

From: [REDACTED]
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: SSD 16_7709 & SSD 5066 MOD1
Date: Wednesday, 29 May 2019 12:47:32 PM

Dear Sir/madam

I wish to object to the this amendment proposal, as it fundamentally changes the consent condition of compliance to the original consent which, unless I'm mistaken, set out that NO commercial activity could commence on that site unless the rail infrastructure was commissioned and fully functional.

As the amendment stands now, the rail head of MIT East will be the primary source of delivery/return of containers by rail to Port Botany which necessitates the transfer of containers by road to MIT West, thus negating the direct delivery of containers to that site and making a mockery of all the well intentioned claims by SIMTA and QUBE and the initial consent condition.

This appears to be an attempt to maximize profits in order not to invest in the interstate rail head at MIT West until much much later in the life of the project IF it becomes commercially viable.

The original consent should stand.

No commercial venture activity from the MIT West site until the rail head at MIT West is fully commissioned and functional.

I also wish to object to the concrete crushing and batching plant to be built at the site as it has no termination date for this supposedly "temporary" infrastructure project.

This project could go on for 30 years, what is the time frame for "temporary"?

A set time for "temporary" for the batching plant, if it must be built, has to be part of the consent without any wriggle room to forestall its closure on its due date.

There also is no guarantee that the crushing material will be 100% asbestos free either by human error or otherwise, regardless of "environmental or "mitigation" measures to be employed.

Any such failure WILL impact nearby residents either in Wattle Grove, Moorebank and/or Casula or all three suburbs.

The absence of rooftop gardens and vertical gardens to absorb noise and CO2 is also a glaring deficiency in the consent condition as is the absence with dealing with the heat sink effect that will be created by thousands of square meters of exposed concrete.

The Port of San Fransisco as an example, worked with the surrounding communities to take real measures of mitigation, one such measure was electric plug in station for all (only modern trucks are allowed on site) trucks so that they could switch off their diesel engines and run on electric back up systems, and another, on site gas powered locomotives of the modern kind to reduce emissions. Surely these two simple measures can not be overlooked?

I also find the road intersection upgrades of Anzac Rd/Moorebank Ave and M5/Moorebank Ave to be inadequate as they only address the immediate locality but ignore the Hume/M5 and moorebank Ave/Newbridge Rd intersections altogether, which no doubt will be significantly impacted by the increase of MIT truck movements to and from the MITs.

The real concern will be the "weaving" on the M5 Georges River bridge which cannot be "mitigated"

by any means whatsoever.

Thank you

Mr Reinard van Lieshout



SSD 16_7709 & SSD 5066 MOD1