

**Meeting:** Port Botany Community Consultative Committee – Meeting No. 4

**Held:** Tuesday 26 August 2014, 5.30pm-7.40pm  
Conference Centre – Lakes Business Park, 2B Lord St, Botany

**Present:**

Roberta Ryan (RR) – Chairperson	Jason Webb (JW) – DP World
John Burgess (JB) – Community	Richard Pollock (RP) – Patricks Stevedores
Lynda Newnam (LN) – Community	Glen Davenport (GD) – Vopak
Paul Pickering (PP) – Community	Jean-Michel Tresmal – Vopak
Michael Kavanagh (MK) – Community Business Representative	Andrew Hogg (AH) – Terminals Pty Ltd
Ross Salter (RS) – Community Business Representative (Kingsford Timber Mitre 10)	Aldo Costabile (AC) – Elgas Limited
Bronwyn Englaro (BE) – Randwick Council	Cliff Bell (CB) – Caltex
Janice Dennay – Randwick Council	Dr Jos Kusters (JK) – Caltex (Kurnell)
Steve Poulton (SP) – City of Botany Bay	John Ieroklis (JI) – SICTL Stevedores
James Goodwin (JG) – EPA representative	Karl McCarthy (KM) – SICTL Stevedores
Andrew Battye – WorkCover	Tony Navaratne (TN) – Port Authority of NSW
Sandra Spate (SS) – Minute taker	Shane Hobday (SH) – NSW Ports
	Alison Wedgwood (AW) – NSW Ports
	Greg Walls (GW) – NSW Ports

**Apologies:** Jacqueline Roberts – EPA representative, Ryan Bennett – Port Authority of NSW, Daniela Vujic – NSW Ports, Melissa Pollock – Orora, Adem Long – NSW Ports, Dave Condon – Burton Contracting (SICTL), Neil Truskett – Patrick Stevedores, Charles Abela – community (apology received after meeting)

Item	Description	Action/Responsibility
1	<b>Apologies and Introductions</b> The chair welcomed attendees and introductions were made. Apologies are as above.	
2	<b>Accept minutes of last meeting</b> The minutes from the May meeting were accepted.	
3	<b>Actions arising from previous minutes</b>	
3.1	Action 3.1. CCC members to email DV Port SEPP questions by 23 <sup>rd</sup> June. DV to pass on questions to DP&E for a response at the next meeting. This was done. AW sent copies of the Department of Planning responses to CCC members. The action is closed.	
3.2	Action 3.4. AW to take feedback on groynes to SPC and that information on design be provided to the CCC between meetings. The response from Port Authority of NSW (formerly SPC) will be provided as an agenda item.	
3.3	Action 3.5 (from February meeting). SPC to circulate Penrhyn Estuary monitoring results to the CCC when available. A response to AW from the Port Authority of NSW was that they were still waiting on results from the consultant.	AW to ask Port Authority NSW for a timeframe on monitoring

	SH noted the target of April/May to complete monitoring followed by the preparing the report. NSW Ports funds the monitoring and SH expressed concerns that this is now overdue. The item remains open.	results from Penrhyn Estuary.
3.4	Action 4.4. Attach the Vopak newsletter to the minutes. (Vopak and RR) This was done. The action is closed.	
3.5	Action 5.0. Provide an update on the status of the Randwick Council Port Botany Forum at the next meeting. BE reported mixed responses to the proposal, with some agencies supportive and others not. The General Manager will make a decision on whether to proceed. An update will be provided at the next meeting.	Randwick Council to provide an update on the Port Botany Forum remains open.
3.6	Action 6.1a. JG to take back to the noise working group a strong recommendation from this committee for community representation on the noise working group. This is included as an agenda item.	
3.7	Action 6.1b. JG to provide an update to the next meeting on the noise working group. Included as an agenda item.	
3.8	Action 6.2. AW to include a reference to the CoA 2.28 of the PBE approval regarding PBE rail noise as a standing Agenda Item. This has been done.	
3.9	Action 6.3. AW to circulate a table summarising the status of reversing beepers on all port tenant sites with the final minutes. This was done and is on the website with the meeting minutes. The action is closed.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Development of Terms of Reference for the PB CCC</b>	
4.1	AW reported NSW Ports is aware that with the amalgamation of committees there is no specific Terms of Reference for this group. AW and RR will look at the TORs for the previous NLG and CCC and circulate a draft prior to the next meeting. RR noted a need to check requirements with the Department of Planning. This will also help address an application from a prospective new member. Once the reviewed ToR for both groups have been completed and the selection process requirements confirmed then it will be possible to consider prospective committee membership.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Port Botany Expansion Construction Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on construction activities - SICTL and Patrick</li> <li>- Environmental monitoring - SICTL monthly reports</li> </ul>	
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on construction activities - SICTL</li> </ul> KM reported Phase 1 was completed on 13 <sup>th</sup> June with an official opening in July attended by some CCC members. Phase 2 is currently 10 days behind schedule due to rain but will be completed on time in the first or second week of January with cranes operating by May. Phase 1 was 21 of the 46 hectares with 650m of quay line, 6 cranes, the truck marshalling yard and marshalling infrastructure. Phase 2 is smaller with 3 more stacking blocks with 6 more stacking cranes in a quicker timeframe. There is still some paving to undertake (650 m of the 1300m) and half of rail capacity. The stacking area now has 6 cranes of the 13 capacity. JB noted a large mound of dirt on site and asked whether this was from excavation. KM replied it is a stockpile of sand from the reclamation which is surplus	

	to requirements. SICTL is currently looking at options for disposal or reuse.	
5.2	<p>- Environmental Monitoring</p> <p>KM reported SICTL is sharing data with Patricks. There have been no non-conformances since last meeting. The annual environmental audit report for the previous 12 months has been issued and is on the SICTL website.</p>	
5.3	<p>- Update on construction activities - Patrick</p> <p>RP reported that construction has been underway for 18 months and the knuckle is two months from completion with the observation tower, buildings and administration area and maintenance facilities on the main terminal to be completed in the next two months.</p> <p>Ramp D is now open and a memo was sent to CCC members. Patrick has switched to the new truck grids with 18 grids opened on the weekend. Patrick is on track to cut over to the automated terminal with autostrad cranes in early 2015.</p>	
5.4	<p>- Patrick OEMP</p> <p>RP gave a presentation on the OEMP as attached to the minutes. The web link is <a href="http://asciano.com.au/p/environment">http://asciano.com.au/p/environment</a> RP noted the OEMP is part of the Development Consent and the existing plan needed to be updated to incorporate the knuckle and the changeover from manual to automated.</p> <p>He suggested the main environmental issues in the OEMP of concern to the CCC would likely be noise, stormwater and traffic.</p> <p>Traffic will still come in from Foreshore Road and then into the terminal from the new ramp.</p> <p>The new workshop covers all the equipment maintenance area which were previously exposed area reducing the opportunity for stormwater to come into contact with maintenance areas.</p> <p>The fully automated terminal will eliminate the need for beepers as there will be no personnel on the ground.</p> <p>Regarding consultation the OEMP will go to regulators for comment this week. This presentation will be attached to the minutes and copies of the OEMP will be available on the website. Patrick is consulting with Department of Planning, NSW Ports, RMS, Councils and the CCC. They are hoping for approval by the end of the year. An update will be provided to the next CCC meeting.</p> <p>PP asked about the location and purpose of the observation tower.</p> <p>RP reported it is solely related to the Patrick site and allows terminal managers a view across the entire site in preparation for full automation.</p> <p>LN asked what is captured in the GPTs on a month to month basis.</p> <p>RP replied they capture stormwater and anything washed into the drain including hydrocarbons. Clean water is then discharged into the Bay. RP can provide the stormwater documents to interested CCC members.</p> <p>There is a huge cage with standard ongoing maintenance and as well as maintenance after flood events.</p> <p>JD asked whether environmental monitoring data is available electronically.</p> <p>RP replied this is on the website.</p> <p>PP asked how many stormwater discharge sites there are.</p> <p>RP replied there are two discharge points on the knuckle independent of the rest of the terminal and six others will remain on the existing terminal.</p>	<p>Attach the presentation to the minutes and include the website link in the minutes (Patrick and RR).</p>

	Requests for documentation should be sent to RP or RR. Comments are due by Tuesday 23 <sup>rd</sup> September.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Port Botany Expansion Operational Update - SICTL</b>	
6.1	<p>JI reported that SICTL has engaged two new shipping line services since April. These lines have larger vessels than those previously serviced by SICTL. The size of these new vessels are up to 4,000 to 5,000 TEU size and are similar to the size of vessels currently stevedored by Patricks and DP World. As a result container traffic is increasing.</p> <p>SICTL Rail operations commenced in July with approximately 4-5 trains a week.</p> <p>Some additional container handling machinery is expected towards the end of the year to deal with increased traffic volumes.</p>	
6.2	<p>LN asked how many containers are on the 4-5 trains.</p> <p>JI doesn't have this information at hand but is happy to provide it when the data becomes available. The number of containers on the train varies. Some trains are full, while others are not.</p> <p>JB asked whether the terminal is taking full trains.</p> <p>JI replied their sidings are capable of taking a 650m long train carrying up to approx 90 containers.</p> <p>PP asked what percentage of containers are being moved by road and rail.</p> <p>JI replied that as the rail has operating for less than two months this information is not yet available. He noted the state government commitment to increase the percentage by rail to 28%. SICTL is pushing to get more containers on trains as it is more economical and better for all, but it depends on customers.</p> <p>PP asked whether percentages could be provided at the next meeting</p> <p>JI notes it will take some time to determine percentages, but he will provide this when he can. So far the vast majority are moved by truck but rail operations have just started.</p> <p>LN noted the target of the previous state government of 40% by 2015. (LN checked this subsequent to the meeting and reports the target of 40% was by 2011).</p> <p>SH advised that last year 14% of all containers at Port Botany were moved by rail.</p>	SICTL to provide the CCC with percentages of cargo by rail when the data is available.
<b>7</b>	<b>Development activities in the Port</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NSW Ports/SPC developments</li> <li>- Tenant developments</li> </ul>	
7.1	<p><b>NSW Ports/SPC developments</b></p> <p>SH reported on the development of the Enfield Intermodal Logistics Centre with the main part of the site handed over to Hutchison Logistics Australia (HLA) to carry out their works. It is expected to be operational in November or December 2014. In this way NSW Ports is working with HLA to grow the rail percentage. NSW Ports has gone to the market for other port related tenants for the remainder of the Enfield site.</p> <p>JB asked about the impact of another proposed intermodal at Moorebank.</p> <p>SH replied that both these facilities will be needed, as well as potential additional facilities at Eastern Creek and in the North West of Sydney if the state government's rail target is to be met, as the Port continues to grow.</p>	
7.2	<p><b>Elgas</b></p> <p>AC reported the main project continues to be the connection to the</p>	

	<p>Qenos terminal with under boring taking place under Charlotte Road. He expects it to be in commission by the end of November. SH noted Qenos will then demolish two of their three tanks on site which will take approximately 6 months.</p>	
7.3	<p><b>Terminals Pty Ltd</b> AH reported on progress for the new 14 tanks with seven expected to be completed in November and seven in December. PP asked whether any of these contain flammable products. AH replied they are not. They are for combustible oils. AC and SH noted the new connection to Qenos is from Elgas current storage facilities instead of using their two tanks on site. Elgas storage is underground with a dedicated pipeline corridor.</p>	
7.4	<p><b>Qenos</b> GW reported approval has been granted for demolition of the tanks and this is on the Department of Planning website. NSW Ports has also given permission to commence demolition.</p>	
7.5	<p><b>DP World</b> JW reported there are no major developments.</p>	
7.6	<p><b>Vopak</b> GD reported that the problems with incorrect design that resulted in odours from the company's bitumen storage facility outlined at the last meeting have been rectified with a new design and vents installed by 22<sup>nd</sup> May. 21,000 tons has been shipped since and the new design has worked successfully. As a result the odour management team has been disbanded but GD gave a commitment to the CCC that Vopak is monitoring the situation closely and will respond to any further community concerns.</p>	
7.7	<p><b>Caltex</b> CB reported construction of a jet tank to replace an existing tank (which was not being used) that is not in good condition. Caltex will pump jet up the pipeline to Newcastle. CB has invited Dr Jos Kusters, the Environment Protection Superintendent from Kurnell to discuss issues raised at the last meeting in relation to Kurnell.  SH asked about progress for the truck refuelling facility. CB replied that while largely resolved, the new lease with NSW Ports hasn't been finalised. The City of Botany Bay is keen to see this work progressing to resolve refuelling issues on Botany Road. Caltex management would also like to see early installation of the refuelling facility.</p>	
7.8	<p><b>Patrick Port Services</b> GW reported Patrick Port Services is nearing completion of car park works at 60 Friendship Road, Port Botany. Commencement on the new truck entrance has been delayed.</p>	
8	<p><b>Port Botany Noise Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Noise Working Group – JG</li> <li>- EPA Noise Testing and Media Release – JG</li> <li>- Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28)</li> </ul>	
8.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noise Working Group</li> </ul> <p>JG noted that while EPA seems to have become the lead agency in collaboratively developing a noise strategy, it is not an EPA Noise Working Group. The group has met several times since the last CCC meeting and is at the point where representatives are trying to get their own organisations to endorse the idea. The challenge is to bring all the organisations along. JG took back to the group the action for community involvement but the</p>	



<p>group is not at the point where community representation is appropriate because they are still preparing the ground for organisations to come on board. The development of a strategy will look at managing noise in the future and land use planning. It is not at a point where community can provide input but a request to consider a process for the strategy has included consideration of the role of the community and key stakeholders in the process. There are also a number of businesses who are stakeholders but there is not yet engagement with them either. The process is at the start of developing opportunities for community input. AW reported NSW Ports have gone to consultants with requests for expressions of interest for preparing the strategy. Part of the responses also included recommendations of community participation and ongoing consultation through the development of the strategy. Last week consultants were approached, now a buy in from agencies is needed. Community participation is an action for the future but there is still uncertainty around whether Councils and agencies are on board. LN noted that going forward some will buy in and others are hesitant. She asked who is not buying in. As a community member she would want to lobby key agencies to encourage their participation. JG replied that all the representatives around the table support the development of a strategy, but there is a need to firm up proposals and seek executive support. Executives will want to know what it looks like and how much it will cost. EPA is supportive of the concept but will need to review as proposals firm up. JD noted Randwick Council is on board but is at the stage where it needs to know the cost of the strategy and what it involves. LN noted so far the practice of picking low hanging fruit is important while the process of developing a strategy takes time, such as Patrick and SICTL being automated. She asked whether there is other low hanging fruit that could be considered. NSW Ports have contacted tenants whose noise sources such as rail gates, long travel alarms and beepers have received community complaints. Other sources such as container bangs are more difficult to deal with. AW noted NSW Ports can't simply tell tenants what to do but where developments are subject to NSW Ports' approval, then they can stipulate some things such as no reversing beepers. CCC members asked for feedback from WorkCover. LN noted the majority of letters in the Southern Courier are about noise from Port. She noted research that suggests squawkers don't have the same impact as beepers. Questions were also asked about strobe lights at night instead of beepers or squawkers. RS asked what could businesses in the process of changing safety devices refer to in WorkCover legislation. He asked what an operator would have to do for instance if changing from noise alarms to strobes at night.</p> <p>AB replied that beepers and alarms are safety devices which cannot simply be de-activated, but there is a risk based approach. However, WorkCover could assist the operator through risk assessment processes, and guide them without approving changes. There is nothing prescriptive but duty of care lies with the business to have control measures in place and to review control measures. Legislation has moved away from the prescriptive legislation of 20 years ago. WorkCover can provide advice and assistance, but won't endorse measures.</p> <p>LN and JB suggested that there have been misunderstandings of WorkCover's role with people invoking WorkCover as not allowing</p>	
---	--

	<p>changes of alarms. JB noted that it is up to the operator. If they fail to do a risk assessment they are open to action if an incident occurs.</p> <p>AB replied the Act of 2001 and earlier was more prescriptive, but the newer Act of 2011 introduces the concept of “reasonably practicable based on foreseeability”.</p> <p>RS noted there has been some discussion about retrofitting existing devices such as replacing beepers with suitable alternatives such as flashing lights at night. It sounds as though AB is saying it is plausible that Workcover would allow this depending on an assessment of the situation.</p> <p>AB replied that the rational for changing would need to be looked at. Is it as good or a better control measure. A risk assessment would need to be done. It is specific to the circumstance.</p> <p>LN asked whether WorkCover is represented on the Noise Working Group.</p> <p>JG replied they are not.</p> <p>LN noted Orora is keen to join the Noise Working Group.</p> <p>JG replied that it is not yet at a point where business stakeholders can be involved.</p> <p>LN suggested that offers be taken up when people are interested, instead of dragging them back later.</p> <p>JG responded that Orora cannot be made a special case. It is similar to community involvement. EPA licences only one stevedore likely to impact residents. Council regulates many.</p>	
8.2	<p>- EPA Noise Testing and Media Release</p> <p>JG reported on a recent press release from EPA about an error in the reporting of the July 2013 noise monitoring.</p> <p>He suggested the key questions are why did it happen and what is EPA doing about it?</p> <p>As a result of questions asked at the February CCC meeting about parameters this was taken back to the appropriate people at the EPA who in offering to look at a different sample identified a problem regarding timing. A problem with the earlier analysis was identified and after speaking with residents rectified. The equipment was outside a residence and a lot of data is collected, 36,000 results per hour. In addition the resident could activate the device and record the previous 10 seconds and the following 29 minutes and 50 seconds. These loggers are widely used by the EPA but generally in a more consistent noise environment. This is the first time it has been used in a complex noise environment. EPA provided raw data and were analysing for additional time periods not nominated. 36,000 results per hour was simplified into a 15 minute period. Now rather than use the software data that comes with the logger they will give an audio sample. In this case it captured a crashing noise such as may come from a train rumbling or a container. They focussed on the period using residents notes. EPA has gone back and re-examined data. JG commended the questions from people that led to this. EPA will repeat the monitoring exercise and look for additional locations and engage residents who were previously involved.</p> <p>The Chair thanked JG, RS and other residents involved.</p>	
8.3	<p>- Port Botany Expansion Rail Noise (as per CoA 2.28)</p> <p>SH noted the Condition of Approval requires that there be consultation regarding Port Botany Expansion rail related noise. SICTL has commenced rail operations. There has been no complaints regarding their rail activities. This will be a standing agenda item going forward.</p>	

<p><b>9</b></p>	<p><b>Response to questions regarding Caltex Kurnell</b></p> <p>As a result of questions from the last meeting regarding Caltex’s Kurnell site, CB invited Dr Jos Kusters, Environmental Protection Superintendent from Kurnell to provide an update regarding an incident on 24<sup>th</sup> March.</p> <p>JK provided an update. The incident resulting from heavy rain was reported to SPC at 3.25pm. SPC advised on actions to dissipate the sheen and for booms at Bonner Point by Caltex and Kurnell Village by SPC. These actions were undertaken. The tide was going out and the wind direction was south east, taking the sheen towards the heads of Botany Bay. SPC and Caltex observations on the day and the following day didn’t find evidence of impacts at Bare Island, Congwong Bay and Little Congwong Beach. Caltex was therefore surprised by contradictory observations raised in the media.</p> <p>Inspections of Congwong Bay by the EPA found evidence of hydrocarbons and issued a clean-up notice. Subsequent observations by specialist consultants between April and June found no difference between reference sites and impacted sites. No hydrocarbons were found in sand and there seemed to be no impact on fauna colonies at the rock platform and in sand.</p> <p>JB raised concerns that Caltex was first aware of the incident at 3.20pm when he and others in the local community were aware of the oil leak some considerable time earlier and had taken action to notify the authorities. JB has concerns about the credibility of the Caltex / consultants reports as the extent of the oil leak and slick was substantive as evidenced by photographs and soil samples taken and visual observation of the slick by a senior Fisheries officer who was en route to Canberra via plane that afternoon. JB will meet with EPA tomorrow to progress the issue, and samples taken by his organisation have been sent to University Western Sydney for testing.</p> <p>JK questioned JB’s reported timing of information.</p> <p>LN noted there is Congwong Bay with Congwong Beach and Little Congwong Beach. She asked whether there were enough booms laid, noting Caltex’s concern to protect the RAMSAR wetlands, but not Congwong Bay which is our local area and a major dive site.</p> <p>JK replied that Caltex’s action had been based on known understanding and past experience and the fact that booms must be tied to something so there is a restriction in where they can be placed.</p> <p>MK noted that the incident occurred when rain was less than a 1% chance. He noted four or 5 major rain events since then, and asked that with these occurring more frequently, has Caltex changed practices to prevent a recurrence.</p> <p>JK replied that Caltex is working through a multi-million dollar stormwater program to prevent a similar occurrence.</p>	
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>Port Traffic and Safety</b> - Emergency exercises</p>	
<p>10.1</p>	<p>SH reported NSW Ports conducted a test of the contact list for the Port Botany Emergency Plan on 17th July. This was successful with contact made with 99% of the list. An emergency exercise involving port tenants and emergency services is planned for 14th October.</p>	
<p>10.2</p>	<p>JB reported no progress between Orica, RMS and Council regarding secondary containment barriers on Foreshore Road.</p> <p>LN asked why an update is needed as Orica can’t move the barrier.</p> <p>JB replied a sensible solution needs to be found as enhanced egress to</p>	



	the Port is needed as the Port expands.	
<b>11</b>	<p><b>Port Botany Community Assets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Molineux Point signage (SH)</li> <li>- Foreshore Beach groynes design (TN)</li> <li>- Penrhyn Estuary and bird hide</li> </ul>	
11.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Update on Molineux Point signage</li> </ul> <p>SH reported on a project to revamp Molineux Point signage with designs expected later this week</p>	
11.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Foreshore Beach groynes design</li> </ul> <p>TN reported concept and detailed designs for the groynes are finalised. Two options are being considered, entailing two or three groynes to deal with sand erosion issues and stormwater pipes. Discussions are being held with Sydney Water. The concept of three groynes would incorporate Sydney Water pipelines into two of these. The design of groynes is for a composite groyne with a stone section along the beach transitioning to a sheet pile section into the sea. The stone section on the beach is flat with a 1:5 slope up to it. People can walk across the even surface. The designs also incorporate protection for the boat ramp. With the three groyne option the groyne closest to the boat ramp will be extended to provide protection from north westerly winds. For the two groyne option a separate sheetpile wall will be provided to protect the boat ramp. The PA of NSW internal processes are expected to be finalised in the next few weeks. After finalisation of discussions with Sydney Water it will go through the planning approval process with tenders expected to be called before Christmas. Construction should commence in January or February and to take eight to nine months.</p> <p>RR asked about the choice between two or three groynes. TN replied these are a result of extensive modelling and will depend on buy in from Sydney Water. If PA of NSW goes alone there will be two groynes which will fix the beach but to incorporate the stormwater pipes, three groynes would be needed and Sydney Water will need to partially fund the project.</p> <p>LN asked how much beach would be lost, recalling what the beach was originally intended to look like. TN replied nothing of the beach would be lost. The groynes will be a mound which can be walked over. LN sought confirmation that people could stand on top of the groyne and walk out on it. TN confirmed this is the case for the stone portion which ends at the low water mark. You can't walk out beyond that.</p> <p>LN asked if designs would be put on exhibition. This question was taken on notice with the decision to be made following finalisation of the planning process.</p> <p>LN asked whether signs will go up on the beach indicating the design for the groynes. JB also suggested local media for consultation.</p> <p>PP asked what the shape of the beach would be. TN replied there would be individual scallops between the groynes. The intention is to maintain the crown of the beach where it is.</p> <p>PP asked if drainage pipes would be back towards the amenities in a two groyne solution.</p>	<p>Suggestions for consultation around groynes including signage on the beach and in the local media be taken back to Port Authority of NSW from this meeting.</p>

	<p>TN replied the stormwater pipes are owned by Sydney Water who are in the process of getting funds for this work.</p> <p>PP asked about the life of the sheet piling and whether things will grow on it.</p> <p>TN replied it is a long life product and overseas experience is that marine life has grown on it.</p>	
11.3	<p>LN reported that recently going out around Penrhyn Estuary on a Sunday and finding the gate to the bird sanctuary locked. Predators such as foxes can get under the gate and trespassers could climb over the gate so it only prevented people such as herself from access. There was a stupid excuse about the guy responsible not opening it. Can there be a better way of doing this?</p> <p>SH reported that as a result of LN's complaint PA of NSW will ensure the gate will be open in daylight hours in future.</p> <p>LN suggested a sign to indicate whether the gate is opened or locked at the start of the path.</p> <p>LN asked that this also be revisited using actual hours instead of sunrise and sunset.</p>	
<b>12</b>	<p><b>Safety and Environmental Incidents/Complaints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Summary of complaints</li> </ul>	
12.1	<p>AW reported 17 noise complaints since May. These have been responded to and logged. Complaint location when provided have been mapped to assist with the noise strategy. There have also been five odour complaints (associated with Vopak's bitumen tanks) but none in recent months suggesting Vopak's new design was successful</p>	
12.2	<p>LN asked if there is progress towards a 24/7 service for complaints.</p> <p>SH replied it is not intended for a 24/7 service, but complaints made over night are responded to the next business day.</p> <p>LN noted this meant complaints over the weekend are not dealt with till Monday.</p>	
<b>13</b>	<p><b>General Business/Next meeting :</b></p>	
13.1	<p>LN raised the issue of an application by a prospective member.</p> <p>RR replied that procedures around applications will be picked up in the Terms of Reference for the group.</p> <p>LN noted this means the applicant cannot attend the next meeting and applications for membership from Matraville are rare.</p> <p>AW replied there needs to be clarification as to whether members of the CCC need to be approved by the Department of Planning as per the PBE project approval. This will be included in the reviewed Terms of Reference.</p>	
	<p><b>Next meeting Tuesday November 25</b></p>	
	<p><b>These minutes have been endorsed by the meeting Chair</b></p> <p><b>Signed:</b> _____ <b>Date:</b> _____</p>	