

Objection to the proposed oily and biological waste treatment as proposed in 10-12 Smith Street Emu Plains.

Project application Number 10\_0077

My main concern is the control of the odour emission from this process. And traffic matters.

There was previous emissions of unbearable odour from this site and reports to the Penrith City Council was initially "fobbed" off and after further inquiries with other owners it was admitted that the "NO FUSS LIQUID WASTE FACILITY" was the emitter. Council officer said it be gone in a day or two. In the meantime me and my family suffered. Other owners lodged strong protests also to my knowledge.

There are residences within 50 meters (in Railway Street – at the back of the facility) and 2 more within 80 meters also in Railway Street. Including my property at #17.

This is despite the 25 year experienced "odour" consultant report. Which mentioned only one house nearby and that is apparently not used at present as residence. But left the other houses where people live nearby as of no consequence. In my opinion it would have been more helpful if the report would include a visit to a existing similar site and the inclusion if this site is in a mixed residential or only fully industrial site. That would lend some more weight to the report.

A further concern is the inclusion off 30% "organic" waste without any further details. Organic waste can be in many forms but mainly in a decaying state or putrescent condition. This is surly not an odour free arrangement.

As to the traffic report –very nice report- but failed to mention that during morning and afternoon peaks delays of 10 to 15 minutes are not unknown. A recent nearly finished car park of 240 cars is there plus the existing Emu Plains Railway Station car park that can hold about 100 cars and both are usually full. There is the Boral Quarry that has a constant stream of trucks/trailer combinations also using the Smith Street / Old Bathurst T intersection. McCarthy high school also generates substantial traffic by private cars and school buses. Plus local traffic plus the inability to access the no fuss site without reversing into the street as another consideration. Bank ups of cars toward roundabout at Russel Street is common during peak hours making entry too and from Smith Street difficult.

Consideration should be given to the emission of possible hazardous gases both from the " oily waste water" and organic waste (Methane, Hydrogen?)


There should be in place a DIRECT method to contact a authority that is in charge of any emissions and that will respond strictly (within a couple of hours if at least 2 persons lodge a complaint)

In my opinion the facility should be fitted out with approved systems that can contain any odour emissions in a safe an efficient manner before even a "test run" should be permitted.

Again I lodge a strong objection to the proposed project #10\_0077 and some of the reasons are outlined above.

I do NOT give permission to disclose my contact details to any other 3. party.

Regards

  
Owner and resident at  
Railway Street Emu Plains  
Copy under 10\_0077 No Fuss

*Attached  
Political Disclosure  
Statement*

Emu Plains, 2750.

1<sup>st</sup> February, 2011.

Major Development Assessment,  
NSW Government Planning,  
Mining & Industry Projects.  
GPO Box 39,  
Sydney, NSW. 2001.

Chris Ritchie.  
Ph 9228 6338  
Fax 9228 6466

*Your Ref: 1009800*  
*No Fuss Oily Liquid Waste Water Treatment Facility (MP 10\_0077)*  
*10-12 Smith St. Emu Plains (Lot 330 in DP575290)*

Dear Sir,

As the owners of [redacted] Smith St., Emu Plains, near the site of this proposal, we would like to object to any further approvals in relation to the treatment of waste at the "No Fuss" site.

For the period of time that 'No Fuss' has operated out of this site there has been foul odours being emitted from this site. Many businesses and associates have complained to the Council and the EPA, and this foul smell is still present. This seems to us an overdevelopment of a very small site which is unsuitable for this type of operation. Large trucks turning and reversing in this dead end street impact on the surrounding businesses, not to mention their employees using all the on street parking because there is none available onsite during the day. If this proposal is approved, the immediate business area will suffer because of the nature of the immediate area will become very unpleasant to us and our customers. The potential problems this will cause are unknown at the stage, but it could be very devastating us and our neighbouring business owners. Our customers comment now on the very unpleasant smell.

This proposal makes use of the landscape area for turning circles etc, to gain access to this very small site. Any other developments must provide on site parking for employees and customers, why should this application be exempt from this? Trucks must also move in and out in a forward direction, this is near impossible at present and is not practical on this site even though the design indicates unauthorised use of the cleared landscape area.

On many occasions the site is accessed by trucks and semi-trailers from other waste companies..are they operating under their current DA? If not, who is policing this and who says this application will be any different with double the traffic movements to what is indicated!!

Normally, we thought that you applied for permission to build something (DA) ..got approval then built it, subject to conditions imposed...this seems to be "a back to front" approach to this whole process, by this application. The areas well-being and productivity has not been considered and we feel the best location for such a plant would be near a sewer treatment plant etc where the two business would be beneficial to each other and have no adverse impact on the area.

After reading the odour report there has been no effort by the applicant to manage existing or potential odours. This is evidenced by trucks discharging in open doorways into open pits and tanks, something that you would believe to be unacceptable in this day and age. If this plant continues to operate the bare minium odour control should be filters and extraction rather than "keeping the doors closed when possible", this is just not practical and does nothing to control the odour problems that we experience now.

After viewing the recent flooding in Qld, we are amazed that you can have open pits and tanks in this current proposal, when anyone who knows this area, knows it is likely to flood at some point in time, as it has in the past. The downstream areas will be polluted with this foul waste!

As you can see we have been impacted by this poorly located business and any approval to basically double their output will double the odour, traffic, parking, and environmental risks to this sensitive location. We feel there could be a better outcome for all of the community if this application is refused.

**We do not want our personal details provided to the applicant or any third party. We will copy this letter to Penrith Council under the same conditions for their information.**

Yours sincerely,

Copy to Penrith City Council, PO Box 60 Penrith 2750 NSW.

Major Development Assessment  
NSW Government Planning  
Mining & Industry Projects  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Emu Plains 2750

Chris Ritchie  
Manager Industry  
Ph 9228 6338  
Fax 9228 6466

Ref file :1009800

**No Fuss Oily Liquid Waste Water Treatment Facility (MP 10\_0077)  
10-12 Smith St. Emu Plains (Lot 330 in DP575290)**

To Whom It May Concern,

As a business owner and occupier in Smith St Emu Plains, the proposed site of this operation, I would like to strongly object to any further approval/s in relation to treatment of waste of any kind on or at this site.

**I do not want my details provided to the proponent or any other third party. I consider this to be confidential and very important in regard to this proponent. I will copy this letter to Penrith Council under the same conditions.**

Over many months there have been odours emitting from the site under their current operating procedures and licences. Many business owners and employees have complained to the Council and the EPA, and the stench continues. This area is basically all small businesses with a few employees and a few residential houses nearby - there are 2 High Schools, a Railway Station, Village Shops, Hotel, Correctional Institutions and a Caravan Park all within close proximity, which suffer from the "odours" from the current plant. This small industrial area is surrounded by residential dwellings to the east and south east.

This appears to be an overdevelopment of this very small site, considering the number of truck movements and the number of employees indicated, not to mention outside contractors depositing waste in semi-trailers and other trucks.

**This occupier currently impacts on the local amenity of the area by way of traffic - parking and this very unpleasant odour.** These problems will only increase with approval of a plant which has already been constructed and now seeks **retrospective approval**. I find it hard to believe that this is now considered "State Significant" as a Major Project.

I would presume that an operator of such a plant would be ticking all the right boxes currently, before planning to have any further impact on the area's amenity.

The current operation, I believe, is for sewage/septic waste with 5-6 trucks operating from the front unit. I have no idea of the volumes permitted under the various licences. I can only presume that they are similar, judging by the truck movements.

At present the drivers park their own vehicles on the street as there is no provision for on site parking. The trucks are reversed into the site and parked on the hardstand adjacent to both doorways. Trucks are also parked on the "landscape setback area", which has been cleared and gravelled for this purpose. The trucks park partly in or adjacent to the doorways when discharging waste.

On occasions semi-trailers from other companies deposit waste and cause all sorts of traffic problems for nearby businesses in this dead end street.

Any approval to expand this operation to receive an extra 100,000 litres/day of oily waste water or possibly grease trap waste for processing is going to have a major impact on existing businesses through traffic and parking problems and the "potential odours" and impact on the amenity of the area. It should be refused on these grounds alone. The volume of 100,000 litres/day is not for the operator solely, but seems to accommodate outside sources, because they state that that only 10,000 litres/day will be processed by them. One can only assume that the potential impact will be horrendous!

**The fact that this "new" plant is already built, indicates that he assumes this is a mere formality by the proponent. This site is too small to accommodate the existing operation, not to mention any proposed expansion or increase in volume of waste and truck movements.**

**The traffic management plan** indicates that the trucks will use the landscape setback area as a turning circle to access the plant. This is near impossible considering the driveway angle and the limited space for turning large ridged trucks - it looks OK on paper but it contravenes Council guidelines. The current operation in the front unit prevents any clear truck movement to the back unit, but there is no mention of what happens if a truck is discharging in the front area and access is required to the back unit - will they park on the street, blocking a lane of traffic as there is no on-street parking available during the day and wait, as there is no other option.

**The proposal has no management of odour, other than keeping the door closed.** The trucks discharge their wastes adjacent to or in the doorway of the factory, with the door/s open. The new plant will not allow a truck within the plant with the door closed, this means there is no odour management or control on discharge. There is no consideration of odour and the consultants report is questionable considering the plant was not operating at the time of inspection and report. They seem to adopt a "suck it and see" type of approach, which is not acceptable under the circumstances and the likely impacts on the amenity of the area. I have included part of the report on odour because it supports what has been happening in the past and will continue into the future. See Consultant's report selection.

**Other environmental impacts that need to be addressed** are the "bundling" on the site being able to contain a major spill. I believe that the recommended capacity is for the largest container of volume plus 10%. The fact that semi-trailers discharge in the carpark area now, the bunding should be capable of retaining at least 30,000litres plus 10% otherwise any spill is down the driveway and into the stormwater gutter. This kerb gutter flows directly on to the open Prison farm land open channel (less than 100m) and on to the Nepean River. This would not only have major impacts on the dairy cattle of the Prison Farm production but the whole of Nepean River downstream. Another impact is the possibility of flooding (1/100) and the capability of the plant being able to retain all liquids on site, when the report talks of open pits and holding tanks. This is just not acceptable considering the potential damage, when it can be avoided.

The report does not detail how or where the sludge and waste is stored on site before transport and how it is transported?

**If the existing plant continues to operate it should have a proper filtration system installed prior to any expansion to assist with the current odour problem.**

**Presently**, there should be a restriction on the number of trucks permitted to deposit waste at this site. There should be no semi-trailer type trucks. There should be no third party waste deposits (other Companies) as it is impossible to control their movements as is occurring now. There is insufficient parking and turning at present for the 5-6 trucks which work out of the site, without any further projected increases. **This proposal does not address the issue of off street parking for the present employees or any proposed new employees with the projected proposal.**

Many of the consultant reports do not consider the existing use in conjunction with the current proposal, but as a mere isolated proposal. This tends to negate the scale of impact of this proposal on surrounding stakeholders.

This is an overdevelopment of a small site which is too small for this scale of operation, involving large trucks with the likely potential to further adversely impact on the amenity of the area. **If this is allowed to proceed, the immediate area will suffer from a stigma by the general community and the small businesses will suffer a "turn-off factor".**

This odour will further impact on our customers and employees and the area will become unviable because of this proposal.

I am totally opposed to this type of operation in this totally unsuitable location. This proposal will negatively impact my business and my investment in this area.

Yours sincerely,

28<sup>th</sup> January 2011

**Copy to Sent to Mayor Penrith City Council**

**Emma Barnet - Online Submission from Karl Storr of Director (object)**

4

**From:** Karl Storr  
**To:** Emma Barnet <emma.barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 20/12/2010 8:42 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission from Karl Storr of Director (object)  
**CC:** <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

---

Dear Sir/ Madam

I refer to your letter regarding the proposed No Fuss Oily Liquid waste Facility.

The environmental assessment on the planned facility reveals that there will be an odour produced from the plant. There appears to be no concern for the occupants that work and own businesses within the Emu Plains industrial area or the difficulty the odour will make finding and keeping tenants.

We have owned the Units at 9 Smith St for 32 Years. No Fuss liquid waste is a more recent addition to the Emu Plains industrial area. As frequent and pungent as the odour currently is we would not choose to purchase a property in the industrial area.

The current odour produced by No Fuss liquid waste has made working in the units in the Emu Plains industrial area uncomfortable, any increase will further discourage workers, customers, tenants and business owns from coming and remaining within the industrial area.

I strongly request that the facility be rejected and that measures are taken to reduce the current odour that the occupants of the Emu Plains industrial area have to live with.

Regards,

Karl Storr

Name: Karl Storr  
Organisation: Director

Address:  
18 Bedford St  
Emu Plains NSW 2750

IP Address: cpe-143-238-112-205.lns10.cht.bigpond.net.au - 143.238.112.205

Submission for Job: #3955 Oily Waste Water Treatment Facility  
[https://majorprojects.onhive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_job&id=3955](https://majorprojects.onhive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3955)

Site: #2242 No Fuss Waste Water Treatment Plant  
[https://majorprojects.onhive.com/index.pl?action=view\\_site&id=2242](https://majorprojects.onhive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2242)

-----  
**Emma Barnet**

E: emma.barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au  
-----

Powered by Internetix Affinity

## **Submission 5 summary**

Objection to No Fuss Oily Liquid Waste Water Treatment Facility:

Reasons:

- It is an overdevelopment of the property.
- The street is currently subjected to odours at all times of the day and night, concerned that intensification of odour will negatively affect business.
- Smith Street is a dead ability for large trucks to turn around.
- The proposed truck turning circle will impact the proposed on site parking.
- The site is low lying and susceptible to floods, concerned over impacts on open vats.

6



PCU018935

12.1.2011

Major Development Assessment  
Department of Planning  
GPO box 39  
SYDNEY  
NSW 2001

Department of Planning  
Received  
28 JAN 2011  
Scanning Room

I am the owner of the premises at 11 Railway Street Emu Plains NSW 2750.


I oppose the submission from No Fuss Oily Liquid Waste Pty Ltd (10-0077).

My reasons are that the company renting my premises has rang me with complaints regarding the foul sewage smell that has been noticed coming from the above company on many occasion.

I feel they will not longer want to rent my premises if this expansion goes ahead & more foul smells are noted, I feel it will then be very difficult to find new tenants if this submission goes ahead & more smell will be evident.

I make no political donations.

Yours sincerely,



Keven William Stevens