



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1039629

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**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**

**LOCATION:** **BRIGHTON LAKES GOLF CLUB  
THE GREEN VIEW ROOM  
43 BRICKMAKERS DRIVE  
MOOREBANK, NEW SOUTH WALES**

**DATE:** **10.30 AM, TUESDAY, 18 JUNE 2019**

MS D. LEESON: Good morning, everybody. I'm not sure I'm going to need a microphone. Good morning, everybody. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet, the Darug and the Tharawal 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 this public meeting on the proposed modification and development application from SIMTA, the applicant, who is seeking to amend the concept plan of the Moorebank Intermodal Facility West and begin construction of Stage 2 of the Moorebank Intermodal Facility West.

My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm Chair of the Independent Planning Commission Panel, which has been appointed to help determine the proposals. Joining me are my fellow commissioners, Alan Coutts and John Hann and David Way from the Commission Secretariat. Before I continue, all appointed commissioners must make an annual declaration of interest, identifying any potential conflicts with their appointed role. For the record, we are unaware of any conflicts in relation to our determination of these proposals.

You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts on the Commission's website, and in the interests of openness and transparency, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on our website. This public meeting gives us the opportunity to hear your views on the assessment report prepared by the Department of Planning and Environment before we determine the development application.

The Independent Planning Commission was established by the Government on 1 March 2018 as an independent statutory body operating separately to the Department of Planning and Environment. The Commission plays an important role in strengthening transparency and independence in the decision-making processes for State Significant Development and land use planning in New South Wales. It is the independent consent authority for State Significant Development applications and provides an additional level of scrutiny where there are more than 25 objections of reportable political donations or objections by the relevant local council.

The Commission is not involved in the department's assessment of this project, the preparation of its assessment report or any findings within it. This public meeting is just one part of the Commission's process. We've already met with the department on 14 June and the applicant on 17 June 2019. The panel will also conduct a site inspection and locality tour this afternoon. Transcripts of these meetings and notes from the site inspection and locality tour will be made available on the Commission's website.

After today's meeting, we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required and matters raised, and, again, records of all meetings will be published on our website. Following today's meeting, we will

endeavour to determine the applicant and modification application as soon as possible. However, there may be delays if we find need for additional information.

5 So before we hear from our first registered speaker, I need to lay some ground rules that we expect everyone taking part in today's meeting to follow, and we do have a set of public meeting guidelines at the back of the room if anybody would like to have a look at those. First, today's meeting is not a debate. Our panel will not take questions from the floor and no interjections are allowed. Our aim is to provide maximum opportunity for people to speak and be heard by the panel. Public  
10 speaking is an ordeal for many people, and though you may not agree with everything you hear today, each speaker has the right to be treated with respect and heard in silence.

Today's focus is public consultation. Our panel is here to listen, not to comment.  
15 We may ask questions for clarification, but this usually is unnecessary. It will be most beneficial if your presentation is focused on the issues of most concern to you. It is important that everyone registered to speak receives a fair share of time, and we will enforce time-keeping rules. As chair, I reserve the right to allow additional time for provision of further technical materials. A warning bell will sound one minute  
20 before the speaker's allotted time is up and again when it runs out. I ask you to please respect these time limits.

Though we will strive to stick to our schedule today, speakers sometimes do not show or decide to not speak. If you know someone who is registered to speak today,  
25 but will not be attending, could you please advise David Way. If you would like to project something onto the screen, please give it to David before your presentation. If you have a copy of your presentation, it would be appreciated if you could provide a copy to the Secretariat after you speak.

30 Please note that any information given to us may be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to your information, and there is also copies of that at the back of the room, or you can find it on the Commission's website. Finally, I would ask that everyone present turn their mobile phones to silent and thank you for that. I will now call the first speaker, who I've actually left on the  
35 table. Thank you. That's actually Paul Van Den Bos.

MR P. VAN DEN BOS: Thank you for the opportunity of speaking at this meeting. My plea to the commissioners is to please give careful consideration before increasing the TEU limit to 500,000. My aim is to provide you with enough  
40 background so that this new limit can be considered properly. I hope that by the end, you can share my concerns. To me, this increased limit clearly shows that whoever provided that advice has a very limited understanding of the transport and traffic issues. In this booklet, I have – the left page is my speaker notes so that I can keep on time. The right page has maps, tables and graphs, etcetera, and references are  
45 included.

Since this is such a complex issue, I will use simple examples, treat flows in one direction only and consider the AMP ..... Page 38 onwards are answers to possible questions. First, a background from a transportation point of view. Page 2 shows the traffic flows over the M5 bridge and the Light Horse Bridge, which is seven per cent less than the Sydney Harbour Bridge Flow. From a transportation point of view, this is the east-west traffic. Page 4 shows that the north-south traffic is about half of the Harbour Bridge traffic. Page 6 shows the Cambridge Avenue. The shaded white area represents Moorebank Intermodal.

10 SIMTA EIS 3 states that the crash rate is about 20 times higher than the RMS guidelines. Page 8, Moorebank Avenue. It's a very similar story. The additional traffic alone is expected to generate a crash rate four times higher than the RMS guidelines. Page 10 shows a table comparing crash statistics reported in SIMTA EIS 1 and SIMTA EIS 2. There is about a 20 per cent increase over five years. SIMTA  
15 EIS 3 used a different study area and we couldn't use those results. Page 12 shows the crash rate on the M5 is about 40 times higher than the RMS guidelines.

This data comes from MICL EIS. The MICL EIS implies that the M5 widening funnels more traffic into this congested section with very predictable results: more crashes, slower speeds, lower traffic throughput. And the economics. Page 14 comes from SIMTA EIS 1. SIMTA catchment area 2016 and 2025. In 2025, the SIMTA catchment areas is greatly reduced. New South Wales Government's submission to Infrastructure Australia, for economic reasons, SIMTA should operate in 2016 rather than 2021 and the RTA website refers to a 2013 start.

25 So a summary from a transportation point of view. It's strange to build something so big with such a short economic lifespan in an area with east-west traffic volumes similar to Sydney Harbour Bridge flows and north-south traffic volumes half of Sydney Harbour Bridge flows in a local area, having crash rates 20 and 40 times  
30 higher than the RMS guidelines.

Now, the planning is about Sydney Aerotropolis, see page 16, a new city, that yellow area that's about twice the size of Brisbane, therefore, it needs freight about twice the size of Brisbane's freight volume, and New South Wales freight policy appears to be  
35 rail the containers to Moorebank and truck the containers to Aerotropolis, and the quickest way is over the M5 bridge with its high crash rate. Given this background, the traffic analysis does not show a pretty picture. Let's look at the first level of technical issues. Please stop me if it's – I'm going too fast, but there's a fair bit I  
40 want to cover.

Page 18. There's a lot of information, one step at a time. This comes from Mickel EIS, top right-hand side. This is output from a software package used to calculate the green times at traffic signals. Underneath the Parsons Brinckerhoff logo, intersection of Hume Highway and Reilly Street. Below it, next to traffic light icon,  
45 the 2030 base AM, that's about 10 years from now, and no intermodal traffic. I've put a brown box around the 464.0 numbers. This is a mathematical model and hence its accuracy.

This column title, 95 per cent of back of queue distance, and that's in metres. Simply, this is the queue length. The blue arrow points to the south for the approach. The Hume Highway S, that's for the southern approach from the Hume Highway. The queue length is plotted on the Google map. The brown arrow points to the distance. This is rough but good enough for illustrative purposes. Notice that the Reilly queue blocks the M5 Motorway and the Hume Highway intersection. See that red box.

Page 20. This is that blocked intersection. Below Parsons Brinckerhoff logo, we read the intersection of the M5 Motorway and the Hume Highway. Same routine, the brown box, 1100.9 metre queue length. Plot queue length on Google maps at 1.1 kilometres. Notice that this queue blocks Graham Avenue and De Meyrick Avenue's traffic lights. The red box with the number 469.4 has a red arrow pointing to the queue on the Hume Highway on ramp. This queue stretches close to where we see the water on the bridge – water on the river. Sorry.

Two more data points from this table. The same row to the left, a red box shaded with a number 1.214 and it's column title, degree of saturation. Also on the same row, to the right, a purple box with 1.43. It's column title, effective stop rate per vehicle. On average, every right-turning vehicle must stop 1.4 times and 25 per cent of the heavily loaded intermodal trucks will turn right. You can see that on pages 49 and 50.

Now, why do we see these queue lengths longer than distance between intersections? And the answer, the software has a switch which enables intersections to be connected into a network. The mathematics incorporates all movements, including the parking vehicles. In a network, if a queue blocks a departing vehicle, that departing vehicle cannot move. The vehicles behind it also cannot move. Any newly arriving vehicle must queue behind those blocked departing vehicles. This is a very simplified explanation of how gridlocked networks are calculated.

Parsons Brinckerhoff treats each intersection as an isolated intersection. Hence, queue length can be longer than the distance between intersections. Therefore, a better question is, why did the models not flick that network switch? That is the question for the Commissioners to ask those modellers. See page 36 for some other possible questions.

Intuitively, if the degree of saturation is 100 per cent, or 1.0, it is fully saturated. I just wanted to – wanted you to see a number higher than 1.0 and we saw 1.214. How can we have a degree of saturation of 1.2? Well, this is a mathematical model. In simple terms, more vehicles want to make a movement than the theoretical capacity. In this case, 20 per cent of the vehicles wanted to turn right but could not. And therefore, these numbers are taken out of the mathematics. Think about those trucks from intermodal. Twenty per cent will not be able to turn right here. And that's in addition to the 1.4 stop rate.

Now, what would the net impact be if a network model were used? Clearly, in this case, the queues would grow very long and spill back even further onto the M5 Motorway. Such a long queue would reduce the distance available for the weaving and merging.

5

Now, I like to go half a step deeper into the technical area. Page 24 shows a graph from the Australian Research Report 341. We're looking at the relationship between vehicle spacing on the Y axis and speed on the X axis, for a 100 kilometre roadway. This data is from a freeway in Melbourne and it's technically identical to the M5 Motorway in front of the Moorebank Intermodal. The top right-hand side, we see a representative picture of a few vehicles on the road. The arrow points to the spacing between the vehicles. In this case, the spacing is large and do not worry about the numbers.

15 In the middle of the right-hand side, a picture shows more vehicles. The arrow points to the short spacing, but note the speed is 100 kilometres per hour. In the middle of the graph, we see a blue arrow indicating critical spaces. Here, the green curve changes to the red curve. As more vehicles are added to the roadway, the average speed drops very quickly and so does the spacing. As Professor Mike Florin would say, we have too many cars on the road.

20 Page 26 shows the SIMTA EIS 1 survey speed on the M5 bridge, which is now about 10 years old, and speeds collected by the members from our community. The blue arrows point to the expected spacing between vehicles. The length of a B-triple is also shown and this is the preferred mode of transport for the Moorebank Intermodal. How can a large truck fit into a small space safely and at speed? In addition from the intersection analysis on page 20, with the queue spilling onto the M5 bridge, the distance for this lane changing is shorter.

30 Question now is, how many trucks are expected to change lanes? In the case of toll road modelling, modellers were asked to generate numbers as high as possible. In the case of intermodal modelling, the modellers were asked to generate numbers as low as possible. And page 28 shows the response – the Transport for NSW response to SIMTA EIS 1. Modellers should have used truck numbers about 10 times higher in their model work. For comparison purpose, factor the Transport for NSW number down to one million TEUs.

40 Page 30 comes from ..... first book. This table is a sanity check of truck volumes from all intermodals in Sydney. This is based on the freight database downloaded from the NSW Government website. The yellow column shows the truck numbers factored up to one million TEUs. The last two lines are of interest. The average is roughly four times higher than the Transport for NSW figure. So how many lane-changing trucks do we have for half a million TEUs? Well, see page 35 for details: about 65 per cent of all the intermodal trucks will change lanes, and it roughly translates to 12 seconds between trucks in one direction, and 12 seconds between trucks in the other direction.

45

Page 32 summarises its implementation. Fitting a large truck into a small space, with high frequency, at speed, within a short distance. Unfortunately, this is a gross oversimplification. The community survey showed that lane 1 and lane 2 operate at different speeds. The trucks must change from a lower-speed lane into a higher-speed lane. At the same time, the M5 traffic wanting to exit have to change from a higher-speed lane to a lower-speed lane. And both these movements have to occur within a restricted length.

And finally, page 26 showed that the speed has reduced since SIMTA survey, 10 years ago, and it's highly likely that the next 10 years, the spacing would even be smaller still.

In summary, the truck size and the spacing between vehicles are operational concerns. They're not affected by the TEU levels. The gridlocked Hume Highway and the surrounding roads are environmental constraints, not affected by the TEU numbers. However, increasing the TEU limit impacts the right-hand turn at the Hume Highway. Intersection capacity shows that 20 per cent cannot make a right-hand movement, and that's not counting the trucks from the intermodal. And remember that those truck have to stop 1.4 times.

The impacts – the queue length, of course, are going to spill further back onto the M5, reducing the distance for the available lane changing and the frequency of lane changing in this greatly reduced distance. As I leave you with these thoughts, I hope that you can share my concerns. We already have a crash rate that is 40 times higher than the RMS guidelines, and 85 per cent of the Moorebank Intermodal traffic will use this spot.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Paul. Still not working – there we go. If I could now ask John Anderson to come to the microphone, thank you.

MR J. ANDERSON: Yes, good morning, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to thank the IPC Commissioners for the opportunity to speak at this public meeting. I will outline a number of reasons to reject this application, as will be the best interests of residents and the community and for good business operations.

MS LEESON: Excuse me, John. If I could - - -

MR ANDERSON: Sorry. Sorry.

MS LEESON: Sorry to bother you. That's the - - -

MR ANDERSON: The wrong one? That's all right. That might make it a bit better, won't it? Firstly, that traffic congestion, as outlined by Paul Van Den Bos, is well known, and a recent NRMA survey of 13,000 individuals stated that these individuals voted the M5 and the Moorebank Avenue as the most congested area in Sydney. And with this in mind, it would not be practical to use this site, as

companies will not be able to operate fully, given their vehicles will be held up in massive traffic delays. If their vehicles cannot do their work in a normal way, those companies will be badly affected. That's just good business acumen.

5 The pollution from many freight ..... and mainly up to 20,000 diesel vehicles would pose a great health risk to residents, with 53 per cent being aged under 34. Now, I'm one who has a great concern for our young people, because their bodies don't mature until about 25. And also I've been a long-time advocate for the koalas in the area, and they – they sort of are in a very close area to this intermodal, and the diesel  
10 emissions would have a huge impact on their welfare.

The noise from the operations will not be able to be mitigated, as I've been in the area for 10 years, and I've heard many strange noises on a regular basis. And given that the operating limits were set at 43 decibels in the Land and Environment Court,  
15 it would make operation of handling containers practically impossible, given that the cranes that lift these containers operate at a noise level of 90 decibels.

The local population is expected to double in the next 20 year, and any upgrades will just struggle to cater for the anticipated increased road traffic. Combined with the  
20 airport, the intermodal will choke on traffic, which will be highly likely – which will mean that the area would – and it is just a matter that the area in that area will be up to a million people in the near future. So the last thing that you're going to have an operation – residential area, and the airport as well – the intermodal will just choke up the whole area, and will be against what the government is trying to achieve.

25 Now, this is not very good planning. And an intermodal is only effective if it is used for rail close to the final delivery ..... with only one or two per cent of delivery in this area, it will result in triple-handling of cargo, with the containers handling – landing in Port Botany, they would have to come out to Moorebank, and then go into Eastern  
30 Creek or Newcastle, because it has been estimated that 45 per cent of the cargo will be, sort of, used for the Eastern Creek area, with the result that there would be additional, unnecessary cost to consumers for these goods. Parkes, Port Botany, Penrith or – and even – and Perth are the best sites for freight movements, and would keep ..... within acceptable limits.

35 Health in the Liverpool district is very bad. It has been my knowledge that the area contains the third highest number of residents with disabilities, and the resulting air pollution problems suddenly would potentially see massive consequences ..... and I'm entitled that they're going to increase the cost to the Liverpool Hospital by 700  
40 million. But I've spoken to the local member, and I said, my idea is that it's all right increasing cost for the hospital, but you got to trying to help these people with these type of illnesses and that, because, you know, I know that for a fact that we have 11 per cent diabetes in the area, and there's a huge, 5 per cent higher mortality rate, and that there's a high cardiovascular problem in the area. And with 53 per cent under  
45 34, these just – these make our health situation bad. And I've been asked by many people, well, why did they – why do they continue with this intermodal, given that huge impact on our health here?



5 The area is home to the greatest number of koalas in the Sydney basin, stretching from Holsworthy down to Camperdown, and Menai and Sandy Point, and the level of diesel emissions would greatly impact on their numbers. With present indications, they will be extinct by 2050. Surely we must do more to protect our iconic wildlife, along with many other threatening endangered species.

10 Now, it's all right to have biodiversity credits, but in the area where we got so many – I know we got about 27 threatened and endangered species, and also we got many plants that are very valuable – now, we had a recent case where the Hibbertia ..... was – was thought to be extinct, but the last time when it was recorded, back in nineteen – 1823. Now, I – I have seen the area regarded as “Sydney’s Kakadu” and “the lungs of Sydney”. So why is all this pollution adding contamination to that going to come to this area? It just doesn’t make sense.

15 Now, we have kept up our campaign for many years. I have been involved in 11 years. And I think that – and what really makes me very, very mad is that we don’t seem to be getting any recognition of the prominence which we have ..... over many years. Dr Ewett, from the Doctors for the Environment, has stated that the area is the most polluted in New South Wales, and it is totally reckless to expose the area to  
20 much more pollution. The area has been subject to ..... on the Holsworthy army base, and we are still awaiting results of this inquiry into the harmful effects.

25 The Liverpool Council has commissioned a peer review on traffic, which Mr Paul Van Den Bos is going to do. And also they’re going to do a peer review on the pollution, as Dr Ewett. So I believe that any decision on this matter should await these two important peer reviews, because I think the rest of this area should be entitled to some sort of consideration for many issues that I’ve outlined.

30 Our valid concerns have been ignored – at the least, glossed over – in the past. And I request that you Commissioners have a more vigorous review of these serious matters, given regard to the health and the local ..... of the local population. I have travelled around the area for about 35 years – I was 17 years in Moorebank, seven years in Hoxton Park, now 10 years in Wattle Grove. And recently I have been astounded by the number of intersections where the lights stay green for one second.  
35 And I’ve noted that most intersections where the people go across, the lights stay green for about three seconds. Now, in an area which is hard last, number of people disabilities, this is not acceptable, you know. The health and safety of residents has been ignored too long, and I believe this should be addressed. So I will stop – I will finish on that, and hope that you give us some rigorous review of our situation.  
40 Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thank you, John. Do we have Erik Rakowski here? We understand he might not be well.

45 MR ANDERSON: Yes. He told me that – he gave me a message that he was a bit sick, so I’m not sure if he’s going to come.

MS LEESON: Okay. Well, we're happy to – if he does come – happy to accommodate him when he gets here. Otherwise we will take any submission that he would like to give us. On that – in that case, can I ask Jennifer French to come up to the microphone.

5

MS J. FRENCH: Good morning. I'm speaking as a resident. I'm a former vice president of RAID, but I'm not speaking for RAID. I'm also a member of Liverpool City Council's Intermodal Committee, but I'm not speaking for the council or its committee. The applicant wants to build bulk earthworks, warehousing and an interstate rail terminal. The first trains will be running from Port Botany later this year, and an unknown number will follow from the interstate rail terminal. This will be the start of thousands of trucks running out of the Moorebank Intermodal precincts. Most will be traversing Liverpool's arterial routes, and will actually be travelling out of the area.

15

There are many aspects of concern to local residents in these applications. However, I think the aspects of air quality and traffic are particularly important. Air quality in Liverpool is a contentious issue. Further investigations need to be carried out to establish why some data shows that a major air pollution issue exists in the area and some assessments do not show this. I urge the Commission to require that further comprehensive air quality studies are carried out.

20

The strategic justification for the Moorebank Intermodal relies upon it having excellent access to both rail and road transport. Early consents were, as I understand it, predicated on this. No further consents should be issued until major long-term road or public transport projects that offer comprehensive relief to current traffic congestion in the area have been planned and delivered. I mean, the projected scale of this project is so large, that, as our modelling expert Paul Van Den Bos' study shows, further traffic loadings could at times stall parts of Liverpool's road network. And this is a network which is already facing a major capacity problem within the next few years.

25

30

This evidence-based study that Paul Van Den Bos has presented today: it simply cannot be ignored any longer. Potential remedies to the traffic issues, such as remediating the problems at the M5 Moorebank weave, or the road bridge, developing the Hume Highway/Hoxton Park Road intersection or rather, redeveloping it, and creating a link road to Brickmakers Drive, they represent such major infrastructure investment that the final cost could run into many hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer's money. It is not clear that these measures would solve the problems, given that our area constant population growth. If this traffic issue is not dealt with and the MPE and MPW start operations, the outcomes for Liverpool residents could be considered to be potentially extremely serious.

35

40

Paul Van Den Bos' study shows that additional traffic will place Liverpool CBD and Liverpool Hospital at high risk of traffic hitting the wall on arterial routes on a number of subsidiary city roads. That is, traffic build up will be at such extreme levels that, in some areas, traffic will be at a standstill during busy periods. This

45

effectively means that the city and its businesses, educational institutions and essential services such as Liverpool Hospital, one of – well, probably the largest hospital in the country, will stop functioning properly.

5 The combined traffic on the M5 overbridge in Liverpool and the Light Horse Bridge over the Georges River in Liverpool, as Paul Van Den Bos said, nearly equal the amount of traffic that uses the Sydney Harbour Bridge each day. This immense traffic loading can be pushed to the point of unworkability with increases of only a few per cent. Of particular concern is the Moorebank Intermodal. This is a massive  
10 project that will pour thousands of trucks per day onto the M5, the Hume Highway and other roads.

So one of the factors leading to non-expert acceptance of separate projects is that the finding that one or two per cent in projected traffic loads sounds innocuous. Yet  
15 cumulatively, an existing congested system such as Liverpool's, it can lead, as Paul said, to intersections failing to clear and backlogs that are kilometres long. One of the effects of increased through traffic, such as transport trucks, is that local traffic is either held up on feeder – either held up on feeder roads and/or moves across to other roads to access the CBD and other locations, causing flow on major problems on  
20 those roads.

For example, local traffic would move off the Hume Highway onto Bigge Street, the street that feeds the front entrances of Liverpool Hospital. This street has already become very congested from traffic moving away from the Hume Highway, as result  
25 of the speed limit being changed from 70 kilometres per hour to 60 kilometres per hour. With an increased traffic loading, Bigge Street would hit the wall. That is, it will be at a standstill. Though there are a couple of rear access roads, ambulances would have difficulty gaining access to the hospital. There is also a major private hospital there and both hospitals have a continuing building program.

30 Large existing and planned educational and research institutions would also be heavily impacted. This is just one example of how the quality of life in Liverpool and its surrounding area would be downgraded. I urge the Commissioner to refuse the applications. However, should the Commission decide to approve them, the  
35 following conditions should be set down.

Firstly, due to concerns raised by expert traffic modelling engineer Paul Van Den Bos, that has, for example, demonstrated the use of dated, incorrect or  
40 inappropriately generated data in intermodal traffic-related studies, there should be an independent traffic inquiry carried out for the entire Liverpool area. The crash rate projections are extremely serious.

Secondly, a condition should be imposed that all traffic-related infrastructure work in the wider Liverpool area and M5 be carried out and assessed before the project  
45 begins operation. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Jennifer. If I could ask Robert Storey. Thank you.

MR R. STOREY: Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm just a resident. I am a member of the Environment Committee of Liverpool City Council and I'm also on the Floodplain Committee. So I've got quite a few issues with the flooding. The main reasons why Liverpool are objecting to the intermodal freight terminal at Moorebank are for the following reasons: the exit ramp of Moorebank Avenue onto the M5. Now, this was already discussed, so I'm not going into great detail. The article from the NRMA Magazine May/June 2019 issue – and I will give you this – reads as follows:

10           *The M5 Motorway at Moorebank has been voted the single worst congestion hot spot in New South Wales after the NRMA conducted the largest transport survey in the state's history.*

I will give you the actual article. There is there. So it's true fact. Now, with that, there has been a lot of public exhibitions and I went to one of them and – and I actually raised that issue, the exit road on the M5, with a traffic engineer. And went up to him and I said, "Look, this a major problem." Of course, I had already spoken about it. He said, "Mate, we will deal with that when it comes." Now, I keep speaking about – here we are now, and it's not dealt with. So I – I'm just disappointed.

The site is unsuitable for the type of development – right. The site is unsuitable for this type of development and only has one roadway. That is Moorebank Avenue. It is just like being on an island. The proposal would adversely impact on the local and surrounding community. Too right it does. The technical report provided with this application are inadequate and do not address the issues. They simply acknowledge the issues, that they are there. They do not deal with them. How can you do any project when they're not dealing with the issues? It's going to affect thousands and thousands of people.

The MPW and the MPE applications should be considered together. To address the increasing impact, there should be one master plan. One master plan would stop all – what we've been doing. Their – their proposals have been hotchpotch. They've just put little bits in, little bits in, and then they say, well, you've approved this so now you've got to approve that. If there was a master plan, all the information we know now, the project would never have been approved from the start.

The proposal is not substantially the same as the concept approval and section 96(2) is not the correct planning process to assess the proposal. The increasing truck movement would have adverse community impact on the whole of the Liverpool community, as the existing road system is inadequate. We have had our state and federal members object to this project. They have spoken in parliament about their objections but still, it proceeds on. The Liverpool City Council is also objecting to the proposal.

Now, a new issue. A legislative council committee has called for the government to investigate freight rail options between Port of Newcastle, Port Botany and Port

5 Kembla. The committee has also recommended that the government review its ports policy, because they're not right, including the potential for a container terminal in Newcastle. Once the Federal Court proceedings have concluded – so there – it's happening now, or at such time as the house determines. I will give you some information about this. I presume you already know about it.

10 In 2014, the Port of Newcastle was leased to a private sector operator for a period of 98 years. Recently, that operator, referred as the Port of Newcastle, has support for plans to develop a container terminal in Newcastle, which is argued, would enable economic growth in the Newcastle and Hunter Region and alleviate congestion in Sydney, therefore reducing the need for the public work infrastructure in Sydney.

15 The Port of Newcastle has claimed that it is currently uneconomical for it to pursue a container terminal development due to the provisions contained within the Port's commitment deeds. There was things that the government put in that deed, I think it was about \$100 a terminal – container excess, that has got to be put on every container that goes into Port of Newcastle.

20 Now, I will go on to the fill. Approximately 1.6 million cubic metres of fill to raise a site generally two to three metres. 46,130 cubic metres was proposed. So they've jumped from forty – this is the – the planning, from 43,000 cubic metres to 1.6 million. Not a bad jump. The Department states, page 7, Executive Summary:

25 *The modification does not substantively change the nature of the development.*

Well, I personally think it does.

30 *The location of imported fill should not indirectly impact on biodiversity values of the conservation area.*

This statement is incorrect as some of the fill will be washed into the conservation area – pretty obvious. How much will depend on the rain, how long it lasts and its intensity. Why does the site have to be raised two to three metres? And up to 3.6 metres in some locations. Why? Nothing in the report tells me why the levels have to be raised. Nothing in the report tells me that the floodplain – and this is – I will go into detail later about this, the floodplain will be protected or filled. I will presume the whole of the floodplain will be filled. The two detention basins have been cut into the conservation area, page 66. They shouldn't be in the conservation area. It's to do with levels.

40 What is stated in the document is one per cent annual exceedance probability. Now, I wouldn't have a clue what that means. It's nothing – it's something to do with the floodplain but I don't know what it is. Now, I just go on to the floodplain area, because this – this just doesn't affect the Liverpool residents. This is the whole of the Georges River, right – right downstream. So I have a document here which fully elaborates. So I will just sort of – I did a summary of what's in this document.

Have we forgotten about the flooding on the Georges River? And the most important part of the river is the floodplain area – riparian area. The Georges River is one of the most populated urban catchments in Australia, with over one million people living in that catchment. The Georges River runs adjacent to the CBD of Liverpool and is over 100 kilometres long, from its headway near Appin, the river runs north towards Liverpool, through Chipping Norton, Lansvale and then through Bankstown to Botany Bay. It has a number of major branches, Cabramatta Creek, Prospect Creek, O'Hares Creek and ..... When these creeks – or when the Georges River floods, these creeks flood and they also flood out large populated areas. The Georges River has a catchment area of 890 square kilometres.

Flood history. The Georges River has a long history of flooding and most of the flooding data has been recorded at the Liverpool Weir. This is very important because I will now sort of tell you how the floodplain area on the intermodal site has been ignored. The weir was constructed in 1836 as a causeway crossing of the river and a source of fresh water for Liverpool. Now, from that weir, all the flood levels are determined. It is fresh water from the weir back to Campbelltown. The – because it's a weir, you have now tidal limit. It's flat. So when you go to the banks of the river in front of the intermodal, you go up nine metres and that's where the 100 year flood stops. So, in other words, all that land, from nine metres down to the Georges River, is called the flood plain area.

To reach a one in 100 year flood, the water rises nine metres above the weir. This event occurred four times in 1873 to 1900 – four times in 27 years. Now, if that happens in another 100, 200 years' time, it will completely wipe Liverpool out. It will be absolutely disaster. From 1900, we have reached six metres above the weir 15 times. The largest flood ever recorded at the weir was in 1873, 10.3 metres above the weir. The water came to the steps of St Luke's Church. Hard to believe – I still find it hard to believe – true fact. The largest flood in the past 100 years was in 1956, when the flood water was 8.2 metres above the weir. The last significant flood occurred in 1986 – and you might remember this – 1986 and 1988, when the flood water was 2.2 and 2.3 metres above the weir. That caused millions of dollars' worth of damage, and it was only, like, seven metres.

The Chipping Norton Lakes: the lake scheme was part of an overall rehabilitation program following an extensive land extraction from the Georges River at Chipping Norton. The scheme, which was developed in 1977, resulted in a series of 150 hectares of lake connections within the river. Although rehabilitation there was a major objective of the scheme, it still provided a positive flow mitigation benefit to the area – very minor – because it's filled. If it was a dry area, it would sort of help, but because it's filled, it takes a little bit more water.

Like most river systems in New South Wales, the Georges River has more than its share of flooding problems. At times it has been the subject of perhaps the most flooding investigation – any other area in Australia. It also has a wonderful showcase of different types of flood plain management measures, that have been spent millions of dollars on, have been undertaken by different councils, in an

attempt to reduce flooding problems. So the councils spending millions of dollars, and – to stop the flooding, and one of the best ways to stop the flooding is to make sure no development goes in the flood plain area.

5 The Georges River, around the Liverpool area – the Georges River – there are times when flooding issues appear to have been given a low priority, and possibly overlooked. More recently – and this is – this report was only in 2004 – the Federal Government owned land, and some two million tonnes of fill had been proposed within the flood plain area, apparently without any assessment of its impact on  
10 flooding. So it's – the Liverpool Council are taking it very serious, as I will tell you in a minute. That is equivalent to two billion litres of additional water to be displaced in the Georges River to raise the flood levels.

The flooding area or riparian zone: this is the area where the water goes over the  
15 bank of the river or creeks. We had an incident in 2015. I do environmental work down on the Georges River – I get grants from the State Government; I'm an environmentalist – so I really know about the actual river and what a magnificent river it actually is. It's better than Centennial Park and some of the areas down there.

20 The water is then held in the flood plain area, right, and in 2015, we had the mass flood that happened at Picton. It was only just a mass cloud that went to Picton. It came down. We had – the water went two metres over the weir. Because the weir is two and a half metres below the tidal flow on the bottom, that was four and a half metres downstream. And what I noticed is, that four and a half metres, it just started  
25 to break the flood plain, and flooding started. When the water breaks from the flood plain, it becomes a major problem, and flooding occurs. One tonne of fill displaces a thousand litres of water.

30 Summary: I'm reminding everyone in this room that the flooding problem exists and will exist – always exist on the Georges River and its creeks. The most important thing I can now – is that the flood plain area are protected from flooding, and they should never be filled. I just have a little – there's a little picture there. I will give you this – these documents.

35 But Liverpool City Council has a policy, and they really enforce this. The loss in flood storage in a 100-year flood must be compensated. Excavation of a similar volume would be required to ensure that there is no impact on the flood level and for compliance with the requirements in council's DCP. So if you got a block of land you want to develop, it's in a flood area, and you want to fill that little bit, you've got  
40 to excavate out there so it compensates for the same amount of water that goes onto the site. So that's what that is.

The next item I want to talk about: the ability to subdivide the land as part of the  
45 future development. That's in this – hey, this is a major – why do they want to subdivide? If they want to subdivide – to me, subdivision means they're going to sell it. It is – this is a clear indicator that the project will be a white elephant. That's why they want to subdivide it: get rid of the – it won't work. And that's going to

cause major problems, once they subdivide, because then they will put – just put – keep putting the blame on other people: “No, that’s them. They own that. They’re causing the problem.” It should never be allowed to be subdivided. And that’s in the document.

5

The increase in building height above the Liverpool City Council DCP, because they lifted the ground up. Yes, because they lifted the ground three or three and a half metres, now they’re saying, “Oh, our buildings are higher, but hey, our buildings are still 21 metres, but they – they’re not complying because we’ve lifted the ground.”

10

And my – like I said before, why did you lift the ground? Please, I would love to have one comment, why they need all that fill.

All right. The other issue I have: transfer the containers by heavy vehicles between the MPE, the IMT facility – that’s across the road – and the MPE warehouse. How will this affect – and there’s nothing in here; that just says, you know, they’re going to run the containers on a truck from one side to the other, blocking the road – how will this affect the general traffic? How many containers per day, and how many – and for how many hours?

15

20 Thank you for listening to my speech. And I will give you all this information. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Robert. If we could now ask Michael Byrne. Thank you, Michael.

25

MR M. BYRNE: Thank you, Commissioners. I thank the Independent Planning Commission for this opportunity to address you as a panel on this development. I think you must be asking, after the presentations to date, is – how can this be? How can it actually be, given the facts that have been given today? And these are facts. I have been engaged with the East Liverpool Progress Association now for about 35 years. It’s an old standing organisation, few in numbers these days, but active. But active in the sense of campaigning. And over the years, I’ve witnessed a big difference between campaigners and activists.

30

35 Activists have an agenda to work to, and no matter what piece of truth comes in, or fact comes in, they stick to that agenda. These people are campaigners, because they see the facts, and they just keep working at it, and keep working at it, in the hope that some ears will actually pay attention to it and act. Now, in the past, up till now, over the last nine years, since we’ve been involved in this – many of us – the only recognition we’ve had of the issues is from PAC – was PAC; now yourselves, as the  
40 PDC, is it? Yes.

MS LEESON: IPC.

45 MR BYRNE: IDC. Yes. Okay. The only recognition we’ve had. And that is via them placing a 250,000-TEU throughput limit on the approvals, on the – as a condition of approval, as a limit to conditions, based upon the requirement that the



traffic capacity is not exceeded. Now, I think you've heard enough, and there's enough facts and figures, to show that, and as Bob mentioned, the NRMA survey, out came on top the M5 Moorebank Bridge as the most congested.

5 And I say it's the most dangerous, too. I had the terrible experience the other day – now, when you're driving on it at this merge-weave point, where they're sending – going to send 5000 trucks in and off that bridge – I was shocked. I was – because there's a 100-kilometre speed limit at that point. And I was driving in, and of course my rear-vision mirror had no look at that – I was coming at a different angle; you  
10 had to come into the lane to merge into the through lanes – and a truck – a semi-trailer went past at 100 k. And I was shocked. I grabbed the wheel, you know.

That's the danger of the point. Somebody can be just – and it's proven in the figures, that – if you look at the – we just know by numbers of accidents by what we hear in  
15 the background now on Facebook. You know, "M5 has collided again". So, look, there's real issues. And that's to date. It has been packed. It's back to – so – and from that – let me say that I'm an empirical sort of bloke, you know; I don't like numbers and letters coming together in formulas and graphs and things. I just look at things. And I tell you, the bad air of this place – if you're on the tee at the Ridge  
20 Golf Course, on the first tee, and you look at 10 o'clock, on the day when the conditions are right, you will see just a layer – a layer of filthy air, resting, which is the river basin, because you're looking to – to the Georges River.

A fact. Dirty air just sits in our region – sits in our river basin of Liverpool. That's  
25 why Governor Macquarie settled there, because he had the magnificent Georges River – was to be the Georges River there. But as a river basin, from my home in Chipping Norton, about four kilometres away, I get the aroma of the bread. Is it Goodmans? Fielders Bread bakery, you know, which is four kilometres away. The air comes down. So, look – and this is a real problem. It was empiricism that gave  
30 us the fact that we knew the traffic wouldn't work. From day one, we said, "Well, this is a ridiculous idea. It will go nowhere." But it has gone. And how can it be?

Well, let me remind you just what it is. It is the dirty diesel, noise-emitting, light-emitting industry that is being dumped – and I will use that word, "dumped" – within  
35 300 metres of established housing, in flat lands, and between the riparian – it's not even between; it goes into the riparian and through the banks of the Georges River, a magnificent natural feature we have in our city here. So that's what it is, and that's why we've been so active about it, because we're not working to an agenda; we are simply working on the facts that are before us.

40 It was justified on a nine- to 11-billion-dollar economic benefit over 30 years, whatever that means. But the costs that are going into it – the costs that have gone into it and have to go into it to even make it work half – at 50 per cent, tally to about 1.8 million. It was \$880 million for the move of the army, to get the army out.  
45 There was \$300 million on the project steering, just to get it going. There was \$380 million funding commitments to date for some of the infrastructure. And there was – and this is in Qube's own report – no, MICLs report, the Moorebank Intermodal

Company's report – \$225 million just to make the western MPW, which is the subject of this, to make the land stable and clean. \$225 million that Qube will get – or whatever private entity runs it – will get it rent-free. It's ridiculous.

5 So it's – and the whole thing has been made to fit. We've got noise coming from – they're saying that there's 250 degrees of the rail curve, to minimise sound – noise of the wheel squeal from the trains, coming in two an hour, if this ever goes through to its maximum, two an hour rail movements. And what's the angles to make it fit? 160 degrees. So this is – they know it. They know it, but they do nothing about it.

10 Where is the development? Well, this is the key thing for the commissioners to understand. Moorebank is in East Liverpool which is a traffic corridor. Now, if you look at the map of Sydney – and I will try and do it in the right way – there's the ocean for yourselves, there's the line across Hornsby – from the ocean across  
15 Hornsby out to the west. Down south, we've got from Cronulla across a little bit of a dip to Moorebank, right. So everything below Cronulla is bush, the National Park and what have you. So you go from Cronulla across to Moorebank and then we go across the Georges River and there's massive development in the south-west region, Macarthur area.

20 That is going to house residents more in number than Brisbane, and the only way out of that is through Moorebank. So this massive, you know, 20 k, 20, 30 k of residences and small business are using the Moorebank Bridge, M5 bridge, as the traffic corridor to go anywhere else in Sydney. That ..... has always stood out. Mr  
25 Corrigan knows this. We've written to him and he had one of his sub lieutenants write back, "You're just too worried", or something along the line. The governments know this, but all the time, they've moved.

Now, why have we got here? Well – and I might mention too that the latest  
30 Macarthur plans for Macarthur road system has at the top of it an arrow – one arrow. There are no roads running east from Campbelltown upwards to Moorebank. All roads go north and they get to Casula and turn right through Moorebank, and what have we got here? We've got a heavy industry – heavy vehicle enterprise that's looking to use that bridge. It's like putting such a thing at Gladesville – to go onto  
35 the Gladesville Bridge. It's like putting such a thing at Kirribilli, trying to go onto the bridge. It just cannot work and, in fact, it's not working. That's the point, and we're getting nowhere outside of PACs limitations, and we're asking for that to be re-enforced at least.

40 Now, look, there's been a lot of sophistry in this. The background to this, and I've got a timeline on all this, is – and I might ask for an extension of time, if I might, because, look, it's important. Why is it before us? It should have failed years ago, but there is a domino effect. Every letter we write, we get a response, "This government passed it. That government passed it. This report recommended it.  
45 That reported recommended it", and they were all feeding off each other right back to 2004, and I can give you the origins of this and why we've got this dynamic where facts don't come through, this incredible dynamic, and now everything I'm stating

here is referenced back to newspaper reports, Senate Hansard minutes. Okay. So everything is references back. Chris Corrigan in 1998 fought a battle on the – what does that mean?

5 MS LEESON: That means your time is up. I will give you two more minutes.

MR BYRNE: Okay. This will be quick. In 1998 led the battle on the wharves, became a hero of the Liberal Party and hated by the Labour Party. In fact, he had a development there in Ingleburn and for four years, including the local council and  
10 the local member, Mr Knowles at the time, who became minister, there was a battle against Corrigan's interests at Ingleburn. All recorded. Mr Knowles as Minister, by ministerial directive, formed the Freight Infrastructure Advisory Board full of business leaders, trade union leaders, government people, to map out the railings of freight from Port Botany.

15 That was their purpose. They came up with a report. Recommendation 3 was explicit. The SME site, which is MPW, which is this development – this site shall be a freight intermodal. One mention of the fact that Mr Corrigan's extended interest – he wasn't there at that time, but the seeds had been planted, because it was actually  
20 Liberal Party policy in 2004 for his development to go ahead, prior to approvals, of course.

So what we've got here is that this dynamic that saw – in 2007, that report was picked up, and that was referenced by all these later reports, which whatever we read  
25 today references back to those reports – this domino effect – that recommended Moorebank and Senator –Mr Albanese MP took it on, as Minister, to set up Infrastructure Australia, by ministerial directive, sent it into Infrastructure Australia, put it on the desk, no business – no benefit-cost analysis, which broke the rules, it was reported on, for it to come into play so that the effect of that – the effect of that,  
30 which was an old trick down by Campbelltown Council, was using landowners' consent.

For four years from 2010 to – 2009 to 2013, while Labour was in government, they blocked Mr Corrigan. He could not – his land, MPE, on the other side of the road,  
35 needed access to get across the MPW site, which we're talking about now. They needed access and landowners' consent was withheld for four years, but, of course, government changed in 2013 and within 12 months, everybody was happy and we've now got this current situation. So look, I can give you more information on that, but that answers how it can be. So all I can ask now is that, look, the key word in your  
40 constitution is "independent". We can only encourage you to exhibit it on the facts that are coming in from the floor today.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Michael. What we might ask you to do, if you have anything further that you would like to add, we will take submissions for another  
45 week.

MR BYRNE: Yes.

MS LEESON: So if there's anything you weren't able to convey to us today, please  
- - -

MR BYRNE: Well, yes. That's - - -

5

MS LEESON: - - - make a submission and we will take that into account.

MR BYRNE: For sure. Okay.

10 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR BYRNE: Thank you very much.

15 MS LEESON: Thank you very much. Thank you. Okay. If I can now call Sharyn Cullis.

MS S. CULLIS: So thank you for this opportunity. Because I have a PowerPoint, I'm really glad that you're moving. So once again, thank you for this opportunity today. I speak on behalf of the Georges River Environmental Alliance, which has, since 1993, acted for the protection of environmental quality, biodiversity and amenity values of the Georges River and its catchment. We object to the approval of the Moorebank Precinct West Modification and Concept Proposal and urge this IPC to reject both rather than grant any approvals with the proposed conditions, because we don't think the conditions are adequate.

25

With limited time, I will just gloss over three of our major concerns. The first is about unacceptable levels of risk associated with the magnified landfill proposal. They're up there for you, the three dot points. The second about a failure to properly consider cumulative impacts well beyond the precinct, and the third is the failure to pursue proper obligations for what is sensitive urban design and Urban Heat Island Mitigation.

30

So firstly, the modification proposes, as previously mentioned, an increase of fill to the site from just over 46,000 cubic metres to 1.6 million. This represents a multiple of 34 times the original. It will blanket the entire site that is around 500 metres wide and more than two kilometres in length. It will be a new landform, a vast concrete capped plateau looming up to 3.6 metres above the human communities on one side and the Georges River at its other edge. This is an extreme – in fact, an almost obscene – well, it is obscene – increase in the scale.

40

Applying a simple test of commonsense blended with morality beyond expertise, that is not a modification. It is really a new proposal. It makes any past environmental assessment based on the lesser amount of fill invalid. 34 times the fill could mean an uncalculated and unknown risk – sorry; increase in a whole suite of risks. That requires a whole new assessment process, not just a fiddle with the existing one.

45

Secondly, I note and appreciate that the Department of Planning and Environment states in their assessment report that any future DAs should include precinct-wide cumulative assessments for traffic, noise, air quality, storm water and ecological impacts, and future management should include water-sensitive urban design and urban heat mitigation. However, I add two essential qualifiers that need to be addressed.

The first is that the project impacts are not just precinct-wide, but can be felt more broadly throughout the region. For example, the huge landfill project, covered in hard surface capping, has the capacity to increase, deflect and redirect flood water in unpredictable and unpredicted ways not previously experienced, not just locally but far downstream.

So Brucher Consultants claimed, in a technical paper of 2001, that the Georges River flood plain – and I acknowledge that some of this has been covered, but I take a given slant – ranks as one of the most severely flood-prone valleys in the state. They were referring to the flood plain stretched between Moorebank to Milperra, which is just a few kilometres downstream – not even that – of this intermodal site.

Since 2001, there has been an intensification of urban development on that flood plain, and approvals were based on risk assessments that did not foresee a mountain of fill dumped just upstream, nor its capacity to generate flash floods and downriver flood deflections. It is disappointing downstream cumulative impacts and maximum floods beyond the one per cent standard are not taken more seriously in this assessment.

The second is to protect and enable water-sensitive urban design and heat island mitigation in future DAs. This modification must be rejected. It is the foundation for future DAs, and since it is totally unsustainable and environmentally unfriendly, it will predicate and shape the development that comes after it. Just as an example, the intended fill and its gradients predetermine the location and form of the storm water detention basins, which are not optimal in terms of water-sensitive urban design.

Further, thick fill across the site requires the removal of all vegetation. The Department of Planning report observes this. So how can urban heat island effects be mitigated if all urban forest and canopy tree elements are removed and replaced by unshaded concrete and bitumen? For example, I refer to the substantial urban forest shown in figure 10, which is on the left, of the Department of Planning's report, at the northern end of the site. Can you actually see the bushland patches at the north? Retained in the midst of the development, it would be heat-mitigating.

Whilst the distant biobank site is an important offset for other reasons, it won't be relieving heat on the precinct west side, and anything deflected from that. Can you see the yellow areas, which is the biobank site, and how distant it is? The northern forest is shown as obliterated entirely in figure 4, which is on the right, which is a layout of the precinct concept. That layout does not reflect the need for urban heat

mitigation through tree canopy provisions and the New South Wales Architects Green Places Policy.

5 Now on to the Georges River, which is not just a local precinct asset; it is the iconic natural centrepiece of a whole region, and its catchment of well over one million people. The reach of the Georges River adjacent to the intermodal site is very, very vulnerable – is a very vulnerable impoundment behind Liverpool Weir, where pollution impacts are magnified in low-flow conditions. This is a particular threat to the aquatic ecosystem, which supports sporting fisherman, who fish this part of the river for bass.

10 Water quality matters, and just downstream is the clubhouse of New South Wales Barefoot Water Skiing Association, and the river is their playground, and that should not change. The negative impacts upon the Georges River from this development will be echoed far downstream as well, whenever high flows overtop the weir. As evidence of this claim, Dr Ian Wright, from the University of Western Sydney, in 2012 tracked water quality and ecological impacts from a mining project in the upper Georges, and found it had measurable negative effects for at least 15 kilometres.

15 It is critical to protect the green riparian zone, and that has been recognised by the Department of Planning's assessment document. But increase to water velocities are certain outcomes of this proposal, and threaten the natural stream banks of the receiving streams, including the Georges and, basically, its fate year after year. If not adequately managed, these will exacerbate the very real threat of bank scarring and collapse, already both a natural process and an exacerbated human impact in places all along the Georges River in its flood plain reaches, and also adjacent to the site, because this is adjacent to the site.

20 Any retreat – and this is actually on the – adjacent to the site as well, just further downstream – any retreat of the fragile riverbanks will result in the reduction in the width and ecological value of the conserved riparian corridor. This is a strong argument for a riparian setback in excess of the statutory requirement of 40 metres. I note also that two of the major storm water detention ponds proposed appear to be located within what is supposed to be the conservation riparian zone; this is totally unacceptable. The storm water management basin should sit within the footprint of the development, not in a conservation area.

25 It is encouraging that the alluvium peer review of the site storm water and flood management plans provide very convincing evidence of shortfalls and failures in what the applicant proposes or relies upon. In their report, for example, they claim drainage outlets have insufficient capacity; and information provided by the applicant is confusing; and that their proposals create, in terms of flood, an elevated risk to the community. Could I have more time? Thank you.

30 The report instead promotes an approach where channels are wider, with ..... embankments, vegetation, and with a more natural creek form, that is more representative of current practice. They give illustrations of other, more preferable

case studies, some dating back to 2007, that are better than what is proposed for Moorebank here in 2019. The consultants are constrained, and didn't make – of course; they're professionals. I will say what they really mean, I think. The applicant proposes last-century style storm water management, not water-sensitive urban design that protects communities and the environment. Morally, I say to the panel, it's really inappropriate to approve that.

So, in conclusion, I really do feel anger at the fact that what was proposed in 2013, which is on the left, in terms of a concept plan – and this was approved – has become, by 2019, through a set of incremental and cynical modifications, even worse environmentally than it ever was. Let me illustrate that. In 2013, we had wide green areas, maximised and used as buffers around natural pondages, with no direct discharge into the Georges River indicated. There was plenty of room for grassy swales, bioretention zones and multi-use possibilities – even wildlife.

We were conned. By 2019, we had deep, narrow and very engineered form of storm water basins, no greening, and, worst of all, three distinct discharges, to spew filthy, greasy waste water directly into the Georges River, in huge volumes, and at great, eroding velocities. That is bad practice, not water-sensitive urban design.

Let me illustrate what that can become. So this is Warwick Farm, just downstream. Note the pipe – it's actually hidden, close to a tree, which has since died, in the middle of the photo. Vegetation loss – all the excessive amount of rock armouring, to prevent anticipated bank erosion and bed erosion from the structure.

So this direct discharge is in Chipping Norton Lake, into the Georges River. That was last-century storm water management. The riverbank once extended about 10 metres in front of that drain at least, and was all propped up with ..... baskets. The whole structure has collapsed.

So my prediction is, with my lived experience and careful observation of the river all of my life, you are looking at what your approval of this project can achieve along the river frontage of this intermodal site. I hope that is something you might seriously ponder. Thank you.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Sharyn. Has Erik Rakowski arrived? No. Okay.

MR J. HANN: Paul has said that Narelle is a few minutes off. I don't know if she has arrived.

MS LEESON: So our next speaker, then, Narelle Van Den Bos, is a couple of minutes away. So we will give her some time to arrive – I think she has had commitments at school this morning. So if you would like to make yourself a cup of tea or a cup of coffee, we will wait for a little while for Narelle to arrive. Thank you.

45

**RECORDING SUSPENDED**

**[11.56 am]**

5 MS LEESON: Thanks, everybody. We will now ask Narelle Van Den Bos to speak. Thank you.

10 MS N. VAN DEN BOS: Hello, everyone. Sorry for the wait. Good afternoon, Dianne Leeson, Alan Coutts and John Han. I am Narelle and I'm a very concerned resident. My husband and I have – first of – oops, wait a minute. Where has it gone? There we go. My husband and I have our own transport modelling company and have owned it for the last 29 years. We're on the Queensland, the ACT and New South Wales modelling panels since their beginnings and we have just as much knowledge, or more knowledge, than anyone else who would like to say anything about modelling to do with the intermodal.

15 I'm assuming that by now, you've given us and the more than 100,000 people that will be adversely affected by this development the respect of at least reading the two books and watching the presentation we sent with our submissions. The two books that we've written on the intermodal have been sent. There's this one here and this  
20 one here. And we don't do these lightly. This doesn't take place over half an hour. This takes place over months. And we've not been paid for any of that. We've done this because we have integrity and we really care for the community.

25 These are presentations that we've given and there's well over 30 presentations we've given to the RMS; Karen Jones, the Director of Infrastructure Planning; to Ian Hunt, who was part of MICL; the Ministry of – briefing for Warren Truss, his staff. The many organisations that know that we want to see the solutions to the traffic problems before they go ahead and put more traffic on the roads around Chipping Norton.

30 I've given you a sheet of paper that has the summary as we're going through. That's what this is here, just to sort of get your memory going afterwards. So the PAC Planning Advisory Commission seven years ago allowed 250,000 TEUs to be allowed at SIMTA. This was a little bit before, I guess, that we sort of came on the  
35 scene and if we had been on the scene a bit earlier, we might have been able to mount a better defence for this, because that 250,000 TEUs that was approved then should never have been approved. We have not seen any plans regarding the infrastructure. We've not seen the correct modelling and how is this going to take place?

40 Why would the New South Wales Government now approve another 250,000 TEUs without any published work? We cannot see how the traffic is going to work for our local area. We're still waiting to see reputable traffic modelling, including workable solutions to traffic, and we've been waiting for five years and we haven't been  
45 waiting quietly. We have spoken to a lot of people and they're very aware that we want to know what's happening.



5 Just the next point. Now, this is a little bit laborious, but I am going to read through it. We approached Karen Jones, who's the Director of Infrastructure Projects for New South Wales and we said, look, we are terribly concerned about the traffic models. And I'm going to read these because every one of them is extremely profound.

*We're still having difficulties understanding why the microsimulation did not use the future traffic in the future base scenario.*

10 Profound. They most definitely should have used the future traffic and they haven't. Suspect the reason, too much traffic.

*Acknowledgement that our outdated technology was used for the modelling.*

15 They used technology of 2000. We're now in 2019 and that is, again, profound.

*Acknowledgement that some trips were unable to get onto the existing network because the roads are so congested.*

20 That's currently. The roads are so congested that, in their model, they could not get all the trips in.

*Acknowledgement that because of incorrect factoring, the lower numbers for traffic flow were achieved.*

25 So they have less numbers because they had factored incorrectly. They've acknowledged this. And this one, the reason I put the stars around it is, this is absolutely gobsmacking. If you were a transport modeller, you would look at this and think, my goodness.

30 *We still need to understand how the most senior government modellers and the government's independent reviewer could claim that a small increase in traffic would have little effect on an already congested road.*

35 This is clearly contradictory to transport modelling principles, which shows a highly non-linear relationship between traffic flows and traffic delays. It's almost exponential. And these people have written into reports that, a little bit more traffic is not going to make a difference. It's not a little bit more traffic. It's a huge amount of traffic. They have made the numbers much smaller than they should be because they have done things incorrectly.

*There's acknowledgement that the Hume Highway accident hot spot was included in the strategic model but not in the microsimulation modelling.*

45 This is important, as it is the microsimulation results that have been used for the evaluation process. That accident hot spot we're talking about was earmarked by the insurance companies to say that it's the worst accident hot spot in New South Wales.

These trucks are going to have to go over that hot spot. It's already a trap. People will die.

*No warehouse modelling.*

5

Again, it was acknowledged that that wasn't done.

*No induced traffic.*

10 Again, that was acknowledged that that wasn't done. These are all profound as far as doing the modelling correctly. Now, we're not vicious people. We want to see things done correctly. That's all we're asking for, a legitimate model that we can look at. That is the other sheet of paper that I've given you, there. We've contacted Karen Jones and her eventual comment to us was, no further comments to make.  
15 Well, the poor woman. I mean, what was she supposed to say? She has already acknowledged that there were huge issues. We tried to get the paper interested but they're only interested in certain things.

20 The government has spent in excess of over half a million dollars building the traffic model but we have not been given access to the results. It is well known for many organisations that we're very keen to see the results. We've said many times, we want to see that it's done properly. I feel that we've been deliberately kept away, as we would be able to analyse the model with a professional eye and pick up errors, as we have done in the past. So if I were them, I certainly would not let us look at the modelling. I certainly wouldn't let us look at the infrastructure that needs to be put  
25 into place for this intermodal to work.

If you look here, this is the location of Moorebank Intermodal. The light is not very bright. Can you see the little bit there, where I'm pointing to? Yep? That's the  
30 location of it. There's a river that surrounds it. If you have a look, it goes right around here like this. So we're effectively putting the intermodal on an island. Before I get to that, I should say that since the MICL EIS, all the traffic modelling so far only considers the traffic leaving and entering the site, not the wider network.

35 So what has happened and, in fact, it has got worse, I think, since we were in and made comments, they consider that they only have to get the traffic out onto Moorebank Avenue. It's like, once it gets to Moorebank Avenue, it disappears. It just goes somewhere else. And we're talking about trucks, you know – it's a bit rubbery the numbers. Certainly the numbers they have are very low, but you're  
40 looking at maybe six trucks a minute or – to that size, and certainly the bigger it gets, the more trucks. And the trucks are not as they say. They don't – the trucks don't just disappear. They have to go somewhere. So with the modelling, they're not considering this here. They're not considering the island.

45 How are they going to get off the island? They're going to have to go over these – somewhere here. So the roads – there's one road, which is the Hume Highway. It goes up here. There's another road where they can go west here, if they can get onto

the M5, and there's other roads, just a couple that can go around sort of in here to get onto Cabramatta Road. There's a few too, but, eventually, there's only one link here. So eventually, they might sort of split up into two here, but, eventually, they've got to get over the bridge and north.

5

So let's have a look. Now – so with the SIMTA report, they told us that together, I think, it works out to be 45 per cent of traffic needs to go north, and you've got to get it over the bridges and through this area here. Okay. So we've got now – I just want – sorry. My husband and I, as traffic modellers, believe that the area surrounding Intermodal will not cope with the resulting traffic from 250 TEUs, let alone approving another quarter of a million TEUs.

This is a literature review. Rather than just us saying, “We've got problems in this area, problems with traffic”, because you probably wouldn't believe us, we decided to do a literature review, and, basically, that's what this book is about. It shows us local reports that have come out and the traffic issues. So, firstly, the hotspot I was talking about before is this one here, Sydney's worst accident hotspot. And – did I say New South Wales or Sydney before? Anyway, whatever. Here. Sydney's worst accident hotspot is right here. We've got the Intermodal here.

15  
20

Liverpool Council report says that all of these intersections are beginning to be problems or are already problems in our network. And so you remember the Intermodal is here. We're trying to get 45 per cent of the traffic originally from SIMTA up here, and these intersections are already giving us trouble. This is the – shows the river where you can see you've got to get over the river, and that's a big deal, because bridges are expensive.

25

Bankstown Council has said, “We've got issues here and here”, and both of those – it's looking like the solution needs to be what we call a grade-separated intersection, and we've needed those for years. And you might think, “That's a long way from the Intermodal. Maybe that doesn't need to be looked at”, but you have a look. The Intermodal is here. If the traffic is trying to get north or this way, and some of it is, how's it going to do it? It has to cross here, maybe continues up Moorebank Avenue, tries to turn here, tries to turn up here, which is already earmarked as being maybe these guys, or it's going to come along up Moorebank Avenue, maybe along here, Epson Road, maybe we can get it out here. That's sort of what they're looking at.

30

35

Campbelltown City Council has said, “Once the Intermodal goes in here, how are the residents that were travelling up here going to get there in the future?” This was from a Transport for New South Wales study and it said, “In 2026, we expect peak hour conditions along here all day, and along here all day”. So to be adding trucks, even one or two trucks a minute, is going to make a huge difference there. The M5 widening report said that these intersections are already in trouble. We need to be looking at what we're going to do with those intersections, and, again, the Intermodal is just here. So these intersections will definitely be used by the Intermodal in order for traffic to go north.

40  
45

Then we have the SIMTA EIS itself. Now, what's interesting about this is when they do the conclusion to a study, they often don't actually reflect what's in the study very well, so that most – knowing most people will read the synopsis and the conclusion, because people are very busy. They don't – they happen to just leave out some of  
5 the data that really should be put in. And if you look closely at the EIS, you will see that all of these intersections have – they have – it's said that they're a level of service F, which is right up there. You're going to be having trouble. There's traffic jams. There's congestion.

10 That comes from their report. That doesn't come from ours, but, yet, if you look in their conclusion – if you look in their synopsis, that's not written there, but if you delve into the report, you will actually find some of that modelling was done reasonably well for the conditions they had, and they showed us level of service F. Remember they brought the numbers down of trucks that are coming out of the  
15 Intermodal to as little as they can. They've decreased this, and you're still getting a level of service F, remembering we've got to get the traffic north. So these – if you put it all together, these are the intersections that are going to be in trouble. 34 intersections are outlined in this book, and the references to each of those are here as well. It's not something that we've dreamt up. This has come from reports that  
20 already exist.

The traffic modelling does not reflect these issues, or at least we're not told in the conclusions that these issues exist. They do exist, but they're not told. We've been asking for the modelling to be done correctly for the last five years to many agencies.  
25 From these bodies, it can be seen that there's 34 locations which require attention. Many of these are upgrades on bridges, because, remember, the Intermodal is on an island, so whenever you want to get out, you have to go over a bridge. Refer to our book.

30 As well as that, 1200 hectares of potential warehousing land outside the Intermodal has been earmarked, or at least they've been encouraged to take this up to support the Intermodal. This – just by looking at the map, you've got some idea of seeing where this warehousing is, and I was actually speaking to a lady this morning that said there's further warehousing out near the M7, because that's where they expect to  
35 take up. So there's going to be a lot more warehousing in other areas coming up. So what happens is SIMTA claims that they still have a lot of warehousing going on within here, but they don't take into account the warehousing that's going to go on in the area around us. So all of these locations are possible warehousing.

40 Now, to model these is not that difficult. You just make an estimate of the amount of trucks that would be going into the warehousing and the trucks coming out, and knowing that you've got to come from here, you put it into your trip table, and that overlays what you already have and it adds to the traffic. Well, as you can see from the work that we've done for Karen Jones, none of that has been put into the model,  
45 and that adds to the traffic. It's going to be a big issue.

The other one is the warehousing from within the Moorebank Intermodal. There's going to be warehousing inside, and then they say, "Yes, but the warehousing is actually a small percentage". No. No. The warehousing is still there, and as they're surreptitiously bumping up the number of TEUs that are going to be present at the place, we're going to get, presumably, more and more warehousing. So it just – I wanted to show you here, 215,000 square metres gross floor area for warehouse use in the Moorebank Intermodal West. That's huge. That's huge.

And we've got here – in this book, I've relayed already to you – if you have a look on this page, I address very briefly – sorry. I address, very briefly, how, when you take in one TEU, one truck, and that's de-stuffed, which is what happens in warehouses, that can very quickly go to many trucks – maybe 16. And you have to consider – it could be more; it could be a lot more than that, because you've got to consider the trucks coming in to take the goods from the TEU, the trucks going out – and there's not just one. There's Coles, there's Woollies, there's the whole lot that need to be doing this.

So – and that has not been estimated. That has not been done in any of the modelling that we have seen. We don't have estimates for that type of warehousing. So that has not been included. The traffic modelling for the warehousing is unacceptable. We asked for the modelling to be done reputably, and we're still waiting five years later.

There's other traffic, called induced traffic, and this hasn't been considered either. But once you get this warehousing, you're getting trucks running backwards and forwards, doing repairs of other trucks, doing the plumbing, the electricians, the amenities, all of that sort of thing. And again, it's easy to pop into the trip tables to be able to do the modelling.

So not only do we have congested roads, shown by other reports – not ours – but we have this overlay of warehousing that has to take place, this overlay of induced traffic. And the warehousing is not just outside warehousing, but there is a substantial amount of warehousing that's taking place inside the intermodal. So, again, we say, having the intermodal on an island makes the infrastructure costs so much greater.

Any time you want to go out of the island, you will need to go over a bridge. Bridges are expensive. Governments don't like building them. Can the government really afford to build the largest intermodal in the southern hemisphere on such a small island? I don't understand why the experts seem to have so much difficulties working out that we have huge traffic problems in our area.

They say that there's only two infrastructures required, and that would be the – a rail connection here, and upgrading the M5 – the widening of the Moorebank Avenue, originally, it was put out, only in 2029 or 2030; that's it. They say, by doing that, we have solved the infrastructure problems for this intermodal. They've not done the

modelling; they haven't regarded the fact that the trucks do not disappear. They – those trucks remain, and they have to get out of the island somehow.

5 Okay. We asked Ian Hunt, over two lengthy discussions, to carry out professional, mesoscopic traffic modelling, unlike the subprofessional modelling done by SIMTA. However, it is clear that this did not happen, or at least we haven't seen it yet. Paul has explained some of the issues. We cannot see the traffic solutions for a safe access to the M5, and also these particular intersections here, which are going to prove – they have already been in trouble, but they're going to prove much worse, and being able to turn up onto here is – is difficult. So if there are solutions, we want to see them, and we want them costed.

15 Speaking about costs, we tried to have a look at the costs initially, when the – because I was quite flabbergasted: they reckoned that there was \$10 billion worth of profits in this thing. That's because there were no infrastructure costs; this was just going to happen. And they have very incorrect information as to why the cost/benefit analysis would be as high as it is. And in the video that I've given to the Commissioners, the – if you watch that video, it explains very clearly how the cost/benefit analysis was done, and how it's not correct. They've made false assumptions. It is ludicrous to think that the benefit/cost analysis is 10 billion. That's just not correct. If you take into account the infrastructure costs of getting over these bridges and widening, you will see that it's going to be a very different case.

25 Although we have written, demonstrated and pleaded, over a four-year – it's longer now – five-year period, we still do not have the unredacted business case for SIMTA or MICL or, for that matter, Moorebank Intermodal West, to examine, so that we can see how the benefits, secondary benefits, are going to be achieved. The plans for the intermodal should not be approved without public being able to examine the cost/benefits, as well as the solutions.

35 We need solutions before this goes ahead. It can't go ahead without solutions. The atrocious traffic modelling has the potential to cost the taxpayer a huge amount of money, possibly in the billions. Now the BCR could be minute. Not such a good idea for the government to approve further traffic from Moorebank Intermodal by making it bigger and making our problems worse. The extra TEUs of trucks should not be approved until the intermodal modelling is done correctly and these intersections improvements costed.

40 Now just looking from my personal experience, in the mornings, I travel east to get onto – where's my – can we see my light? Has the light gone, has it? No, there it is. It's still there. I travel from here – so the – this is the traffic jam. Traffic jam comes back to the roundabout here, and comes up here. This is partly due to a new, small – very small development in comparison to this – that has taken place here. And what they did was, they said, "All right, we'll just put in another lane," but there happens to be a little underpass here for the horses, so that one is still one lane, and they've put two lanes here and two lanes there.

My thought is, if they can't pay for that little tiny underpass to be made into two lanes, how on earth are they going to pay for the cost of the – getting over the bridges with – for these huge trucks? They're baulking at this. They can't even put a little thing in there. So what happens is that there – this: the traffic is banked back;  
5 people try to sneak in here, and then it gets banked back more, and then they're forced to join the other traffic. It's a recipe for disaster. This is currently – currently, every morning, when I go to work. Not always banked back to there; in fact, this morning there was very little traffic. But often there is.

10 And this is exactly the indication that the level of service is getting close to F. That's when we see this happening sometimes. And eventually it doesn't take much to tip this over. If you put a B-double or a B-triple here at this intersection, you could stuff the lights for a couple of cycles, and then your queue is going to get much bigger.

15 In the afternoons, it's the same deal: it banks back to Cabramatta Road. That might happen once every fortnight, perhaps, it goes all the way back, but usually there's already traffic here. Now, people you speak to – and I know for myself – if you try to travel this part of the road in the peak hour times – not even peak hour times; it's quite busy – people just don't use it. So I know people that work here; they actually  
20 avoid this. They go – they live down much further – they actually do a big loop around to avoid going on the Hume Highway, because they know that that's going to stuff them up at least 20 minutes longer than it should. This is currently. This is now, without adding to our traffic.

25 Okay. So just pointing that out at the end. This is what they said, that there's going to be 24-hour peak hour conditions here and here. And this is important for the intermodal: they need to get up here, and they need to get along here. Just showing you again, the intermodal is here; this is where the traffic conditions are extreme; I know for a fact that it banks back here quite regularly, on a regular basis.

30 Before we revealed – now, this is – this is rather profound – before we revealed the traffic issues with Moorebank Intermodal, we were able to access the freight data and analyse the traffic using our own reputable data models of the Moorebank area. And that was the case for all modellers. We could get access to the RMS data, so that for  
35 anywhere in Sydney, we could do the modelling. But since we've caused issues, the modelling – they've stopped us – excuse me; I presume that's the half-hour, is it?

MR HANN: That's one minute to go.

40 MS VAN DEN BOS: One minute to go. Would you mind if I finished what I came to say?

MS LEESON: Well, I think we can give you another couple of minutes.

45 MS VAN DEN BOS: Another couple of minutes, okay. I'm getting to - - -

MS LEESON: Just to close out where you're - - -

MS VAN DEN BOS: Yes, all right. Yes. After we revealed the traffic issues, we were unable to access the data any more. In toll road modelling, the purpose seems to be to deceive of the highest possible flows, so that it looks good for the banker; with intermodal modelling, it's the lowest possible flows, so it looks like you don't need to put in infrastructure. And people are getting – a lot of us are getting into trouble over this.

Senator Abetz came to speak to us, and when he finished, he said, “We will – I will fight my own government to kill the Moorebank Intermodal.” When he got back to Canberra, his mind was changed. Why was it changed? Because Canberra doesn't know. Canberra – there's nothing – why would they say that the intermodal is going to be a problem? Because they're getting information from the proponents to say it's not a problem. And our thing is to try to show that there – when we've spoken to people, they can see, there's issues here. So all the more – but they don't know.

Just – I put to the Commissioners that in the other speech that I gave – the video – I explained these issues as well. So there's no urgency for planning; why the original BCR is not correct; residents are with 200 metres; other planning, 40 years ago – was it two extra highways or one, Paul? I might have - - -

MR VAN DEN BOS: I think there were two.

MS VAN DEN BOS: Well, there were two extra highways planned to go in that never went in, but that would have done a loop around Liverpool. So 40 years ago it seemed like a good idea, but it's not now. Warehousing takes place, without supplying much needed jobs. Other locations would be much better. That was done in the other one.

So I put to the Commissioners that there's no signs to support the Moorebank Intermodal, and that nothing should be approved until all reports stand up to professional and transparent scrutiny, covering transport modelling, cost/benefit analysis, social and economic – sorry – environmental impacts, and the full modelling results for the new picture, which is a combined Moorebank Intermodal West, East, whatever – the whole operation – have been examined ethically and transparently. There's no urgency.

If the Moorebank Intermodal West concept plan is accepted prematurely, then the government could be in for some expensive shocks, and hundreds of thousands of people could be unnecessarily disadvantaged. And I get this number from the people that are actually trying to use the roads to get to work in the morning, like myself, that is already having issues. So I just plead with the Commissioners that you please try and make people aware that there are issues. We want to see the modelling. We want to see the costing of the infrastructure that needs to be put in place done before any more approvals are made.

MS LEESON: Thank you, Narelle. That now – unless Erik has turned up – no – that then concludes the speakers and presentations that we have today. As I said at



the outset, we will try and make our determination on this as soon as we can, and there've been a lot of issues raised today that we will need to take into careful account. If you would like to make further submission to the Commission, they will be – we will be receiving those for a week – David? Yes. So we will be receiving those for a week. So I would like to thank you all for coming along today, and for those in particular that spoke, and I hope you have a safe trip home. Thank you very much.

10 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[12.39 pm]**