



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1042152

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH LIVERPOOL CITY COUNCIL

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

MOOREBANK INTERMODAL PRECINCT WEST STAGE 2

PANEL: **DIANNE LEESON
ALAN COUTTS**

ASSISTING PANEL: **DAVID WAY**

COUNCIL: **CHRIS GUTHRIE**

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

DATE: **10.32 AM, TUESDAY, 25 JUNE 2019**

MS D. LEESON: All right. Well, let's get started. So – good morning, Chris. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people. I would also like to pay my respects to their Elders past and present and to the Elders from other communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting. SIMTA, the applicant, is seeking to amend the concept plan and undertake construction of stage 2 for the Moorebank Intermodal Facility West in the Liverpool City Council area.

My name is Dianne Leeson. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner Alan Coutts, as well as David Way from the Commission Secretariat. Due to a scheduling conflict resulting from Liverpool City Council requesting a postponement of this meeting, John Hann is able to – unable to attend this morning. John will review the transcript of this morning's meeting, and should he have any additional questions, he will provide them to the Commission Secretariat to follow up with Council.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request that all members today here introduce themselves before speaking for the first time. We will now begin. So thank you.

MR A. COUTTS: for you.

MS LEESON: Yeah. Thanks, Chris, for coming. We appreciate that Council has sought to have a meeting. So the best way to start, perhaps, is to open it up to you to explain to us some of Council's concerns with the proposal and, you know, comments on the project.

MR C. GUTHRIE: Yes. As I mentioned when I came here, I'm a member of the City Economy team. So I'm not a strategic planner. I'm not a town planner. I did – I have been briefed by the strategic planners on the proposal. And they've provided me with a copy of Council's submissions for both these – both the proposals, which were lodged on 23 August 2016 and 30 November 2016. Both the submissions argued against the – both the proposals, on the basis of traffic impacts, noise and air quality, biodiversity impacts. And Council considers that the assessment of stage 2 should be deferred until the outcome of the modification of the stage 1 concept approval, SSD 5066.

And in relation to that particular modification, Council holds similar views: that many of the issues have not been addressed. And we're finding it very difficult to justify the development to our community, given that they have raised significant concerns with us. And we're having to deal with, already, complaints to the
5 construction phase. We're just not confident that the impacts have been assessed properly. We're aware that it's a State Significant Development and it does have implications for the whole of Sydney.

The other thing that I'm particularly concerned with from a City Economy and
10 economic development perspective is we just don't think the development is going to create the jobs that they've projected. And on that basis, I have put together a short discussion paper, um, just detailing the type of businesses that we're talking with that are looking for land within our LGA. And we are starting to run out of industrial
15 land. Um, and part of that problem is that – the intermodal site itself being suitably zoned for many of the businesses we're talking to that want to set up in Liverpool. Um, it's not ready for them. And it's virtually quarantined from development. And I can table this. I don't know – can I pass this paper - - -

MS LEESON: Please.
20

MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: Table that. That will be placed on our website, if you're comfortable
25 with that. I mean - - -

MR GUTHRIE: That's fine. Yeah. Um - - -

MS LEESON: So it's

30 MR GUTHRIE: Well, parts of it may be a bit – I have - - -

MS LEESON: If you would like to think about what is in the document and whether there's anything that you would prefer redacted - - -

35 MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: Why don't you have another look at it and then submit what you want through David.

40 MR GUTHRIE: Okay. All right. Okay. Well, I can give you a copy now to look at whilst I'm talking. But basically, I've put together a table. We're dealing directly with a number of businesses that are looking for land.

45 MR COUTTS: Looking for land different to what the – they would get in the Intermodal Terminal?

MR GUTHRIE: Well, no. The land in the Intermodal Terminal would suit them. But because the SIMTA development is virtually quarantined for warehousing, they're unable to access it. So it's really - - -

5 MR COUTTS: I get you.

MR GUTHRIE: It's locking them out.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

10

MR GUTHRIE: It's crowding out – I'm an economist by profession rather than a town planner. It's crowding out our higher-value employers and our higher-employing industries. They're being forced further out. But we don't have zoned and serviced industrial land further out.

15

MS LEESON: Right.

MR GUTHRIE: So it's really - - -

20 MS LEESON: So can I just clarify – what we do have is a site owned by SIMTA or through the Intermodal company. There is an approved concept plan for the site for Intermodal and associated warehousing. It seems what you're saying is that Council has a view that there are other industrial users that would like to be on that land, because of its proximity to Liverpool, but they're being sort of squeezed – or not
25 being provided access to it.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

30 MS LEESON: So I'm trying to reconcile Council's issue with the project, when it's an approved concept plan and it's owned by others – is it still a fundamental opposition to the project as a whole?

35 MR GUTHRIE: It's probably fair to say Council is putting up with the project being – the existing approval has taken place. And they're aware it's a State Significant Development, of course. We're not – it's probably fair to say that Council is not happy about it and our residents aren't happy about it. But we can – we could live with it if it was – I think if it was – if the impacts were – if the negative impacts were better dealt with and communicated to our community.

40 MS LEESON: And they're the ones you talked about before: traffic noise, air quality, biodiversity.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yes.

45 MS LEESON: Okay.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: And you're not confident that they've been properly assessed.

MR GUTHRIE: Nowhere near confident enough. If Council – and I was talking with David Smith before I came. He gave me a briefing. And he agreed that if we
5 were dealing with a development of this type, there's no way we could approve this development without the applicant having demonstrated that they've addressed those issues. And we're not confident that even our submissions that we put in in August and November 2016 have been properly addressed. So those issues are still live on the table.

10 Now, on top of that, I guess I'm presenting additional information today from an economic development perspective: that the jobs that are being projected through the development are not being realised. And we don't think they will be realised with the current additional modification and stage 2 proposal either. And if you just
15 look at – if you look at the stage 2 development for two hundred and ten – 215,000 square metres of proposed warehousing area – even the projections in this current document are for that to create 750 operational jobs.

20 Now, that per hectare is very low employment per hectare in comparison to some of these other industries that we're talking – and businesses that we're talking to, such as advanced manufacturing and construction industries. I know the proponent has told us that they will be bringing head office-type employers to the site. But we're not seeing evidence of that, even on the approved eastern site. And based on this
25 assessment of 700 jobs over – 750 operational jobs over 215,000 square metres – it's not a good use of our prime industrial land, which we're starting to run out of, because we know that we could put businesses on that site, in a better planned and designed business park, that would employ a lot more people.

MS LEESON: Within the application, they don't appear to be seeking approval for
30 head office-type development, in any event.

MR GUTHRIE: No, which is surprising to me, because in the Deloitte's report, that's how they justified the 6800 jobs. So it seems to me to be a bit of a mismatch of some of the documentation.

35 MS LEESON: Right.

MR GUTHRIE: So I just don't – and talking with other economists – we just don't believe that Deloitte's report is reflective of exactly what is going to occur on that
40 site. So I guess in summarising an economic development position, the – and the strategic planning position is, "Look, we don't think the negative impacts – we think the negative impacts have not been properly addressed, and they've been underestimated, and we think the positive effects to our community of the employment have been overestimated."

45 So – and we just – our community feels like they're – like, we know there's a traffic problem in Sydney. And we know that we have to get freight away from the wharf

and out to where it needs to be. But our community feels like they are having to resolve all of Sydney's traffic problems with this particular development or the Western Suburbs traffic problems with this particular development. We're getting all the negative aspects; we're not getting a lot of positive - - -

5

MS LEESON: We heard quite a lot about traffic concerns when we had the community meeting last week.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yes.

10

MS LEESON: So that has certainly been brought to our attention, how the community feels about it.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

15

MS LEESON: That's right. Chris, do you feel comfortable to talk about some of the more technical aspects of the project, given David's not here?

MR GUTHRIE: Some of them. If I'm not comfortable, I will just take it on notice, if you like.

20

MS LEESON: Okay.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. And get David to - - -

25

MS LEESON: Let's start with traffic, then.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

30 MS LEESON: Traffic seems to have been a real concern by the community. And you've expressed Council's concern that the assessment hasn't been thorough enough or that there hasn't – Council's concerns haven't been taken into account well enough by the proponent. Are you able to expand on that? I've had a look – a quick look at the Response to Submissions document by the proponent, where they reference a whole lot of points in their documents that these matters are addressed and why different traffic models were used, different versions of traffic modelling software were used. Are you able to comment any further on that? Or is that something you - - -

35

40 MR GUTHRIE: I was hoping to have our traffic engineer here today. But having spoken with him – he doesn't believe that the modelling has been completed in a thorough enough fashion, particularly with the – in relation to the M5 weave areas and other impacts throughout the whole city of Liverpool. There are other impacts that haven't been taken into account. And the modelling we just don't believe. But we are doing some more work on that, as I understand it. And so we can provide the Commission with some more technical detail on that in due course.

45

MS LEESON: That might be the approach to take, with Council - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Okay.

5 MS LEESON: Because we will take submissions for another week from today.

MR GUTHRIE: Okay. I'll just make a note.

10 MS LEESON: So if Council would like to make further submission on the traffic side, given that, um, you can't deal with it today in any detail, that would be helpful.

MR GUTHRIE: Traffic. Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

15 MS LEESON: We did hear about the weave issue on the M5 from the community meeting.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. Yeah. And I have experienced it myself. It is quite alarming. Um, I - I don't think that's - and the other thing is the \$48 million expenditure on - ah, VPA with RMS - there's not a lot of detail on that, where that's
20 being spent, at this point in time. That's a big concern to our community. And \$48 million doesn't seem a lot for the amount of traffic that's going to be generated. I know there's background traffic as well that has to be taken into account. And how much the proponent should be contributing, whether we've got that balance right - well, we're not sure.

25 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR GUTHRIE: \$48 million doesn't go a long way when you're upgrading roads, particularly regional.

30 MS LEESON: RMS would appear to be comfortable with it, if they've accepted a VPA for that amount as a contribution to the network.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Well, we're certainly not.

35 MS LEESON: Okay. All right.

MR GUTHRIE: But we can get to - I will get back to you on some more technical aspects on that.

40 MS LEESON: And maybe that's the approach with any of the technical matters, that - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Okay.

45 MS LEESON: You know, if you want to put something back to the Commission on those as we go, that would be fine - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Sure. Yeah.

MR COUTTS: - - - because it would be useful to have – I mean, the Liverpool Council submissions date back to August 2016.

5 MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: Yes.

10 MR COUTTS: We've now got the department's assessment report, which includes a range of conditions around how things like traffic noise, other things should be managed.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. You need a response.

15 MR COUTTS: It would be interesting or valuable to us to get Liverpool Council's response to whether they are satisfied with what the department is suggesting in terms of managing some of those issues.

20 MR GUTHRIE: Okay. Yes. I can pretty well guarantee that we're not. But I will get back to you with some more - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes. Well, I think you've sort of said you're not.

25 MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MR COUTTS: But I guess we would like a bit more substance to that.

MR GUTHRIE: Sure.

30 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Understand. So what's the date for the final - - -

35 MR COUTTS: A week from today.

MS LEESON: Let's – yeah.

MR GUTHRIE: A week from today. So that's – what's today? The - - -

40 MR COUTTS: 25th.

MR GUTHRIE: 25th.

45 MR D. WAY: 2nd of July.

MR GUTHRIE: 2nd.

MR COUTTS: Yep.

MS LEESON: It will be Tuesday next week.

5 MR COUTTS: Yep. Whatever date that is.

MR GUTHRIE: COB Tuesday next week.

MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

10

MS LEESON: Thanks.

MR GUTHRIE: Right.

15 MS LEESON: Okay. Biodiversity. You touched on that.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. I just don't – we just don't – like, looking at the whole – we just don't understand why they need to clear the whole site. And reading through the reports, there's a lot of threatened species, both fauna and flora, on that site.

20 Couldn't they do it a lot smarter? We just don't think it's good planning, either the way they're just virtually razing the whole site and then trying to do offsets in different places - - -

MS LEESON: It has been put to us that the need to raze the site is driven in large part by where Moorebank Precinct East sits and their stormwater drainage management. And there's clearly some divergent views around landscape treatment for the site, riparian corridors and where they start and are established. So it's fair to say that we've had some divergent views on biodiversity by default, I think, with that riparian zone in particular. Has Council had a close look at what's proposed in terms of the riparian corridor? And do they have any comment on it?

30

MR GUTHRIE: Again, I will have to get back to you. I can get back to you by next week on that one. Yes. That would be great, if we could give you some technical detail on that, because I know – speaking to our – our community is very concerned about the effects on the biodiversity and the natural fauna and flora, because we're just losing it too quickly and I was just talking to one of your office people here before. I'm looking out over Hyde Park; I'm thinking we don't have these type of parks in Liverpool because we just – we haven't planned it well enough so that we have been able to maintain these corridors.

35

40

And this is an opportunity – we would like to think that whole riverfront could be maintained as a public amenity area. And we've got plans to at some stage re-zone along the Georges River, along the eastern side of the Georges River. And some of those businesses that I've provided you details on that we're talking with have taken options from developers. And they would like to move at some stage.

45

It gives us an – it provides us with an opportunity to improve that amenity of that whole Georges River corridor, which is a little bit north of this current site. But there's two things with that. One is we would like to see that corridor continued right through and maintained. And the other is we would like the opportunity for those – for somewhere for those businesses to move to so that we could actually create those better places. At the moment, our CBD and our – our riverfront, um, interface and the riparian corridor around our river is, um, not ideal. But we've got big plans and a – a vision to improve that.

10 MS LEESON: That was going to be my question.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

15 MS LEESON: Does Council have a riverfront strategy or a riparian corridor strategy and development strategy for along the riverfront within the LGA that we should be looking at?

MR GUTHRIE: We have a draft Georges – we've got a draft Georges River plan, which has not yet been adopted by Council but that's the general direction Council is – it's – it's a – a Georges River masterplan. So it looks at the potential for re-zoning along the eastern, um, riparian corridor of – of the city.

MS LEESON: And does that establish what Council considers an appropriate riparian corridor?

25 MR GUTHRIE: Ah - - -

MS LEESON: We have the one that DPI – DPI established, which is a 40-metre zone from top of bank. Does Council accept that one? Or does Council have – have its own - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Well, at the moment, as I said, it's – it's still in a – still in a draft format. So we're still working through that, unfortunately. I – so I can't give you a definitive answer on that. But I'm just saying in general terms, and having also gone through the collaboration area strategy with the Greater Sydney Commission, there are – and that gives us some direction as well as to where the community would like to see that corridor go or – or how they would like to see it developed. I can - - -

MS LEESON: Is that public, that draft plan?

40 MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. Yeah. Sorry. The Georges River masterplan - - -

MS LEESON: Masterplan.

45 MR GUTHRIE: - - - is public. Yes.

MS LEESON: That's public.

MR GUTHRIE: And the collaboration area strategy is also public. You would have seen that on the Greater Sydney Commission's website.

MS LEESON: We might have a look at those, David.

5

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. So we'd like – we don't think that the current strategy has really addressed – the current, sorry, proposals, sorry, have really addressed that whole Georges River – and – and probably, to be – to be fair to everyone, Council's not really – hasn't adopted that Georges River masterplan yet either. And we're also developing a Light Horse Park masterplan. So that whole corridor is still in, ah, development. So that's – our argument is really we'd like – we'd like to see this put on hold until we've got all these elements put in place. Ah - - -

MS LEESON: Yeah. I – I think the view – without speaking, necessarily, for them. But I think the view that the proponent would probably put to us is that they've owned this site zoned for it.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

MS LEESON: And, ah, they've – they have an approved concept plan. They're now looking for the detail and - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - progressing the development. So - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Yes

MS LEESON: I – I understand Council's sentiments. But I'm not sure if that's - - -

30

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. That's - - -

MS LEESON: - - - cause to put a hold on the development.

MR GUTHRIE: Ah, well.

MS LEESON: So – okay. Um, other issues, concerns that you'd like to raise with the Commission?

MR GUTHRIE: Ah, the other big one was, ah, the, um, noise and air quality, um, during both construction and operation are likely to be greater than identified in the EIS due to the traffic assumptions used. Ah, furthermore, the EIS cannot be adequately assessed without the release of RMS modelling. So I – I believe our traffic people have been requesting it for some time.

45

MS LEESON: Which modelling is that?

MR COUTTS: Traffic. Traffic

MR GUTHRIE: The RMS modelling on traffic.

5 MS LEESON: RMSs model.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

MR COUTTS: The traffic – yeah.

10 MS LEESON: I understand that RMS doesn't release its model - - -

MR COUTTS: were saying the other day.

15 MS LEESON: - - - was what the – we were advise last week. Ah, the proponent, I think, has offered that they will make their information available. Has Council followed that up with the proponent, to get that information?

MR GUTHRIE: I believe so. But I – my understanding is the RMS modelling has

20 still not been provided.

MS LEESON: Yeah. And I'm not sure that that - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Oh, and it's – it's being withheld - - -

25 MS LEESON: I'm not – as I say, I'm not sure that RMS is releasing that publicly generally. So - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah. Well, we find that – we think that's pretty disappointing,

30 because this is a significant project that – we're having to deal with all the negative impacts. We would like the opportunity to, ah, critique that modelling, at least. I think it would be fair for – for our community.

MS LEESON: Okay.

35 MR GUTHRIE: As – as you're well aware from the public submissions last week, the traffic issue is a huge - - -

MR COUTTS: Yeah. Yeah.

40 MR GUTHRIE: - - - big issue for us to try and deal with.

MR COUTTS: Yeah. I appreciate - - -

45 MS LEESON: That and the, ah, riparian zone, I think - - -

MR GUTHRIE: And the riparian zone. Yeah.

MS LEESON: - - - were – were the two key issues that – that seemed to come out
- - -

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah.

5

MS LEESON: - - - time and again. Um, related to the riparian zone – sorry to take
you back - - -

MR GUTHRIE: You're right.

10

MS LEESON: - - - is flooding impact along the Georges River. Ah, the
proponent's looking to raise the site by two to three metres and change significantly,
therefore, the contour. So has council done any flood analysis or has any flood
analysis that the commission should be aware of in relation to the raising of that site?

15

MR GUTHRIE: I believe we have done some initial work. I can get you that on
notice as well if you like. That will be

MS LEESON: Thank you. Thank you.

20

MR GUTHRIE: It's probably fair to say we're not comfortable with – with the
raising of the – of that site by an amount. It just seems to – tries to be an
overdevelopment but I guess they can make – if they can make it work, they will
make it work by digging the OSDs to suit, but – but the cost of doing that to our
community is huge. And I believe the next door neighbour – one of our ratepayers at
ABB has raised issues with the stormwater as well onto their site which has not been
– I'm not sure that's been properly addressed by the applicant either.

25

MS LEESON: We were advised by the applicant that the ABBs concerns had been
addressed.

30

MR GUTHRIE: Okay.

MS LEESON: We've not yet sought to verify that with ABB as to their view, but
certainly the applicants told us that.

35

MR GUTHRIE: Okay. Okay. Well, I might take that on notice also and check with
ABB whether that's the case.

40

MR COUTTS: Some of the conditions in the approval quite specifically

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah, well, I know ABBs submission was – they didn't have much
comfort at the original flood modelling/stormwater aspect was going to not affect
their site negatively.

45

MS LEESON: Has council had a look at the draft conditions recommended by the
department in the department's assessment report?

MR GUTHRIE: No, we haven't had a chance to do that yet is my understanding.

MS LEESON: If council does have any comments on the proposed conditions, it can - - -

5 MR GUTHRIE: Are they available on the website?

MS LEESON: It's attached to the department's assessment report.

10 MR COUTTS: It's in the assessment report.

MR GUTHRIE: Okay. Yep.

MS LEESON: So if council does have any comments to make on the draft

15 conditions - - -

MR GUTHRIE: We needed - - -

MS LEESON: - - - if they could come along as well.

20 MR GUTHRIE: Well, having said that, David may have had a look at them. I will have to check with him.

MR COUTTS: I think you need to - - -

25 MS LEESON: Yes.

MR COUTTS: - - - because obviously a lot of the issues that council has raised in its earlier submission the department has taken note of and attempted to pick up that

30 and other issues that have been raised in the conditions for the approval. So things around biodiversity, traffic, etcetera – there are conditions there, so it would be useful if your council's offices were to have a look at those because they may in fact mitigate against some of the issues you've got.

35 MS LEESON: That's right.

MR GUTHRIE: Well, I will double-check on that, but I know having – speaking to David, he was of the view that he didn't believe that the condition – the proposed

40 conditions that he – as he understood them had been addressed appropriately. So anyway, I will get back to your

MR COUTTS: Who's David? He's the - - -

MR GUTHRIE: David Smith's manager of strategic planning.

45 MR COUTTS: Right. Okay.

MR GUTHRIE: So - - -

MR COUTTS: So he's the right fellow?

5 MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yeah. He would have been here today. Unfortunately he just couldn't make it. So I'm representing him as well as I can.

MR COUTTS:

10 MS LEESON: All right. What else? Anything else that council would like to make us aware of?

MR GUTHRIE: Well, I think I've – well, I've actually provided – just to support the paper that I've provided you and you can put the – on the website and I've
15 actually taken away consultation from – we produced two industrial land studies in the last couple of years - - -

MS LEESON: Right. Thank you.

20 MR GUTHRIE: - - - which I can table today.

MR COUTTS: This paper is really talking about opening up other areas for industrial rezoning around Kemps Creek and the like.

25 MR GUTHRIE: Well, yeah, it is, but it also – but it's really addressing two issues. The first is that we do have strong demand for industrial land in our LGA and we'd like to see the Kemps Creek area rezoned, yes, of course. And part of the reason why we do have this mismatch of demand and supply in our LGA is because the Intermodal site has taken up all our primary industrial land right in Moorebank which
30 is a very successful industrial precinct.

MR COUTTS: But, unfortunately, that's a bit of a fait accompli, isn't it, because Qube have got the site?

35 MR GUTHRIE: Well – well, I'd like to think it's not because some of these business – I don't see why they can't locate them on the site. Why does everything have to be big box warehouses on this Moorebank Intermodal site? Why can't we put some advanced manufacturing in there to mix it up, make it a better quality planning outcome and provide additional employment – close to the transport node
40 because we can – well, hopefully one day we will have a bridge across from Casula station.

MR COUTTS: I guess the response to that is they've got a concept approval to do what it is they're doing.
45

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah, but a concept approval to do 250,000 T a year up it to 500.

MR COUTTS: I think we got a concept approval to do 1.1 million, haven't they?
Across the two - - -

MS LEESON: 1.205, I think.

5 MR COUTTS: - - - across the two sites.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah, well, it's – all right. Well, all right. Let's – so - - -

10 MS LEESON: And this is concept plan modification and stage 2 for Moorebank West. So there will clearly be a stage 3 of Moorebank West. It might be that if council really has strong motive to put different development down there, that's a conversation that you could have with SIMTA about the stage 3 development if this, you know, is a fait accompli, so to speak, for at least a stage 2. So it might be

15 something that, you know, you would encourage council to talk to SIMTA about.

MR GUTHRIE: Yeah, well, we do. We regularly talk with SIMTA and Qube but they just seem to be focused very much on warehousing and transport logistics and we talk to their agents and we talk to them – it's just big box warehousing. I think

20 we can do better.

MR COUTTS: I suppose without – I mean, the issue I guess I'm – I'm having sitting on – on this panel is to say to you that the sort of things that you're putting to us are a little bit outside our purview - - -

25 MR GUTHRIE: Yes, I know.

MR COUTTS: - - - in terms of looking at this – this – this project.

30 MR GUTHRIE: Yes, I know. Yes, maybe. Yes. I understand that.

MR COUTTS: I mean, I understand where you're coming from, but, you know, Qube, SIMTA for all essentially got a concept approval for a warehouse development. They're now looking for further approvals to put that into – into

35 action. It's a bit hard to revisit whether they should have actually had that in the first place and whether there's better usages for that site.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes, I understand. It's just I would like still like to discuss it, yes.

40 MR COUTTS: Yes. No. Look, I'm not suggesting you don't put it on the table.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes. It is what it is.

MR COUTTS: And it - - -

45

MR GUTHRIE: And that's why counsel is in the position we're at. We're saying we want to get a – all right. We understand this estate development. Well, let's try and mitigate these negative effects so that we can - - -

5 MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.

MR GUTHRIE: - - - handle and assist our community - - -

10 MR COUTTS: I mean, one of the - - -

MR GUTHRIE: - - - who are really upset about it. Anyway.

15 MR COUTTS: I mean, one of the things, just – I just had a very quick read over this paper, but, I mean, clearly one of the things if you're not already doing is you probably should be having some further conversations with the Department of Planning and the Sydney Commission.

20 MR GUTHRIE: We do. We've had this conversation ad nauseam. The trouble is – and, again, this – this is probably outside this discussion, but the Greater Sydney Commission has produced their land use infrastructure implementation plan for out around the – in the growth areas around the airport, and yet the staging and the servicing requirements, we need – we need things to happen pretty soon and it just seems like we – we're – we're out of land now. Prestons is basically full. Moorebank is full and Intermodal Terminal is quarantined for warehousing and transport logistics. We've got nowhere to put these businesses. We've had these discussions with DPE and with Greater Sydney Commission. We seem to be getting nowhere.

30 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR GUTHRIE: So very frustrating.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

35 MR GUTHRIE: And we're starting to lose jobs and businesses as a result – starting to go interstate and further south and it's not good for our community and it's not good for Western Sydney, where we need jobs.

40 MR COUTTS: Yes.

MR GUTHRIE: We've got a huge jobs deficit, so - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

45 MS LEESON: Yes, you do. Okay. I think we – we understand all of that. As Alan says, some of that is probably beyond our remit - - -

MR GUTHRIE: Yes.

MS LEESON: - - - in terms of what we have in front of us.

5 MR GUTHRIE: But I thought as a member of the Community Consultative Committee, it was appropriate that I meet with – with the panel and just ensure that all these issues are being raised.

10 MS LEESON: And we appreciate you coming along.

MR GUTHRIE: Yes, and I appreciate your time.

MR COUTTS: Is that the Community Consultative Committee for this project?

15 MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yes.

MR COUTTS: Okay.

20 MR GUTHRIE: Yeah, it was established, I think, on one of the approvals.

MR COUTTS: How is that working?

25 MR GUTHRIE: Ah, as you can appreciate, the community is still very nervous and agree about the project so some meetings go okay, others can be quite fractious. I know I was there one time when there was a lot of dust as a result of the works on site and that the mitigation measures on that particular day were insufficient and I'm not sure that the representative seemed to really address that very well. There's various issues get raised. The biodiversity issue is raised often. The stormwater issue is raised often. We're just trying to keep the developer honest. And there's
30 other issues like flooding, like, Moorebank Avenue and there's flooding along Moorebank Avenue that we don't – not sure whether that's being addressed properly because we - - -

35 MS LEESON: Is that between the two Intermodal sites?

40 MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yes. There's issues with traffic, of course, already, during construction. I'm not sure that it has been properly managed. We're not sure that they're really informing people well enough. We would like to see them put more signage up to let them know where they can contact, because when we get to these Consultative Committee meetings and it's really the community and council saying, "Well, here's all the problems," and they're saying, "Well, why haven't people given us – why haven't these been registered through the SIMTA website?" Well, people don't – they come to us. They don't go – they don't – they come to council, I expect
45 - - -

MR COUTTS: Yes.

- MR GUTHRIE: - - - and the Community Consultative Committee to resolve these problems.
- MR COUTTS: Yes. Yes.
- 5 MR GUTHRIE: They don't go to SIMTA.
- MR COUTTS: Yes.
- 10 MR GUTHRIE: Because they think – most people don't think – don't realise that this is not a council project. They think, "Well, why – what is council doing?"
- MS LEESON: Yes.
- 15 MR COUTTS: Yes. They think you've approved it.
- MR GUTHRIE: Yes, and they think we have compliance powers as well. We don't have any powers. We didn't approve it. We don't have compliance powers either, so - - -
- 20 MR COUTTS: Yes.
- MR GUTHRIE: It makes it very – it puts us in a very difficult position, so I don't enjoy going to those Community Consultative meetings, I can tell you. They're not
- 25 fun.
- MS LEESON: I think – think I understand. Okay. I think we have a flavour of council's concerns and issues.
- 30 MR GUTHRIE: Yes.
- MS LEESON: Unless there's anything else particularly that you wanted to touch on today, Chris, we might leave it with you to follow up with - - -
- 35 MR GUTHRIE: Yes. Yes.
- MS LEESON: - - - David and others back at council and give us some further information to have a look at.
- 40 MR GUTHRIE: I've got some – I've got some – yes, some things to take back. Great. All right. Thank you both for your time.
- MR COUTTS: Well, thanks for coming in.
- 45 MR GUTHRIE: And, yes, I will get back to you within the week.
- MS LEESON: All right. Terrific.

MR COUTTS: Yes.

MS LEESON: Thanks, Chris. Thanks for your time.

5

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.08 am]