

20 December 2017

NSW Planning Assessment Commission Determination Report Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421)

1. INTRODUCTION

On 20 November 2017, the Planning Assessment Commission (the Commission) received from the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) a State significant development application from Bingo Recycling Pty Ltd (the applicant) to demolish an existing waste transfer station and construct and operate a new resource recovery facility (RRF) at 20 Hearne Street, Mortdale in the Georges River local government area (LGA).

The Department has referred the development application to the Commission for determination in accordance with the Minister for Planning's delegation because the Department received more than 25 submissions from the public in the nature of objections.

Ms Lynelle Briggs AO, Chair of the Commission, nominated Mr David Johnson (chair), Ms Carol Austin, and Mr Soo-Tee Cheong to constitute the Commission to determine the development application.

1.1 Summary of Development Application

The development application proposes to:

- demolish existing buildings and structures and construct a new 2,534 square-metre waste processing shed, with ancillary infrastructure, including weighbridges, material bays, plant and equipment, and a separate office and staff amenities building;
- increase the site's currently approved maximum waste processing capacity of 30,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 220,000 tpa;
- process dry non-putrescible construction and demolition (C&D), commercial and industrial (C&I) and domestic (Council clean-up) waste;
- distribute processed waste offsite to licensed recycling facilities or landfills (for residual waste); and
- operate the facility during the hours of 6am – 10pm, Monday to Saturday.

The site is located in the south-eastern portion of the Peakhurst industrial area, which is zoned IN2 Light Industrial pursuant to the *Hurstville Local Environmental Plan (HLEP) 2012*. The project will provide 15 full-time equivalent construction jobs and 30 long-term operational jobs (25 new operational jobs).

1.2 Background

In its original Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS), the applicant proposed a waste processing facility of up to 300,000 tpa over 24 hours a day, six days a week, with no restrictions on accessing the site. In response to public and government agency concerns, the applicant amended the application, in accordance with Clause 55 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* and with the agreement of the Secretary. The amendments included:

- a reduction in processing capacity from 300,000 tpa to 220,000 tpa;
- the proposed hours of operation (including delivery and removal of waste) reducing from 24 hours a day, six days a week to 6am – 10pm only, six days a week;
- prohibiting all vehicles accessing and exiting the site via Barry Avenue;
- introducing additional arrangements to restrict heavy vehicle movements to Hearne Street only;

- removal of a bin storage area on site to increase space available for vehicle manoeuvring;
- an increase in operational staff numbers from 12 to 13 per shift due to the addition of a traffic controller at the site entrance; and
- updating the Capital Investment Value from \$2,466,000 to \$3,745,020.

The application also seeks an amendment to the development standard in relation to Clause 4.3 Height of Buildings of the HLEP. A maximum building height of 10 metres (m) applies to the site as a principal development standard. However, the existing building has a height of approximately 14.5m from the existing ground level and thus exceeds the maximum building height permitted under the HLEP. The proposed new building also has a maximum height of 14.5m.

1.3 Need for proposal

The applicant has justified the need for the development by highlighting that:

- it would assist in achieving the targets of the *NSW Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Strategy 2014-2021* (WARR Strategy) through reducing the amount of waste going to landfill;
- the site is well positioned to service approved demolition and construction projects in the region;
- the project does not pose any risk to the environment which cannot be effectively managed;
- the current processing capacity of 30,000 tpa under-utilises the site and fails to cater for Sydney's recent growth in construction and resulting need for C&D waste recycling; and
- the project would cater for local recycling needs, as well as the shortage of C&D recycling facilities in the Sydney metropolitan area in general.

2. DEPARTMENT'S ASSESSMENT REPORT

The Department's assessment report identified traffic, site and operational management, and noise and vibration, as the key impacts associated with this proposal.

The Department considers that the development would:

- be capable of handling 220,000 tpa of waste;
- positively contribute to the State's performance in regard to the *WARR Strategy*;
- meet the relevant air quality and noise criteria at sensitive receivers;
- accommodate any additional traffic generation; and
- provide a range of environmental and economic benefits for the region.

The Department concluded that the impacts of the development can be appropriately managed through implementation of their recommended conditions of consent. Consequently, the Department considered the development is in the public interest and should be approved, subject to these conditions.

The Department also recommended that the Commission agree to varying the height of the building development standard as set out in Clause 4.3 of the HLEP as they consider:

- the applicant's written request adequately addresses matters required to be demonstrated by Clause 4.6(3) of the HLEP; and
- the development will be in the public interest as it is consistent with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives for development within the IN2 zone.

3. COMMISSION'S MEETINGS AND SITE VISIT

As part of its assessment of the proposal, the Commission met with the Department, Georges River Council, the applicant and also visited the site. Notes from these meetings and the site inspection are provided in **Appendix 1**. The Commission also conducted a public meeting. The list of speakers and summary minutes from the public meeting are provided in **Appendix 2**.

3.1 Briefing from the Department

On 4 December 2017, the Department briefed the Commission on the proposal.

3.2 Briefing from the Applicant and Site Visit

On 12 December 2017, the applicant briefed the Commission on the proposal. The briefing was followed by a site visit.

3.3 Meeting with Georges River Council

On 12 December 2017, the Commission met with Georges River Council to discuss their views on the proposal.

3.4 Public Meeting

The Commission held a public meeting at the Mortdale Community Centre on 12 December 2017 to hear the public's views on the proposal. A list of the 6 speakers that presented to the Commission is provided in **Appendix 2**. A summary of the issues raised by the speakers and provided in written comments is provided in **Appendix 2**. In summary, the main issues of concern include traffic generation, site and operational management, noise and dust.

4. COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION

In this determination, the Commission has considered carefully:

- all information provided by the applicant including additional information;
- the Department's assessment report;
- advice and recommendations from government agencies;
- relevant matters for consideration specified in section 79C of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act), including:
 - relevant environmental planning instruments;
 - the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*;
 - the likely impacts of the development on both the natural and built environments;
 - social and economic impacts in the locality;
 - the suitability of the site for the development;
 - written and verbal submissions from the public; and
 - the public interest, including the objects of the EP&A Act.

The key matters considered by the Commission include traffic, site and operational management, and noise and vibration. The Commission has also addressed other matters of the Department's assessment report including the Clause 4.6 – Exception to Development Standards, and air quality and odour.

The Commission is satisfied with the Department's assessment of all other matters.

4.1 Traffic

The Commission heard concerns at the public meeting and received comments relating to the project's generation of traffic and its subsequent impact on the safety, capacity and efficiency of the local road network as well as increased noise between 7pm and 10pm. Council had also raised concerns with the project in relation to:

- management of vehicle queuing to prevent impacts to traffic flow on Hearne Street;
- increased traffic generated by the project on Boundary Road; and
- proposed use of Barry Avenue, which contains residential properties.

These concerns were shared by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA).

- *Construction traffic and parking*

The applicant proposes to provide 20 off-street parking spaces for staff, with 40-60 construction staff estimated to be onsite at any one time during the 34-week construction period. Due to the limited availability of off-street parking, staff would be encouraged to carpool and use public transport to

reach the site. The applicant states that the staff arrival and departure times would not fall within the road network peak periods for the Mortdale area.

The Department notes that they received no submissions which posed concerns with construction traffic and parking. However, the Department is concerned that the provision of only 20 construction staff parking spaces would saturate on-street parking provision in the local road network. To prevent this the Department has recommended a condition of consent requiring the preparation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) under condition B1 to detail adequate parking arrangements within the site and haul routes, identify traffic controls, and prohibit construction staff from parking within the local road network.

The Department concludes that with adequate controls in place, the construction phase of the development would not impact the safety, capacity or efficiency of the local road network.

- *Operational traffic generation*

The applicant suggests that the existing facility in its operations as a waste transfer station predominantly caters for small and medium rigid trucks with low tare weights (average of 5 tonnes) carrying lighter comingled wastes. The existing facility generates approximately 204 truck movements per day at a processing capacity of 30,000 tpa, but the proposed expanded operations are predicted to generate 336 truck movements of larger sized trucks a day.

Concerns were raised at the public meeting regarding impacts from the increase in operational traffic generation. To address these concerns the applicant has outlined that they will use larger trucks, including semi-trailers and truck and dog combinations, to transport heavier waste streams, which would have the effect of limiting the overall truck movements required for the additional processing capacity. The applicant also indicates that several larger trucks delivering waste to the site would also be utilised to dispatch waste from the site in the same trip, which would further limit the number of trucks for the intended processing volume.

The applicant has confirmed that no trucks accessing or leaving the site would utilise Barry Avenue and has outlined measures to achieve this, which include driver briefings, the installation of a 'left turn only' sign at the exit of the site and the use of a traffic controller to direct outbound trucks to Hearne Street only.

The applicant operates eight facilities in the Sydney basin and is in a position to send waste that temporarily cannot be accommodated at the Mortdale RRF to other sites. The applicant is able to control its fleet of trucks via a real-time tracking system, which can contact drivers and advise them to delay approach or divert their load to another facility. This would prevent a build-up of unprocessed waste onsite and any subsequent back up of trucks onto Hearne Street.

The applicant's Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) concludes that the predicted number of trucks generated by the increase in processing capacity could not be expected to compromise the safety or function of the surrounding road network.

The Department states that the development represents a modest increase in heavy vehicle traffic to the site and the surrounding road network. However, the Department notes that the site's operational peak (11am-12pm) occurs outside of the peak hours for the road network and that the project would only add an additional 32 truck movements on Boundary Road, which is presently operating at a level of 100-200 vehicles per hour below the Roads and Maritime Services' (RMS) operating capacity for a two-way road.

The Department has recommended conditions of consent requiring the applicant to prepare and implement a Driver Code of Conduct to minimise traffic impacts on the local road network, including

requiring haul routes to be specified, prohibiting the use of Barry Avenue, and requiring the applicant to prepare a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) and a Traffic Management Plan (TMP).

The Commission notes that Council and the EPA were satisfied with the applicant's response to their concerns regarding operational traffic generation.

- *Truck manoeuvring and queuing*

In response to Council's and the Department's previous concerns about the lack of robust assessment and information regarding justification that the site could accommodate truck volumes, the applicant provided a revised traffic analysis. This included a more comprehensive swept path analysis, a time-step analysis, vehicle stacking plans showing the location of truck waiting areas outside manoeuvring areas and a draft TCP. To accommodate the movements and stacking of trucks, the applicant has also removed a proposed bin storage area and relocated a fuel point.

The applicant's time-step analysis indicates that during typical operations a truck would spend on average 25 minutes on site between the entry and exit point, and that during typical operations, nine of the 31 stacking spaces would be occupied. As the maximum number of vehicles expected during the peak operation of the facility is 21, the applicant suggests the stacking arrangements are more than sufficient under normal circumstances. This analysis also concluded that even during a worst-case scenario in which trucks remain on the site for 50 minutes, there would be enough space to accommodate the number of waiting trucks which would prevent queuing on Hearne Street.

To ensure the site operates effectively the applicant proposes mitigation measures to incorporate the vehicle stacking plan and associated management protocols to allow for up to 31 trucks to be held on site at any one time, maintain internal vehicle swept paths through line marking and implement the TCP.

The Department considers the applicant has provided the necessary information to carry out a robust assessment of truck manoeuvring and stacking. The Department has recommended conditions of consent under conditions B4(c) and B5(C)(i) requiring the preparation of a TMP and TCP which will detail measures to prevent queuing on Hearne Street.

The Department concludes that should the facility operate within the confines of the mitigation measures provided by the applicant and the Department, and Council's recommended conditions of consent, it is unlikely the development would compromise the safety and efficiency of Hearne Street.

- *Conclusion*

The Commission acknowledges the community's concerns regarding the potential for the development to impact on the safety, capacity and efficiency of the local road network, through increased traffic generation and queuing of vehicles onto Hearne Street. The applicant has outlined mitigation measures to ensure the site operates effectively for internal truck manoeuvring and to prevent potential queuing within the public road network. The Commission notes that the Department has recommended a suite of conditions which will ensure the construction and operational phases of the development will not impact the nearest residences to the site and will not compromise the safety and efficiency of Hearne Street.

The Commission finds that the development would not adversely impact the local road network.

4.2 Site and Operational Management

The Commission heard concerns at the public meeting and received comments relating to the suitability of the site's size and location to accommodate an increase in processing capacity. The Department and the EPA also raised concern regarding the ability of the site to handle a processing

capacity of 220,000 tpa, due to the site's size and location and the size and type of recycling equipment proposed.

The applicant's processing machinery would be purpose-built for this development and the type of waste being processed and would receive daily maintenance. It would be configured to process up to 70 tonnes of waste per hour, operating below its maximum processing capacity of 100-150 tonnes per hour. However, any breakdown or blockage of this machinery has the potential to cause a build-up of unprocessed waste in the incoming waste receival area. As the waste to be received is non-putrescible and would be stored under cover within the processing building, the applicant states that there is a low likelihood of odour issues from waste build-up, and with the applicant's ability to redirect its trucks if necessary this would prevent a build-up of unprocessed waste onsite.

The applicant has committed to a number of management measures to ensure efficient and effective handling of waste, including:

- scheduling and tracking of waste movements;
- appropriate acceptance, handling and removal of waste; and
- a planned machinery maintenance regime.

With regards to any unexpected finds of non-conforming waste (NCW), such as asbestos, the applicant states that it has developed procedures to deal with these situations, which include storage in a covered skip or banded cage. NCW would then be removed every day to a facility lawfully permitted to accept this waste type.

The Commission notes that the Department undertook an assessment of the project's capability to handle and process up to 220,000 tpa of waste each year. The Department is satisfied the purpose-built facility would be of an appropriate size and design with adequate management processes to facilitate storage and removal of waste in an efficient manner. The Department is also satisfied that there are sufficient procedures and processes in place to adequately manage unexpected finds of NCW.

The Commission notes that the Department has also undertaken an assessment of the project against the EPA's draft Standards for Managing Construction and Demolition Waste in NSW. The assessment focussed on requirements relating to inspection, sorting, no mixing of waste, storage and transport. The Department is satisfied that the development would comply with the requirements of the draft Standards.

The Department concludes that the applicant has appropriate procedures in place to ensure the satisfactory operation of the RRF, complies with draft Standards for Managing Construction and Demolition Waste in NSW, and satisfies the requirements of the *WARR Strategy* by contributing to and exceeding the target recycling rates of 70% and 80% for C&I waste and C&D waste respectively.

The Commission acknowledges concerns raised regarding the suitability of the site's size and location to accommodate an increase in processing capacity. The Commission supports the Department's assessment that the purpose-built facility would be of an appropriate size and design to process this capacity of waste, and is satisfied that the applicant has appropriate procedures to deal with any breakdown or blockage of its equipment to prevent a build-up of unprocessed waste onsite. The Commission notes that the applicant has committed to a number of management measures to ensure efficient and effective handling of waste, including any unexpected finds of non-conforming waste.

The Commission finds that the site is suitable to accommodate an increase in processing capacity and there are sufficient mitigation measures to ensure satisfactory operation.

4.3 Noise and Vibration

The Commission heard concerns at the public meeting and received comments regarding the amenity impacts associated with increased traffic generated by the development, particularly from heavy vehicles, during its operation. The Department also notes that the development has the potential to emit noise and vibration impacts during its operational phase, through sources such as vehicle movements and operating machinery, which could impact on the amenity of the locality.

- *Construction noise*

The applicant acknowledges that construction noise would be generated by construction plant such as hand tools, trucks, saws and excavator/loader machinery. The applicant's Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) recommended a site-specific noise management level for the nearest residential receiver (R6 – 27 Barry Avenue) during construction hours of 51 decibels (dBA) LAeq(15minute). This level was developed in accordance with the guidelines for noise management levels under the EPA's *Interim Construction Noise Guidelines 2009* (ICNG).

The applicant's CNVMP predicts that construction noise levels will not trigger the 51 dBA noise management level for the nearest residential receivers (R1-R16). However, the CNVMP also states that where construction works are predicted to exceed the noise management level, the investigation and implementation of feasible and reasonable construction noise management and mitigation measures would be required.

The Department is satisfied that construction noise levels at nearby residences would comply with the relevant noise management levels of the ICNG and has recommended a condition of consent to ensure compliance with these levels.

- *Operational and traffic noise*

The applicant has amended the original project to respond to the community's and Council's previous concerns to the Department regarding noise emissions from night time operations and trucks using Barry Avenue to transport material. These amendments included reducing its operating hours to exclude night time operations, and prohibiting the use of Barry Avenue for all vehicles.

The applicant states that the existing noise levels at the most noise affected receivers along Boundary Road already exceed the EPA's *NSW Road Noise Policy* (RNP) criteria of 60 dBA for daytime and 55 dBA for night-time periods, respectively. The RNP 2 dBA noise increase 'allowance' criterion therefore applies for this project in assessing feasible and reasonable mitigation measures.

The applicant highlights that traffic noise levels would increase by 0.7 dBA and 0.4 dBA during the daytime and morning shoulder periods, respectively. The RNP states that an increase of up to 2 dBA represents a minor impact that is considered barely perceptible to the average person. The applicant notes that for the development to result in a 2 dBA increase in existing noise levels the number of site related heavy vehicles would have to increase the traffic flow by 60% on Boundary Road. The applicant highlights that the additional number of heavy vehicles required to result in this level of increase on Boundary Road would not be generated by the project. The applicant concludes that additional road traffic noise generated by the proposal will be minimal and will not be at a level which is predicted to have an impact on amenity of residents fronting Boundary Road.

The Department notes that the applicant undertook noise monitoring to determine the ambient noise environment at the nearest sensitive receiver, R6 (27 Barry Avenue), and to develop project-specific noise criteria for site operational noise impacts, as prescribed by the EPA's *Industrial Noise Policy 2000* (INP). The project-specific noise criteria devised for day (7am-6pm) and evening (6pm-10pm) periods were 47 dBA and 43 dBA respectively.

The applicant also undertook modelling to predict operational noise levels at sensitive receivers, which could then be assessed against the project-specific criteria to determine the level of impact. The modelling found that residence R3 (128 Boundary Road) would experience daytime operational noise levels equal to the project-specific noise criteria of 47 dBA. Residence R6 (27 Barry Avenue) would also experience day and evening operation noise levels equal to the project-specific noise criteria (47 dBA and 43 dBA respectively).

The Department considers these operational noise levels to be acceptable due to the distance of these receivers from the facility and given the applicant's assessment was under a worst-case scenario, where all processing machinery and plant were operating simultaneously. The Department also informed the Commission that the types of noises generated by the development would not be new to the locality as it would be located within an existing industrial zone.

The Department considers that the increase in traffic noise levels generated by the development would not impact on residential receivers adjacent to the surrounding road network, including Boundary Road and Barry Avenue.

The Commission notes that the Department is satisfied the development would be capable of operating within the project-specific noise criteria for day and evening periods and recommends a condition of consent to ensure the development complies with these criteria.

- *Operational vibration*

The applicant's Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) identifies proposed speed humps, heavy material handling (trucks unloading) and the finger screen plant as potential sources of vibration. In light of this, the NVIA recommended measures to reduce the likelihood of these sources of vibration exceeding the Vibration Dose Value (VDV) under the EPA's *Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline*, including the removal of the speed humps to be replaced with posted speed limit signs.

The applicant recommends that the external vibration emissions and location of vibration generating plant and activities should be controlled so that the operation does not adversely impact upon neighbouring receivers and occupants within the proposed development.

The Department is satisfied the development, with the recommended controls in place, would not impact on surrounding receivers and has recommended a condition of consent requiring vibration to be addressed in an Operational Noise and Vibration Management Plan (ONVMP).

- *Conclusion*

The Commission acknowledges the community's concerns regarding the impact on the amenity of nearby residences from noise and vibration generated during construction and operation of the development, and from road traffic noise. The Commission notes the applicant's measures to prevent any impacts includes reducing operational hours and prohibiting the use of Barry Avenue for trucks accessing the site. The Commission also notes that the development's construction and operational noise levels will not exceed project-specific noise management levels for the nearest residential receivers. Road traffic noise levels would also present a negligible impact above what is currently experienced in the locality. The Commission is satisfied that there are sufficient controls to prevent the nearest residences from experiencing any impacts of vibration.

The Commission finds that the development would not have adverse noise or vibration impacts on the amenity of the locality.

4.4 Other Relevant Issues

4.4.1 Hurstville LEP (HLEP) 2012, Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

As previously stated in **Section 1.2** of this report the applicant has made a written request to vary the height of buildings standard applicable to the site pursuant to Clause 4.6(3) of the HLEP. The applicant proposes an exception to this standard to allow for the height of the development to be 14.5m.

The applicant has justified the exception to the development standard by stating that:

- the height would be consistent with the height of the existing building;
- the height and scale of the proposed development is compatible with surrounding existing and likely future development; and
- the development is consistent with Council's key development objectives for the IN2 – Light Industrial Zone and the overarching objectives of the *NSW Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Strategy*.

Council and the Department are both satisfied with the applicant's justification for the height variation for the reasons set out above, and based on the requirements set out in Clause 4.6(4)(a) of the HLEP, the Department is satisfied that development consent can be granted despite the contravention of the development standard.

The Commission finds that the applicant has provided sufficient justification for the height variation and finds that the contravention of the development standard for this project is reasonable.

4.4.2 Air Quality and Odour

The Commission heard concerns at the public meeting regarding the impact of dust emissions and odour generated by construction and operation of the development on nearby residences.

The applicant's Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) demonstrated that the impact assessment criteria would be met all residential and industrial receptors for particulate matter, including deposited dust. The applicant also notes odorous materials such as putrescible waste will not be accepted at the site. The applicant has committed to incorporating comprehensive air quality management measures into the final versions of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP). To reduce the likelihood of exceedances emanating from the proposed facility, the applicant will also prepare an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to form part of the OEMP.

The Commission notes that the EPA did not raise any concerns regarding air quality. However, the EPA noted that odour had not been assessed due to the low likelihood of occurrence but an odour impact assessment would be required should odour impacts occur.

The Department concludes that with appropriate measures in place, including a requirement to prepare and implement an AQMP and the installation of a wheel wash at the exit to the site, the proposal would have minimal air quality impacts on surrounding receivers.

The Commission is satisfied that the applicant has proposed sufficient mitigation and management measures to reduce any impacts on air quality from the construction and operation of the development, which the Department has required as part of their conditions of consent.

The Commission finds that the development would not have adverse air quality or odour impacts on surrounding receivers.

5. COMMISSION'S FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION

The Commission has considered carefully the applicant's proposal, the Department's assessment report and the relevant matters for consideration under section 79C of the EP&A Act. The Commission has noted the advice and recommendations from Georges River Council, and government agencies including the EPA. Finally, the Commission has heard from members of the community about their concerns for the proposal during the public meeting in Mortdale.

The Commission finds that:

- the development would not adversely impact the local road network;
- the site and its operational management is suitable to accommodate an increase in processing capacity;
- the development would not create adverse noise or vibration impacts on the amenity of the nearest residential receivers; and
- the development would not adversely impact on the air quality of surrounding receivers.

The Commission also considers that there is sufficient justification for the height variation of the development and finds that the contravention of Council's development standard under Clause 4.3 of the *Hurstville Local Environmental Plan (HLEP) 2012* is reasonable.

For the reasons set out above, the Commission has determined to grant consent to the development application subject to the conditions set out in the instrument of approval.



Mr David Johnson (Chair)
Member of the Commission



Ms Carol Austin
Member of the Commission



Mr Soo-Tee Cheong
Member of the Commission

**APPENDIX 1
RECORDS OF COMMISSION MEETINGS**

**Minutes of Department of Planning & Environment Briefing with
Planning Assessment Commission**

This meeting is part of the determination process.	
Date: 4 December 2017	Time: 2.00pm
Project: Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421)	
Meeting place: PAC Offices, 201 Elizabeth Street, Sydney	
<p>Attendees: Commission Members: David Johnson, Carol Austin, Soo-Tee Cheong.</p> <p>Commission Secretariat: Matthew Todd-Jones (Senior Planning Officer), David Koppers (Team Leader).</p> <p>Department of Planning & Environment: Chris Ritchie (Director – Industry Assessments), Kelly McNicol (Team Leader – Industry Assessments), Sheelagh Laguna (Senior Planning Officer – Industry Assessments).</p>	
The purpose of the meeting was for the Department to brief the Commission on the proposal	
<p>The following matters were discussed:</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department provided an overview of the waste industry and their role in assessing developments. • The proposed facility will take waste from all over Sydney. • The applicant has a network of recycling facilities across Sydney. • The site is located off Hearne Street, which is a 12-metre-wide road with on street car parking available on either side. • Rainwater collected from the site will be used for dust suppression. Any water that comes into contact with waste during the site’s operation won’t be used in this way. • The facility will not be allowed to receive any contaminated soils. <p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts from increased traffic generation were the biggest issues raised in submissions from the public. • This included the impact on the safety of pedestrians, particularly those using the nearby children’s play centre and a dance school. • Concerns over the impacts of noise and vibration generated by traffic, particularly at night time, were also raised. • The Department noted that since the applicant has amended the project the facility will not operate at night and traffic will be prohibited from using Barry Avenue where the play centre and dance school are located. • If the site is operating properly then there shouldn’t be any issue with queuing traffic affecting Hearn Street. • The Department clarified that B-double sized trucks are currently prohibited from using Hearne Street. <p><u>Site and Operational Management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department noted that trucks which will dump material into the receival area may also take processed material away from storage bays on their way back out of the site. 	

- There will no right turn out of the site for all vehicles, and there will be a site controller to direct outbound trucks to use Hearne Street only.
- Employees of the facility will be prohibited from parking on Hearne Street.
- There will be a small percentage of VENM deposited at the facility. Soils of this type are more suitable to be processed at larger open-air facilities.
- The processing building itself will attenuate any noise impacts. The facility will not be generating a new intensive noise to the area as this is an existing industrial zone.

Compliance

- The Department's proposed conditions of consent will require quarterly and annual noise monitoring when facility is in full operation.
- As soon as a complaint is received, the Department's compliance team will promptly respond to it.
- The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) undertakes a similar compliance role to the Department when monitoring their licencing requirements.
- The Department has been looking to standardise waste conditions and make them stronger and more enforceable.
- The Department has a strong relationship with the EPA and has consulted with them on the proposed conditions of consent.
- The Department undertakes audit campaigns for various industries, including resource recycling.

Meeting closed at 3.15pm

**Minutes of Planning Assessment Commission meeting
with Georges River Council**

This meeting is part of the determination process.

Date: 12 December 2017

Time: 9.00am

Project: Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421)

Meeting place: Georges River Council Offices, 24 MacMahon Street, Hurstville

Attendees:

Commission Members: David Johnson, Carol Austin, Soo-Tee Cheong.

Commission Secretariat: Matthew Todd-Jones (Senior Planning Officer), David Koppers (Team Leader).

Council: Tina Christy (Manager – Development Assessment), Peter Nelson (Development Assessment Officer).

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Council's views on the proposal.

The following matters were discussed:

- Council's previous concern with the proposal was the noise impacts on residential receivers, the processing capacity of 300,000tpa and its late-night operation.
- The applicant's proposed reduction in time and processing capacity has removed these concerns.
- Council queried whether all vehicles could be accommodated on site at all times. There is the potential of trucks backing up onto Hearne Street and this needs to be carefully managed.
- Council highlighted the importance of the area near the receival area being free of obstruction to ensure the effective operation of the facility.
- Council highlighted that there is limited on-street parking on Hearne Street.
- Council stated that surveillance of any non-compliant parking would be strong as other businesses and people in the area will notice if trucks and vehicles associated with the facility are parked on Hearne Street.
- There would be safety risks if conditions relating to truck movements and parking aren't adhered to.
- Although all processing of waste would be undertaken in the shed, not all operations would be covered. A greater roof cover of the load out area should be required. Council recommended a condition to cover all operations.

Meeting closed at 9.30am

Minutes of briefing from Applicant

This briefing is part of the determination process.	
Date: 12 December 2017	Time: 10.30am
Project: Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421)	
Meeting place: 20 Hearne Street, Mortdale	
Attendees: Commission Members: David Johnson, Carol Austin, Soo-Tee Cheong. Commission Secretariat: Matthew Todd-Jones (Senior Planning Officer), David Koppers (Team Leader). Applicant: Mark Tartak (Managing Director – Skylife), Daniel Tartak (CEO – Bingo Industries), Ros Dent (Environmental Manager – Bingo Industries), Brad Searle (Business Leader, Environment – Arcadis), Richard Collins (Principal Environmental Consultant – Arcadis), Matthew Abrahamian (Planning Director – Skylife), Shivesh Singh (Planning Manager – Skylife).	
The purpose of the meeting was for the applicant to brief the Commission on the project	
The applicant provided the Commission with a presentation, which can be viewed on the Commission’s website. In addition, the following matters were discussed: <u>Project Background</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The applicant has 14 operational sites across New South Wales.• The applicant stated that they do have facilities that operate 24 hours.• No food waste will be accepted at the site which means there will be no odour issues.• The applicant still believes the facility can accommodate a processing capacity of 300,000tpa. They state that all of their background studies suggest this.• The applicant has written to the Department for amendments to conditions of consent.• The applicant has confidence in the capability of the site’s proposed infrastructure and has significant contingency measures for unexpected shutdowns of the facility.• The applicant believes that there are enough mitigation measures to safeguard the community from any impacts of the development. <u>Strategic Justification</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project would contribute to an objective of <i>A Plan for Growing Sydney 2014</i>, which requires the recycling of an additional 380,000 tpa of Commercial and Industrial waste.• The South East of Sydney doesn’t have much waste infrastructure. <u>Traffic and transport</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There will be 13 to 15 staff on site at any one time. The applicant anticipates that only 11 to 12 cars will be needed for all staff as there is likely to be carpooling and staff would use public transport. The applicant will prepare an Employee Transport Plan.	

- There will be 12 staff car parking spaces and this requirement will form part of the Operational Environmental Management Plan.
- The construction phase would only generate 14 to 46 vehicle movements per day.
- Stating that trucks will spend 25 minutes on site is a conservative estimate. Other sites within their network average 15 minutes.
- The queuing of heavy vehicles would be entirely accommodated and managed within the site and would present no issue with queuing onto Hearne Street.
- There will be three traffic controllers on site.
- The applicant is satisfied with the requirements of conditions B1, B2 and B5 in relation to construction and operational traffic management.

Noise

- There will be mitigation of construction noise impacts under condition B27.
- The development would comply with criteria under the Industrial Noise Policy.

Air quality

- The processing operations would be fully enclosed and air quality controls such as misting and sprinklers will be installed for dust suppression.
- There would be no dust would be generated by the storage bays.

Community engagement

- The applicant has been proactive with community engagement.
- They believe that issues raised from community were mainly because of how the previous owner of the site operated.
- There is a perception amongst the community that 10 times the increase in tonnage will mean 10 times the increase in traffic through the area.

Amendments to conditions

- The applicant feels that condition A8 and the associated Table 1 is overly prescriptive. The applicant has been required to adhere to tonnage limits for all of their other sites, as per guidance from the Environment Protection Authority.
- The applicant feels that condition A29 is too prescriptive and would require modifications to the consent to change the types of machinery. This would limit operational flexibility.
- The applicant discussed this with the Department who stated that studies had been assessed against the machinery originally outlined and the condition should be kept.

Meeting was closed at 11.50am

APPENDIX 2
LIST OF SPEAKERS AT THE MORTDALE RESOURCE RECOVERY FACILITY
PUBLIC MEETING

Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421), Hearne Street, Mortdale

Date & Time: 2:00pm, Tuesday 12 December 2017

Place: Mortdale Community Centre, 2B Boundary Road, Mortdale NSW 2223

Meeting Schedule	
2 pm	Opening Statement from the Chair – Mr David Johnson
Registered Speakers:	1. Kim Johnston
	2. Sonia Elphick
	3. Mark Coure MP Member for Oatley
	4. Matthew James
	5. Margot Butler
	6. Jayne Sutton
	7. Warren Tegg
END	

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETING

Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421) – Public Meeting	
Meeting notes taken by Matthew Todd-Jones	Date: Tuesday 12 December 2017
Project: Mortdale Resource Recovery Facility (SSD 7421)	
Meeting place: Mortdale Community Centre, 2b Boundary Road, Mortdale	
<p>Attendees:</p> <p>Commission Members: David Johnson, Carol Austin, Soo-Tee Cheong.</p> <p>Commission Secretariat: Matthew Todd-Jones (Senior Planning Officer), David Koppers (Team Leader).</p>	
The purpose of the meeting is for the Commission to hear the public’s views on the Department’s Assessment Report.	
<p>The following matters were raised:</p> <p><u>Strategic Context</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other businesses in this industrial area are required to operate under local controls set by the Council’s Development Control Plan. This restricts businesses to operating between 7am and 7pm. • The development wouldn’t conform with local light industrial zone controls. • The development should be determined by locally elected members of the community or be referred to the Minister as it would have a long-term impact on the area. • The Department has set out a range of unenforceable conditions of consent. • The development would not contribute significantly to the job growth target for the region. <p><u>Traffic generation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the site and the intersection with Hearne Street will be too narrow for trucks. • The applicant’s figure of 336 vehicle movements per day is an underestimation. There will be a truck travelling down Hearne Street every 2 minutes. • The size and processing capacity of the site would only exacerbate existing traffic problems on local streets and major roads in the area. • If there is a backup of trucks this would cause queuing onto Hearne Street. • Staff parking on local streets will add to the parking and traffic impacts in this area. • There is an over reliance on truck management in the Department’s conditions. It is likely that people accessing and exiting the site would be unfamiliar with the management procedures. • It is not clear whether the proposed traffic controller for the site’s entry and exit will always be there to ensure the truck management procedures are followed. • It is not clear who would be responsible for monitoring the restriction of trucks using Barry Avenue to access the site. <p><u>Site and operational management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should have a light industrial use as per its zoning under the Hurstville LEP. This proposal is contrary to the objectives of the zone. • This is not the best location for this type of facility in Sydney. It should be located in an area of heavy industry. • The proposed processing capacity is too large for the site. • Waste transported to the site would not be from the area and it is not clear where processed waste would be transferred to. 	

- There is already potential for the processing capacity to increase as the applicant may seek to modify any consent.

Noise

- The development would create noise impacts on residences of Barry Avenue.
- Even though operations are not proposed to start until 6am there would be staff and trucks turning up to the site before then. This would cause sleep disturbance to the people living nearest the site.
- Noise monitoring was only undertaken at midday and not during the night time period.
- Large trucks would be operating during the evening period after 7pm when other businesses on Hearne Street have closed, creating noise impacts for nearby residences.
- There should have been an independent assessment of the applicant's noise assessment.

Air Quality

- The area currently experiences issues from dust generated by industry.
- The development would generate dust along Hearne Street from trucks travelling to and from the site.

Meeting Closed at 2.35pm