



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1038770

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

**RE: MOOREBANK INTERMODAL WEST CONCEPT PLAN
AND STAGE 1 MOD 1**

MOOREBANK INTERMODAL PRECINCT WEST STAGE 2

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON
ALAN COUTTS
JOHN HANN**

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID WAY**

APPLICANT: **MICHAEL YIEND
DAN BLYDE
RICHARD JOHNSON
MICHAEL BARROW
NOEL McGOWAN**

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

DATE: **2.04 PM, MONDAY, 17 JUNE 2019**

MS D. LEESON: Welcome. Good afternoon. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present and to the elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting.

5 SIMTA, the applicant, is seeking to amend the concept plan and undertake construction of stage 2 of the Moorebank Intermodal Facility West in the Liverpool City Council area. My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining are fellow commissioners Alan Coutts and John Hann, as well as David Way from the commission secretariat. In the interests of openness and transparency and

10 to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of

15 information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all

20 members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

We will now begin. Again, welcome. We have met with the Department of

25 Planning so far. We have a site visit and public meeting scheduled for tomorrow, and we are still trying to organise – work out, I think, whether we're meeting with Liverpool council and when and how that might occur. So we've received a pile of documents – thank you very much – the department's assessment report – and now is an opportunity to meet with you, as the proponent, to – I think you've got a

30 presentation there to show us, to take us through. You have a preliminary agenda with the sorts of things that we would like to get through on that, in no particular order. So it will be a bit as it unfolds. So perhaps the best place to start is with your presentation, and we will take it from there.

35 MR M. YIEND: That's fine. Yes. That's fine.

MS LEESON: Okay. Who will do that?

40 MR R. JOHNSON: I will do that.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: So it's Richard Johnson - - -

45 MS LEESON: Thanks, Richard.

MR JOHNSON: - - - on behalf of Qube. So what we wanted to cover off is just give an overview of the proposal that was submitted in the application, cover off the future environmental assessment requirements that have been identified as a result of the modification to the – or proposed modification to the concept plan, look at the key issues identified by the DP&E in their assessment report and the key agencies that also raised issues, go through in some degree of detail draft conditions that have been proposed that we think there’s some scope for alteration, and then conclude with questions and comments. We have a series of A1 plans that we can open up for questioning and then - - -

5

10 MS LEESON: Terrific. Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: Better view later.

15 MS LEESON: That’s - - -

MR JOHNSON: But - - -

MS LEESON: Trying to see them at A4 is - - -

20 MR: We’ve wrangled - - -

MS LEESON: Is almost - - -

25 MR: - - - some A3

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR: - - - from the department, but A1 would be even better.

30 MR JOHNSON: And what we will do is tomorrow, when we’re out on site, we will actually have some A3. So they will be easier to flip through - - -

MR: Okay.

35 MS LEESON: Terrific. Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: - - - and have some detail as well.

40 MS LEESON: Thank you. And they will then just be – whatever they are will be put onto our website.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. If – post the presentation - - -

45 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: - - - if there’s questions - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: - - - that we want to – we can roll out some of those and - - -

5 MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: - - - talk to them. So the project site is Moorebank Precinct West, shown in there by the coloured hatchings and the biodiversity conservation areas to the western side, immediately to the east of the Georges River running through the
10 centre of that picture. So the boundary of the site running all the way down here. There's just over 200 hectares. Moorebank Precinct East, subject to separate approvals, sits over here.

The MPW2 application includes the entirety of the site for works for stormwater
15 basins, earthworks, vegetation clearing, stabilisation and construction of the interstate rail access terminal and warehousing in this proportion – this portion of the site. These blue areas are the proposed OSD: on-site storage detention basins for stormwater management. As presented in the application, the development description allows for these components. I'm going to guess that you've read
20 through those to some degree. If you want me to go through them, I can - - -

MR: That's okay.

MR JOHNSON: - - - but I think they're pretty self-explanatory.

25 MS LEESON: I think that's fine.

MR JOHNSON: They key is out of the total 300,000 square metres GFA permissible under the concept approval, this application seeks 215,000 of it, the
30 remainder subject to a future application. It includes the internal road network. Access to Moorebank Avenue, with intersection upgrades where necessary, and connection to the rail link are the mitigation strategies applied for supporting infrastructure, and it's a 24/7 operation for both warehousing and freight movement.

35 That freight movement is along the rail connecting corridor to the SSFL, as approved under MPE Stage 1. So in the next few pages we just go through and identify the future assessment requirements as identified in the concept approval, as modified, and where we believe those requirements have been addressed in our existing application. Again, I will leave these for your review and cross-referencing back
40 rather than go through them individually.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: So it covers off all of the key issues identified in the SEARs and
45 FEARs.

MS LEESON: It's a good acronym, FEARs.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Prospective as well. So our view is that the stage 2 proposal is generally in accordance with the concept approval and the modification to undertake minor adjustments to the concept approval has been put in place so that our stage 2 application is consistent with the to be approved concept plan. In the
5 DPE assessment report, the key issues were traffic importation of fill, urban design, landscaping, urban heat island mitigation, storm water repair in corridor, koalas as an addition to our biodiversity assessment for our flora and fauna species, and contamination remediation.

10 Similarly, these reflect the issues identified by the key agencies, OEH, RMS, DPI, the two councils and EPA. A lot of these conditions are very – or issues are very similar to the ones raised by MPE project to the east as approved. Probably the – the
15 standout differences are the consideration of Riparian Corridor and koalas. So, the next section talks to the proposed changes of wording within the draft conditions for the concept. In E61A, what we are looking at is that this proposed condition would
20 restrict us in having any onsite detention basis within the Riparian Corridor. It's our position that the DPI guidelines permit up to – OSDs to be within 50 percent of the outer portion of the corridor, which aligns with our planning and design, and we would seek to have that carried through in – from concept into the staged approval.

25 When we're looking at the conditions, one of the things as lessons learned from the current MPE approvals and some of the MPW stage 1, is that where there is a – a condition that's been drafted that is quite proscriptive, it has been very hard to get any flexibility in that, where we have a – what might be otherwise considered a
30 minor design change without the need for going back and having a modification, as an example on east we're currently in the process of two modifications with a third to come in the space of the 12 months of that approval being in place.

35 So, what we're looking for given the scale and complexity of a project such as this, and other infrastructure projects, having some degree of flexibility where the
40 planning secretary can otherwise agree to adjust some of the wording or accept something that is an equivalent to, but not necessarily proscriptively exactly the same as one of the conditions. And the example that we've given there is the proscription in the UHIMS and UDLP documentation has led to about 14 months of consultation
45 to get approval on a management plan.

MR A. COUTTS: So are you suggesting that as a general condition, or are you suggesting it be incorporated in specific conditions?

40 MR JOHNSON: I think it's specific. If we're – if the resultant condition I think is going to be proscriptive, particularly around quantification, so the – an example
45 might be that we have to have canopy tree planting every six to eight car bays, then maybe if we – it should be in something like that, where – okay, maybe that's not achievable in all the circumstances, but an equivalent might be able to be agreed with the department.

MR COUTTS: Do you want – do you want to give us a mark-up as to where you would – which conditions you would have suggest the wording be incorporated?

MR JOHNSON: We can do that, yes.

5

MR COUTTS: Is that all right?

MS LEESON: Well, no, I think that's fine. Because – and I understand the issue of proscription, and you will come back. If you change something by a square metre, then technically you have to come back for a further DA or whatever else. So I - - -

10

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: I think Alan's thought is fine if you want to come back with a mark-up of the conditions as you would prefer to see them - - -

15

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - then we will have a look at that by all means.

20

MR JOHNSON: Thanks a lot. When we get into the MPW2 – stage 2 definitions, the definition of “construction” at the moment includes what is, essentially, earthworks, importation of fill, fill placement, earthworks and removal of spoil. What we'd look to see when you go down to the definition of earthworks, it then identifies that these are works required in preparation for construction. The conditions as a whole have many mentioned plans that are required prior to commencement of construction, so we're in a part of a – we say there's a bit of a circular argument that your earthworks are required to prepare the site for construction.

25

30

But you need all of the construction documentation prior to the commencement of earthworks, whereas an activity such as the crushing of fill and material that is already on site as a result of the demolition from stage 1, it doesn't have any impact on traffic, it doesn't have any impact on flora and fauna by selecting location, it – it can be managed under the erosion settlement control plans that are in place and included already in the conditions. And it can be managed by a construction noise and vibration management plan. So two – well, what would otherwise be construction plan elements would enable something like crushing as an activity to commence in advance of the suite of other documentation required pre-construction for other built elements.

35

40

MS LEESON: bit of a circular universe in a way, that you can't get started without these detailed plans.

45

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes, okay.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. So, something like a landscape management plan that's required prior to commencement of construction would constrain us from doing earthworks. The soil and water management plan itself, to prepare that for earthworks you'd have to – we'd have to come back and then update it again to
5 prepare it for now, we've got to find the site for construction and here's how it's going to be managed as a construction item.

I've got a document for each of you for – of handouts, and in there I've got a table that goes through and looks at the provisions relate – and how they relate to
10 earthworks versus construction - - -

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: - - - so you can see where I think you can switch some on and
15 some off - - -

MS LEESON: All right. Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: - - - just for consideration. The administrative conditions, the A
20 conditions, would all be applicable. Condition B2, largely the issue with this condition is its relationship to, or definition of the riparian zone. At the moment there are two potential definitions for how you define where the riparian zone extends from, either the top of bank or the one percent flood level.

Our position has been that the top of bank is where the Georges River is at its level
25 99 percent of the time, as opposed to the flood conditions which obviously are a lot higher. At the site there is a defined terrace, and under this definition the defined terrace would be the end point of the riparian zone, and that terrace varies between 28 metres and over 200 metres in distance from the edge of the Georges River.

30

MS LEESON: Will we see that tomorrow?

MR JOHNSON: We should be able to see it get down to the dustbowl area. Where
35 the – where the terrace is at its narrowest is – is in rougher bushland and we can't actually get to there, but you will be able to see the difference in height that represents the terrace versus the – what we see is the top of the bank. Georges River at this point is governed by Weir downstream, so any flow greater than the mean that you see now overtops the Weir and – and goes down. So it's only really in that very high storm events that it gets up near the terrace level. And again, in this document
40 I've identified – I've concluded the DPI guideline for riparian zones and structures within those zones, and the technical memo that we presented to the Department in its consideration of defining the riparian zone.

MR COUTTS: So your definition would get a riparian zone somewhat less than
45 what the department's - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. There was a - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Because the “at least” puts us to the one per cent AEP floor extent and, at the moment, a portion of that, when you add on the additional buffer requirements for native vegetation and access, instead of being a 40 metre riparian corridor where we currently sit at about 28 metres away from the edge of the boundary, it chews out to 53 metres, so it’s extending that. And the riparian corridor definition by DPI includes a transition zone to protect the bankside vegetation, hence, they can – their acceptability of construction of stormwater works within the outer 50 per cent.

MS LEESON: So in the scheme of things, how much land does that effect in sort of, I don’t know, eight hectares or square metres. I mean, are we talking about a significant impact or is it relatively minor?

MR JOHNSON: Two - - -

MS LEESON: If you took, say, the one per cent rather than your definition?

MR JOHNSON: Significant. And it’s significant in two ways: there’s, as I said, in one part of the site, we’re in excess of 200 metres away from the edge of the river. In another part, the one per cent actually cuts into our existing OSD basin design, and that’s the point that’s at 28 metres away from the river.

MS LEESON: Is that mapped?

MR JOHNSON: Yes. And we’ve got that.

MS LEESON: Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. We’ve got it in small copy and I believe we’ve got it in A1 as well.

MR COUTTS: There’s a bit of an issue with your OSD basin design versus what the department wants?

MR JOHNSON: There has.

MR COUTTS: Are you coming to that as we go through here or - - -

MR JOHNSON: In here, I don’t know that we address the 1:4. So we believe we can achieve the 1:4 batter design that they’ve asked for. One of the things we do ask for, they’ve asked for every edge or wall to be 1:4. And we’re saying, well, that’s – we should have some flexibility in that, because you’re – the point at which you discharge may not necessarily be 1:4, you’ve got a what you call an outlet plate design that isn’t necessarily going to be sloped and there’s other areas where we just get a bit – on one of the basins, it’s a bit of a tighter fit. And so the 1:4 just

encroaches a little bit. So you've got biofiltration in the base of the basins, so if we encroach, we actually start to impact on the biofiltration. So we've got the plans that show the 1:4 design, but under the definition of "riparian zone" that then encroaches.

5 MR COUTTS: It seems to be a bit of a different view of design criteria between the department's advisors and your advisors.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: Is that fair to say?

MR JOHNSON: That is fair. We've – so if we go back to MOD – the modification for MP Stage 2, we've had, as a result of the stormwater, well, the requirements for the 1:4 batters on our basins, we've identified to fit that basin in, we've had to
15 change – amend our design and include a basin outside of the applied footprint and approved footprint. And that application, as a result of the condition requiring 1:4, has required a MOD. So we're now in a process of modifying the consent to get extra land to be able to put the 1:4 on. It's still in our land, but it has required a
20 modification. In that – as part of that modification, we've identified where other sites, industrial sites and commercial sites, have accepted vertical walls.

MR COUTTS: Is this for east or west you're talking about now?

MR JOHNSON: That was for east.
25

MR J. HANN: That's for – yes. Okay.

MR JOHNSON: So, yes, as the example.

30 MR HANN: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: At the moment, the basin is on west. We believe we can get the 1:4 in in the majority of cases, but there are some portions of the basins themselves that it won't fit.

35 MS LEESON: And that's typically on the riverside.

MR JOHNSON: On the riverside, yes.

40 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: So do you have these same issues with east with the department?

MR JOHNSON: No, because we don't – the riparian corridor for Anzac Creek is
45 further south from the site.

MR COUTTS: Right. Right. So it's really because of the conflict around the riparian zone that you're having these issues.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. It's the proximity to the Georges River.

5 MS LEESON: And the bank to the river.

MR JOHNSON: And the terrace, yes.

10 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: So this light blue line, dashed, is – represents the mean top water mark. Anything above that goes over the weir. If there's a major storm event that floods, this light blue solid line that jags through - - -

15 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: Sorry. That's – this bit is the key area where you can see it actually goes into where our 1:4 batter would be.

20 MR COUTTS: So that's under - - -

MS LEESON: Just there.

25 MR JOHNSON: So, yes, by - - -

MR COUTTS: So that's under a flood, a ten-year flood, or something, is it?

MR JOHNSON: As of – no, 100 year.

30 MS LEESON: 100 year.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

35 MR COUTTS: Sorry. My eyes

MR JOHNSON: At a one in 100 year flood level, in reality, the water would just drain straight into the top of the flood level water. You don't really need a basin. You wouldn't need a wall. So at the moment that cuts in, we would have to have a

40 10 metre buffer back from there for – because there's native vegetation, and then another three metres, so it cuts right into our basin design as it currently stands as opposed to down this end where here's your top of water level now with Georges River and the one in 100 cuts in up through here. There's a drainage channel through here and then along, so – and that represents the terrace.

45 MS LEESON: The light blue line here.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: Yes, yes. So what we presented back to the department was you need some consistency in planning. And the definition of “riparian zone” shouldn’t
5 give us two different outcomes that don’t give us consistency. So for certainty, we believe that should be the definition of “riparian zone”.

MR COUTTS: Is this the area you’re talking about that gives you the – you know, the 50-odd - - -
10

MR JOHNSON: The 100, yes. And there’s even further south again. So if we come to here and it’s - - -

MR HANN: If you end up with 200 metres - - -
15

MR JOHNSON: Yes, yes.

MR HANN: - - - you’re saying thereabouts? Yes. Okay.

MR JOHNSON: And because it’s prescriptive of – it’s a flat 40-metre, or one per cent. It’s a solid line as opposed to, you know, if we’re giving you 150 per cent of the 40 metres down here, but we’re giving you 95 or 80 per cent at one end.
20

MS LEESON: Okay.
25

MR JOHNSON: So conditions B3 and B6 talk to the – just we have a requirement that we can’t open more than 65 hectares of land during earthworks at one point in time, so that comes into one of the later conditions of the ones we’ve referred to in B41 before.
30

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR JOHNSON: What we believe is that if we’re restricted to only opening 65 hectares at once, then we should, if that’s the case, be able to stage reports that reflect
35 we’ve now completed the stabilisation works and earthworks on that 65 hectare lot, then we should be able to progress with the other management plans that are in place, or that can be in place to enable us to commence construction on that 65 hectare lot, as opposed to, if we can’t stage them, we have complete earthworks across the entirety of the site before we can commence any of the other works or submit much
40 sooner these plans without saving them.

MR COUTTS: So you don’t have a problem with the 65 hectares, you just have a problem with being how it’s signed-off and its stabilised and how you get on to the next - - -
45

MR JOHNSON: We would rather not have the 65 hectares.

MR COUTTS: No, I understand that.

MR JOHNSON: But given that it's there, if it's going to stay, then, yes, then we should be able to stage the other documentation accordingly. If the land is stabilised
5 and it's ready to go for construction, where it's – I think it talks to 95 per cent or 90
per cent stabilisation before you can commence works in the next site – I think 75
per cent, then 95 – then it should be good to build on. If we've got the layout
drawings in place and it's, to me, not that much difference from a rolling subdivision
where we develop these lots and then, as we finish building those, we move to the
10 next, move to the next.

MR COUTTS: Presumably, you've had these discussions with the department.

MR JOHNSON: We have.
15

MR COUTTS: What was the department's response to that?

MR JOHNSON: Their main concern is that they, by doing it by portion, by
20 breaking it up, that there's a potential risk that they get painted into a corner; that we
get to the last 65 lot and, if there's a quantitative requirement, say, of 10 per cent of
the area being landscaped, we get to the last lot and we can't meet that 10 per cent
guideline. You know, we might only have eight per cent left available across the
site. So they're concerned at being painted into a corner where we don't achieve
some other quantitative measure with the last residual lot.
25

MR COUTTS: And what's your response to that?

MR JOHNSON: I think that's our compliance management requirement, that it's on
30 us to manage and there's obligations for us to do it.

MR HANN: In relation to the eastern site, how is this applied there?

MR JOHNSON: We didn't have the restriction.

MR HANN: You didn't have that one on there?
35

MR JOHNSON: No.

MR HANN: Right.
40

MR JOHNSON: No. The only restriction we've had on east has been associated
with stormwater management and commencement of staging construction, so - - -

MR HANN: Right. So for the 600,000 cubic metres of fill and the earthworks
45 related to that, that wasn't a condition.

MR JOHNSON: No.

MR HANN: Is that what you're saying?

MR JOHNSON: No. And we were able to start works under stage management plans for warehouse 1 precinct, which you will see tomorrow - - -

5 MR HANN: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: - - - in advance of the balance of site. And that's applied to urban design, landscape planning and stormwater.

10 MS LEESON: So is it that the only reason that the department has changed their approach to the conditions and the 65 hectares and the staging?

MR JOHNSON: It - - -

15 MS LEESON: Because MP East was, certainly, 650,000 more than you're having here, in terms of fill, isn't it?

MR JOHNSON: West is more. This is 1.6 million.

20 MS LEESON: Sorry; west. I will get east and west sorted at some point.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. We weren't aware that this was coming in.

25 MS LEESON: All right.

MR JOHNSON: There's - - -

MR HANN: So it wasn't in your – I don't want to put words in your mouth – was this driven by issues that arose on MP East?

30 MR JOHNSON: No, I don't think it was. I think it more comes from the review of MPW and being such a large site, just seeking how we were going to stage the development to make sure that we had controls in place without causing unnecessary disturbance or erosive risk. So if we – if, in their view, we were going to clear the whole 220 hectares in one hit and then slowly stabilise it, then there's a risk, while we're not stable or waiting for stabilisation to take effect, you've got a high erosion risk and dust emissions, but it's not in our client's interest to not develop the site once stabilised.

35 MR JOHNSON: So what are you going to do with the southern end, once you've done all the earthworks there and stabilised, or are you expecting to roll through with another DA for the southern - - -

40 MS LEESON: Okay.

45 MR JOHNSON: It rolls through the next stage, yes.

- MR JOHNSON: I think that covers both. Yes. So if we have the 65 – in summary, if we have the 65 hectare restriction, then we should be able to stage the plans associated with that in our mind.
- 5 MR COUTTS: So what you envisage is you have your 65 area cleared, stabilised, move onto your next 65 hectare area with earthworks, but in the meantime may well start construction on your warehousing on that first stage.
- MR JOHNSON: Yes.
- 10 MR COUTTS: Which at the moment you – that's – you're not able to do that.
- MR JOHNSON: Not – yes. That's right.
- 15 MR HANN: And is there – is the 65 hectares a third, roughly?
- MR JOHNSON: Roughly.
- MR HANN: There's three
- 20 MR JOHNSON: Yes. That's - - -
- MR HANN: Yes. Okay. Yes. Okay. Yes.
- 25 MR JOHNSON: That's what the department has defined it as, is it's roughly a third.
- MR COUTTS: Is the department concerned that you might only develop part of the site and not the – I suppose I should ask the department, but is that a concern that they have?
- 30 MR JOHNSON: I say it would – well, it would be. Sorry, it may be, but – because the concept approval gives consent to 300,000 square metres GFA warehousing on this site. So if we've got 215,000 approved in this current stage, there's 85 left. So they see half the site developed as warehousing, you've got 85,000 left. What's
- 35 happening with the remainder? Now, while I say that, they may perceive that as a risk, equally, they also are aware of the intended design to extend beyond the current 300,000 square limit, so they know that we're going to build something on there, it's not staying vacant. And – but that's subject to future applications to address that.
- 40 MS LEESON: So you do all the earthworks in the 65 hectare stages, you start work on the first one, in terms of construction, you have all your plans in place for that. Are they for that first stage only and then would – I guess you would – are you looking to then replicate those or modify those as needed for each subsequent stage?
- 45 MR JOHNSON: Yes. So we can only – we could only build in the top half of the site, because that's the area for warehouse construction under this staged application. The other component for the – that restricts us slightly on the 65 hectare - - -

MS LEESON: Yes. Yes.

MR JOHNSON: - - - is our cut for the site actually comes from the southern part of the site where we won't be building warehouses under this application. So we need
5 access to there to cut to place the material in the northern part of the site where we then start construction.

MS LEESON: The source of your fill.

10 MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: The 160,000. That's coming, what, partly from the south, from what you've just said?

15 MR JOHNSON: 1.6 million.

MR HANN: 1.6 million.

MS LEESON: 1.6 million.
20

MR JOHNSON: So 1.6 million of imported.

MS LEESON: Yes.

25 MR JOHNSON: And then there's cut and fill on site.

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR COUTTS: Where is most of your fill coming from?
30

MR JOHNSON: Infrastructure projects around the city.

MR COUTTS: So WestConnex.

35 MR JOHNSON: I don't know the specific - - -

MR M. BARROW: Yes.

MR COUTTS: I think WestConnex was mentioned in one of the reports. So it's
40 basic construction material.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR BARROW: Yes. And from their trail and all the other sandstone excavations
45 that are going on now.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

5 MR JOHNSON: And there is a cut and fill figure in there.

MR COUTTS: Is there any plenty of landfill around at the moment? I guess with all the work that's going on.

10 MR BARROW: Yes, there is, for a short window of time.

MR COUTTS: Window of opportunity.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

15 MR BARROW: Till Badgerys Creek starts.

MR COUTTS: Right. Okay. And then it will all go to Badgerys Creek.

20 MS LEESON: So with the levels, do you want – just want to take us through the rationale for raising the site to the height that you are and how that works with the stormwater?

MR JOHNSON: In short, when you see the site tomorrow – you haven't been out to the site before?

25 MR HANN: No.

MS LEESON: Not yet.

30 MR JOHNSON: It's very, very flat. So to have the drainage works – so right now drainage across the site is sheet flow, or right now, before we had our basins in there. We've got basins in there to control it. It would – just goes off as sheet flow, drops down the terrace, and into Georges River. To get the drainage to work where we have the requirement to manage stormwater levels on paved areas to keep them out of warehouses and to get the – and the grade in the drainage lines to get to the OSDs where the biofiltration sits, you need the elevation. Partially linked precinct-wide we've had to get that elevation over on east to be able to effect the drainage into Anzac Creek and prevent additional flood risk, and then carries across Moorebank Avenue

35

40

MS LEESON: We assumed you weren't doing it just for the sake of it, that, you know, there was - - -

45 MR JOHNSON: No.

MS LEESON: It's not an inexpensive exercise.

MR JOHNSON: No. It's just the preference of drainage being underground rather than above, and maintaining a grade.

5 MR HANN: So what was the rationale, then, originally when there was just 47,000 cubic metres required in the original concept plan?

MR JOHNSON: I didn't part of it.

10 MR YIEND: Yes, the original concept plan of - - -

MS LEESON: Sorry. You might just need to state your name, Michael.

15 MR YIEND: Yes. This is Michael Yiend from Qube. The original concept plan we inherited from the Moorebank Intermodal Company. So we actually had not done a lot of the preparation in and around that original concept plan.

MR HANN: So it didn't have you input into it? Is that what - - -

20 MR YIEND: That's correct, yes.

MR HANN: Okay.

25 MR YIEND: So we took our concept plan and then have done that further design development of the concept with the stormwater - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

30 MR YIEND: - - - which, in our view, needs to have this level adjustment to be able to adequately deal with stormwater for an industrial precinct.

MR HANN: Okay.

35 MR JOHNSON: I guess the context was the two applications, or the two precincts, East and West, were running concurrently for a period of time and independently of each other.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

40 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HANN: All right.

45 MR JOHNSON: So this is the one in – our question on the 1:4, that if we can satisfy (a) and (b) with our basin design, (a) visually unobtrusive and ensures public safety, then we shouldn't necessarily have to have all sides with a batter slope of 1:4.

MS LEESON: That wouldn't necessarily satisfy the issue of biofiltration, would it?

- MR JOHNSON: That will - - -
- MS LEESON: It will?
- 5 MR JOHNSON: No, no, our basin design still has to meet the requirements of the percentage of biofiltration for the catchment.
- MS LEESON: Okay.
- 10 MR JOHNSON: And that's all included within our basin design, as it was when they were vertical walls.
- MS LEESON: Okay.
- 15 MR JOHNSON: Sorry; the second one.
- MR YIEND: Is there any questions on the 1:4?
- 20 MS LEESON: Well, the department was of a view that they wanted a 1:4 slope to – particularly west-facing, I think, to facilitate some growth of macrophytes or other – you know, water matter in there, and they weren't sure that this was actually going to be able to achieve that. So I wasn't sure whether they wanted it 1:4 on all sides, or whether it was the west-facing one that got most sunlight is what they were after, but you're saying that this will satisfy that?
- 25 MR JOHNSON: I don't know about vegetation on there, but in terms of – so the vegetation, I think they were looking from a screening perspective, so to have that visual obstruction from residents in Casula, looking across the river to - - -
- 30 MR HANN: No, I think they're talking about filtration.
- MS LEESON: No, no, no, they were talking about within the filtration within the - - -
- 35 MR HANN: Effectively, filtration.
- MS LEESON: Within the basins.
- 40 MR JOHNSON: I don't know why we would want trees on the outside of our batter for filtration inside the basins. So - - -
- MS LEESON: I think it was a water quality issue within the basins. We will go back and we will have another look - - -
- 45 MR JOHNSON: Okay.

MS LEESON: - - - and if there's a question around it for us still, then we will come back to you with a follow-up question.

MR JOHNSON: Okay.

5 MR COUTTS: I think there's a bit of a view against vertical walls in these designs these days, is there?

MR JOHNSON: It was a bit of a surprise for us to see it in the MPE approval.

10 There are instances in Liverpool Council where they've approved vertical walls. I did the EIS for the Tallawong Stabling Facility for Sydney Metro that has vertical walls 11 metres high across a road from a residential and immediately adjacent to a watercourse. So it's been accepted - - -

15 MR COUTTS: I thought they were moving away from vertical walls.

MR JOHNSON: I think where you've got public-accessible land, that makes sense. This is a bonded site, so it's not publically accessible. It's not - - -

20 MS LEESON: It is a bonded site?

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

25 MR JOHNSON: It's not open to general public access.

MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

30 MR HANN: Yes, their key point was solar access for plants to sustain the plants.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR HANN: And they didn't feel that that was possible with vertical walls, hence

35 the batter.

MR JOHNSON: And we provided – for both sites, we provided solar diagrams that show the proportion of radiant light they get - - -

40 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HANN: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: - - - and that can be achieved.

45 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HANN: All right.

MR JOHNSON: Particularly for west. I mean, the majority of the basins run north-south.

5 MR HANN: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: So winter to maximise sunlight.

10 MR HANN: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: This one is just aligning the condition to staging a report in 844 and the opening at 65 hectares so that we don't have that staging layout that's not consistent with the areas that we've got to stabilise. So, again, if we've got the 65

15 hectares, the other documentation should align, or be able to align.

MS LEESON: With the importation to fill the construction hours, you're looking for 10 pm at night. What's driving a 10 o'clock construction time for earthworks and site stabilisation?

20 MR JOHNSON: Largely, it gets the traffic out of the peak periods, so we don't have – so the total cap for the site is 22 square metres – cubes a day.

MS LEESON: Cubes a day. Yes.

25 MR JOHNSON: Yes. So - - -

MS LEESON: That's for both sites – across both sites?

30 MR JOHNSON: For both sites, there's a cap.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. So you don't want that flow going into the peak periods, am

35 or pm. That gives us flexibility to have vehicles moving on the road at night when there's not - - -

MS LEESON: Okay. And the department's view is just stick with standard construction hours unless there's a - - -

40 MR JOHNSON: Valid reason otherwise, and that's - - -

MS LEESON: Another case comes back from you.

45 MR JOHNSON: Yes. Which - - -

MS LEESON: And your - - -

MR COUTTS: And you valid reason otherwise is as just expressed.

5 MR JOHNSON: That's essentially it. Largely, otherwise, you're – we're restricted to operating under the out of hours work protocol, which would mean we would have to go through a noise assessment for the particular activity and otherwise get approval from the planning secretary.

10 MR COUTTS: With east, are you doing a similar staging as to what you're proposing for west, in that you're doing – and I'm presuming there's – is there a similar requirement of doing so much earthworks – stabilise, or no?

MR JOHNSON: No.

15 MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: No. So because we've staged the first development site for the first warehouse on the site, we've had to identify under the conditions the subsequent triggers for the – balance the site staging. So we've done that for landscaping, stormwater. One of the commitments we made to the department is that trigger would be – we would have the – balancer site staging reports or applications to them at 80 per cent of the earthworks – bulk earthworks being undertaken on the site – as a trigger, not a limitation. So we're still allowed to do the entirety of the earthworks, but that would be the trigger for the next reporting stage.

25 MR COUTTS: And does the – if you got what you want here in terms of your approved staging, does that have any flow-on effects to other conditions in the report around management plans and - - -

30 MR JOHNSON: Yes. It would. So that's - - -

MR COUTTS: Presumably

35 MR JOHNSON: Our preference is to not stage. Our preference is to have, "Here's our single sort of plan upfront." If there's any minor changes in detail that happen through design – detailed design or construction, we adjust and we provide the update to the department. But where we're restricted from being able to start until lot 1, 2 and 3 are sort of well underway - - -

40 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: - - - it doesn't quite help us, in a development sense, to have that delay.

45 MR COUTTS: All right.

MR HANN: Sorry. Just on the vertical walls versus the one in four, MP East, what happens there?

MR JOHNSON: We've revised – we revised our stormwater management plan, where we've been able to demonstrate we can achieve one in four batters on two of the basins.

5 MR HANN: Right.

MR JOHNSON: The other one that's to the north and close to the freight village, we haven't been able to achieve that because it's a much narrow basin and there's – it's wedged between a warehouse and the freight visage. Similarly, we have central
10 drainage down the spine of the site, and we've not been able to include that. We had to take that out, underground it and have that divert into the basin at the south of the site, which has created the additional space requirement, and that's why we've had to modify, because we're now outside of the – to put that size basin in with the one in four on both sides - - -

15

MR HANN: Right.

MR JOHNSON: - - - we're outside the construction footprint, which we did try to do, as – I guess, as an example of prescription, we did try to do through the
20 conditions, identifying that the conditions have been a direction on us to achieve this outcome.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

25 MR JOHNSON: “Here's how we can achieve it. You should be able to give effect to that through a departmental process,” and the department said they could not - - -

MR HANN: All right.

30 MR JOHNSON: - - - and we had to go down the - - -

MR HANN: Okay. Thank you.

MR JOHNSON: 48. So this is the Urban Heat Island Mitigation Strategy
35 requirement. The change here is just to remove green roofs. It was one that came up in MPE as well – MPE Stage 2. Given the design of our warehouses are for very open plan, large storage, automated movements, stacking, sorting, the structural supports for the roof won't sustain a green roof on top it. Warehouse 1, as you will see tomorrow, has solar panels on it that achieve a UHIMS benefit as well.

40

Again, when we come to the prescriptive consideration in a condition, if we were to discuss the mitigation strategies we were intending to apply for the site and we excluded green roofs, it has – in the previous experience, it has come and saying,
45 “No. You still need to consider green roofs as an option.” So for the – for our interests of saving time, that it's not a viable consideration for us.

MS LEESON: Essentially, is that because the warehouses are of such a large floor area, clear span – basically, I guess, a steel structure with cladding bolted onto it?

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

5 MS LEESON: And so it's a structural issue that you can't take the weight.

MR JOHNSON: That's correct.

10 MS LEESON: That's the structural issue.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: Okay.

15 MR COUTTS: And, presumably, what you're saying there is the present condition you – you would simply say you've considered all those measures, including the green roofs, but you haven't been able to do green roofs because A, B, C.

20 MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: And in the last one we got pressed on, "No. You've got to give it further consideration." So - - -

25 MR COUTTS: So you're just trying to get rid of something that creates a bit of for you.

30 MR JOHNSON: Exactly. And prevents rework from the department, Government Architect and us. For 68, the landscaping requirements. So this condition excludes a consideration of biofiltration within the OSD basins as part of the quantified requirement for soft landscaping. The OSD basins aren't permanent detention basins, so they don't have water sitting in them the entirety of time. In the absence

35 of water sitting in them, they are open space with vegetation in the bottom of them, and we don't see why that can't be considered as soft landscaping. Even with water, it still provides a – an ameliorative effect for landscape design and an urban heat island, and it has been considered and accepted as a part of that quantification for MPE Stage 2.

40 MR HANN: Okay.

MS LEESON: Right. Okay.

45 MR COUTTS: So if you include the OSD basins, it means that you've got to have a greater percentage of your warehouse area as soft landscape.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes. We would have to find that elsewhere.

MR COUTTS: That may well be the reason the department wants to leave the
basins in there.

5 MR JOHNSON: It – no. No. They want to take the – sorry. They want to exclude
the basins from the - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes. Sorry. Yes.

10 MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

MS LEESON: From the calculation. Yes.

15 MR COUTTS: I understand that, but that may be the reason they may well want to
do that. They - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

20 MR COUTTS: They want to be forcing you to have - - -

MS LEESON: Put more.

MR COUTTS: - - - a bit more - - -

25 MR JOHNSON: In their assessment report, they talk to – the Government Architect
talks to a requirement for additional landscaping.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

30 MR JOHNSON: We come back to it's a – it's an intermodal terminal where
automated processes – and there's a high – obviously, high freight vehicle
movements. Lots of open space required from a safety perspective. Not trying to not
provide landscaping or soft built environment. There's other alternatives to it than
35 having trees. An example from stage 2: we proposed, for the condition that requires
us to have landscape bays, that we would have soft landscaping, porous pavements
that could be driven over – so you still have access to the parking bay; you still have
a tree at the end of that bay, but the surface itself is considered soft landscaping – and
40 that was rejected by the department – or by the Government Architect. So it's –
where we can retain it, we will. We're not trying to avoid having soft landscaping.

MS LEESON: What do you mean they're that sort of checker plate - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes. It's - - -

45 MS LEESON: A chequered pattern where it has got grass between - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes. We had some that was – there was grass.

MS LEESON: - - - the parking bays?

5 MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes. Okay.

MR JOHNSON: We gave a few different alternatives. So - - -

10 MS LEESON: Do they have a view that doesn't work or - - -

MR JOHNSON: No. They just expressed that they didn't want that – they didn't consider that was addressing the condition for soft landscaping in the car park.

15 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: So the wording in B87 currently says that existing and future private – existing and future utility service infrastructures must be located outside the road upgrades. At the moment we've already got both public and private utilities in there which means we would either have to go in and take them out. Some of them we actually don't own. We don't have control over Sydney Water's sewer. Typically, we've been able to encase such infrastructure and still have it beneath the road surface. There's no – at the moment in its current wording it creates a significant impost on us.

20

25

MS LEESON: Have you spoken with the utilities about that? Does Sydney Water have a view on it? Have you spoken to them?

30 MR JOHNSON: I believe we have.

MR BARROW: Yes.

MR COUTTS: What is their view?

35 MS LEESON: What's their view?

MR BARROW: We can either or relocate it, but it's quite a significant sewer – so half the Liverpool area – so it's not just moving that sewer. It's actually so it's quite a significant piece of work

40

MR COUTTS: But as far as they're concerned, they would be happy

MR BARROW: Yes, yes. They're happy for us - - -

45 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BARROW: - - - to either encase it or relocate it

MR COUTTS:

5 MR HANN: And that's fairly standard practice, isn't it?

MR BARROW: Yes.

MR: If you want to build a swimming pool - - -

10 MR: Yes.

MR: - - - in your backyard

15 MS LEESON: Encase it.

MR: Okay. All right.

MS LEESON: And so that's your proposal - - -

20 MR: That's right.

MS LEESON: - - - to encase it.

25 MR:

MS LEESON: Is that the most significant one?

MR BARROW:

30 MS LEESON: The sewer.

MR BARROW:

35 MR JOHNSON: And there's telecoms. 169. This proposed change sort of bundles a couple of conditions together, so it's 165, 66. Talks to requirement for progressive contaminate management plan and remediation plans, actual plans, in the absence of a statement A. So site audit statement A is one that identifies that the land has been suitably remediated and it is fit for its intended land use. Our – rather than have that replicated in each of the conditions, we've said, “Well, if we have a site audit statement A that's completed as – in accordance with current MPW stage 1 consent that says exactly what we need it to say, then that should be able to be used to address each of those conditions.” 164, 65 and 66. And, therefore, it would obviate the need for those additional documentation requirements that are currently specified

40 in there. So again, rather than replicate that same requirement in each one, we've just bundled it into this one condition. This also ties to the staging. So at the moment we can't stage our site audit report, but if we're required to open up 65 and

45

..... 65 hectare, then we should be able to submit a statement that says that's all clear; we can start construction. Any questions on that?

MS LEESON: No. There probably will be more at some point.

5

MR JOHNSON: So 170 is again around staging just to align that remediation with stabilisation of earthworks areas which will be able to be undertaken. So we can demonstrate that it's fit for use for that 65 hectares. That should liberate it as opposed to needing to wait for the entirety of the site to be remediated, stabilised, before we can have that statement issued. 171. Again, this is very similar. Aligns to the staging requirements.

10

MR COUTTS: Let's all just pick it up

15 MS LEESON: The six – yes.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: I suppose wanted to understand why the department has a concern around this issue, because so much of what you're putting to us is revolving around - - -

20

MS LEESON: The staging.

25 MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR YIEND: Yes. Linked to the staging component. That's correct.

MR JOHNSON: And if they see – if we can demonstrate – I mean, if we can demonstrate through the design layouts and staging reports that here is the infrastructure that's in place for the site, it actually takes away a lot of the risk that they see of having exposed site that has no controls on it. But in the absence, and if we've got the staging, then other documentation should be aligned to that.

30

35 So what we've covered off in the presentation is the concept FEARs in the – as proposed in the revised concept approval have been addressed in the assessment documents provided. It addresses the SEARs that have been issued as well as consultation undertaken with agencies, including their responses to submissions, our response to their submissions, and some of the conditions we looked to have amended to make sure that they're commensurate with our nature, scale and extent of impacts and our ability to manage the site in either a holistic or stage manner.

40

MR COUTTS: In terms of the staging that you're looking for, whilst it may well be desirable, what's the implications if you don't get it?

45

MR JOHNSON: It means that - - -

MR COUTTS: From an operational perspective and, you know, from a business perspective.

5 MR JOHNSON: It's more the commencement of construction perspective. So it means that we would have to – we can do some remediation on the vegetate areas and we can clear those. We have to do that before we then clear the vegetation. Then we have to open up 65 hectares to excavate the – to do the cut. Then we have to stabilise that, and we have to bring it back to the first area that we're going to operate on, open that 65 hectares, and we don't commence construction – actually we
10 can't commence construction until we've almost stabilised the final 65 hectares and then got the site audit statement report in place - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes. So it actually delays your construction by whatever the timeframe is for your full three metre lift to the side.

15 MR JOHNSON: Yes. And like I said, staging as a total isn't preferable to us because we would rather have one document that – here's the plan for the site, here's what we intend to do, here's how we're going to manage it as per the assessment, we can align to most of the conditions, and if there's a change, we can update that
20 through the department directly.

MR D. BLYDE: And I might just add – sorry; Dan Blythe from Qube. I might well just add that from a business point of view to your question, we have interested parties seeking to locate themselves, and we're in negotiations with them, and I guess
25 in regards to meeting their expectations for occupancy, it's important to us that we can get the warehousing in place as we go.

MR COUTTS: Do you have a sense of what the variation in timing would be?

30 MR BLYDE: That's probably not a question for me.

MR COUTTS: Are we talking two months, three months, six months?

35 MR BARROW: Are we – I mean - - -

MR COUTTS: Well, let's say you've got a development without the things that you're proposing. So you have a timeframe of how – what that construction is going to be for you when you get your first warehouse on stream. If you have these changes as you're proposing them in allowing you to stage and construct, how much
40 quicker could you get your first warehousing up and running?

MR BARROW: It's probably worth so just for the transcript, Michael Barrow from Qube. The west area that we're – that you will see on the tour, we actually were able to start an early works part of it, which meant we were able to knock down
45 all the buildings, and so were actually in a position to actually start construction on those warehouse areas probably maybe 18 months ago, and through the processes

we've actually been further delayed actually getting to a point where we would have been on the east area.

5 So to answer your question, rather than how much delay would we – how much further ahead would we be if we started straightaway, we're actually going to be further delayed by not having the same definition of construction as we had on the east. On east, we had a wider definition of construction which allowed us – and not staging – which allowed us to get on and start the construction work and get the management plans in place.

10 What we fear is if we attack the west exactly the same way, is that we will be waiting possibly maybe a year, 18 months delay if we go through exactly the same process of the management plans going through and not being able to start work on the west. When you're out in the west, I understand normally the department's fearful of
15 starting construction before buildings get demolished and a site being left just but we've already started that process, and the way the development is at the moment is actually sitting there with the sedimentation and the erosion control in place, probably, in my personal opinion, in a worse state if we don't – if we're not allowed to get on and actually put the controls in place by starting construction staging across
20 the site if that's 65 hectares is put in place.

MS LEESON: So 12 to 18 month is - - -

25 MR BARROW: Yes, I would say so. Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - the impact of staging it versus - - -

MR BARROW: Yes.

30 MS LEESON: - - - a single approach to the site management.

MR BARROW: Yes. If we have to put in place all these mechanisms before we actually start construction, our experience currently is that these management plans are taking between six to nine months to get through the process. So - - -

35 MS LEESON: Dan, to your question and Alan's about the commercial side of it, you said you've got – discussing with people now who are interested to come out there. Are there any commitments with prospective tenants?

40 MR BLYDE: I might just pass to Michael Yiend, who is better placed to answer that.

MR YIEND: There is a reservation agreement on a portion of the west. As far as any other binding commercial agreements at the moment, there isn't anything.
45 However, the biggest impediment to us going down the path of binding commercial agreements is certainly of being able to deliver.

MS LEESON: Getting a timetable.

MR YIEND: The way the conditions are drafted, the delay isn't just in how long to take the works, it also is the works end up being, as Richard described, out of
5 sequence and it's not in a logical sequence of how you would normally go about doing all the site preparation and remediation works. So it's that double impact of having to stage and not be able to work on your earlier stage, but also having to go back and rework areas because of the fact of the site audit clearing conditions.

10 MR JOHNSON: And I think it's fair to say, too, the interest that has been generated for the precinct with the progression of Moorebank Precinct East, we have – you're likely to have tenants start to get more interested in what's happening, "We can see what's happening on east. When can we get a bite of west?" What we don't have
15 visibility of is a given tenant might want a certain design, size, scale, shape, orientation of their warehouse, which might not fit with the area that we've opened up first. So they then become lagged in their ability to get on the site until we've opened that portion of land. Or we can have the site ready to go from an earthworks perspective, such that any area is able to be triggered based on actual demand with all the relevant controls, mitigation controls, in place.

20 MS LEESON: And all these warehouses are tied to the intermodal facility, aren't they? They're not just, you know, freestanding independent warehouse that's – they're all related to rail freight.

25 MR JOHNSON: That's right. The conditions - - -

MR BARROW: That's correct.

MR JOHNSON: The conditions link it - - -

30 MS LEESON: It's a condition. Yes.

MR YIEND: Not only the conditions, the interest from all of the commercial entities that we're currently in negotiations with for warehousing is specifically for
35 that purpose, for the benefit that they get out of using that modal shift for both of the rail terminals.

MS LEESON: We see that you've got a VPA with RMS to the tune of \$48 million or thereabouts. Can you give us your thoughts on the VPA?

40 MR YIEND: Yes. The specific feedback you would like on - - -

MS LEESON: Well, the VPA talks about regional network improvements that need to be done.

45 MR YIEND: Right, yes.

MS LEESON: Do you have any concerns about the speed with which they might be implemented or, you know, how the VPA will work?

5 MR YIEND: The VPA is led – has been borne out of a requirement in the rezoning of the land from being special use defence to industrial and, within that rezoning in the - - -

MR JOHNSON: LEP.

10 MR YIEND: - - - LEP. There was a requirement put in that led to the negotiation of the VPA and all the provision for satisfactory arrangements to be entered into prior to any further development application being approved on the site.

MS LEESON: Okay.

15

MR YIEND: The quantification of the contribution as part of the VPA and all the works associated with the VPA was what RMS deemed as satisfactory arrangements in their view as a contribution from the development to that road network.

20 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR YIEND: The roadworks that are, in our view, as the developer of the site, directly required to be able to make it work, are direct works in kind that we've, through both Moorebank Precinct East and Moorebank Precinct West, have been put in our statement of commitments as works to be carried out. So those direct components that we do believe are required in timing for the development to roll out, we are in control of how that contribution is spent by the state in the regional road upgrades has less of an - - -

30 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR YIEND: - - - impact or concern as to exactly where it is spent or at what time it is spent.

35 MS LEESON: And I take it from what you said, then, the VPA was actually agreed some time back at rezoning, so that's - - -

MR JOHNSON: No.

40 MR YIEND: No. The requirement to enter into a negotiated VPA was put into the LEP some time ago.

MS LEESON: Okay.

45 MR YIEND: The actual agreement of the VPA was only more recently.

MS LEESON: More recently. Okay. Thanks.

MR COUTTS: So you don't have a sense of whether you're getting a good bang for your buck or not?

5 MR YIEND: That's correct. We would like it to be spent, rather, locally and sooner as it will obviously be better for the development, but it's not a must-have on our side of things. We believe the critical components of the infrastructure for the development, we can control those getting online ahead of - - -

10 MR COUTTS: And that's that Moorebank Avenue area and the internal roads, and so forth.

MR YIEND: Yes, that's correct. Yes.

15 MS LEESON: And the road further south - - -

MR JOHNSON: Cambridge?

MS LEESON: Cambridge Avenue, yes.

20 MR JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

MR BARROW: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: Which is outside of ours.

25 MS LEESON: Which is outside the area, and the trucks are not meant - - -

MR JOHNSON: Don't go there.

30 MS LEESON: They won't be going to go there.

MR JOHNSON: No.

35 MS LEESON: So do you have truck driver guidelines or operational rules for them as to where they can and can't go?

MR BARROW: Chain of responsibility?

40 MS LEESON: Chain – yes.

45 MR BARROW: Yes. There's a chain of responsibility as part of our contract and part of our obligations under the legislation. So the actual – the way the truck drivers use it going out of the site – they get inducted to the site. Once they leave the site, then like any other driver, can use the roadways, but, yes, we can control, through the infrastructure, which way they can go through the traffic controls and lights etcetera, and - - -

MS LEESON: Okay. So is there something to happen down the bottom end to Cambridge Avenue that will prevent them coming that way or - - -

5 MR COUTTS: There's camera that says it will spot them coming out if they turn left instead of right.

MS LEESON: Okay.

10 MR JOHNSON: There's also a code of conduct required by – under the traffic management plans – access management plans for the site.

MS LEESON: Right. Okay.

15 MR JOHNSON: So that will be implemented as well.

MS LEESON: Okay.

20 MR COUTTS: But you do actually have something – a camera to make sure they don't do the wrong thing or go down the - - -

MR JOHNSON: I know there's one down near Cambridge, but – from Moorebank Precinct West, the design of that access and egress up at Anzac Avenue is somewhat prohibitive to that - - -

25 MS LEESON: To that movement?

MR JOHNSON: To a right turn out of the site. It's just out you go.

30 MS LEESON: Okay. Okay. Very good. John, have you got any further queries or questions?

35 MR HANN: Well, actually, it goes back to the fill, the 1.6 million cubic metres, and we talked earlier about where is it going to come from. It really goes the basic Gantt chart we've seen that's your schedule of works. You've got, I think, what appears to be the – the fill importation and placement happens in the first quarter of year 1, and then in the final quarter or fourth quarter of year 1 – or I may have misread that. But it's a matter of how do you manage that in terms of that timing, you know, packing that into three months in the beginning of the year and then the final three months of the year, to get all of that in with your 22,000 cubic metres per K, I think it is.

40 other words, is that – given it's coming from different locations, you're dependent on the availability of it.

MR BARROW: So - - -

45 MR HANN: I just wanted to understand how you think that will work.

MR BARROW: Yes. So our – because we've been doing this on the east - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

MR BARROW: - - - and also we've had some requirements on the rail access part as well. So we've been controlling the import of supply material and sandstone from various sites for nearly 18 months now, so we've got a pretty good handle. We've got agreements with the suppliers that have agreements with the various sites. So we're pretty confident through our controls that we can control the level of material coming in, we can turn it off and on as required. So to date, we've been able to manage the import. The only risk for us is, as I said earlier on in the hearing, was if the - we lag behind where the projects are currently going, because we're relying on Metro, and we're relying on the WestConnex projects.

MR HANN: Yes.

MR BARROW: But if you look at the sandstone volumes that are predicted to happen over the next four or five years, there's going to be plenty of sandstone available unless Badgerys Creek comes online earlier than is predicted. And - - -

MR HANN: Okay. So the pipeline, in your view, is going to be sufficient to be able to then regulate - - -

MR BARROW: Yes. It's - I mean - - -

MR HANN: - - - the intake, if you like, according to your development schedule for the site.

MR BARROW: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR BARROW: We're pretty covered. And given our experience on east. But, you know - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

MR BARROW: You know, we're always at the variability of the market. So - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

MR BARROW: You know, and various suppliers. But at the moment, we're pretty confident we can manage being able to turn it off and turn it on as required.

MR HANN: So, I guess, if you get squeezed and you need to take in a lot in a hurry to meet your own schedule of development on the site - and I'm just going back to, I think, it's the department's traffic people - they were concerned that there wasn't enough detail around the peak construction traffic and there wasn't enough detail around what - in order to get that amount of material in, there's going to be a peak -

this is in peak hour as well as the peak levels of volumes, and I just wondered whether you've got any - - -

5 MR BARROW: Yes. I mean, our - - -

MR HANN: What your response is to that.

10 MR BARROW: Sorry. I I mean, the main – that's the main reason why we've asked for the extension of the hours - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

15 MR BARROW: - - - is because that way it's a lot easier. You can get more trips in and - - -

MR HANN: This is to 10 pm versus 6; is that right?

MR BARROW: Yes, yes.

20 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR BARROW: Exactly. Exactly.

25 MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

MR BARROW: Because what ends up happening, you know, the trucks on the road, it's not as an efficient operation, you know, because they caught up in all the peak hour traffic plus having had relationships with the government, the government are much keener for us to have trucks, you know, not in the peak periods, because, you know, out of – you know, it's better to have the trucks in the later period plus, I mean, there's the facility, ultimately, be running 24/7, so it's not considered that – an issue with the local environment. So - - -

35 MR HANN: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: It also works at the supplier end, that if they're operating overnight, they don't end up with massive stockpiles on site that they've got to clear through the next day.

40 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: The other is on east, we've also demonstrated the ability to bring in the 600,000 cubes of the material. That hasn't – so the prediction of the – they've built a cap on the 22,000 cubes per day was both sides working concurrently.

45 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: So we haven't had that. If we – I don't think we quite – we've hit the peak of 22,000 in a day in in importing that 600,000 in a much shorter time period without the competition next door.

5 MR HANN: Okay. Yes.

MR JOHNSON: So now that that's all but done, then - - -

MR HANN: Is that right?

10

MR JOHNSON: Yes. The progression - - -

MR HANN: I'm not aware of the exact timing of MP east, but you're virtually - - -

15 MR JOHNSON: Yes. The progression of that is well advanced.

MR HANN: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: You will get a glimpse of that tomorrow.

20

MR HANN: Okay,

MR JOHNSON: So, really, the bulk of the import is to west.

25 MR HANN: All right.

MS LEESON: Have you been crushing on MP east?

MR BARROW: Yes.

30

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR HANN: Another sandstone, I presume, is it?

35 MS LEESON: So you have approval for the crushing.

MR BARROW: Yes. We – we can crush – so we've got an EPL across the whole site which allows us to crush. We can crush on the east, but unfortunately because of the concept conditions on the west, we can't crush there. So we've all got this demolished material waiting to – waiting to be crushed, but we can't crush – we

40 crush on east. We can't crush on west. Even though we've got an EPL across the whole site area, EPL says we must have the condition of consent to start crushing. So - - -

45 MR JOHNSON: And that's where the definition of earthworks and construction hurts us a bit, because my – we've got the material - - -

MS LEESON: But you do want to crush on West?

MR BARROW: Yes, because we've got all this – you know, it's environmentally

5 MR HANN: If it's sandstone ---

MR BARROW: Yes.

10 MR HANN: --- you're going to have to bust it up?

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR HANN: Yes. Okay.

15 MR JOHNSON: Well, no, no, no. There's demolished buildings.

MR BARROW: We've got – we've got demolished buildings.

20 MR HANN: And you've got demolished buildings, as well? Yes. Okay.

MR BARROW: We've got demolished buildings sitting on the West waiting to ---

MR HANN: All right.

25 MR YIEND: Yes. So we've stockpiled the concrete to then crush that and use that
as ---

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

30 MR YIEND: As a recycled construction material on the site, rather than truck it
offsite to a concrete-crushing waste facility ---

MS LEESON: Yes.

35 MR HANN: Yes.

MR YIEND: --- which is a bit illogical.

40 MR JOHNSON: And then have to bring import fill to ---

MS LEESON: And then bring it back.

MR YIEND: And then have to bring it back in.

45 MR HANN: Sure.

MR YIEND: It's much more sensible to crush it on site. But, again, part of the legacy issue we have by inheriting the concept plan. That wasn't included as part of what they applied for at that time. So - - -

5 MS LEESON: Would you look to use the hours till 10 pm for crushing, as well, or would that be a - - -

MR BARROW: No, no. We would just – we would – I mean, moving trucks into the site has – has a lot less impact than crushing. It's much noisier – it's a noisy
10 material. So - - -

MS LEESON: So they will come off the M5 down Moorebank Avenue, in and out?

MR BARROW: Yes, yes.
15

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR COUTTS: Does crushing fall under earthworks or construction?

20 MR JOHNSON: Right now?

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: They're one and the same. It falls under construction. So the
25 department has identified that in our EAS documentation we included everything post-demolition as being construction activity. That's why – well, part of the justification for having the definition the way it is.

MS LEESON: Yes. Ask the question.
30

MR HANN: Okay. Noise and the wall. Look, we had a good discussion with the department on Friday, but it'll be important for us to understand just your views on the noise attenuation, the mitigation with the noise wall and, yes, your views on it. Because there appears to be a difference of opinion in relation to the wall along that
35 western – I think it's on the western side of the - - -

MS LEESON: Yes.

MR HANN: Of the internal road, if that – if I'm correct.
40

MR JOHNSON: So the noise wall as identified in the documentation, the draft conditions, runs down this – outside the roadway – sorry, just outside the access road.

45 MR HANN: On that western side of that - - -

MS LEESON: On the western – yes.

MR JOHNSON: On the western side, yes.

MR HANN: - - - road corridor.

5 MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MR HANN: The internal road corridor, yes.

MR YIEND: That's correct.

MR HANN: Yes.

15 MR JOHNSON: So the background is that when the concept approval for MPW
and stage early works EAS was being undertaken and it was distinct from the MPE
rail access, there were three rail options considered: a – well, they're termed a
northern, central and southern. Those rail actually came in off the – from the north
here cut across and then ran down. In that study for noise, they – they tried – they
20 basically did a hypothetical of if we've got the rail positioned on the western
boundary - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

25 MR JOHNSON: - - - as one of the options identified, can we attenuate the noise
impact to the residents on this side and what attenuation would that give us. They
monitored or did modelling for a noise wall and then identified the potential for an
11 to 14 decibel drop, bearing in mind the rail's right here, and proximity to
residential here, warehousing would all be on the eastern side.

30

MR HANN: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: In – our position is that the rail is now on the eastern extremity of
the site and we have warehousing in between what would otherwise be the location
35 of the wall to operate as a buffer. In the preparation of the MPW stage 2 documents,
they took the inference that the noise wall had been included as a mitigation. Their
assessment identifies the consideration of the warehouses as a buffer with the rail on
the eastern side and that there is – inclusion of the wall would further reduce that –
any noise impact, and you have a – I think there's six to nine houses that have a one
40 to two decibel difference.

Our reading of the assessment is that it's carried across the hypothetical requirement
for the wall to achieve that outcome, as opposed to being an additional mitigation
onto the buffering effect of the warehouses proposed on the western side of the rail.
45 So we haven't – as you've seen in the – we did raise with the department that we
didn't think the noise wall should be mandatory. They've included it in the
conditions. We haven't objected to that, but we have told them we believe if – if we

can demonstrate that the noise modelling demonstrates that there's no impact – significant noise impact over here, then we should be able to come back and remove that requirement for a noise wall, but that's not part of our present position or application.

5

MR HANN: Right.

MR JOHNSON: We believe it can be mitigated without the wall.

10 MR HANN: Because I think the modelling, as I understood it, showed some exceedances in - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes. As I said - - -

15 MR HANN: Some of those sensitive receptors anyway on that - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: It's only one – one-to-two dBA, wasn't it?

20

MR JOHNSON: Yes. From recollection, it was - - -

MR HANN: Yes, yes.

25 MR JOHNSON: - - - there was about six houses that had the one-to-two dBA.

MR HANN: I can't remember the exact number, but, yes. Yes.

30 MR JOHNSON: A one decibel – and part of the department's other argument is we've also gone to a 24/7 operation. To get a one-decibel difference in traffic movement, you need to, basically, double the traffic. So while we go into 24/7 operation, that's – a lot of that's internalised within the warehouses, not necessarily freight traffic in and out of the site. So, again, we believe we should still have the ability to demonstrate that noise modelling can show that the noise wall isn't - - -

35

MR COUTTS: So you will come back and deal with that at some other stage.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

40 MR COUTTS: Is that correct?

MR JOHNSON: Well, basically, on – once this is approved, we will then – yes, assuming it's approved, and we've got that condition in there, then we will come back and look at the modelling to be undertaken - - -

45

- MR HANN: So the modelling that was done that showed the one-to-two dBA for the residents at the receptors. Did that – was that with the noise wall in place or without?
- 5 MR JOHNSON: That's the point of difference we actually have with our consultants.
- MR HANN: All right. Because – yes.
- 10 MR JOHNSON: Because the wording – the way they've documented their wording in the assessment is here – here's the impact of the – the buffering impact of the buildings.
- MR HANN: Yes.
- 15 MR JOHNSON: And then they talked to the noise wall being additional mitigation on top of that.
- MS LEESON: Make - - -
- 20 MR JOHNSON: They've – that's - - -
- MR HANN: Right, but you're saying that's ambiguous?
- 25 MR JOHNSON: That's how I read it. They say, no, they're – they've written it as their modelling includes the wall.
- MR HANN: All right.
- 30 MR JOHNSON: So that's why we say - - -
- MR HANN: So you take the wall out, you'd expect greater exceedance of the - - -
- MR JOHNSON: In their view.
- 35 MR HANN: Based on that scenario.
- MR JOHNSON: Yes, that's right. Yes.
- 40 MR COUTTS: Well, I think the department's concern is that all that modelling and all that information with the noise wall goes right from the very start of the LAS, the response to submissions, so to take it - - -
- MR JOHNSON: That's right.
- 45 MR COUTTS: To take it out now - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: They're uncomfortable taking it out now.

5 MR JOHNSON: Yes. And that's why we haven't in the current presentation asked to have that removed.

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MR JOHNSON: That's – we believe that's for - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: If we want it adjusted - - -

15 MR COUTTS: For another day.

MR JOHNSON: - - - that's for us to prove.

20 MR COUTTS: For another day.

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. Happy if you want to take it out.

25 MR COUTTS: No. No, for another day.

MS LEESON: No, no.

30 MR HANN: All right. No, no, no. I think you've got enough on your plate to - - -

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

MS LEESON: One of the things that we're interested in, I think, is the visual impact, given the site's raised, you know, by about three metres, and we've seen some photo montages that seem to indicate it's not much of an impact at all. Are those photo montages verified in any way? Like, survey verified? Or is it - - -

40 MR JOHNSON: Put together by an architect.

MS LEESON: Okay. Okay. I haven't looked at it closely yet, so I don't know how much of a - - -

45 MR JOHNSON: I would have to go back and confirm process.

MS LEESON: Whether I have a query about it or not, but I was just – sort of asked for the process that was done first before I have a look.

MR YIEND: We can confirm the actual verification process that they go through to be able to make sure that they're accurate.

5 MS LEESON: Okay. Okay. Thank you. And then – this is an open-access terminal?

MR YIEND: That's correct.

10 MS LEESON: Yes. So all sorts of locomotives come into here. Do you have any sort of requirements for the types of locomotives that come in – you know, emissions, noise, wheels, squeals – all that sort of business?

15 MR JOHNSON: Yes. There's a – if I use the MP example, there's best practice requirements have been incorporated into those conditions or consent. They're reflected in these, as well. Our position with transport from New South Wales and EPA has been that, yes, it's our intent to try and achieve the improved outcomes and best practice, however, given we're open access, we – it would constrain us to exclude all the – you know, we don't have control of all locomotives or all wagons on the network, and because we're open access it's not necessarily competitive for us to exclude ones that wouldn't meet the – a standard that's not applied routinely across the state - - -

20

MR COUTTS: Does Rail Access Corporation have – they must have best guidelines, don't they, for rail squeal and all that sort of stuff.

25

MR BLYDE: They do, and in relation to the locomotives, there is a process for operators to get their locomotives onto the network and they have to pass various - - -

MR COUTTS: I see.

30

MR BLYDE: - - - or demonstrate various standards - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35

MR BLYDE: - - - which has been part of our discussion with the EPA and transport, that locomotives that have been allowed onto the network and meet those standards, it's difficult for us to reject them from entering, because - - -

MS LEESON: No, I understand. Yes.

40

MR BLYDE: - - - we're open access.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

45

MR BLYDE: However, it's – we're clearly seeking to improve the standards, but we can't do that on our own as a developer.

MR JOHNSON: And what we have committed to is video and acoustic monitoring on that rail connection, particularly around the curves coming off the - - -

5 MR BARROW: So we've got to as part of our consent for MP we've got an angle of attack monitor which basically detects wheel squeal as you come in from the GWS site. So that sits there, and it will have published results on a website, so people can access to see the noise calculations of the wagons as they're coming into our rail spur.

10 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: And the ability to scan a wagon to identify the wagon, as well - - -

15 MR BARROW: Yes.

MR JOHNSON: - - - I believe, so it's not just a case of we've got data. It's that wagon that's not good.

20 MS LEESON: Right. Koalas. You mentioned those earlier in your biodiversity conversation.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. So - - -

25 MS LEESON: This is a recent find, by the sound of it. Koala.

MR JOHNSON: It is. So koalas were considered in the original assessment as being – the habitat being potential koala habitat. During nest box surveys in this area around the other side of East, which is known as the boot land – the extended version makes this area look like a boot – there was a single male koala found. So in the 10
30 years we've been working on site, it's the first koala we've seen in the area, and this area has been surveyed for a lot of that time, because it's part of the bio – proposed BioBanking area, as has this area to the west. We undertook some additional surveys for koalas, both ecologists, and we had a scat – koala scat detector dog.

35 The only presence of koala was found – or scats were found, I believe, in this area – vegetated area on West. We updated the biodiversity assessment report to reflect that presence, and you now have the condition for the koala natural plan included in the conditions. One of the requests we did make of the department was they identify the implication for fee trees across the precinct and the preservation of those, which
40 we're – you know, the fee trees within the conservation area, yes, we can understand the reasoning for those fee trees to still be in place and would always be intended to. And, actually, the dustbowl area at the moment – the dustbowl area was an excavation training yard, essentially - - -

45 MS LEESON: It's a great name.

MR JOHNSON: And apt for so there's no – there's not a lot of tall vegetation in there, but part of the remediation strategy is that that area gets revegetated. So the requirement for the management of trees across the precinct through the scatterings that we've still got left doesn't seem necessary or applicable for the one koala that
5 we found. The set 44 talks to core koala habitat being a viable population with a breeding female, which we haven't seen - - -

MS LEESON: Haven't seen.

10 MR JOHNSON: - - - on the site.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: But we do have presence of fee trees.

15

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR JOHNSON: So the biodiversity assessment report has been updated to reflect presence of koala.

20

MS LEESON: All right. Thank you.

MR HANN: Can you – just the rationale for the road transport from East to West, just for my benefit, if you're able to clarify the - - -

25

MR JOHNSON: I – given maybe - - -

MR HANN: - - - basis for that.

30 MR JOHNSON: Partially the interstate terminal is on West. The Imex will be completed on East in the first instance.

MR HANN: Yes.

35 MR JOHNSON: So the Imex is the port shuttle.

MR HANN: Yes.

40 MR JOHNSON: So if we have a warehouse that's developed on this side that wants to access Imex in advance of that access being provided on West would come out of the site up here - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

45 MR JOHNSON: - - - and then go on to East and load to the Imex terminal.

MR HANN: So it's flexibility for your future customers, your lessees, if you like, yes.

MR JOHNSON: Yes. I don't know if there's any more detail.

5 MR HANN: And that wasn't originally envisaged, because it was developed as two separate sites - - -

MR JOHNSON: Two different sites, yes.

10 MR YIEND: That's correct.

MR JOHNSON: Yes.

15 MR HANN: So the driver of it is it's now one site and you need that flexibility. Okay.

MR YIEND: That's correct, yes.

20 MR HANN: All right.

MR YIEND: Because the – each of the different terminals give a different rail function. The Imex, being a port shuttle, is a train operation to and from Port Botany - - -

25 MR HANN: Yes.

MR YIEND: - - - for import and export containers.

30 MR HANN: Yes.

MR YIEND: The Interstate Regional Terminal is for trains going regional New South Wales and interstate.

35 MR HANN: Yes.

MR YIEND: A lot of the tenants and the customers that we're talking to are talking about utilising both terminals, so they're not exclusively one or the other. So if they're located on the East or the West, they will be wanting to move - - -

40 MR HANN: Yes.

MR YIEND: - - - product to and from the terminal on the other side.

45 MR HANN: And as that increases, are you – we – I don't know if we mentioned this earlier, I just can't recall. Is there likelihood to close off Moorebank Avenue ultimately? Yes?

MR JOHNSON: I was just going to say. So the other part of the VPA - - -

MR HANN: Okay, all right. Okay. Yes.

5 MR JOHNSON: So there's a contribution, 48 million, and then there's works in kind, and the works in kind is Moorebank Avenue realignment, and that's – runs from just south of Anzac - - -

MR HANN: Yes.

10

MR JOHNSON: - - - and then runs around the eastern side of MPE - - -

MR HANN: Okay.

15

MR JOHNSON: - - - and then will come back into the east hills.

MR HANN: All right.

MR JOHNSON: That will then open up that space for the transfer.

20

MR HANN: So does the Commonwealth still own the - - -

MR JOHNSON: Boot land?

25

MR HANN: Part of Moorebank Avenue? Is that - - -

MR YIEND: So all of the – all the land the subject of this application and the boot land is all owned by the Commonwealth - - -

30

MR HANN: All right.

MR YIEND: - - - but it's leased to a private vehicle - - -

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

35

MR YIEND: - - - for 99 years, and then that private vehicle has appointed Qube as the developer for - - -

MR HANN: All right.

40

MR YIEND: - - - for the entire site for all the land as an integrated precinct.

MR HANN: And that includes Moorebank Avenue?

45

MR YIEND: That includes Moorebank Avenue, that's correct.

MR HANN: Okay. All right.

MR YIEND: So it's privately Commonwealth-owned land, but leased into this vehicle that then enables it to control applying for a realignment of Moorebank Avenue, closing the road and - - -

5 MR HANN: So the upgrade of the intersections then that relate to Moorebank Avenue, that's on Commonwealth land; isn't that right?

MR YIEND: The bits that are on Commonwealth land are actually part of that leased land.

10

MR HANN: Yes, okay.

MR YIEND: The bits that are not on Commonwealth land go through a similar process, which I think we have – council land and some RMS land.

15

MR HANN: Some – yes.

MR YIEND: Both of those go through the usual processes with council and RMS for doing a road upgrade. That's a requirement of the development.

20

MR JOHNSON: And there's a little bit of DJLU land and – on that corner.

MR HANN: Right.

25 MR JOHNSON: Around that intersection.

MR YIEND: So that's Commonwealth defence land.

MS LEESON: Right. Thank you.

30

MR HANN: All right.

MR COUTTS: Does the current rail line from Port Botany – does that need to be upgraded to run terminal once it's up and running, or is it satisfactory now?

35

MR YIEND: No. No, it's – yes, it's satisfactory. The Southern Sydney Freight Line is the dedicated freight line that goes just on the western side of the Georges River. That's what the rail connects into.

40 MR COUTTS: So it runs into Port Botany?

MR YIEND: That's correct.

MS LEESON: Yes.

45

MR YIEND: Fully dedicated freight line. The - - -

MS LEESON:

MR COUTTS: I know the line runs into Port Botany. I just wasn't sure whether it was actually at capacity – the sort of capacity - - -

5 MS LEESON: Well, I think they've started duplicating the line - - -

MR YIEND: Yes.

10 MS LEESON: - - - at the Port Botany end, haven't they?

MR YIEND: Yes, the duplication just outside of Port Botany is more to provide additional flexibility and reliability of the windows for the paths into and out of the - - -

15 MR COUTTS: Right.

MR YIEND: Not so much as an overarching capacity requirement. It's more about getting the flexibility for that window allocation.

20 MR COUTTS: I was born at Matraville, so I'm very familiar with the Port Botany rail line. My father was telling me a story how he almost ran into one of the - - -

MS LEESON: This is being transcribed, remember?

25 MR COUTTS: It's all right. My father was telling me a story how he almost ran into one of the train hoppers one time, because they didn't have lights on them, and there was no gates in those days. So you – the railway line would come over the hill and there'd be a – this black thing in front of you which is a railway car. Things

30 have improved since then.

MS LEESON: They have indeed. Okay. John, have you got any more queries - - -

MR HANN: I think that's it from me.

35 MS LEESON: Questions?

MR HANN: Thank you.

40 MR COUTTS: I'm done - - -

MS LEESON: All done? Okay.

MR COUTTS: All good.

45 MS LEESON: I think we're fine, thanks. If there are any things that come out of it, so it has been a good heads up for us this afternoon. It's clarified a couple of things.

Thank you very much. But if there are other things that we want to raise with you or go back to in terms of what was discussed today, we will do that through David, through the Secretariat. Other than that, we will see you on site tomorrow – some of you? All of you? I'm not sure – on site tomorrow.

5

MR JOHNSON: I'll be there.

MS LEESON: And we will have our public meeting, as well. So thank you very much for your attendance this afternoon. We will close the meeting now and - - -

10

MR JOHNSON: Sorry. Just before you do, just - - -

MS LEESON: Sorry. And you will table these.

15

MR JOHNSON: Those handouts.

MS LEESON: Thank you. Thanks.

MR COUTTS: Thank you.

20

MR HANN: Great, thanks.

MS LEESON: And then this will be posted on the website, as well. Thank you. All right. So we will formally close the meeting. Thank you very much.

25

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.30 pm]