

6 November 2023

Department of Planning and Environment
Director - State Significant Acceleration
Attention: Judith Elijah (Judith.elijah@dpie.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Judith

**SSD-52604208 – BTR – 85-97 WATERLOO ROAD & 2 BANFIELD ROAD,
MACQUARIE PARK**

Think Planners are appointed by AstraZeneca Pty Limited to provide the following submission on the SSD proposal by Goodman Property Services (AUST) Pty Limited for a BTR development at 85-97 Waterloo Road & 2 Banfield Road, Macquarie Park. AstraZeneca operates a manufacturing facility at 47 Talavera Road, Macquarie Park.

At the outset it is noted that AstraZeneca objects to the proposal in relation to the adequacy of the analysis and supporting documents.


Separately AstraZeneca is concerned with the shift in fundamental use of the site to a residential purpose. The introduction of residential apartments in the vicinity of an established industrial activity that operates 24 hours a day has historically led to amenity concerns arising, and is not a harmonious outcome in the precinct. AstraZeneca is cognisant of the prevailing planning provisions that permit the introduction of a residential use adjacent and near to industrial activity, however, press that is therefore imperative any assessment or approved development does not prejudice such activities, but rather the onus for protection of amenity and minimising of disruption is entirely upon the proposal. We urge the Department to ensure that any approval arising for the proposal, is robustly assessed and that the existing lawfully operating uses in the precinct are comprehensively protected through the application of built form measures, conditions of consent, notations on title, etc.

AstraZeneca Operations

AstraZeneca has been manufacturing at 47 Talavera Road since 1969.

AstraZeneca manufactures at the site medicines for Australia and for export overseas and employs approximately 350 permanent workers at the site.

The site operates 24/7 with materials delivered and trucks moving products to a warehouse, noting that the site does not do any warehousing on site, but consistent movement of finished products to warehouses occur from the site. There are personnel moving to and from the site at all times, with peak movement during shift changes.



Our clients have had the experience of historically being surrounded by only commercial and retail buildings. However, recently a residential tower has been built nearby (Tower B, 101 Waterloo Road). The recent development of this residential tower has resulted in some complaints about truck noise and other industrial noises, as well as the release of gases into the air (which we are instructed is steam). The most recent complaint was made on 9 May 2022. AstraZeneca is alert to applications that could result in any prejudice to their established activities, arising from poorly located or poorly designed developments, or poorly informed future occupants who are not cognisant nor accepting of the established business, industrial, manufacturing and other practices present throughout Macquarie Park that results in an environment different to a purely residentially zoned area.

Cumulative Impacts

Relevantly, the EIS appears to limit its assessment of cumulative impacts to surrounding future development. However, the Cumulative Impact Assessment Guidelines for State Significant Projects is clear that such an assessment should include establishing baseline conditions and then assess existing environmental conditions (including social and economic) by taking into account the ongoing impacts associated with currently operating projects. Relevantly the Guidelines state that

Project-level CIA can inform decision-making on the merits of the project and assist in setting conditions of approval if the project is approved.

The submitted EIS states that “An assessment of the cumulative impacts associated with future proposals are considered under the relevant subheadings under Section 7.0”. This section comprises the Assessment of Impacts and deals with matters such as visual impact, residential amenity, social impact, etc. Our review of Section 7.0 concludes that it does not include a cumulative impact analysis, as required by the Guidelines, of ongoing impacts associated with currently operating projects. This is the primary concern of AstraZeneca who have an established manufacturing facility in the precinct, that is critical to its business operations.

A pertinent example is Traffic Generation. The submitted Traffic Report confirms that the proposal will increase traffic generation on the site from that which currently occurs and that when modelling the capacity of the road system, by as soon as 2026 a number of local intersections will be impacted including from a Level of Service of LOS C to LOS F within 3 years and another from LOS D to LOS F within 3 years.

This is clearly a cumulative impact, that the proposal contributes to, that has a negative impact on traffic, that is not sufficiently analysed with respect to currently operating businesses within the precinct.

The Traffic Report fails to adequately identify, discuss or recommend measures to deal with 24/7 operations of businesses in the precinct, and their impacts upon the proposed BTR proposal.

We submit that the Traffic Report conclusions that the proposal will not result in any adverse impacts on the surrounding road network is false. The report articulates that the proposal will result in increased traffic generation from that which exists on the site today and that in only 3 years time the cumulative impact on the local road network of development in the precinct will lead to intersections performing at significantly reduced levels of service. Neither the EIS nor the Traffic Report recommend measures to address this. This is of significant concern to AstraZeneca who have been operating for 54 years in the precinct and who rely upon 24/7 access to the site by its 350 employees and trucks that serve the manufacturing facility.

Noise Impacts

We have reviewed the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment to review what assessment has been undertaken of 24/7 traffic movements in the precinct and what measures are proposed by the development to protect residential amenity from this existing scenario.

We note that the external noise intrusion assessment makes an assumption that the 7-Eleven fuel delivery and transfer activities will be conducted during daytime only in the future. We recommend that the Department carefully review whether such assumptions can be made and whether this could lead to a future conflict.

This is particularly relevant to our client's concern. The external noise intrusion assessment does not articulate if consideration has been given to truck movements in the precinct that occur 24/7 from existing lawfully operating developments. We are unable to determine whether the recommendations in the report relating to minimum glazing and frame performance have factored in 24/7 noise emissions from local traffic.

In explaining the "Project Amenity Noise Levels" the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment states:

The amenity assessment is based on noise criteria specific to land use and associated activities. The criteria relate only to industrial-type noise and do not include transportation noise (when on public transport corridors), noise from motor sport, construction noise, community noise, blasting, shooting ranges, occupational workplace noise, wind farms, amplified music/patron noise.

Having regard to the location of the site in the vicinity of a transport corridor and noting the variety of uses and consequential vehicle movements in the precinct 24/7 it is imperative that the noise assessment take into consideration such. Including



recommendations to the building to protect new residents from established noise emissions.

Construction Management

We are cognisant that a final Construction Management Plan can only be prepared once a builder is appointed to a future approved development and that this will be endorsed prior to issuing of a Construction Certificate. However, it is imperative that a condition of consent clearly articulate the minimum requirements for the future construction management plan in maintaining 24/7 road access for other businesses within the precinct.

AstraZeneca supports the preliminary CMP that shows all construction vehicles accessing the site via Waterloo Road and Lane Cover Road and no access proposed via Talavera Road or Khatoum Road.

Conclusion

Before any approval could be granted to the proposal it is appropriate that a full assessment of the proposal include consideration of the existing and ongoing operation of approved businesses and activities proximate to the site. This should include ensuring that the proposal incorporates appropriate measures relevant to the future built form and occupant behaviour that ameliorate any impact upon AstraZeneca and other lawfully operating existing businesses in the area.

Objection is registered to the lack of detail in the submission in relation to analysing, and providing adequate response to, the established and ongoing businesses in the precinct. In particular AstraZeneca is concerned that the proposal has not considered the cumulative impacts of existing operations in the precinct; considered impacts arising from 24/7 traffic (vehicle and truck movements) that exist and will remain within the precinct; or the adequacy of recommended noise attenuation measures to proposed residents arising from existing and ongoing operations in the precinct.

We would appreciate being advised of the future RTS submission and the opportunity to make further comment on the adequacy of that submission in relation to the matters raised herein.

Regards

Adam Byrnes

Director

THINK PLANNERS PTY LTD

PO BOX W287

PARRAMATTA NSW 2150