



Mr Garry Rush
Director
Autorecyclers Pty Limited
PO Box 4022
MARAYONG NSW 2148

13/12/2019

Dear Mr Rush

**Pick n Payless Metal Recovery and Recycling Facility (SSD-8375)
Response to Submissions**

The exhibition of the development application including the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the above proposal ended on 4 December 2019. All submissions received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/projects.

Please note a submission has not yet been received from the Water Group of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. This submission will be forwarded to you when it is received.

The Planning Secretary requires that you provide a response to the issues raised in the submissions, in accordance with clause 85A(2) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*. In addition, it is requested you address the issues raised by the Department in the Attachment to this letter. Please provide your response by Wednesday 11 March 2020.

Note that under clause 113(7) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your response to submissions is received by the Planning Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

If you have any questions, please contact Bruce Zhang, who can be contact at 02 9274 6137 or by email at Bruce.Zhang@planning.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

Chris Ritchie
Director
Industry Assessments
As delegate of the Planning Secretary

13/12/19.

Attached: Department of Industry and Environment (DPIE) Key Issues

PICK N PAYLESS METAL RECOVERY AND RECYCLING FACILITY (SSD-8375)
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT – KEY ISSUES

GENERAL

1. The EIS stated the proposed hours of operation for Pick n Payless Self-Serve Auto Parts would be 8 am to 5 pm between Mondays and Fridays and 9 am and 3 pm on Sundays. Also, the proposed hours of operation stated in the EIS is inconsistent with the hours of operation depicted in the Environmental Noise & Vibration Assessment (ENVA). Section 2 of the ENVA states the development will operate on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week basis, including operating machines between 6 am to 6 pm and carrying out maintenance between 6 pm and 6 am. Please clarify the proposed hours of operation.
2. The hours of operation stated in the EIS and technical reports are inconsistent. Please update the EIS and supporting reports to ensure consistency between documents regarding hours of operation.
3. Should any works be undertaken within Breakfast Creek reserve, please provide a land owner consent for the reserve.

WATER MANAGEMENT

4. The Department concurs with the EPA's request that details of stormwater, wastewater, leachate, firewater management systems including the capacity of onsite detention systems and measures to treat, reuse or dispose of water must be provided in the Response to Submissions report.
5. Please clarify if any parts of the site will not be hardstand and relevant measures to manage the potential contaminants' interception with the groundwater table.
6. The Soil and Water Report (SWR) prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart lacks a site water balance as required in the SEARs. Please provide a site water balance in the Response to Submissions report.
7. The SWR lacks an impact assessment of construction works on water quality with relevant mitigation measures. Please include a construction water impact assessment and relevant mitigation measures in the Response to Submissions report.
8. Contamination Investigation prepared by Sullivan Environmental Sciences states surface water discharging into Breakfast Creek from the two stormwater outlets is impacted by heavy metal and TPHs. Heavy metals (particularly zinc) are reported at concentrations of up to two orders of magnitude greater than the adopted water quality criteria. Surface water discharging from the site may pose a health risk to the ecological system of Breakfast Creek, as such, abatement measures should be employed during future development of the site to address this issue. The SWR states it is recommended that each oil patch be excavated and removed offsite to a waste disposal facility, an oil absorbent mat should be placed beneath each vehicle that is stored on unsealed ground to absorb drips and leaks from engine parts as an interim measure until the soils can be excavated. Please confirm the recommended management measures and any additional management measures will be implemented to address the identified contamination issue.
9. The Site Plan (CC160136-DA Sheets, Revision A) in the SWR shows a SPEL Stormceptor (to the south-west of the below-ground OSD pond) will be installed for treatment of contaminated stormwater runoff. Please provide the capacity of the proposed SPEL Stormceptor.
10. The Department concurs with the EPA's position that the SWR lacks a water discharge impact assessment (WDIA). Please provide a WDIA in the RtS detailing pollutants at each discharging point, characterising the quality of the discharge, the potential impact on the receiving waterway and associated mitigation measures in case of any exceedances.

11. Please provide a monitoring program for concentration of pollutants discharged to Breakfast Creek based on the WDIA. The monitoring program must detail the monitored pollutants, units of measure and frequency.
12. The SWR does not provide a description of the proposed firefighting water containment, treatment and discharge system. The Department also notes the Fire Engineering Brief prepared by Red Fire Engineers Pty Ltd states the required water run-off containment capacity is 320,000 litres for stage 2 (SSD). Please provide a detailed description of the firefighting water containment, treatment and discharge system with required firefighting water containment capacity depicted in the Fire Engineering Brief.

FLOODING

13. The Department concurs with the Climate Change and Sustainability Division of the Department submission that the Flood Impact Assessment (FIA) does not include an assessment of the development in a Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event. Please provide a PMF assessment in the FIA.
14. Figure 6 in Appendix A of the FIA shows the development will alter flood water levels in the proposed container storage area to the south of the new shear. The south-eastern part of the container storage area will experience increase of flood level up to 0.5 m in a 1% AEP event. The FIA does not provide an assessment and relevant mitigation measures for this area in a 1% AEP event. The Department notes the containment storage area may store filled containers which has the potential to release contaminants to flood water and cause downstream impacts. Please provide an assessment and relevant mitigation measures for the container storage area in the full range of flooding up to the PMF.

CONTAMINATION

15. The Contamination Investigation prepared by Sullivan Environmental Sciences recommended a series of mitigation measures for oil-stained soils including excavation, stockpiling, classification, offsite disposal. It is unclear the location of oil-stained soils, the temporary onsite stockpile following excavation and any relevant management measures during removal of oil-stained soils offsite.

TRAFFIC AND ACCESS

16. Please provide a breakdown of daily vehicle movements including truck and light vehicle movements in the TIA.
17. The Site Plan (Appendix A) shows the existing landscaped mound will encroach into the proposed internal road. Please clarify if the landscaped mound will be amended and any tree removal is required to facilitate the internal road.
18. The Appendix B Swept Path Analysis of the TIA shows the proposed heavy-duty concrete access road is 4 m wide. This is inconsistent with the Site Master Plan and Fire Engineering Brief which show the proposed access road is 6 m wide. Please clarify the proposed width of the access road.
19. The TIA does not provide haulage routes for construction and operational trucks. Please clarify the proposed haulage routes.
20. There are three driveways serving the site. Figure 5 Existing Driveway Survey Results and Figure 7: Proposed Development Traffic Generation do not specify to which driveway these figures refer. Please clarify in the RtS report.
21. Figures 5 and 7 of the TIA show in both the existing and proposed developments, during both AM and PM peak hours, there are/will be vehicles approaching the site from west via Vardys Road and Tattersall Road. Meanwhile, there are/will be vehicles leaving the site westbound through Tattersall Road and Vardys Road. However, Figures 8 and 9 show the proposed AM and PM trip distributions

exclude vehicles traveling through Vardys Road and Tattersall Road. Please clarify the discrepancy in the RtS report.

22. Should vehicles use Vardys Road and Tattersall Road to/from the site, then a SIDRA modelling for Vardys Road/Tattersall Road intersection is required to be included in the RtS report.
23. The Department notes Section 5.3.3 of the Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment (ENVA) prepared by Day Design Pty Ltd states there will be 378 truck movements passing 187 Sunnyholt Road. This means trucks will travel to/from the site via Tattersall Road and section of Sunnyholt Road (south of Tattersall Road). This is inconsistent with Figures 8 and 9 of the TIA. Please clarify if trucks will travel along Tattersall Road and section of Sunnyholt Road (south of Tattersall Road) to/from the site.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

24. The Department does not support the proposed operating hours between 9 am and 3 pm on Sundays considering the potential noise and vibration impacts on nearby sensitive receivers.
25. The Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment (ENVA) prepared by Day Design Pty Ltd does not include cumulative impact assessments for operational and road traffic noise. Please update the ENVA to include the aforementioned cumulative impact assessments.
26. The ENVA must include a noise contour map showing the predicted noise exposure levels within the site's surrounding areas.
27. The Department concurs with the EPA's request that the ENVA must clearly identify the proposed haulage routes and provide an assessment of the noise impacts from other
28. Site Plan included in the ENVA is different to the Site Plan shown in Appendix A of the EIS. Please update to ensure consistency between documents.
29. The ENVA does not provide further feasible and reasonable mitigation measures applying to noise emission sources except the proposed noise wall. Please update the ENVA to include these measures.

FLOC STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

30. The site currently contains floc stockpiles. Please clarify what measures are proposed to safely remove these stockpiles to facilitate the development.