

**APPENDIX 1
RECORDS OF COMMISSION MEETINGS**

Notes of Briefing from the Department

This meeting is part of the Determination process.		
Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley	Date: 11 December 2017	Time: 10:00am-11:15am
Project: Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan MOD 2 and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal SSD 7628		
Meeting place: Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street, PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Commission Members: Annabelle Pegrum AM, Steve O'Connor, Peter Duncan AM Commission Secretariat: Robert Bisley, David McNamara Department of Planning and Environment: David Gainsford and Karen Harragon</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting: For the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) to brief the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) on the Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan and State Significant Development (SSD) applications.</p>		
<p>The Department briefed the Commission on the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project background: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stage 1 previously approved the freight terminal and spur lines. It also included early works and contamination works. ○ Work for Stage 1 is currently underway. ○ 8 warehouses are proposed for this development, totalling 300,000sqm. • Traffic/Moorebank Avenue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic modelling prepared by the applicant has not been entirely satisfactory. ○ Roads and Maritime Services has prepared its own modelling. ○ The traffic cluster did not want only half of Moorebank Avenue being upgraded as part of this proposal and half being upgraded in association with the Moorebank Precinct West application. • Fill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Environment Protection Authority NSW (EPA) is satisfied with the levels of the fill proposed and the potential impacts associated with it. • Noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A cumulative assessment was undertaken for the site. ○ The expert noise report found that there was a higher than originally predicted level of background noise. ○ The proposed development should not exceed the relevant Industrial Noise Policy noise criteria. ○ Noise will only to be a potential issue during late night activities for residents located east of the development site in Wattle Grove. ○ The proposal does not include noise mitigation measures along the eastern frontage of the development as it is intended that the warehouse layout will mitigate noise (warehouse entrances on north/south (internal facing) elevations). • Biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impact of the proposed development on protected or vulnerable species is not considered a substantial issue. The site has some scattered vegetation that will be cleared, however this is not 		

of high biodiversity value. The Boot Land, the area of highest biodiversity value, will have only minimal disturbance.

- The biodiversity values of the Boot Land, and the fact that it is owned by the Department of Defence, make fire management regimes more complicated than normal but manageable.
- Subdivision
 - The applicant is seeking to subdivide the land as they claim without subdivision approval, leases greater than 5 years cannot be granted and this will affect their commercial viability.
 - Subdivision is necessary in some instances to enter into separate tenancy agreements.
 - The applicant will still be responsible for the management and maintenance of the roads and site vegetation if the subdivision was to proceed.
- Stormwater and Urban Design
 - The Department is not satisfied with the applicant's stormwater and urban design proposal.
 - The Department's recommended stormwater conditions were acceptable when discussed with the applicant and were included as conditions of the recommended consent.
 - The applicant has not proposed a master plan for the site.
- Construction hours
 - The recommended conditions of consent allow for extended hours of operation. However, this excludes certain activities during certain time periods (e.g. rock breaking and land-forming works at night). This is consistent with some other projects and will reduce the duration of construction activity.
 - There are road network benefits from allowing trucks to arrive at the site during extended hours but this needs to be balanced against the potential impact to nearby residents from carrying out works into the evening.
- There is an appeal in relation to a Stage 1 development consent currently before the NSW Land and Environment Court. This does not prevent the Department or the Commission making an assessment or determination of the applications. The Commission is required to make its determination accordingly.
- Owners consent has been resolved for this project.
- The term 'freight village' is not a land use identified in the standard instrument Local Environmental Plan (LEP).
- The site will not be an EPA licenced facility. Therefore, the monitoring and compliance role will be undertaken by the Department (not Liverpool City Council or the EPA).
- Poly-Fluroalkyl substances (PFAS) is likely to be present on the site. The Department will provide the Commission with additional recommended conditions to ensure that contamination issues are adequately addressed.

Documents: N/a

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: The Department to send through additional information on proposed condition amendments including those being put forward by the applicant.

Meeting closed at 11:15am

Notes of Briefing from the Council

This meeting is part of the Determination process.		
Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley	Date: 11 December 2017	Time: 1pm – 2:15pm
Project: Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan MOD 2 and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal SSD 7628		
Meeting place: Liverpool City Council		
Attendees: Commission Members: Annabelle Pegrum AM, Steve O'Connor, Peter Duncan AM Commission Secretariat: Robert Bisley, David McNamara Liverpool City Council: Ash Chand, Charles Wiafe, Steven Tuntevski, Neil Ramsay, Louis Chen and Madhu Pudasaini		
The purpose of the meeting: For Liverpool City Council (Council) to brief the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) on the Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan and State Significant Development (SSD) applications.		
Council briefed the Commission on the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council requests determination of Moorebank Precinct East be delayed until details of the Moorebank Precinct West site have been finalised.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There is a need to assess the cumulative impacts of both the Moorebank East and Moorebank West precincts.• Traffic:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Moorebank Avenue needs to be widened for the whole length of the road adjoining the intermodal terminal.○ Council agrees that the intersections proposed to be upgraded, should be.○ Impacts of the proposed development will be felt on Council's local roads which are at or nearing capacity.○ Council needs clear Road and Maritime Services infrastructure timeframes.○ Council requests Moorebank Avenue be classified as a State road. The proposed classification of the road wasn't discussed with Council.• The applicant has agreed to provide Council with a 1% monetary contribution as part of the project. However, Council thinks this is 'unfair' and requests it be increased to 2% with a peer review of the cost estimates prepared by the applicant's Quantity Surveyor.• Stormwater:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Council requests the stormwater be managed onsite rather than transferred to the Western edge of Moorebank Precinct West.○ Council has concerns regarding the impact on the environment and on public safety at the Georges River as a result of the proposal.○ Council questions if the relevant authorities for managing water are satisfied with the applicant's approach.○ Council believes there is insufficient information within the EIS to determine if the stormwater impacts are manageable.• Design of the warehouses will have noise, dust and vibration impacts on nearby residents. Council is concerned that warehouses on the Moorebank Precinct West will be used as noise mitigation measures for this proposal and yet there is no certainty Moorebank Precinct West will be approved.		

- Council requests the establishment of reliable independent baseline data for all potential impacts. This will provide the community with data that the project can be compared to.
- Council requests that any conditions nominating Council as the monitoring authority be delegated to either the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) or Environment Protection Authority NSW (EPA). Council is not resourced to monitor the impacts of the proposed development.
- Council does not as yet have a position on the subdivision of the site.
- It is requested that the applicant prepare a formal consultation strategy outlining how the community (and Council) will be consulted.
- Council requests standard business hours be adhered to for construction and operations at the site.

Documents: N/a

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: N/a

Meeting closed at 2:15pm

This meeting is part of the Determination process.

Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley

Date: 11 December 2017

Time: 2:30pm – 4:45pm

Project: Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan MOD 2 and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal SSD 7628

Meeting place: Moorebank Precinct East site office

Attendees:

Commission Members: Annabelle Pegrum AM, Steve O'Connor, Peter Duncan AM

Commission Secretariat: Robert Bisley, David McNamara

Applicant: Michael Yiend (Qube Development Director), Michael Barrows (Qube General Managing Delivery), Dan Blyde (Qube Senior Corporate Affairs Adviser), Steve Ryan (Tactical Managing Director), Nathan Cairney (Tactical Director), Jane Rodd (Acradis Senior Ecologist), Nic Hall (Wilkinson Murray Noise Specialist)

The purpose of the meeting: For applicant to brief the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) on the Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan and State Significant Development (SSD) applications.

During the meeting, the applicant gave a PowerPoint presentation providing a summary of the project, discussion of the Future Environmental Assessment Requirements, proposed conditions and an outline of potential project impacts.

The applicant also briefed the Commission on the following matters:

- When the Moorebank Precinct East traffic assessment was undertaken, Moorebank Precinct West was not far enough advanced to be considered as part of the proposal. The assessment only included known details. The cumulative assessment included all known elements of Moorebank Precinct West.
- Moorebank Precinct West acoustic buffering is beneficial but not necessary to ensure noise criteria for Moorebank Precinct East is met.
- The applicant requests amendment to a number of conditions (published within their PowerPoint presentation).
- Traffic:
 - Vehicle movements within the traffic studies refer to the 'peak' on any given day.
 - The traffic study doesn't consider vehicle movements internally within the site.
- Noise:
 - Construction noise predicted to increase noise received by Wattle Grove residents (nearest sensitive receiver) by 1dBA.
 - Operational noise predicted to increase noise received by Wattle Grove residents by 1dBA (nearest sensitive receiver).
 - The Boot Land will act as a noise mitigation measure for residents at Wattle Grove.
- The applicant had not considered in any detail but intends to undertake rooftop rainwater capture where possible.
- Onsite detention basins were proposed as they are the most efficient forms of removing water off the site.
- The purpose of the fill is for both flood protection and to manage drainage of storm water off site but also because it will make a much better construction base for building foundations.
- The applicant will be responsible for managing the Boot Land as part of the biobanking agreement.
- The project will only involve minimal clearing of land and the relevant agencies are satisfied with the offsetting arrangements proposed.

- The applicant is happy for the cost estimates prepared by the applicant's Quantity Surveyor to be independently reviewed as per Council's request.

The meeting was followed by a tour of the Stage 1 works under construction, existing drainage canals, the sheds to be demolished and interactions between the site and the Defence Joint Logistics Unit and Boot Land.

Documents: N/a

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: Applicant to send through additional information on the subdivision layout, a copy of the presentation and the proposed changes to the conditions.

Meeting closed at 4:45pm

Notes of Briefing with the Department and stormwater expert

This meeting is part of the Determination process.		
Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley	Date: 18 December 2017	Time: 9:30am-10:30am
Project: Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan MOD 2 and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal SSD 7628		
Meeting place: Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street, PAC Office		
<p>Attendees: Commission Members: Annabelle Pegrum AM, Steve O’Connor, Peter Duncan AM Commission Secretariat: Robert Bisley, David McNamara Department of Planning and Environment: Karen Harragon, Heather Nelson Consultant: Richard McManus (Alluvium)</p>		
<p>The purpose of the meeting: For the Department of Planning and Environment’s (the Department) stormwater consultant, Alluvium, to brief the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) on stormwater issues relating to Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan and the State Significant Development (SSD) applications.</p>		
<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consultant spoke to issues related to sustainability including environmental impact and maintenance, visual aspects of the proposal and public safety. • The applicant’s approach (reliance on rudimentary concrete engineering solutions to stormwater management) is not contemporary best practice. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The onsite detention basins will have up to 3m vertical concrete walls with vegetation along the base (in some sections). ○ Some sections of the culvert will be covered by roads etc which can create blockages – this has only been partially considered to date. • Importation of fill would not have been the only way of resolving the site drainage design. • 20% of the water that moves into the onsite detention basins will be retained. This is likely to lead to sediment accumulation along the base of the onsite detention basin. • There will be a large amount of upkeep required to maintain the sediment and bottom of the onsite detention basins. This will be complicated by the restricted access presented by the design of the culverts including the large number of vertical surfaces (rather than battered banks or similar). • Stormwater collected on Moorebank Precinct East will flow into the onsite detention basin 10, then through the existing east-west culvert into onsite detention basin 5. Moorebank Precinct East will rely on the existing large culvert running through the Moorebank Precinct West site to manage stormwater. • The applicant is committed to upgrading the existing culvert if Moorebank Precinct West does not proceed (i.e. Moorebank Precinct East must be able to manage stormwater in isolation of any other development applications). • There has been no consideration of roof water capture & reuse, green walls or green roofs. There is no consideration of contemporary water sensitive urban design measures (WSUD). • The Department raised a number of concerns regarding safety, fencing and maintenance of the culverts. • Due to the depth and orientation of the onsite detention basins, vegetation proposed along the base will struggle to survive with the limited sunlight (likely to only be up to one hour per day). • The depth of the basins will not interact/impact with the watertable. 		

- It is recommended that the applicant improves the proposed intersection with the George’s River as the current discharge point has failed.
- Concerns were raised with the applicant’s proposed use of gabion walls:
 - They only have a short life-span (generally not greater than 10 years);
 - There is a need to maintain them on a regular basis
 - They aren’t innovative and are not best practice; and
 - It is recommended that the applicant adopt a more natural sympathetic environmental approach.
- The Department are planning to recommend a number of conditions to manage stormwater impacts on the Moorebank Precinct West precinct.
- There is potential in the future to include a walking track along the eastern side of the George’s River to mirror the existing track on the western side, however this is not currently planned.
- Moorebank Precinct East can manage stormwater impacts independently without Moorebank Precinct West proceeding. However, a cumulative approach across both the precincts would have achieved the best outcomes. The nature of the staging of the development has precluded this and applications must now be considered as they are proposed.
- The applicant used the MUSIC (Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation) tool in preparation of the EIS.
- It is recommended that a condition of consent be included to retain a 1% bio-retention system for the site. This may help overcome concerns the system may be undersized and/or may not operate at predicted level of functionality due to the design flaws with vegetation in the base of the OSD.
- Condition B141 contains the principles of environmentally sensitive design. The applicant intends to achieve these principles but has not committed to it.

Documents: N/a

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: The Department will review Alluvium’s Stormwater Quantity and Quality report and confirm to the Commission how the recommended conditions were addressed within the recommended consent.

Meeting closed at 10:30am

This meeting is part of the Determination process.

Meeting note taken by Robert Bisley

Date: 18 December 2017

Time: 10:30am-11:45am

Project: Moorebank Precinct East Concept Plan MOD 2 and Moorebank Intermodal Terminal SSD 7628

Meeting place: Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street, PAC Office

Attendees:

Commission Members: Annabelle Pegrum AM, Steve O'Connor, Peter Duncan AM

Commission Secretariat: Robert Bisley, David McNamara

Department of Planning and Environment: Karen Harragon, David Gainsford

Transport Group: Colin Langford, Tim Dewey, Rachel Cumming

The purpose of the meeting: For the Transport Group to brief the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) on the road and traffic issues associated with this project.

Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) provided the Commission with a presentation detailing the applicant's traffic impact assessment, mitigation measures and the proposed conditions of consent and modification.

The following matters were also discussed:

- RMS has undertaken a significant amount of background work including studies and modelling over the past five or so years for this project and this area of Sydney. An internal base model has been prepared along with a 2036 demand model.
- RMS modelling shows that there will be generally less than a 5% traffic increase resulting from the project on the key network intersections.
- RMS also acknowledged as part of longer term planning due to growth and surrounding development that this area of the road network will undergo further development and improvements.
- The applicant and RMS have had a number of discussions regarding what intersection upgrades are required and could be considered fair and reasonable to be attributed (in full or in part) to the applicant.
- The need for four lanes along Moorebank Avenue is directly proportional to the traffic movements generated by the proposal.
- The ownership and road authority status of Moorebank Avenue is complicated:
 - Northern section of Moorebank Avenue north is a dedicated public road reserve and the RMS is happy to manage upgrade of the road on behalf of Liverpool City Council.
 - Southern section of the road is owned by the Commonwealth and will need to be designated as a "temporary road" to allow RMS to authorise the necessary upgrades.
- RMS is happy to review the classification of Moorebank Avenue and consider making it a State road in the future.
- RMS has worked with the applicant to include an upgrade of Newbridge intersection as part of this application.
- The amendments to conditions B13 and B23 proposed by the applicant are not supported by RMS.
- RMS requested construction and operational traffic management plans and are comfortable that the conditions of consent will deliver them.
- 'The weave' is the name given to the section of road along the South Western Motorway between Moorebank Avenue and Hume Highway intersections. It is identified by RMS as having significant existing traffic issues. Concern has been expressed that the movement of trucks from Moorebank Precinct East and Moorebank Precinct West has the potential to further increase the issues. RMS considered that the

current application alone did not impact significantly further work on the weave at this time however that this was a longer term network issue that it would need to address.

- A voluntary planning agreement (VPA) is being negotiated as part of Moorebank Precinct West application and aims to collect contributions that will be allocated towards various intersection works including upgrades to alleviate issues connected to 'the weave'. A key point of negotiation is what represents a fair and reasonable apportionment for the project site towards those identified network upgrades.
- The delivery of active transportation (cycling/pedestrian movements) has been the subject of previous conversations between the Transport Group and the applicant. The Transport Group are satisfied with the applicant's proposal however further evaluation will need to be undertaken once the site is occupied.
- The Department included a condition that requires the applicant to pursue a range of services that support provision for cycling facilities within the development site (bicycle storage and end of trip facilities).
- The RMS would support a condition for a shared pedestrian and bicycle path along Moorebank Avenue to contribute toward the establishment of active transportation opportunities.
- The Transport Group sees the delivery of a pedestrian bridge connecting Casula train station to the site as an unnecessary proposal. It would necessitate complex engineering and is not considered a priority infrastructure work.
- Having onsite detention basins within the road reserve is not supported.
- RMS noted they did not consider making the modelling work available to Council or the general public to be appropriate. They confirmed the nature of the modelling requires appropriate knowledge and skills to interpret. Furthermore, they are very comfortable with the modelling work undertaken to date which has helped confirm the project related traffic impacts on the network. (consider replacing this paragraph with the one below)
- RMS advised that they had consulted with Council, the community and the applicant on the traffic modelling over a number of years and have their own base model and a 2036 demand model however that due to complexity, targeted and network wide assumptions that it remained a model for its internal planning. Transport for NSW and RMS are very comfortable with the modelling work undertaken to date which has helped confirm the project related traffic impacts on the network.

Documents: N/a

Outcomes/Agreed Actions: The Department will review Cambray Consulting's traffic report and confirm to the Commission how the recommended conditions were addressed within the recommended consent.

Meeting closed at 11:45pm