

MINUTES
MEETING # 28
Intermodal Logistics Centre
Community Liaison Committee (CLC)

Location: ILC
 Enfield Site Office, Cosgrove Rd, Enfield
 Date: Monday 5 September 2016
 Time: 4.00 pm

Attendees	
<p>Community Members: Jenny Maddocks Bill Thompson Jacqui Thorburn Louise Symonds</p> <p>City of Canterbury Bankstown Council Graham Humphrys</p> <p>Independent Chair Ian Colley</p> <p>Minute taker Sandra Spate</p>	<p>NSW Ports Matthew Fahey Alison Wedgwood Adem Long Ian Henderson Trevor Brown</p> <p>IMT Operator/Aurizon Michael Dorrian</p> <p>Flower Power John Sammut Michael Spiteri</p>
<p>Apologies: Heath Anderson and Sharon Tang – Aurizon Frankie Liang & Sophie Olsen – Strathfield Council</p>	

Action Items:
<p>1. Introductions</p>
<p>2. Actions from previous meeting</p> <p>Jacqui thought she hadn't received the previous minutes. Alison says they have been sent and they are also on NSW Ports website. Jacqui will confirm whether she has received them.</p> <p>Acceptance of the minutes from the June 2016 meeting was moved by Jenny and seconded by Bill. The minutes were accepted.</p> <p>Action: Alison/Matt will follow up outcomes of negotiations with Swift around reversing alarms at their Greenacre site. Alison and Matt followed this up and confirmed that Swift did change equipment alarms from beepers to quackers. NSW Ports also received an email from Louise thanking Ports for the change at the time. NSW Ports passed this feedback onto Swift as well. Louise confirmed that she and other residents are grateful for the relative quiet compared to beeping sounds at night. On behalf of the CLC Ian C congratulated NSW Ports for the achievement.</p> <p>Action: Daniela to check whether NSW Ports received submissions from residents on Modification 10. Daniela confirmed four submissions had been received and are on the website.</p> <p>Action: Adem to forward the NSW Ports presentation at the Rail Forum to CLC members. This was sent to CLC members with the June minutes.</p>
<p>2. Project Update</p>

- **Construction (Southern Precinct) – NSW Ports update**

Matt reported the pathway is in place. Work is continuing on landscaping prior to the opening which is currently estimated for February or March 2017. Signage design has been finalised. Once signage is installed the rail turntable will be relocated to the other side of Mt Enfield and will be visible from viewing areas.

- **Operations – IMT Operator (Aurizon)**

Matt reported IMT operations currently includes a regular port shuttle service of one train a day, 6 days a week and some regional freight.

Michael D reported there has been no increase to overall working hours but a small increase to volumes with plans to continue to increase trade based on demand.

- **Operations – Swift and Pitkin Transport**

Matt reported Pitkin and Swift are operating from Area G. Swift have now moved all their operations from Greenacre to Area G and a small area adjacent to Aurizon. It has been a good result for the temporary use of the area.

3. Development update

- **Tarp Shed – Garden Centre**

Michael S reported Flower Power's Development Application for the Tarp Shed area has been lodged with Strathfield Council and is currently on exhibition. He and John S are attending to answer any questions.

Alison sent the Development Application link to CLC members.

John said the plan is to relocate the existing Enfield garden centre to this site and create a beautiful garden centre with ambience and landscaping. Tens of millions of dollars are being spent to beautify the area.

Bill said he was surprised to see 216 parking spaces and asked where they will be located.

John replied it would be on the Mt Enfield side of the site.

Daniela said it will require some excavation into Mt Enfield to provide for the required parking.

Ian C asked about the size of the car parking area.

Michael S said it would be roughly 9,000sqm compared to the building of 8,000sqm.

Jenny asked how many car spaces are in the current Enfield centre. She noted there weren't enough.

John replied there are about 125 spaces at the current site so this would increase to 216 at the Tarp Shed site.

Louise thinks the plans look great. She said local residents are happy about the plans and wish there were more of these types of developments compared to some others in the area. Some awful industries have been allowed to expand near residential areas. This is a lovely facility more appropriate next to residents.

John said they want a successful business and to keep existing customers happy. Car parking is an issue that Flower Power wants to resolve. They want a better offer to customers. They currently co-exist in a residential area. Operations don't cause much noise. The intention is to keep the bones of the building, add ambience to the place and utilise as much of the existing building as possible.

Jacqui asked if this provides an opportunity for NSW Ports to have a community briefing for people not on the CLC and provide opportunity for them to get behind the proposal. Will NSW Ports make this into a communication opportunity?

Daniela replied they would rely on Flower Power to communicate plans perhaps through their existing site.

Michael S reported a briefing was held at the Enfield store with a letterbox drop undertaken in the immediate area.

John said they are happy to undertake more communication with the community.

Jacqui thought it could be more an opportunity for NSW Ports.

Alison said a piece would be included in the next community newsletter which will be sent out in the next couple of months.

Daniela thought that this has the potential to be a good planning outcome for the site with an ideal use located across the street from residents. Prior consultation indicated this use is considered favourably by the community but ultimately Council needs to approve it. Daniela recommends community members who support the proposal consider lodging a supportive submission to Council. Council hasn't been supportive of the site being developed and has only supported community uses such as open space. The area is not suitable for open space and this is the best outcome for adaptive reuse of the building.

Daniela reported that Flower Power will also need to submit a modification to the ILC Project Approval to remove this site from the Part 3A approval. It was originally all part of the footprint for the intermodal terminal. But removing this area from Part 3A approval would facilitate the development and provide the onsite parking for the development while improving ongoing compliance and monitoring by Flower Power.

Jacqui asked if the modification would impact on heritage requirements.

Michael S said Flower Power would comply with all heritage requirements. It is just to remove the site from Part 3A approval so that land around the building can be dedicated to uses needed such as car parking. The area will also be landscaped.

Jenny responded that there is a history and a reason Council has taken their view. Under the original proposal for Port Enfield the southern end was earmarked as a community and ecological space. The community space has been consistently eroded to the point it consists of a walkway and commercial use of the tarp shed. The community has been removed from that end of site. There is now a proposal to cut into the ecological site, impinging on the RE2 zone and frog habitat. She is unhappy with this as the frog habitat was an offset for the original proposal. It is a complex development application and she is still working through it. Jenny requests an extension of the exhibition period. She is generally happy with the nursery except that it impinges on the frog habitat with no assessments or mitigation measures.

Michael S replied the proposal does not extend into the frog habitat area.

Daniela noted that the area was identified on the map as part of the community ecological area, however while it goes slightly into the RE2 zone, the required 2 hectares of frog habitat is being retained and is separate from the proposed garden centre.

Alison said the current fencing designates the frog habitat. Fencing is not moving and the site won't operate across that boundary.

Jenny suggested the overland flow path running off into the frog ponds as identified in the Frog Management Plan would be impeded. Where will water to the ponds come from?

Alison said flows come from Coxs Creek and the ponds are fed from a NSW Ports detention basin to the north. The movement corridor has a designated flood overflow, frog habitat and flow paths. But this is not a reason to disallow the development. There are ways to mitigate any potential impacts and NSW Ports don't believe this development will impact on the frog habitat.

Daniela said that when the Part 3A Project was being prepared, the future of the tarp shed wasn't known and hence any redevelopment of the Tarp Shed was to be subject to a separate assessment which has now been undertaken. Regardless of what development is proposed for the Tarp Shed, whether a sports centre, garden centre or other commercial use, parking would be required. There is no opportunity in front of the building due to the close proximity to the road. The ecological area was never intended to be open access for community, only restricted access with an access pathway up the side of Mt Enfield. What is now provided is more than that with a pathway up to Mt Enfield to provide better access and daytime access for the community. More has been given but uses are limited due to contamination and heritage interpretation. She doesn't think the proposal is taking more than the community had. It prevents the building, which is of state heritage value, becoming eroded to the point where demolition would be required. The car park is currently a rail cutting and the side of Mt Enfield is steep and hence it is inappropriate to have the community to access this area. The focus should be on the overall outcome of the site and its usability and benefit to the community rather than focusing on the number of hectares that is allocated to a precinct which is not publically accessible. The proposal is making use of a space that isn't accessible currently and will provide appropriate landscaping around the site.

Michael S said that the frog area was fenced off when they looked at the site.

Jenny takes these comments on board and understands there is no public access to the frog area, but access for frog movements is still needed for a national and state listed threatened species. Impacts need to be assessed. Green and gold bell frogs used to inhabit the whole area around Coxs Creek with a big population in the Greenacre area. There have been cumulative impacts over the last 20 years.

Daniela noted the Environmental Assessment stated that historically there have been no sightings of the frogs on the Enfield ILC site. They had been identified at the brick pit site. The original approval identified an opportunity for a corridor through the site. Habitat on site is not being removed and there shouldn't be any impacts on frogs. The species loves industrial sites and there is an opportunity to coexist in the precinct.

Ian C sought clarification that the community and ecological area issues are largely about frog corridors.

Jenny suggested a lot of potential issues exist such as impacts of herbicides, frogs moving outside the fence, the pallet area becoming an attractive area for frogs.

Alison asked whether mitigation measures in an Operational Management Plan could address these issues such as protocols for if frogs were found on site.

Jenny thought perhaps it could with a slight adjustment to the site layout, especially the pallet area. Frogs like to get underneath timber. There may end up colonising underneath pallets.

Alison suggested that Green and Golden Bell frogs are highly dispersive, moving kilometres at night so 50 metres or so would be unlikely to make a viable difference.

Matt noted the overland flow west of the Tarp Shed runs in a swale north to Coxs Creek bypassing the frog ponds. The garden centre would have a similar bypass arrangement through stormwater pipes to prevent stormwater from the car park entering the ponds. The ponds are currently fed from a bio retention basin and possibly rain water tanks or towns mains in the future

Daniela suggested contacting Council if there are issues with late submissions and requests for extensions.

Alison noted Council will include conditions of approval for the development. The closing date for submissions is 14 September.

Jenny noted this isn't long for submissions and there is a substantial amount of material. She is flagging this as an issue.

Bill said there have been concerns over a long period of time regarding how Mt Enfield could serve the community. He noted there were tree plantings a couple of years ago and asked if there is an opportunity for a linkage between Flower Power and Mt Enfield to make it more attractive to the community, to encourage the community to go there. He notes that there is a pathway up the crest from Punchbowl Road. Flower Power could enhance the Mt Enfield site for the community. If people come to buy they may want to climb Mt Enfield.

John said there will be retaining walls, and lots of landscaping making it a pleasant place and adding to the ambience.

Alison said Flower Power will also maintain the pillar water tank and NSW Ports signage on the walkway will overlook it.

Daniela replied a short cut to Mt Enfield would need to ensure grades comply with Australian standards. NSW Ports can speak to Flower Power but management of the daytime access to Mt Enfield is a NSW Ports responsibility.

Bill hopes rules and regulations won't prevent it being used.

Alison suggested there may be opportunities for additional signage and information around the Flower Power site. The southern portion of the site is currently overrun by lantana and there is the disused rail cutting. This development will result in vast visual improvements.

Jenny asked where the turntable would be located.

Matt replied it would be at the north west side of Mt Enfield.

Jenny recalled the CLC had originally suggested relocating the pedestrian bridge there for viewing but that has now gone to Dorrigo.

Graham asked what the hours of operation would be. Michael S said hours would be from 7am to 6pm in daylight saving hours and 7 days a week.

Jenny asked if this applied to tenants. Michael S said one tenant (fruit and veg) may go till 9pm.

Graham asked how many staff would be on site. Michael thought it would be a bit more than the 50 to 60 at the current Enfield site. He hopes the venture will be employment generating.

- **Proposed Project Modifications**

Regarding Modification 10 to truck in and truck out or rail to rail movements Daniela reported this is still being assessed with additional information yet to be provided to the Department of Planning. Other modifications are being sought also.

Modification 11 is to construct an additional warehouse in Area G to interface with the intermodal terminal. There is currently an approval to construct six warehouses. The new warehouse would support Swift's operations on site giving direct access to the intermodal and allowing containers to go straight to the warehouse from the train instead of internal truck movements. This could reduce the number of internal truck movements required. This development will be located on the former TOLL site. This should be lodged with the Department of Planning before the next meeting. NSW Ports will inform the CLC when it has been accepted by the Department of Planning and about to go on exhibition.

Modification 12 is to take the Flower Power area out of Part 3A approval as previously discussed. Jenny asked what the necessity was for this and what the implications are.

Daniela replied that under current planning laws you can't have Part 3A and Part 4 consents overlapping. To facilitate the garden centre development and also ongoing compliance management, it is preferred that the Tarp Shed site is removed from the Part 3A Project Approval. Flower Power in their DA is committed to complying with the relevant Part 3A conditions / commitments such as heritage management. They will continue to be responsible for this compliance.

Jenny asked whether this site would be subdivided out of the title.

Matt said this is not currently proposed. There is currently an overlap and this is to put a line in the sand where the NSW Ports ILC project extends to.

Alison noted Flower Power will have their own approval conditions. They will remain tenants of NSW Ports but will be fully accountable for their own consent conditions which won't include some of the freight related conditions of the Part 3A approval as these are NSW Ports obligations.

Louise doesn't have issues with the current proposal as there are no associated noise issues, but if Flower Power pulls out and another tenant takes up the area do the same regulations apply?

Trevor replied NSW Ports is still the landlord and any development needs the owners' consent so NSW Ports are able to influence standards to be upheld.

Alison noted it would be the same as any other tenant's plans such as Swift's. All DA documents for the site went through NSW Ports first.

Louise suggested it is a shame that Council doesn't enforce standards as NSW Ports do e.g. with noise issues.

Daniela said NSW Ports have the advantage of background experience of understanding and managing such matters, particularly at Port Botany. But she noted that this development is not yet approved. It is up to Strathfield Council to assess and approve the development. If the DA is refused it is open for another type of development permissible in the zone. Council is not in favour of the development. They want the area as a park but this is not viable. If Flower Power doesn't go in something else will. A park is not a viable use for a number of reasons such as contamination, slope and the fact that the Tarp Shed is a heritage item. To maintain it and restore it, the cost of management would be significant. It can't just be left to degenerate. And a public recreation area is not possible without significant remediation.

Louise suggested the current proposal is the next best option.

Bill said it was originally designated for community use and the committee explored various options such as a youth centre but because the building is dilapidated it is difficult to visualise it being a community centre. Trevor considers not for profit uses unviable. Alison noted any other uses would still require on-site parking.

Matt reported on a modification (likely Modification 13) for a couple of rail sidings to facilitate Aurizon and provide flexibility for rail operations. There is currently a 2.6km through line and two 920m sidings. The modification would continue the sidings through the empty container area to improve access for longer regional trains.

Alison noted this would also improve access to warehouses and provide the ability to load straight

onto rail, reducing the number of internal truck / forklift movements required. Matt reported Aurizon is also seeking to install a refuelling facility and more office space in the intermodal. There would be some excavation for the rail sidings with this material being relocated on site. Jenny asked where soil from the excavation for Flower Power would be placed. Alison replied that it would be on site, to fill the disused rail cutting area. Daniela said some may go to the other side of Mt Enfield.

4. Other

Bill asked whether WestConnex East is expected to affect rail operations. Adem replied there will be no impacts. The freight line will remain operational. The proposal for driverless trains on the new Bankstown the track will be fully fenced and it was initially proposed to close the Southern Sydney Freight Line. But this won't occur. Bill thought it a given that trucks will use WestConnex stage 3 to get to Port Botany through St Peters. The rationale is to allow trucks to stay in the tunnel. He was hoping the Enfield, Moorebank and St Marys intermodals would take some trucks off the road. Adem said WestConnex will link Port Botany with the M4, and once completed will divert some trucks off the M5 and on to the M4. Trucks will go through tunnels onto the M4 then others such as the M7. Notwithstanding these road developments, the provision of intermodal terminals across Sydney will still reduce truck movements on roads. Daniela stated it will reduce the growth in truck movements, it will not reduce the overall number of trucks. Michael D said the percentage of containers by rail will grow and overall freight volumes are growing.

Jenny asked for information on the closing of the south Korean shipping line (Hanjin). Adem said the ship in question is currently docked at Port Botany's SICTL terminal while next moves are worked out. This is the first bankruptcy of a shipping line in a long time.

- **Operational and Environmental Management Plans**

Alison noted there is nothing to report with operations still under NSW Ports and tenant management plans. NSW Ports gave approval to Swifts OEMPs following extensive review last week.

Louise asked what operation hours are.

Matt and Trevor replied Pitkin and Swift are approved to operate 24/7. Pitkin currently stops at 1.00am and restarts at 5.00am. Swift finishes at 3.00am and restarts at 4.00am.

Matt said Swift have been transferring to site this week but the bulk of operations started today. Louise reported residents haven't heard beeping or excessive noise like containers being dropped since NSW Ports spoke to Swift.

Alison reported she had told Swift noise is a big issue and reversing beepers would not be acceptable on this site. NSW Ports are keeping eye on the situation. If residents hear noise they should inform NSW Ports who can investigate.

- **Complaints summary and follow up**

Alison reported there have been no complaints since last meeting.

- **Communications/ NSW Ports Update**

Adem reported the NSW Government has started the Port Botany Rail Optimisation Group (PBROG). The remit from the Government, at a very high level, is to increase freight on rail. Several taskforces have come out of the PBROG, one of which NSW Ports is leading, focusing on issues analysis. This group is approaching end cargo users and decision makers to receive direct feedback about rail performance. Two other groups are looking at the operational issues. NSW is the only state doing this. It's good for this site and for opportunities such as Moorebank, Minto, St Marys etc. Michael D reported a port shuttle with 80 TEUs came in today replacing 60 to 70 truck movements off road. This is a good outcome. It has only been going for a week.

Louise asked what time it came in.

Michael D replied the interstate train arrives at 8.00am and 2.30pm each day and the port shuttle works around that going out early morning and coming back in the afternoon. There is a host of other

rail movements by ARTC behind the site.

Adem noted the trains at night stop in the ARTC yards adjacent to the site for marshalling.

Jenny asked if the IMT is operated with open access. Could a small business order from China and get a container here from port and return the empty? Michael D confirmed the IMT has open access and small businesses could do that.

Alison gave notice to the CLC that this is her last meeting for 12 months while she is on maternity leave. Questions and comments should be directed to Matt, email

Matthew.Fahey@nswports.com.au or phone 9316 1114

On behalf of the CLC Ian C thanked Alison for her contribution to the committee.

- **Comments/ questions/ other business**

Louise asked whether there is an opportunity for a light rail line to Strathfield Station on the freight rail corridor. Could the corridor be used for light rail to avoid the grid lock on Cosgrove Road? Matt replied that there is probably not the space or capacity.

Daniela suggested this could be raised as part of the release of the Greater Sydney Commission District Plans later in the year. The Department of Planning is looking at future planning.

Date of next meeting: Monday 5 December

These minutes have been endorsed by the Chair, Ian Colley