

Our ref: Americold Prospect Expansion (SSD-9577613)

Mr Anthony Lenehan
Project Manager
AMERICOLD AUSTRALIA PTY LTD
554-562 RESERVOIR ROAD
PROSPECT 2148

21 December 2022

Subject: Additional Matters for Submissions Report - Americold Prospect Expansion (SSD-9577613)

Dear Mr Lenehan

I refer to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the State Significant Development application for the above proposal. After careful consideration, the Department of Planning and Environment (the Department) is requesting that you provide additional information.

You are requested to submit additional information that effectively addresses the issues identified by the Department in Attachment 1. The Department requires that you provide a response to the issues in Attachment 1 of this letter as part of the submissions report requested in previous correspondence dated 9 December 2022. Cumberland Council's response has been received by the Department since the previous correspondence and is also attached.

At the time of writing, the Department has not yet received responses from Transport for NSW, Heritage NSW and the Department's Biodiversity and Conservation Division. Advice received from the aforementioned will be provided upon receipt.

If you have any questions, please contact Dave Auster, on 02 9274 6122 or via email at dave.auster@dpie.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Ritchie".

Chris Ritchie
Director
Industry Assessments

Attachment 1 – The Department’s Comments

Noise

1. The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA) notes a number of noise exceedances are expected, and provides recommendations to ensure noise impacts are minimised. The report states that the exceedances are in large part caused by truck engine compression braking and air braking. The recommendations state that truck engine braking should not be permitted within the facility, and that all trucks should be encouraged to be fitted with an exhaust silencer. Given that this element causes the most noise impacts, the Department requires further information regarding how these measures will be enforced and encouraged. If this recommendation cannot be adequately controlled, other physical noise mitigation may be required.
2. The NVIA classifies the residential properties surrounding the site as Urban. Further justification is required for this classification given the zoning of the surrounding sites, noting that the land to the north (including 566 Reservoir Road) is zoned RU4, and the land to the west (including residential properties along Reservoir Road) is zoned as Western Sydney Parklands. Justification should have reference to the Noise Policy for Industry (NPI). Where a change in receiver category would affect a group or catchment of residential receivers, the justification should extend to a demonstration that the matters influencing the change would apply across the whole catchment.
3. The NVIA provides limited information on how the evaluation methodology to quantify existing ambient and background noise levels has been applied. Further information is required in this regard, with reference to Fact Sheet A of the NPI.
4. The Department notes that the NVIA only appears to describe the proposal with up to 18 trucks concurrently using the site as a worst-case. The NVIA should describe and assess the worst-case scenario, when all loading docks are in use, or clarify why this level of intensity of use has not been assessed.
5. With regard to part 7.5 *Operational sleep disturbance impacts* of the NVIA further information is required to demonstrate why +8 dB(A) has been derived as being reasonable. The source of noise levels for L_{Amax} should also be identified for Tables 25 and 26.
6. The Department requires that the NVIA identify how effective each noise mitigation recommendation will be (grouped by source and transmission path).
7. The NVIA should also be updated to ensure that any updates to the traffic information required by TfNSW (if required) are reflected.

Biodiversity

8. The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) identifies that the north-eastern corner of the site falls within the Coastal Wetland Proximity Area, with Coastal Wetland Area (as identified by State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021 (Resilience and Hazards SEPP)) located off site to the northeast. The Preliminary Site Investigation Report identifies that the eastern part of the site (particularly in the location of

the warehouse addition and works to the north-eastern parking and road areas including significant cut and fill) is high in salinity, and that potentially contaminated historic fill may exist in this area. Further, the site drains towards the north-eastern corner of the site and the Coastal Wetland Area.

9. The BDAR makes no mention of the high salinity levels or potentially contaminated fill on site, and any associated potential impacts of the development on the Coastal Wetland Area. The Department requires the BDAR to assess risks and impacts of this aspect of the site and development in greater detail and provide recommendations as necessary to ensure protection of the Coastal Wetland Area. The BDAR must also provide assessment against the relevant clauses of Chapter 2 of the Resilience and Hazards SEPP.

Flood Study

10. The flood study provided does not appear to specifically reference if the proposed cut and fill in the eastern part of the site adjacent to the creek line along the eastern boundary has been considered. Please clarify that this information was included in the assessment of flood impacts.

ESD & Energy Efficiency Report

11. The ESD & Energy Efficiency Report provided is a draft. Please provide the finalised version of the report.