

Our reference: MDA20/0010 – SSI-8609189
Contact: Kathryn Saunders
Telephone: (02) 4732 8567

6 May 2022

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Attn: Nathan Heath

Email: nathan.heath@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Nathan,

**Response to Submissions – SSI-8609189
Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling Centre**

Thank you for providing Council with the opportunity to comment on the applicant's Response to Submissions (**RtS**) associated with the proposed State Significant Infrastructure (**SSI**) application.

1. Planning Considerations

(a) Staging and extent of works

It remains unclear as to the full extent of works which will be delivered as part of Stage 1.

The Upper South Creek Advanced Water Recycling Centre Submission Report, March 22, prepared by Sydney Water states (p.15) states that Stage 1 comprises the following:

- (i) building and operating the AWRC to treat a daily wastewater flow, known as the average dry weather flow (ADWF), of up to 50 megalitres per day (ML/day); and
- (ii) building all pipelines to cater for up to 100 ML/day flow coming through the AWRC (but only operating them to transport and release volumes produced by Stage 1).

Notwithstanding the above, Page 315 of the Submissions Reports includes that 'Sydney Water is seeking approval to establish the green space area as part of Stage 1'.

The Submission Response also includes that 'Sydney Water is seeking approval for the green space area to be publicly accessible for recreation as part of Stage 1 and is working with DPE to understand whether this aligns with their future intentions for the South Creek corridor. Whether or when a public recreation area is delivered here depends on whether the NSW Government supports use of the land for this purpose'.

Council recommends that Stage 1 include the new green space identified in the EIS and that clarity be provided as to the Stage 1 works noting no approval is sought for later stages.

(b) Sustainability and landscaped areas

As was raised in Council's previous submissions, it remains unclear if the project includes the production of renewable energy generation infrastructure including generation of renewable energy from co-generation and operation of solar photovoltaic panels. The Submission Report no longer includes this aspect of the proposal in the scope of works at page 15 of the Submissions Report.

To ensure that the proposal offsets the environmental impacts of the development and to support the sustainability objectives of the Aerotropolis precinct, it is recommended that the Department require the installation of the abovementioned sustainability features including the operation of solar photovoltaic panels – as is proposed in the original **EIS** (V1, p.51).

Should the sustainability initiatives be limited to provision of landscaped areas, these areas should be restored, regenerated and sufficiently protected through the imposition of adequate conditions of consent which require maintenance and reporting. If 'offset' areas are proposed these are to be protected in perpetuity.

Fencing surrounding riparian or landscaped areas should not prevent terrestrial movement and connectivity between corridors. Fencing without integrated opportunities for crossings (regular spaces gaps under or at the base of fences etc) can affect the dispersal and survival of terrestrial wildlife, and prevents free movement in times of migration, drought, flood and fire. Entrapment in the fencing affects marsupials, birds, bats and reptiles, and fence hanging is a common threat.

(c) Visual impacts

In the December 2021 submission Council raised, that detailed designs of the AWRC structures were not provided and requested the submission of architectural and landscape plans for the site.

Council also recommended that a visual impact analysis of the proposed structures on the AWRC site be produced and include an assessment of the administration building, solar collectors, and structures above 20m and 30m and which had regard to the reflectivity of materials.

In the Response to Submission, Sydney Water has provided that '*the detailed design phase of the project has not yet started. It is during this stage that the specific details including design dimensions and related infrastructure will be determined*'.

It is raised for the Department's consideration that impacts on landscape character, cultural heritage and views will not be insignificant noting the scale and height of structures proposed and that the assessment of the impacts of such structures be appropriately informed.

(d) Impacts on Wallacia village and public places

Council requests that the Department ensure pipeline locations are to avoid bisecting Council reserves and parks. Pipeline locations and the construction

methodologies are to be amended such that the visual and biodiversity impacts, impacts on Aboriginal cultural landscapes and on Council reserves, parks and public places are minimised.

2. Traffic

Council raised in its submission to the EIS, that Clifton Avenue is a local rural road not designed to cater for construction traffic volumes and swept paths, and has noted that the road pavement will prematurely fail as a result on construction activities.

Whilst Sydney Water provides that 'upgrade works to Clifton Avenue to facilitate the construction traffic from the project is out of scope of the project', Council's engineers advise works are required to facilitate the development.

The Department is advised that a 'patch and go' approach to the current roadway insufficiencies should not be supported.

As was included in Council's submission to the EIS, Council requests that Site Specific Traffic Management Plans for compound 8 address:

- (iii) geotechnical testing of existing pavement design life of Clifton Avenue;
- (iv) required pavement upgrade works and localised widening of Clifton Avenue to accommodate expected construction traffic volumes; and
- (v) A dilapidation report of all existing Council assets along Clifton Avenue including drainage assets, signs, pavement, etc.

Council will continue to advocate that road upgrades to any impacted local roads are undertaken by DPE, to ensure the assets are safe, fit for purpose and they do not become a financial and maintenance burdens to Council and a nuisance and safety issue for residents.

3. Development Engineering Considerations

Council reiterates comments provided in its 14 December 2021 submission (specifically Section 12) in relation to engineering and flooding.

4. Environmental Management Considerations

(a) Hazardous Development

The development proposal includes a Preliminary Hazard Analysis prepared by Aurecon Arup (dated 22 June 2021, ref 269002-02).

It is noted within Section 5.5 of the Analysis which assesses goods not classified as dangerous, that at the time of writing, it was not yet confirmed which product is proposed to be used as an antiscalant additive in the reverse osmosis procedure.

The Submissions Report has reiterated that the antiscalant is yet to be confirmed but will be confirmed at the detailed design phase of the proposed development.

No objections are raised with this approach, provided that this is confirmed, and appropriate measures put in place prior to determination by the relevant authority.

Furthermore, in Section 6.6 which discusses release of firewater into the environment, it is stated that the stormwater design for the proposed development was not yet complete at the time of this writing.

Again, the Submissions Report states that this will be confirmed at the detailed design phase. The Department would need to be satisfied with this approach and Council raises no objection, provided that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented should there be insufficient space for fire water, which should be assessed by the relevant authority prior to determination.

(b) Land Contamination

A Soils & Contamination Impact Assessment prepared by Aurecon Arup (dated 27 July 2021, ref 20036007) has been provided along with the proposal.

The Assessment provides an adequate review of the site and surrounds history, as well as providing insight into Contamination Assessments conducted within the vicinity of the proposed development.

In response to previous concerns, the Submissions Report has stated that a Remediation Action Plan, Unexpected Finds Protocol, and Hazardous Materials Survey will all be implemented within both the **CEMP** and the Soil and Water Management Plan and will be effective prior to commencement of the construction phase of the proposed development.

The Submissions Report has confirmed that all material imported onto any of the subject sites for use will be validated appropriately with correct certification. This is considered satisfactory, provided that each of the documents are reviewed and approved by the relevant authority.

(c) Noise Impacts

A Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by Aurecon Arup (dated 28 April 2021, ref AC04) has been provided along with the development proposal for comment.

It is acknowledged that no background acoustic monitoring has been undertaken, and that data from noise monitoring undertaken in 2017 in locations close to the subject area has been adopted for the Assessment.

In response to previous concerns raised, the Submissions Report has confirmed that in relation to the proposed Co-Gen operation, the proposed Co-gen flare, engine and exhaust at the Recycling Centre, the predicted dB(C) will exceed the dB(A) by no more than 15dB. Council considers this satisfactory.

The Submissions Report has stated that proposed release valve sizing will be confirmed at the detailed design phase of the proposed development. This is considered satisfactory, provided that once sizing is confirmed, the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment will need to be amended accordingly to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impacts on surrounding sensitive receivers because of the proposed release valves during the operational phase of the development.



The Submissions Report has also stated that the Land Use Survey and associated mapping will be updated as part of the CEMP and associated Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan. No objections are raised to this approach.

5. Waterways Considerations

(a) Waterway management and water sensitive urban design (WSUD)

It is noted in the supporting updated information that a more detailed assessment of risks and mitigation measures would be considered and developed during the detailed design and construction planning.

No objection is raised by Council, provided that the outstanding information can be reviewed by the Department of Planning and Environment (**DPE**) prior to approval of the scheme and commencement of works and prior to the operation of the scheme. Conditions to this effect are recommend to be adopted by DPE, should consent be granted.

The updated information appended to the Response to Submissions document includes a range of management measures and commitments to ensure that the detailed design of waterway crossings further considers geomorphology, aquatic ecology and groundwater. These measures need to be implemented to the satisfaction of the consent authority and to ensure the design minimises potential risks to waterways. In addition, disturbed areas will need to be stabilised and revegetated in accordance with proposed management measures. Conditions to this effect are recommend to be adopted by DPE, should consent be granted.

(b) Wianamatta South Creek

The updated information has also considered the updated pollution reduction and flow management targets for the construction and operational stages of the development site in the context of the new DPE EES targets for Wianamatta South Creek. This assessment indicated that the proposed reference design management measures will meet the DPE EES Wianamatta South Creek Stormwater management targets. However, it is noted that additional details will need to be provided during the detailed design stage, and this will need to be assessed / approved to the satisfaction of DPE.

During construction, impacts to waterways are proposed to be managed by a range of measures included in a Soil and Water Management Plan as part of the CEMP. The CEMP will need to be in place prior to construction and all commitment must be implemented for the duration of construction. This will need to be reviewed and approved by the relevant authority.

(c) Operational phase

During operation of the scheme, the main potential risks result from the treated water releases to South Creek and Nepean and Warragamba rivers. These reports note that releases have the potential to impact on water quality, geomorphology, aquatic ecology and as a result of altered flow regimes.



A review of the information and consideration of the proposed safeguards indicates that the general impacts of the project are not extensive. The supporting studies included in the EIS and Appendix B Updated Management Measures, included numerous recommended mitigation measures and safeguards to manage the risks, as well as commitment to develop and implement a detailed monitoring and reporting program.

(d) Receiving waters

With respect to the impact on receiving waterways including Warragamba and the Nepean River, the EIS, and Appendix B Updated Management Measures, includes commitments that a baseline and post-commissioning monitoring program to help understand impacts of the project once it is operational.

Council notes that this will need to have water quality, aquatic ecology, and geomorphic components. It is also noted that some additional monitoring will be implemented, and it will be important that this is sufficient to demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts to the health of the river, including with respect to the community's ability to use the river for recreational and other purposes.

The Department, through its assessment and any consent issues, is to require that the monitoring is sufficient to ensure that impacts and issues are identified at an early stage so that rectification actions can be implemented.

In finalising the detailed design of the project and in finalising operational plans for the scheme, consultation with relevant stakeholders including Council should be undertaken.

In doing so, it will be important that adequate consideration is undertaken to ensure the design and operation of the **AWRC** continues to meet water quality objectives, and that any impacts as a result of the project with respect to water quality management, impacts to creek geomorphology and aquatic species are identified and managed.

Should you require any further information regarding the comments, please contact me on (02) 4732 8567.

Yours Sincerely,

Kathryn Saunders
Principal Planner