;
 - Dust and odour, particularly during construction;
- Two intermodal proposals (SIMTA and MIC)
 - There is an ad hoc approach to the two proposals;
 - Cumulative impacts of the two proposals have not been adequately addressed;
 - Confusion as to the total traffic generated from the two proposals, as the modelling for each is different;
- Heritage
 - Removal of heritage features from the site;
- Employment
 - A business park development would employ more people per hectare than an intermodal facility;
- Location
 - Site is surrounded by residential development; and
 - Other sites are preferable, i.e. Eastern Creek which does not have residential development nearby.

6. COMMISSION’S CONSIDERATION

The Commission has reviewed the EA and the Department’s assessment report and considered the submissions from Liverpool Council, Campbelltown Council, other government agencies and the general public. Consideration has also been given to the issues that were raised during the public meeting held on 31 July 2014 and subsequent comments forwarded by community members.

6.1 Project Need and Justification

The Commission accepts that the land associated with both sites at Moorebank has been clearly identified by Government as a critical element in its rail freight network requirements, particularly in relieving the road congestion associated with the Port Botany Terminal.

Transport for NSW (TfNSW) provided advice that the precinct would be able to accommodate up to 1.2 million TEUs of port freight per annum plus 500,000 TEUs for interstate distribution based on internal Bureau of Freight Statistics and rail operations modelling.

The Commission notes this advice from TfNSW is based on freight statistics and rail capacity and does not take account of environmental constraints that must be considered in the planning assessment process.

To meet the Government's goal of a 28% rail share from Port Botany to the south-west catchment by 2020, the precinct will require capacity to handle a throughput of 152,000 TEU per annum. Stage 1 of the SIMTA's proposal at 250,000 TEU per annum will more than achieve this.

The community has strongly argued that the proposal is only going to move the congestion from Port Botany to the Liverpool/Campbelltown region. The Commission understands the Moorebank site is constrained by the surrounding residential and industrial land uses and the already heavily congested local and regional road network. If the concept plan were to be approved with the levels of throughput proposed by both SIMTA and MIC, then clearly the community's case is strengthened.

6.2 Meaning of TEU capacity

The Commission has identified that there may be a misunderstanding by some in the community in the interpretation of the TEU capacity and throughput. To put it simply a 1 million TEU capacity would involve 500,000 TEUs inbound from Port Botany and 500,000 TEU outbound from the intermodal to Port Botany, all of which is proposed to go via rail.

6.3 Two proposals

As noted above, the Commission regrets that the FIAB's recommendation for a master plan for the precinct was not implemented. There are now two proposals for the precinct despite agreement by the proponents that both cannot proceed on the scale proposed. This is causing both uncertainty and alarm in the community, particularly regarding the cumulative impacts should both proceed.

As noted above, the Commission met with the two proponents to explore whether the planning process for the two proposals could be combined. The parties advised that they were in negotiations to achieve this result but with no guarantee agreement could be reached. The Commission notes that it is the right of each party to submit a separate application and it cannot force them to combine their applications.

Cumulative impacts of the two proposals are a major and relevant concern for the Commission and it has considered these in its determination noting that SIMTA's EA assumes a TEU limit of 1 million for the whole precinct.

The Department in its Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) considers it unlikely that both sites will be developed as proposed as the throughput is constrained by such factors as market forces, the catchment and the capacity of the SSFL bringing the freight from Port Botany

The Commission's assessment of the key issues is provided in the following sections.

6.4 Rail Access

The SIMTA proposal involves a rail corridor to the south utilising the East Hills Passenger Rail Corridor, crossing the Georges River and running in a north westerly direction generally along the boundary of the Glenfield Waste Disposal Centre linking to the SSFL.

The rail corridor was subject to agency, council and community submissions and was considered by the Department in its EAR. The Commission accepts that the Proponent will be required to consult with TfNSW on the detailed design of the proposed sharing of the existing rail corridor and the EPA in regard to the issues of contamination and air quality in regard to the Glenfield Waste Disposal Centre.

Several public submissions raised concern that further Georges River crossings were being considered by the MIC proposal. The Commission has noted elsewhere in this report that the MIC

proposal is not before the Commission. However, as a matter of principle the Commission believes that there should only be one rail corridor accessing the site in the event both proposals proceed. The Commission understands that while MIC is proposing to use the same rail corridor as SIMTA, it is also proposing two other rail corridor options. The Commission considers the other options would generate significant noise impacts on residents west of the Georges River.

6.5 Traffic - overview

Traffic was the largest issue raised in the submissions and at the public meeting, with 29% of the public submissions together with Bankstown, Campbelltown and Liverpool City Councils all raising concerns over traffic congestion.

The total traffic generation for the SIMTA proposal when at full capacity is projected to be approximately 6,250 vehicle movements (both directions) per day on an average weekday (consisting of 2,638 trucks and 3,613 cars).

The Department engaged an independent reviewer (Aurecon Australia Pty Ltd) to review the proponent's traffic assessment in the EA.

The EA adopted a three- tiered approach –

- “Core” area – 5 key intersections
- “Inner” area – 8 additional intersections
- “Wider” area – Sydney Metropolitan area

The core and inner areas were modelled using parametrics models and strategic modelling was used for the wider area.

Modelling was undertaken for existing traffic conditions without any intermodal facility in the precinct. Modelling was also undertaken for the 2031 scenario with the intermodal operating at the full capacity of 1 million TEU per annum.

Following this modelling and as a result of discussions with TfNSW, the proponent's Statement of Commitments proposes a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) providing road upgrades in stages, as the capacity of the facility increases.

In broad terms, the independent reviewer concluded that the proposal at full capacity of 1 million TEU per annum would have a significant impact on the core area but would not have direct significant impacts on the already congested intersections outside the core area. While the intermodal would contribute a 2% increase in traffic in key intersections outside the core area, the congestion problem would primarily be caused by background traffic and non-project associated growth.

The reviewer noted that the provision of necessary infrastructure would be critical, including upgrades to Moorebank Ave and of key intersections. This view was also strongly put by Liverpool Council.

The Commission asked the proponent if there was any further information about traffic conditions at the proposed stages 1 and 2 leading up to full capacity, assuming provision of road or traffic upgrades for that stage as proposed in the VPA. The Commission was referred to information in the EA concerning the staging of upgrades but the proponent was not able to provide information about the projected traffic conditions at each stage in the growth of capacity.

The proponent advised that a number of road upgrades continue to be the subject of negotiation with TfNSW. The Commission acknowledges that the SIMTA proposal is only at the concept plan stage and more detailed traffic modelling is appropriate at each development application stage. This detailed modelling will determine the mitigation measures that are required to ensure that the capacity of the transport network is not exceeded.

Another key issue the Commission has considered is whether the EA and the recommended conditions adequately address the potential traffic impacts on Cambridge Avenue. This is a major concern of Campbelltown Council and the community. The independent reviewer noted that there is no supporting evidence or justification as to why Cambridge Avenue was not included in the traffic distribution assessment in the EA. The Commission considers that a detailed assessment of this issue is required before any project approval is given for the facility.

6.5.1 Core area

Five key intersections were identified by the proponent's modelling, these are:

- Moorebank Avenue/Anzac Road;
- Moorebank Avenue/M5 Motorway;
- Moorebank Avenue/Heathcote Road;
- M5 Motorway/Hume Highway; and
- Moorebank Avenue/Newbridge Road.

The Hyder Report clearly indicates that some movements at these intersections *“are operating at close to or at capacity level with low LoS between D and F. Regular overflow queues are observed on Moorebank Ave (north of the M5) and Newbridge Road”*.

The Peer Review (Aurecon) also notes *“The proposed access route to SIMTA site via M5 is expected to exceed capacity as early as 2016, and capacity will be exceeded at key intersections that provided access to the precinct, which was identified in the Long Term Transport Master Plan (2012).”*

The community submissions observed that at LoS F, even small increases in additional traffic flow will result in disproportionately larger delays.

Modelling of traffic conditions in the core area for 2031 with the intermodal facility at full capacity indicates that the traffic generated by SIMTA will *have “significant impacts on the adjacent intersections along Moorebank Avenue”*. The proponent argues that the proposed VPA with staged provision of road infrastructure will address these impacts.

However, Campbelltown City Council has noted that there is a need for all essential on and off-site infrastructure upgrades to be provided prior to the commencement of any operation of the SIMTA site. The independent reviewer agrees with Council and recommends that consultation on the proposed timeframe should be the subject of consultations with TfNSW and Council.

6.5.2 Cambridge Avenue

The independent reviewer has observed that Cambridge Avenue (to the south of the SIMTA site) could be an alternative road freight traffic route due to the adverse delays and congestion at the M5 Motorway and Moorebank Avenue. As noted above, this is a major concern of Campbelltown Council and the community. The reviewer recommended that either:

- Additional supporting evidence in relation to the adopted distribution is provided to justify why Cambridge Avenue will not be materially impacted by the development; and/or
- An analysis of Cambridge Avenue is undertaken.

The Commission notes that the Department's EAR does not address the issue of Cambridge Avenue with the only requirement in the draft conditions being the *"monitoring of vehicle numbers on Cambridge Avenue."* Campbelltown City Council has consistently drawn attention to the modelling that channels all heavy vehicle traffic to the north along Moorebank Avenue without addressing Cambridge Avenue impacts. The Council advised the Commission that the proponent has responded to their recent comments with the following: *"The likely traffic increase from SIMTA towards the south (via Cambridge Avenue) is considered to be low, with only 5% of employee vehicles (180 vehicle movements per day, distributed throughout the day) and 5% of rigid rucks (52 movements per day) using the route, with no B-double/container trucks using it. The Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment has not identified the need for a new link between the Hume Highway and Moorebank Avenue (via Cambridge Avenue)."*

Campbelltown City Council has noted TfNSW advice of the potential closure of Cambridge Avenue. As Council submits *"such a closure would, of course, lead to broader concerns in the local area relating to traffic flows and planning in general."* Council's submission continues *"Sole reliance on the Moorebank Avenue route ignores the need for alternative traffic routes in the event of failure of the (primary) Moorebank Avenue access to the north, in which case the only road alternative into and out of the terminal would be via Cambridge Avenue. Alternatively, terminal operation would need to halt for the period of road route disruption which would not seem feasible given likely continued input of containers from Port Botany."*

The Commission shares Council's concerns and has concluded that more detailed impact assessment of Cambridge Avenue is required.

6.6 Air quality

Air quality was a key issue, particularly within the local community; and was raised in 13% of public submissions. The key concerns regarding air quality included:

- Airborne dust during construction;
- Release of diesel fumes from locomotives, heavy vehicles and other equipment used on site;
- Poor existing air quality of western Sydney.

The Commission acknowledges air quality impacts during construction would be managed under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* through a Construction Environment Management Plan as required under the recommended conditions submitted by the Department. No detailed assessment can be undertaken through the Concept Plan but will need to be undertaken in future Development Applications.

The Commission accepts the proposed consultative role between the EPA and the Proponent as being an appropriate approach in future development applications where impacts to the Glenfield Waste Facility are considered.

The contribution to air quality impacts by diesel powered locomotives entering and departing the site was a major issue to the local community together with locomotive idling and diesel powered equipment used on site in the activities associated with the operations of the intermodal.

The Commission notes the Best Practice condition submitted by the Department as a means of introducing modern locomotive technology together with the proponent's undertaking for other on-site equipment to utilise hybrid technology, electric gantry systems and LPG forklifts as a positive step in managing key sources of emissions.

However, this condition does not account for the increased volume of diesel powered heavy vehicles engaged in the distribution of the containers moving both off-site and back on-site. The emissions associated with this activity will require detailed assessment at future development application stages.

The Commission has considered the assessment of the 'worst case' air quality impacts for residents in the neighbouring suburbs, particularly resulting from the heavy vehicle traffic along Moorebank Avenue which demonstrates compliance with air quality criteria. At a concept plan level, this assessment demonstrates a general ability of the proposal to meet air quality standards notwithstanding the existing elevated background levels.

6.7 Noise

The other key issue identified by the Department was noise. Noise was represented in 9% of all public submissions, and was included in the submissions by the EPA, Bankstown, Campbelltown and Liverpool City Councils.

The Commission considers the assessment of noise at the concept plan level should include:

- A broad identification of the potential noise impacts;
- The performance standards (i.e. noise criteria) that will apply to those impacts; and
- A broad assessment of whether compliance is achievable with mitigation measures.

The Commission regards it appropriate for the more detailed work and assessment to be undertaken at the project application stage.

The potential noise impacts will be generated from the construction works, which will largely be undertaken during Stage 1, and then from the operation of the intermodal terminal. Noise sources during the construction stage will likely arise from construction of the rail link from the SSFL into the site. Noise sources during the operation of the intermodal terminal will include rail movements; truck movements; and use of equipment for moving containers on-site.

The noise assessment undertaken by Wilkinson Murray was based on the assumption of a combined intermodal with a throughput of one million TEUs per annum, and on the assumption that it would be shared equally between the two proposals, SIMTA and MIC. The Wilkinson Murray report assessed the following on-site noise sources:

- Operational noise;
- Road traffic noise;
- Rail traffic noise (on-site and the new connection to the site); and
- Construction noise.

The predicted levels of all of the above noise sources were found to be within established criteria at the nearby receivers.

Wilkinson Murray conclude that at full capacity, operations (ie one million TEUs per annum) with the appropriate mitigation measures applied, the predicted noise levels at nearby receivers (identified as the residential areas surrounding the combined sites) comply with the INP amenity criteria. Mitigation measures include the construction of a noise barrier along the western site boundary, to reduce operational noise within the affected residential area by approximately 4dBA.

The Department's EAR notes that modelling of road and rail generated noise during the concurrent operations of the two sites was not conducted because this is a concept plan. Detailed cumulative assessment would be done for subsequent development applications. The Wilkinson Murray report

contains a series of recommendations for further detailed assessments to be undertaken at each development application stage. These recommendations are reflected in the proponent's Statement of Commitments.

The Department's recommended conditions require the proponent to include in their future project applications:

- Assessment of construction generated noise, vibration and traffic;
- Assessment of operational noise and vibration;
- Practical measures to minimise operational noise from the intermodal facility and rail link; and
- Noise Management and Monitoring Plan.

Future project applications must be prepared in accordance with the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (EPA 2000), Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009), Assessing Vibration: a technical guide (DEC 2006), the Rail Infrastructure Noise Guideline (EPA 2013, Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads Interim Guideline (DoP 2008) and the NSW Road Noise Policy 2011.

All site dedicated locomotives must meet EPA limits.

The Commission is satisfied that noise issues have been satisfactorily addressed.

6.8 Heritage

In terms of Non-Indigenous heritage, the SIMTA site contains 20 World War II era timber post and beam buildings. These buildings provide examples of construction techniques used during that period, particularly for military purposes. The buildings include a Quartermaster's Store and a Carpentry Workshop. These buildings are currently listed on the *Commonwealth Heritage List* and are protected by the EPBC Act. However, once the Department of Defence relocate from the site, the site will lose its statutory heritage protection.

The Commission understands that the external walls of these buildings have been replaced to remove the original asbestos cladding. The Commission also notes that the internal spaces of these buildings are not ideal/suitable for modern equipment used in warehousing, and that the structures would not meet the current fire safety requirements. While the heritage significance of the site is acknowledged, most existing buildings are unlikely to be suitable for adaptive re-use in a modern warehousing facility, and therefore the proposal will impact on the non-indigenous heritage values of the site. However a range of mitigation measures proposed in proponent's revised Statement of Commitments, and the recommended conditions requiring mitigation and management measures including but not limited to, adaptive re-use of buildings, are to be considered at the detailed design stages of the proposal. The Commission accepts that this issue will be further addressed at future development application stage permitting further council and community submissions.

With regard to Aboriginal Heritage, the subject site is not considered to have significant Aboriginal cultural heritage value, primarily as a result of its largely disturbed status. Aboriginal artefacts within the subject site were found to be limited to minor occurrences near the southern boundary. The Commission agrees with the Department's Assessment and considers that the proposed need for further impact assessment and adoption of appropriate mitigation measures during subsequent development applications, in accordance with the proponent's Statement of Commitments, to be adequate.

6.9 Employment

The other issue raised by the community during the public meeting was that of employment. The south-west region of Sydney is growing rapidly, and employment opportunities are required in the region. It was argued that a business park development on the site would employ more people, and more highly skilled people, than the proposed intermodal facility.

The Commission notes that under current strategic planning, the State Government has identified the site/precinct as being suitable for an intermodal facility, and it is not for the Commission to change the strategic planning of the area.

7. COMMISSION'S FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

As noted at the beginning of this report, the Commission is disappointed that the recommended master plan for the precinct was never undertaken, particularly as there are now two competing proposals causing both uncertainty and alarm in the community about the cumulative impacts should both proceed.

In relation to the question of cumulative impacts, the Commission notes that the environmental assessment for this proposal was undertaken on the assumption of 1 million TEU per annum for the whole precinct. The Commission considers the MIC proposal will have to be assessed taking into account the Commission's determination of the SIMTA proposal.

Having regard to the question of Sydney's need for a Moorebank intermodal for Port Botany freight, the Commission finds that it is a key component of the Government's rail freight strategy. However, as a general principle, the Commission has concluded that any intermodal approved for the precinct must not exceed the capacity of the transport network. To ensure this, the Commission considers that it is appropriate to impose a TEU throughput annual limit.

The proponent has advised that its Stage 1 development application will seek approval for up to 250,000 TEU per annum. This will more than achieve the government's objectives for Port freight rail capacity by 2020.

The EA identifies a range of mitigation measures to avoid adverse traffic impacts. Whilst the Commission has no basis on which to endorse the staging of these mitigation measures as proposed in the Statement of Commitments, the need for such measures can be assessed at each development application stage and should be brought forward as conditions of development consent if required for the Intermodal to remain within the capacity of the transport network.

Given the uncertainty about assessing traffic impacts and proposed mitigation measures based on assessments to meet capacity needs far into the future (2031), the Commission considers that concept approval should not be granted for 1 million TEU per annum.

If the proponent undertakes monitoring and modelling of the operation of Stage 1 and can demonstrate that an increase in the volume of freight will not exceed the capacity of the transport network (with or without further mitigation measures), then the Commission considers that subsequent development applications for further increases could be considered up to a total upper limit throughput of 500,000 TEU per annum.


This 500,000 TEU limit should enable the precinct to meet the Government's objectives for rail freight from Port Botany well into the future, providing traffic impacts can be managed.

Accordingly the Commission has determined to approve the concept plan but with modifications and subject to further assessment requirements. The Commission’s findings can be summarised as follows:

- As a general principle, each development stage of the proposal must not exceed the capacity of the transport network ;
- The stage 1 project application should be limited to 250,000 TEU throughput per annum given the uncertainty in assessing traffic impacts and proposed mitigation measures based on assessments far into the future (2031) (1.7 of Schedule 2 of Approval);
- If monitoring and modelling of the operation of Stage 1 can demonstrate that an increase in the volume of freight will not exceed the capacity of the transport network with or without further mitigation measures, then subsequent development applications for further increases could be considered up to a total upper limit throughput of 500,000TEU per annum (1.8 of Schedule 2 of Approval);
- A more detailed impact assessment of Cambridge Avenue is required, not just monitoring of vehicle numbers, and measures should be identified to prevent heavy vehicles accessing residential streets (Schedule 3 of Approval – Traffic and Transport);
- The use of warehousing and distribution facilities on the site must be limited to activities associated with freight using the rail intermodal. This is in response to Campbelltown Council’s concern that the site might also be used for general warehousing thereby generating more traffic (1.12 of Schedule 2 of Approval);
- A Construction Environment Management Plan will need to be undertaken in future Development Applications;
- The rail corridor to the south and south-west of the site generally along the boundary of the Glenfield Waste Disposal Centre linking to the SSFL is acceptable and should be the only rail access to the precinct regardless of whether another proposal proceeds;
- Air quality impacts particularly with regard to the increased volume of diesel powered heavy vehicles engaged in the distribution of the containers moving both off-site and back on-site will require detailed assessment at future development application stages;
- More detailed assessment of both construction and operational noise impacts is required to be undertaken at the development application stages together with appropriate mitigation measures necessary in regard to the neighbouring residential areas; and
- Mitigation measures should be considered for heritage impacts, without being limited to, adaptive re-use of buildings or building elements on site.

The Concept Plan is approved:

- 1) With modifications limiting the throughput of freight as outlined above; and
- 2) Subject to the recommended conditions as amended by the Commission.



Mr Garry West
Commission Chair



Mr David Johnson
Commission Member



Ms Donna Campbell
Commission Member

Appendix 1 List of Speakers

Planning Assessment Commission Meeting

SIMTA Intermodal Concept Plan, Moorebank

Date & Time: Thursday 31 July 2014, 4 pm

Place: Wattle Grove Community Centre, 8 Village Way, Wattle Grove

1. Mayor Ned Mannoun – Liverpool City Council
2. Jeff Lawrence and Ian Reynolds – Campbelltown Council
3. Melanie Gibbons MP – Member for Menai
4. Craig Kelly MP – Member for Hughes
5. Richelle Herron
6. Diane Carroll
7. Allan Corben
8. Michael Byrne – East Liverpool Progress Association
9. Mohan Vijay
10. Angela Machado
11. Mirella Riga
12. Roy Carter
13. Michael Russell
14. Lorrae Lemond
15. Erik Rakowski
16. Cherie Saxby
17. Reinard van Lieshout
18. Kernin Lambert
19. Jeff Thornton
20. Dora Bonic for Alice Lomas (who had to leave)
21. John Anderson – No Intermodal Committee
22. David Mawer
23. Robin Appleton
24. Damien Smith
25. Paul Van Den Bos
26. Narelle Van Den Bos
27. Brian Last

Appendix 2 Notes of Meetings

Notes of Meeting – Proponent

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Wednesday, 30 July 2014	Time: 1:30pm
Project: SIMTA Intermodal Terminal – Briefing from Proponent		
Meeting place: DNSDC – Adjacent to the site of the intermodal facility		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Michael Yiend (Development Manager SIMTA), Steve Ryan (Project Manager Tactical Group), Shannon Blackmore (Environment & Planning Hyder Consulting), Mukit Rahman (Road Transport & Traffic Hyder Consulting), Nic Hall (Wilkinson Murray) and Sean Kellaghan (Pacific Environment)</p>		
The purpose of the meeting is have a briefing and site inspection with the Proponent		
<p>The discussion was around the following key points.</p> <p><u>Transport and traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of trigger points within the VPA for Stage 1 consent and for road and intersection upgrades • Stage 1 – up to 250,000 – 350,000 TEU throughput per annum, the rail line associated connections will be constructed along with the intermodal terminal • Stage 2 – up to 800,000 TEU throughput per annum, the construction of warehouses will commence (some of the existing warehouses will be used in the initial stages of the project), upgrade of Moorebank Ave (traffic lights and widening in both directions) • Stage 3 – up to 1 million TEU throughput, the construction of more warehouses will commence along with the upgrade of Moorebank Ave/M5 intersection • The Moorebank Ave/M5 is a grade separated interchange, which currently has spare capacity, has a trigger point for an upgrade, though it does not immediately need to be upgraded • Hume Hwy already has congestion issues, it is not just the intersections that have congestion issues • Newbridge Rd/Heathcote Rd/ Moorebank Ave intersection also has traffic issues – the proposal is to improve the intersection level of service to increase the efficient movement of trucks through this intersection from the SIMTA site • The Proponent would prefer to have Moorebank Ave; Moorebank Ave/M5 interchange; Newbridge Rd/Heathcote Rd/Moorebank Ave intersection upgrades as triggers set out in the VPA and other intersection upgrades be based on data for the intersections, including the level of background growth associated with the intersection, and SIMTA’s proportion of impact on the intersection • Supplementary traffic report undertaken by Hyder was completed to respond to the questions raised by Aurecon <p><u>Air quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proponent will have details of the air quality impacts for the future development application stage • The largest impact to air quality is the M5. Regionally there will be an increase in air quality, with less trucks on the road, but locally there will be a small decrease in air quality (within the error zones of most air quality monitoring instruments) 		

- Key pollutant for this development is fine particulate matter, it can travel long distances, so regionally there will be an impact from the development

Light spill

- This will be covered in the visual impact assessment report

Other issues

- Currently around 30% of trucks are returning to Port Botany empty, with the intermodal, empty TEUs can be returned to Port Botany via the SSFL

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL

Meeting closed at 2:45pm

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Monday, 18 August 2014	Time: 1:00pm
Project: SIMTA Intermodal Terminal - Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Michael Yiend – Development Manager SIMTA</p> <p>Steve Ryan – Project Manager Tactical Group</p> <p>Karen Jones – Department of Planning & Environment (observer only)</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is discuss some of the key issues raised at the public meeting and to seek clarification on these issues</p>		
<p>The discussion was around the key issues raised at the public meeting and in the information provided to the PAC. A summary is provided below.</p> <p><u>TEU numbers</u></p> <p>There is confusion about the cumulative impacts of the two intermodal proposals, and just how many TEUs will be at the two intermodals. The catchment capacity is a total of 1-1.2 million TEUs across the two proposals, and not for each proposal. Each proponent is applying for the maximum capacity. It was also discussed that the 1-1.2 million TEUs, is not 1-1.2 M TEUs coming in and then 1-1.2 M TEUs going out, it is 500-600,000 TEUs coming in and 500-600,000 TEUs going out again.</p> <p><u>Cambridge Ave</u></p> <p>Cambridge Ave is a private road owned by the Commonwealth, but publicly assessable. SIMTA did not consider Cambridge Ave in their EA due to the fact that it is a private road. MIC might be able to do more planning for Cambridge Ave; given MIC is a Commonwealth company.</p> <p><u>Staging of development</u></p> <p>Stage 1 DA will include the rail link from the SSFL into the site, the intermodal terminal and 300,000m² of warehouses space. The capacity volume at this stage will likely be approx. 350,000 TEUs. Stage 1 will include the VPA – indicating the traffic upgrades that will be required later on (no upgrades will start until after 350,000 TEUs has been reached).</p> <p>350,000 TEUs is likely to result in approx. 1500 trucks on Moorebank Ave. Understanding background growth levels is important for the upgrades, following current background growth levels, and then no upgrades are required. IF SIMTA were to go straight to 1 Million TEUs in the first year, the impact still wouldn't trigger a requirement for any upgrades.</p> <p>SIMTA are looking at getting the Stage 1 SSD application finalised and submitted within about 6 weeks after the determination of the concept plan is finalised.</p> <p>The warehousing is only associated with the terminal, it is not proposed to be leased out for other warehousing that is not associated with the intermodal terminal.</p> <p><u>Cumulative Impact</u></p> <p>The actual cumulative impact for the two sites is the traffic generated from the 1 million TEUs (throughput from the intermodal terminal) + the 500,000 TEUs (for the interstate component of the MIC proposal) + the warehousing (up to 600,000m² for the two sites)</p>		

Other issues

The warehouse timbers will be adaptively re-used for other buildings where possible

Economics of the rail is not great; the warehousing is the more profitable component.

Noise wall along Moorebank Ave is included in the Statement of Commitments, this could possibly be included as a condition – SIMTA would not object to that.

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL

Meeting closed at 2:15pm

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Tuesday, 2 September 2014	Time: 9:30am
Project: SIMTA – Intermodal facility - Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Michael Yiend – Development Manager SITMA</p> <p>Steve Ryan – Project Manager Tactical Group</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the two intermodal proposals and the possibility of a Master Planned Precinct with one intermodal facility</p>		
<p>The main points of discussion are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two developments are causing ‘community overload’, as any Stage 1 DA from SIMTA is likely to be out in the public arena at a similar time as the MIC concept proposal is, and then at some point after that there may be a Part 3A modification application to amend the two projects into one • TfNSW advised that market capacity is 1 million TEU + 500,000 TEU interstate • Environmentally the site can only handle a maximum of 1 million TEU’s as the road network is currently close to or at capacity, and 4 of the 6 identified intersection in the SIMTA concept plan are reduced to a Level of Service F • There are concerns regarding open access rights – how will the operations comply with air quality measures – particularly for rail – open access may not necessarily mean that all operators are using best-practice locomotives – there has been no cumulative air quality impacts • The cumulative impacts have not been adequately addressed in the SIMTA concept plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Warehousing considered from the MIC site was 97,000 m², though this has increased to 300,000 m², ○ There is no interstate component considered in the modelling. SIMTA state that this cumulative impact has been included in the modelling, however it is not likely to be a factor until 2019, so it doesn’t show up in the modelling, ○ Cambridge Ave has not been considered, as part of the road is Commonwealth owned, though some traffic (5% of rigid vehicles) will used this road. Cambridge Ave has been considered by MIC. • The community view is that will the two proposals there will be 2.2 million TEU’s per annum going through the site. • PAC is proposing to send the concept plan back to the Department with a number of deficiencies that need to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identifying the issues that have deficiencies ○ Providing in principle agreement for a one intermodal facility on the two sites ○ Only one crossing of the Georges River, being the southern access point ○ The report would recommend that a consolidated concept plan be provided including a Stage 1 DA for the consolidated Master Planned concept plan ○ Road upgrade triggers are not immediate – the first and second triggers are just for traffic lights and widening of Moorebank Ave ○ Intersection upgrades are tied up in the VPA – however more than just the M5/Moorebank intersections are likely to be at Level of Service before the riggers for upgrades ○ Triggers are for funding of works, not actually for any works – the proposals are a small contributor to the problem, the road/intersections have a bigger problem of background growth 		
Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL		
Meeting closed at 10:40am		

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Monday, 8 September 2014	Time: 2:30pm
Project: SIMTA Intermodal facility, Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Michael Yiend – Development Manager SIMTA</p> <p>Steve Ryan – Project Manager Tactical Group</p> <p>Ian Hunt – CEO MIC</p> <p>Anthony Vaccaro – Delivery Director MIC</p>		
The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the two intermodal proposals and the way forward		
<p>The main points of discussion are outlined below:</p> <p>SIMTA/MIC planning approval process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIC and SIMTA will both be proceeding with separate planning approvals at this stage – if a commercial agreement can be reach then a precinct plan be will introduced, having the intermodal and warehousing on the SIMTA site, and the interstate terminal and warehousing on the MIC site • MIC EIS considers three different scenarios for cumulative impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intermodal and interstate on the MIC site (as per the MIC concept plan) and warehousing only on SIMTA ○ Intermodal on the SIMTA site, and the interstate on the MIC site (interstate proposed in 2029, though this could be built up to 10 yrs earlier) ○ Two intermodal terminals, one on SIMTA and one on MIC, with 1 million TEU maximum across the two sites <p>SIMTA's concept plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sensitivity analyses are all predicated on works/upgrades being done by 2031, however there are currently road network capacity issues • Bases of the trigger points – SIMTA has discussed with RMS the results of the model to ensure that SIMTA does not have an impact on the road network • No impact on the road network prior to those trigger points – the level of service will be the same, the time delays will be marginally longer • The key is the background traffic growth forecasts – if the RMS background growth levels are out by 1%, then over a 5 yr period, that is the equivalent on the SITMA traffic contribution • Clarification is required as to the trigger points provided in the Hyder traffic study, for the number of TEUs, what is this based on? Clarification and validation of the numbers of vehicles from SIMTA using Cambridge Ave • Moorebank Ave; Moorebank Ave/M5; Moorebank Ave/Newbridge Rd are the only intersections/roads that SIMTA have a >5% impact on • What a 'material impact' is, is negotiated between SIMTA and RMS, there is no actual formulae to determine the material impact • SIMTA Stage 1 development does not include warehousing; the warehousing is from Stage 2 onwards • Weaving issue identified between Moorebank Ave/M5 interchange and the Hume Hwy/M5 interchange is an existing problem. RMS does not see the input from SIMTA as being a major contributor to the problem, and therefore SIMTA is not identified as being part of the solution • Noise and air quality issues have been raised <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Air quality – best practice for rail/intermodals should alleviate this issue – also having just a single intermodal on the site ○ Noise issues that were raised at Port Botany have been raised for this site • The SIMTA development is planned to be over three stages, being: 		

- Stage 1 – terminal and rail link
- Stage 2 – warehousing
- Stage 3 – warehousing and other works

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: SIMTA to provide clarification on the staging and the TEU numbers for the upgrades, validation of the numbers of vehicles that are predicted to use Cambridge Ave

Meeting closed at 3:15pm

Notes of meetings –Liverpool City Council

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Thursday, 31 July 2014	Time: 9:45am
Project: SIMTA intermodal - Moorebank		
Meeting place: Liverpool City Council		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Carl Wulff – Chief Executive Officer; Toni Averay – Acting Executive Director; Raj Autar – Group Manager Infrastructure and Environment; Tanya O'Brien – Manager Strategic Planning; Charles Wiafe – Manager Traffic and Transport; Kathleen Higgins – Heritage Officer; Megan Munari – Senior Strategic Planner; Steven Tuntevski – Team Leader, Environmental Health</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is to discuss Liverpool City Council's submissions and concerns about the Proposal</p>		
<p>The discussion was around the following key points. Council clarified that they are not opposed to having an intermodal facility in the local government area; they are opposed to the proposed location, being so close to the city centre.</p> <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consideration of traffic impacts is light, and the values are not supported by robust data • Local road networks are not considered for final transporting of containers • Concept plan does not adequately address many issues which are to be included in the conditions for further development application stages • Background growth and the predicted SIMTA and MIC impacts need to be addressed together for changes by 2030 • There is some description about what the upgrades of the road intersections need to be, these need to be determined at this stage • There are capacity issues on the road networks along with intersection capacity issues • VPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Negotiations need to include what upgrades are required, as there is a significant cost associated with getting trucks onto the M5 ○ Require details of the levels of improvements – not just improve the intersection ○ SIMTA to establish the VPA and not Council – Council feel as though they are on the backfoot ○ What aspects of the road and intersection upgrades are attributable to SIMTA ? • The level of assessment is not present in the concept plan, making it difficult to adequately condition the works, when there is limited detail of the required works • Load limits and other conditions need to be considered at the broader level – will be hard to restrict independent operators, what strategies will there be for mitigation or management of road pavement damage • Staging the approval is fine, however need to include the details of the road and intersection upgrades that are required at each stage, need to enforce the conditions relating to the upgrades • Have a timetable for the upgrades, instead of during the different DA's • The outer area shown in the concept plan is not large enough to cover the impacts on the road network • The development will be bringing the capacity issues forward to when background growth would have 		

contributed to the same capacity issues

Air quality

- These has not be adequately address in the concept plan, and Council have little confidence that these impacts can be mitigated as no health impact assessment has been carried out yet

Noise

- Noise generated at night, particularly from the rail line – containers being moved off the trains 24 hours a day
- The surrounding area is generally a quiet area at night
- Wheel squeal from the trains is a significant noise issue
- There is already heavy vehicle noise in the area, this could possibly get worse

Heritage

- Liverpool has a connection with the military
- A heritage study (guiding document) should determine future development works and should include a hierarchy of protection
 - What is important to keep
 - What can be adaptively re-used (keep the connection)
 - What can be removed (lastly)
- Interpretation Plan needs to be developed to explain the heritage values of the site and the buildings, this will assist with keeping the history of the site
- Considered the Department's assessment as poor, as the Department was just accepting of everything being demolished
- The Council are trying to get the WWII warehouses listed on state heritage registers

Regulatory authority and enforcement

- The intermodal will not be a scheduled premises – so will not be getting an EPL;it should be scheduled to allow greater regulation
- Council are concerned about compliance issues – as they do have the expertise to undertake the compliance monitoring required
- Where are the selected noise monitoring sites going to be, and what and where will mitigation be likely

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: Council to provide some recommended conditions for the Proposal, and what heritage plans and documents should be required at the concept stage (2 week time frame to provide these documents).

Meeting closed at 11:30am

Notes of meetings – Campbelltown City Council

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Thursday, 31 July 2014	Time: 12:00pm
Project: SIMTA Intermodal - Moorebank		
Meeting place: Liverpool Library		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Jeff Lawrence – Director Planning and Environment Campbelltown City Council; Ian Reynolds – Consultant to Campbelltown City Council</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is discuss Council's submission and concerns about the Proposal</p> <p>The discussion was around the following key points. While Council did previously object to the Proposal, they do not object, however they do have some outstanding concerns regarding the Proposal.</p> <p>Council would like to see the strategic context of the site within the broader SW-Sydney area.</p>		
<p><u>Rail</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail is not a certainty, containers could be coming in by road rather than rail to begin with • Intermodal is a good idea, the use of rail for an intermodal is critical, however there is only a commitment to seek a rail access as part of the first DA, no commitment that the rail link will be operational before the intermodal starts operating • There is no agreement on the location of the rail access, and no commitment by the State government agencies as to the location of the rail access • Infrastructure NSW does not spend money on infrastructure • Prior to the first DA, agreement must be reached between ARTC, TfNSW and the Proponent for the rail access, and the intermodal should not be operational until the rail line is operational • The conditions should include a statutory hold point for the rail access 		
<p><u>Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIMTA does not propose any upgrades works on roads south of the intermodal facility on Moorebank Ave • Assuming that all traffic will be heading north from the intermodal along Moorebank Ave, and none heading south • SIMTA have since stated that approximately 5% of traffic generated by the intermodal facility will use Cambridge Ave to the south • Council have concerns about this, particularly in emergencies or when the M5 is blocked, as Cambridge Ave is a narrow road, with a low level weather affected causeway • Closures on the M5 which will force traffic onto Cambridge Ave, has not been considered in the concept plan EIS • Cambridge Ave, is partly owned by the Commonwealth, and party owned by Campbelltown City Council • The conditions direct the Proponent to consult with Council, however the Statement of Commitments does not include Campbelltown City Council • Council want consultation to occur prior to any DA, with specific conditions relating to traffic impacts and monitoring impacts, there are no amelioration measures included, just the requirement to monitor 		

the impact

- Cambridge Ave leads straight into residential areas, so there will be noise and other impacts from heavy vehicles travelling along residential roads, which needs to be covered by any future DA

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: Campbelltown City Council to provide the PAC with a copy of the road ownership plan for Cambridge Ave.

Meeting closed at 12:45pm

Notes of meetings – TfNSW and RMS

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Monday, 18 August 2014	Time: 3:00pm
Project: SIMTA intermodal terminal - Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Simon Hunter (instead of Anissa Levy) – TfNSW</p> <p>Rachel Johnson – TfSNW</p> <p>John Hart – RMS</p> <p>Tim Dewey – RMS</p> <p>Karen Jones – Department of Planning & Environment (observer only)</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the rail link and road/intersection upgrades for the SIMTA proposal</p>		
<p>The discussion was broadly around the rail link and the road/intersection upgrades that have been proposed as part of the concept plan and the VPA.</p> <p><u>Rail</u></p> <p>The 1.2 million TEU/annum catchment capacity comes from the Bureau of Freight Statistics. The 1.2 million port shuttle service is 600,000 TEU each way. Based on market based analysis. There is the possibility of a duplication of the Port Botany rail link.</p> <p><u>Road/intersections</u></p> <p>The VPA is the framework for the negotiations for the road/intersections upgrades, based on SIMTA share of the impacts generated for the roads/intersections.</p> <p>The VPA should be concluded prior to the Stage 1 SSD DA, and will include triggers for the upgrades. There will be different upgrades for different stages of the development.</p> <p>Tables apportioning SIMTA's contribution to the upgrades have been provided to SIMTA. These tables could be included in the conditions in the relevant staged DAs.</p> <p>Newbridge Ave/Heathcote Rd should be included in the VPA.</p> <p>A similar portioning of upgrade contributions would be undertaken for the MIC proposal, based on their impact on the roads/intersections.</p>		
Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL		
Meeting closed at 4:00pm		

Notes of meetings – DP&E

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Wednesday, 30 July 2014	Time: 9:00am
Project: SIMTA Intermodal Terminal - Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Andrew Beattie, Karen Jones, Nathan Stringer, Felicity Greenway, Lisa Mitchell – Department of Planning & Environment</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is have a briefing from the Department regarding the Project</p>		
<p>The discussion was around the following key points, and the level of detail that should be provided for a concept plan approval. It was noted that the distribution ‘catchment area’ for Liverpool would only support one of the two intermodal facilities operating at the proposed maximum capacity.</p> <p><u>Rail links</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) has a capacity of 1.2million TEUs (20 foot equivalent unit – container)/annum • The Eastern Hills Passenger Line (EHPL) rail corridor as enough space to allow for the duplication (to four tracks) of the EHPL and still have room for the SIMTA rail line, though the power lines will need to be relocated • The SIMTA rail line does not have to go within the rail corridor <p><u>Air quality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative impact of the two proposals – SIMTA and MIC (Commonwealth Government development on the adjacent land) • PM₁₀ concentrations met all the relevant criteria • PM_{2.5} concentrations are close to or above the advisory criteria, this applies to the current background levels as well as the predicted impacts • Air quality meeting international best practice for intermodal facilities would be required for future development applications, and this would be required to be done in consultation with the EPA <p><u>Noise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operation of the intermodal is generally likely to meet the noise criteria set out in the INP • Most of the noise generated is associated with the construction work of the rail line from the SSFL and into the SIMTA site, the increase in noise could be up to 4dB • Would be an operational noise breach in Casula of 4dB, the construction of a noise wall on the site is likely to reduce the noise levels by 4dB • Any construction/development on the MIC site will provide a noise barrier to the residents of Casula to the SIMTA site, however the MIC development may have noise issues of its own <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that trucks will be driving on residential streets 		

- There are existing problems with a number of intersections around the Moorebank area, including the M5/Moorebank Ave interchange; M5/Hume Hwy interchange; Moorebank Ave/Heathcote Rd/Newbridge Rd intersection
- A number of the intersections around Moorebank Ave are already operating at a level of service of F, and are likely to get worse with increasing traffic due to regional growth and with the trucks associated with the SIMTA proposal
- The Voluntary Planning Agreement with the State is looking at critical intersection upgrades including 3 of the 4 key movements at the M5/Moorebank Ave interchange will be upgraded as part of the development. The trigger for this upgrade is early on in the staged development of the intermodal, with the trigger point being at approximately 200,000 TEUs throughput per annum.
- The Moorebank Ave/Newbridge Rd/Heathcote Rd intersection is already congested, the impact is more from local traffic movements than truck movements. It is a part of the Statement of Commitments by the Proponent to upgrade this intersection, though it is not part of the VPA at this stage
- Moorebank Ave is a Commonwealth Road, and it is associated with the Defence land on either side of the road, and the access to Holsworthy Army Base.

Other issues

- The WWII era warehouses, these are listed on a Commonwealth heritage register. This listing will be removed, once the land is no longer Defence land. Liverpool City Council has applied to the heritage division of OEH to have these listed at a State level.
- EPA has raised concerns regarding the rail line crossing the Glenfield waste facility. The department have addressed this by providing the EPA with a consultative role in the process.

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided:

Meeting closed at 10:30 am

Notes of meetings – MIC

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Thursday, 14 August 2014	Time: 10:30am
Project: SIMTA Intermodal facility, Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Ian Hunt – CEO Moorebank Intermodal Company</p> <p>Anthony Vaccaro – Delivery Director Moorebank Intermodal Company</p> <p>Karen Jones – Department of Planning & Environment (Observer only)</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is to gain an understanding of the Moorebank Intermodal Company's (MIC) proposal for an intermodal facility adjacent to the SIMTA site</p>		
<p>This briefing was for the Commissioners to gain an understanding of the MIC's proposal and when it is likely to be on public exhibition. The key topics discussed are summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warehousing drives the success of an intermodal terminal; it adds value to the project. The MIC's proposal is for a distribution centre, not warehousing for storage. The initial concept plan did not have sufficient warehousing, so the amount of warehousing area has been increased. • The MIC EIS should be released in about a month or so, it is currently undergoing an adequacy review by State agencies. The EIS includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3 alternative options for the rail link (northern, central and southern links), which there are 3 alternatives only 1 will be constructed, the 3 options was to allow for the successful tender to choose the one that best suits their needs. The worst-case for each of these sites has been considered ○ Increased warehousing, as outlined above ○ There is no link to the SIMTA site ○ Cumulative impact has been done • The rail line (SSFL) has a capacity of 1.2 million TEU's per annum • The impacts are slightly worse having the terminal and warehousing on the MIC site, than if the terminal and warehousing were distributed over both the MIC and SIMTA sites • MIC is seeking 500,000 TEUs for the interstate component of the proposal. There are different schools of thought regarding a cap on the interstate component. MIC will start the intermodal with just the port shuttle service, and then add the interstate component, this will take longer to ramp up • The results of the traffic models were raised in the submissions on the SITMA project, and MIC confirmed that they had relied on different assumptions to SIMTA. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Percentage of containers going straight into warehouses – MIC assumed 20%, whereas SIMTA has assumed 40% - leading to lower traffic numbers ○ More TEUs are have been modelled coming in the MIC site, in the MIC modelling than in the SIMTA modelling ○ Truck size – MIC have assumed that most of the goods (once the containers have been broken up) will leave the site in 4 tonne trucks, SIMTA have assumed that the goods will leave on 10 tonne trucks, again reducing the number of truck movements ○ Empty container park – MIC have assumed different number of empty containers to SIMTA – this reduces the truck numbers in the SITMA proposal • MIC are also assuming the 2700 truck movements per day will be removed from the M5 between Port Botany and Moorebank • Determining the intermodal impact is difficult to do, especially to determine the impact for intersection upgrades • MIC will commence with an opening capacity of around 250-300,000 TEUs. The interstate may ramp up in a couple of stages, after the port shuttle service is up and running, or the interstate could start using the port shuttle terminal (the trains for the port shuttle are shorter than the interstate trains) and 		

be included in the opening capacity of 250-350,000 TEUs

- Port Botany has a current capacity of 2 Million TEUs/annum – 15% of these currently go on trains, and the other 85% go on trucks
- The capacity of the Port could go up to 7-8 million TEUs/annum Port side. Taking 40% of these TEUs on trains, would require more port train infrastructure
- MIC consider that it would take about 7-10 years to get to reach the maximum 1.2 Million TEUs that they are proposing for the port shuttle service
- The SSFL has a current capacity of 500,000 TEUs to Moorebank – passing loops will need to be constructed to get the 1.2 million TEUs from the Port to Moorebank – this will be required in about 7 years from now (2021)
- The ownership of the Defence Land (SME) will be transferred to the Department of Infrastructure (Commonwealth) which will be leased (99yr lease) from Infrastructure to MIC, who will be able to sublease to the operator – the lease will be specific regarding the use of the land

Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL

Meeting closed at 12:00pm

Notes of meetings – MIC

Meeting note taken by Naomi Cleaves	Date: Monday, 1 September 2014	Time: 11:30am
Project: SIMTA – Intermodal facility - Moorebank		
Meeting place: PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Mr Garry West, Ms Donna Campbell, Mr David Johnson & Naomi Cleaves (PAC)</p> <p>Ian Hunt – CEO Moorebank Intermodal Company</p> <p>Anthony Vaccaro – Delivery Director Moorebank Intermodal Company</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the two intermodal proposals and the possibility of a Master Planned Precinct with one intermodal facility</p>		
<p>The main points of discussion are outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two developments are causing ‘community overload’, as any Stage 1 DA from SIMTA is likely to be out in the public arena at a similar time as the MIC concept proposal is, and then at some point after that there may be a Part 3A modification application to amend the two projects into one • TfNSW advised that the market capacity is 1 million TEU + 500,000 TEU interstate • Environmentally the site can only handle a maximum of 1 million TEU's as the road network is currently close to or at capacity, and 4 of the 6 identified intersection in the SIMTA concept plan are reduced to a Level of Service F • There are concerns regarding open access rights – how will the operations comply with air quality measures – particularly for rail (SIMTA have new low emission locomotives, however with open access the operators may not have the same new locomotives or locomotives of acceptable standards) • The cumulative impacts have not been adequately addressed in the SIMTA concept plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ warehousing considered from the MIC site was 97,000 m², though this has increased to 300,000 m², ○ there is no interstate component considered in the modelling ○ Cambridge Ave has not been considered by SIMTA, as part of the road is Commonwealth owned, though it has been considered by MIC 		
Documents tabled at meeting/to be provided: NIL		
Meeting closed at 12:15pm		