

## Timeline re Sydney Water land for Odour Control Unit

- **1980** Kirby Commission of Inquiry into Kyeemagh-Chullora road recommends protection of Wolli Creek Valley (WCV) bushland
- **1984** Wolli Creek Preservation Society (WCPS) formed by long-time opponents to building M5E through WCV (incorporated 1987)
- **1993** WCPS proposed Regional Park status for bushland in WCV; Clover Moore introduced a bill into Parliament, which was prorogued before bill was considered
- **1998** Wolli Creek Regional Park (WCRP) announced by Tim Moore
- **1999** NPWS draft Plan of Management for WCRP included disputed Sydney Water lots
- **1999** M5E is built but goes under WCV
- **2004** Final Plan of management approved after campaign by WCPS
- **2004** New draft boundary proposed by National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) excluded Sydney Water (SW) lots at the South-West Ocean Outfall Sewer crossing of Wolli Creek
- **1/2005** WCPS protested exclusion of the SW lots at SWOOS
- **2009** (maybe earlier, certainly ever since) NPWS proposed boundaries for WCRP included the lots.
- **2010** Campaign (“12 years is too long”) to complete WCRP launched: petition, posters, the great roll-out in Farrer Place.
- *(2009-16 other campaigns, particularly against proposed WestConnex/new M5 impact on Western end of WCV; new M5 tunnel entrance relocated)*
- **6/2017** WCPS wrote to Harwin seeking transfer of SW land in WCV to WCRP
- **8/2017** SW wrote to Unwin St residents alerting them to site surveying and geotech investigations for OCU and promising updates (not provided). WCPS not informed.
- **9/2017** Harwin replied advising SW assessing land not needed for operational purposes – aimed to have land transferred within 12 months
- **7/2018** SW officer gives first indication (in phone call) that SW may seek to retain lot K for operational purposes
- **10/2018** 1<sup>st</sup> meeting with project team; Minns visits site; WCPS to Harwin noting consultation underway and 1<sup>st</sup> WCPS alternative location put on table
- **11/2018** Harwin to Cotsis “properties feature a state heritage listed wastewater aqueduct and cannot be transferred as it is required for operational purposes”
- **12/2018** WCPS to Harwin setting out second alternative site on eastern side of SWOOS with land swap with DoP (no. 22 Unwin St)
- **1/2019** Harwin to Cotsis: 1<sup>st</sup> alternative site rejected on engineering grounds (accepted by WCPS)
- **1/2019** WCPS to SW project team with maps and cadastral showing the swap intended
- **2/2019** Cotsis visits site
- **3/2019** Harwin to Cotsis: SW discussing land swap option with DoP
- **7/2019** SW to WCPS (email) final decision on location not yet reached
- **8/2019** WCPS to Pavey explicitly seeking political intervention
- **9/2019**
- SW to WCPS member: OCU needed for corrosion prevention (first ever mention of this – previously just about Odour) and final decision made, after “high-level, multi-criteria assessment”, to go with SW original proposal for location
- A WCPS member seeks involvement of Washington, who makes reps to Kean (nothing further heard)

- A WCPS member writes to Pavey asking for intervention with SW

- **10/2019**
- SW presented preliminary design to WCPS, WCPS rejected location, put proposal for additional acquisition of adjacent residence (20 Unwin St) to overcome problems with alternative site 2
- SW provided copy of presentation, promised to share internal REF with WCPS (not sent); when acquired through other channels it makes no cost comparisons for using no.22 versus its preferred location; omits all mention of acquiring no.20; does not adequately address how WCPS input was dealt with in the decision-making process.
- REF process makes Sydney Water the proponent **and** the determining authority – no provision for comment/objection;
- WCPS e-wrote to Pavey urging overruling of SW engineers and noting inadequate consideration given to acquisition of no. 20
- **8/2020** SW to WCPS: timetable now said to be detailed design mid 2021, construction late 2021
- **11/2020**
- SW advises that test drilling at their preferred location is to take place **the next day**; construction now set for “mid to late 2021”
- WCPS replies, again expressing implacable opposition to location and asking for a reasoned explanation for the rejection of the proposal to acquire no. 20
- SW response indicates that they assumed no.20 was an **alternative** to no. 22, rather than an addition, but gives reasons for rejection summarised in briefing note prepared by Wollie Creek Preservation Society (see above)
- WCPS replies providing in short form the rebuttals set out in the briefing note
- **12/2020**
- Canterbury-Bankstown Council passes motion of support for WCPS position
- **1/2021**
- WCPS launches petition to the Minister seeking intervention to overturn SW’s location decision
- Virtual meeting held with Pavey’s Chief of Staff – Repeat of SW’s plans and our objections, no progress made.
- WCPS submits an application to Heritage NSW for an Interim Heritage Order to prevent OCU construction.
- **2/2021**
- 4<sup>th</sup> Pavey advises Jenny Leong (MLA Newtown) that she has asked SW to investigate the OCU matter and report back.
- 11<sup>th</sup> - Bayside Council passes motion of support for WCPS petition
- Petition reaches 3,200 signatures on 15 February
- Sophie Cotsis, MLA Canterbury makes statement in LA about the OCU issue
- Letters sent to Ministers Pavey (22<sup>nd</sup>), Kean, and Stokes (both 17<sup>th</sup>) urging engagement to stop an environmental and heritage mis-step and pointing out the kudos to the Government of finally ensuring the completion of the Wollie Creek Regional Park.
- **3/2021**
- 5<sup>th</sup> – Letters sent to Ministers Pavey and Stokes pointing out the inconsistency between the Sydney Water proposal and the principles espoused for a new draft SEPP ‘Design and Place’.
- 9<sup>th</sup> – InnerWest Council passes unanimous resolution of support
- 19<sup>th</sup> – Letter to Minister Harwin (now responsible for heritage matters) asking him to expedite a positive decision on the IHO application.

- 19<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to Kean pointing out powers of compulsory acquisition from SW (with Pavey consent) under NPW Act and seeking action to obtain consent
- 25<sup>th</sup> – Op-ed piece on OCU issue in the City Hub and Inner-West Independent papers.
- **4/2021**
- 1<sup>st</sup> – Kean advises that WCPS 17 Feb letter referred to Pavey
- 14<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to Pavey contrasting RMS action with that of SW in relation to land in Regional Park (commitment to costly remediation prior to handover vs refusal).
- Office obo Stokes to WCPS stating breaches of SEPP principles by OCU are the primary responsibility of Pavey; PS email rebuts this – no further response
- 17<sup>th</sup> - SW advises residents (WCPS on 20<sup>th</sup>) that it is reviewing OCU technology and location (only on its block within the Park boundary) and deferring construction until early 2022.
- 26<sup>th</sup> – petition passes 4,000 signatures; NPWS obo Kean to WCPS – compulsory acquisition of SW land not under consideration.
- 29<sup>th</sup> – PS to Pavey – why SW is not the right body to review the location of the OCU and is not considering option outside Regional Park.
- **5/2021**
- 6<sup>th</sup> – invitation made to Minister Pavey to receive petition at Parliament House on 13 May; SW advises Minister’s office seeking meeting for an update; WCPS agrees suggesting 14<sup>th</sup>, seeks advance copy of new proposal.
- 10<sup>th</sup> – SW says not available, only been asked to give oral update
- 13<sup>th</sup> – Petition at 4,019 handed to local MLAs for delivery to Pavey (who failed to respond to request to receive).
- 27<sup>th</sup> - Minister’s office provides advance copy of SW briefing – no new proposal
- 30<sup>th</sup> - WCPS advises MO that no point seen in meeting given no change from SW. Site visit invitation repeated, campaign to continue.
- 31<sup>st</sup> – PS submits GIPA to SW re Review of Environmental Factors criteria.
- **6/2021**
- 10<sup>th</sup> – Minister’s office repeats request for a meeting; WCPS agrees to July meeting if on-site; campaign to continue meanwhile.
- 19<sup>th</sup> – Article in SMH proclaiming ministerial intervention
- 21<sup>st</sup> – Three letters to SMH re OCU published; NCC and National Trust agree to attend meeting when set
- 23<sup>rd</sup> – On-site meeting set for 8 July; Covid lockdown announced
- 26<sup>th</sup> - SMH article re Justice Kirby’s involvement appears
- 27<sup>th</sup> – WCPS writes to Pavey re environment priority and engineers, plus political decision; PS asks SW about locating OCU at S. end of aqueduct
- 29<sup>th</sup> – SW postpones on-site meeting due to Covid lockdown
- **7/2021**
- 1<sup>st</sup> – SW responds about S end of SWOOS location for OCU
- 5<sup>th</sup> – PS replies accepting reasoning for rejection of site at S. end of aqueduct
- 9<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to Stokes asking for speed up of acquisition of private land in WCRP
- 13<sup>th</sup> – SW GIPA offers documents but seeks payment
- 14<sup>th</sup> – PS replies that neither of the two new document titles offers anything new
- 16<sup>th</sup> – PS makes second follow up request re 210429 objection to SW conducting review of its own decision re OCU location

- 16<sup>th</sup> – SW for Minister Pavey in reply to 27 June letter, avoiding the point and reasserting SW position
  - 18<sup>th</sup> – WCPS (DL) to Cheroux (MD of SW) seeking info re weed management on SW block proposed for OCU
  - 19<sup>th</sup> – SW GIPA provides documents (no payment) – one is useful, but the most relevant info sought is redacted; PS email asks if any reason given for redaction.
  - 27<sup>th</sup> – SW advises that project being redesigned and new Multi-Criteria Analysis will be conducted in Q4 2021, hence redaction.
  - 28<sup>th</sup> – WCPS writes to Minister Pavey with new proposal (Option W) meeting WCPS concerns and overcoming those of SW. Copies sent to Kean and Stokes.
- **8/2021**
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> – NCC writes to Cheroux, MD SW, re impact of OCU on SW reputation etc
  - 5<sup>th</sup> – Media release sent to metros and local papers
  - 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> – update emails sent to 4,300+ petitioners
  - 9<sup>th</sup> – SW replies to letter to Pavey 210728 – Option W to be included in new MCA
  - Article re Option W appears in St George Leader
  - 13<sup>th</sup> – PS to Plowman SW seeking assurances re MCA process
  - 20<sup>th</sup> – PS to Plowman SW conveying proposed criteria and weightings: Plowman ‘appreciates’ SW will be in contact ‘soon’
  - 26<sup>th</sup> – SW acknowledges criteria but makes no comment. Proposes workshops to settle criteria ‘late 2021’.
  - 27<sup>th</sup> – SW makes workshop conditional on ‘optioneering design’ beforehand; provides draft list of stakeholders.
  - 31<sup>st</sup> – PS to CM: Among questions - ‘why can’t stakeholders be settled early’; SW list v. abbreviated, omitting Bayview residents’. SW says stakeholder list only ‘partial’. Defers answers to other questions.
- **9/2021**
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> – Exchange of emails re ‘optioneering’ design, with SW seeing it as determining weighting criteria for MCA, and intimating that it would decide who were stakeholders.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> – WCPS notes: ‘little encouragement to continue with a good faith engagement with the process’ as set out.
  - 7<sup>th</sup> – SW responds: regretting loss of faith; indicating that how criteria and weightings are set will only be explained at first workshop; stating that they have a new option on their land that alleviates all concerns; confirming that only that option and Option W will be assessed in MCA; agreeing to the wider stakeholder list; noting that construction now put off until second half of 2022; suggesting that all our other questions be held over to the first workshop.
  - 10<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to SW: points out very much a one-way street so far; offers three ways for SW to restore some confidence. 1. Settle stakeholders, engage them all in discussion of questions prior to workshop 2. Provide more info about how Options A and B were assessed (criteria etc) 3. Provide broad outline of new option.
  - 24<sup>th</sup> – WCPS leaflet distributed to residents near OCU site countering SW leaflet dated 13<sup>th</sup>.
  - 24<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to stakeholders: providing correspondence, stakeholder list, recent flyers, and seeking confirmation that they see themselves as stakeholder, who to contact.

- 28th - email to petitioner list advising of SW's new option (later labelled Option S) and intention to hold workshops late in 2021. Included a request to send in "I support Option W" pictures.
  - 30<sup>th</sup> – WCPS email of 10<sup>th</sup> remains without response or acknowledgement.
- **10/2021**
  - 4<sup>th</sup> -WCPS to SW: seeking response re Sept 10 proposals.
  - 6<sup>th</sup> – WCPS Media release "Sydney Water 'Turbid'", complaining of lack of transparency.
  - 7<sup>th</sup> – SW to WCPS notifying change of Community Engagement Advisor as explanation for delays; response in two weeks
  - 15<sup>th</sup> – SW to WCPS member: still reviewing alternative locations; more info by end of year.
  - 22<sup>nd</sup> – WCPS to SW noting two weeks up; asking whether only SW insiders were seen as stakeholders for the Technical Site Assessment.
  - 22<sup>nd</sup> – SW to WCPS: advising proposal to hold two workshops (late Nov and early Dec) to consult community on Multi-Criteria Analysis; will 'review' our stakeholder list.
  - 25<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to SW seeking confirmation of conclusions reached about SW position on various matters. Yes/no answers needed. Sought by week's end.
  - 29<sup>th</sup> – D4C\* (see note below) to WCPS: team unable to meet deadline; answers next week; will circulate new option before first workshop giving enough time for stakeholders to review.
  - 29<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C urging immediate provision of new option given workshop 1 planned for late Nov.
- **11/2021**
  - 1<sup>st</sup> – WCPS to Minister Pavey conveying 25/10 conclusions with email thread and seeking her intervention to prevent self-certification by SW.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> – D4C advises new engagement lead person on behalf of SW; provides answers to 25/10 confirmations sought. Basically confirms suspicions that new option will be seen only at last minute.
  - 6<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C asserting confirmation of 25/10 conclusions,; rejecting implication that WCPS seeking special treatment; suggesting that there is only the appearance of consultation.
  - 15<sup>th</sup> – Petition to Minister passes 5,000 signatures; WCPS letter sent to Minister Pavey advising of this.
  - 15<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to Premier Perrottet seeking completion of WCRP during 2022, citing SW land as major blockage.
  - 17th - On phone call D4C advises: two workshops 30/11 and 14/12. Workshop 1 virtual, limited to 20 participants, to hear views on what criteria should apply to option comparison; W2 to see presentation of the two options. WCPS: process appalling, longer period needed for assessing proposals yet unseen; greater opportunity for participants to communicate with each other. Later email – D4C to WCPS advising that workshop 1 moved to early Dec, with Expressions of Interest in attending closing 1 Dec.
  - 19<sup>th</sup> – WCPS delegation meets with Minns to update on OCU situation and urge election commitment to complete WCRP in 2022.
  - 21<sup>st</sup> – WCPS to stakeholders setting out: views on stakeholders; criteria and weightings; and WCPS concerns; also seeking comments ahead of workshop.

- **12/2021**
- 6<sup>th</sup> – D4C to WCPS: formal notification and link to first workshop on 7/12
- 7<sup>th</sup> – First workshop – strongly controlled and pushed through by hired ‘facilitators’ to produce half-baked ‘community agreed criteria’ for ranking options on Community and Environment criterion.
- 8<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: again seeking contact details for owners of No.20 Unwin St; noting the large number of SW staff at workshop and objecting to the way they were used.
- 8<sup>th</sup> – D4C to WCPS: providing overview of three options (A,S & W); changing format of Workshop 2 to ‘Deep Dive’ with a W3 to follow in the new year.
- 9<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: pointing out Xmas/NY difficulties and suggesting late Jan for W3; D4C to WCPS: agreeing to between Jan 20 and 26.
- 10<sup>th</sup> – D4C to WCPS: Formal invitation to meal and second workshop on 14/12; WCPS to D4C initial comments and questions re the three options.
- 13<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: expanded list of questions and comments on the options. D4C to WCPS: second workshop moved to Feb 2 to avoid holiday period.
  
- **1/2022**
- 26<sup>th</sup> – D4C to WCPS: second workshop now postponed to March 23 (later moved to March 24 at WCPS request)
  
- **2/2022**
- 24<sup>th</sup> – D4C to WCPS conveying answers to questions and comments from 13/12 (originally sent unsuccessfully on 8 Feb).
- 28<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: urging better security for power supply to OCU than currently exists at the aqueduct.
  
- **3/2022**
- 2<sup>nd</sup> – WCPS to D4C: raising anomalous photo used for Option S in presentation slides.
- 12<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: additional questions and comments re options, including matters raised on 28/2 and 2/3
- 17<sup>th</sup> – WCPS to D4C: reminder re questions of 12/3 with W2 only a week away. D4C to WCPS: expect to have answers “by early next week”.
- 21<sup>st</sup> – D4C to WCPS: W2 cancelled; new evidence re VOCs in sewer require re-think; “proposed Earlwood OCU may not be fit for purpose in its current proposed location”; Unwin St investigation “put on hold”; new site in Arncliffe to be investigated; probably take 6-8 months.
- 24<sup>th</sup> – phone call WCPS & D4C: VOCs of concern are chloramines (toxic); extra element needed to treat -> bigger plant; Unwin St sites space constrained; answers to questions of 12/3 will not be provided; no decision will be made re which Unwin St option is preferred.

\* "Delivering for Customers (D4C) – a joint venture between WSP, John Holland, Lendlease Services and Comdain – was appointed by Sydney Water [in 2019] as a

Regional Delivery Contractor, under its P4S program.

**Responsible for the delivery of design, construction, maintenance and facility management** across Sydney Water's assets in the Southern region for the next 10 years, the program aims to meet the future needs of Sydney's growing population."

(bolding added - there are many other references via a Google search on D4C - **these used to be core functions of SW**)