14 December 2020

Emma Barnet
Senior Environmental Assessment Officer
Industry Assessments,
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.
GPO Box 39,
SYDNEY. NSW. 2001

Dear Emma

Re: SSD-5339 - Proposed Minto Resource Recycling Facility
No. 7 MONTORE ROAD, MINTO

I refer to the Department's correspondence regarding the proposal to operate a resource recovery facility which will have the capacity to process 450,000 tonnes per annum of concrete, brick, asphalt, sandstone and sand from the building and construction industry. The facility also proposes a range of crushing, screening, sand washing equipment used to process this material, including a pug mill.

Council wishes to make the following comments in response to the proposed Resource Recovery Facility.

Traffic and Site Access

As it is proposed to import and process 1,600 tonnes (342 truckloads) of recyclable material on site each day, queuing is likely to become a far more significant issue with the increased risk of obstructing neighbouring driveways and other premises on Montore Road by the 19 metres long articulate vehicles used to transport these loads

If approved, it is recommended that a condition be imposed to prohibit queuing on Montore Road including a requirement to identify the alternative location(s) for the excessive number of operational vehicles (31) that are unable to be accommodated overnight at the proposed facility.

Further, the submitted "Plans of the Proposed Development" in Appendix 4 indicate that there is provision to stack these trucks within the cul-de-sac and site entry prior to passing over both weighbridges, however, this approach has the potential to fail due to the likelihood of a large number of these 19 metre long delivery vehicles encroaching onto the adjoining road reserve. The distance from the site's entry point to both weighbridges is approximately 75 and 60 metres. It is, therefore, questionable whether stacking any more than eight (8) rigid vehicles within the proposed driveway configuration will be practical given the large volumes of resource material the proponent is anticipating to importing on site.

In addition to the above, the following dot points are included for your consideration:

- The Design vehicle (AV) used in Traffic report and swept paths is taken as 19.0m long, however as per AS2890.2:2018 table 2.1 AV is a 20.0m long vehicle. Traffic report and all swept paths shall be revised to comply with Australian standard
- The swept path for entry manoeuvre for AV into the left most bay indicate vehicle cannot enter safely without encroaching the AV vehicle bay next to it, which implies if vehicles is already in that 2nd bay from left a second AV cannot enter into the 1st/left most bay
- Ensure that the vehicle crossing profile complies with Council's standard drawing SD-R09 Sheets 1 & 2 available on Council's website under Appendix K of the Council's Engineering Guide for Development
- Vehicle crossing shall be designed to provide safe clearance from streets' light pole as per Australian and Endeavour Energy standards
- Council has completed traffic surveys in 2017 and traffic modelling on some of the intersections included in this proposal. Council's modelling identified levels of service significantly lower than those identified in this proposal for the existing conditions. The modelling needs to be addressed by the applicant to better represent the site conditions
- Incoming and outgoing truck numbers provided suggest 31 trucks will remain on site overnight. It does not appear there is sufficient room on site to accommodate this. This requires further clarifications. It is not considered acceptable to have a significant number of vehicles parking on the surrounding public streets.
- The timeframes provided in the report as justification for no queuing of the trucks only account for loading and unloading times, not vehicle movements through the site. While more than one truck may be able to be loaded or unloaded at a time, only one vehicle can manoeuvre the site at a time and this does not appear to have been considered and therefore requires further information.
- Vehicle routes have been assessed against RMS Restricted Access Vehicle Maps and Lists and are acceptable

Operational matters

Section 3 of the EIS includes a list of all the waste streams proposed to be accepted at the facility including concrete, brick, asphalt, sandstone and residue sand material from the building and construction industry.

It is also stated that a large majority of all imported materials will be delivered as pre-sorted loads, however, given the unloading area proposed, all deposited waste will need to be cleared from the discharge area prior to the next vehicle's delivery in order to prevent cross-contamination of these waste streams. This may result in delays to unloading and reduced inbound vehicle movements per hour.

It is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the proponent to explain how it is proposed to maintain the integrity of each pre-separated load in order to avoid any cross-contamination of all imposed waste streams which have been approved to be processed at the subject facility.

The EIS also states that: -

"Incoming trucks would stop at a receival point where the load would be inspected to ensure loads comply with the materials which the facility is licenced to receive pursuant to the Environment Protection Licence."

Given the proposed high inbound traffic flow, there are major concerns about whether it is considered practical that these employees will be in a position to constantly vacate their assigned work post to comprehensively inspect every load imported on site. Further, any employees tasked with this responsibility would also need to climb to a height of 3-4 metres to inspect each load and, even then, only the top layer of material would be visible.

Appropriate conditions should be imposed which require the proponent to clarify how assigned staff will be able to safely undertake these tasks in order to ensure compliance with this important screening requirement.

Air, Odour and Noise Impacts

The SEARs issued for the proposed facility includes a requirement for "an assessment of the potential impacts of the proposal (including cumulative impacts) and develop appropriate measures to avoid, mitigate, manage and/or offset these impacts" (Pg.1) and, in respect to air quality and odour (pg.2), also provide: -

> " - a quantitative assessment of the potential air quality and odour impacts for the development on surrounding landowners and sensitive receptors;
>
> - (details of the) construction and operational impacts, including dust generation from the transport of materials; and
>
> - details of the proposed management and monitoring measures."

If approved, it is recommended that appropriately designed misting and odour suppression systems are installed around all areas of the site where waste is to be stored and/or relocated in addition to ensuring that they always remain operational for these purposes. It would also be in the operator's best interests to maintain these suppressions systems for their own occupational, health and safety requirements.

Further, the submitted 'Traffic Impact Assessment' at Appendix 8 fails to indicate whether the proposed vehicle loading/unloading areas will be open or uncovered. Any unloading in an open area is likely to result in the generation of high volumes of airborne particulate matter as vehicles during these operations. The simple practice of an employee applying a hose to suppress dust during these processes is considered to be ineffective and not likely to adequately mitigate this risk.

As a result, it is also recommended that a condition be imposed requiring all unloading and loading operations proposed on site be conducted from within inside an enclosed or covered area, fitted with an adequate misting system.

To reduce any impact on any residential properties located to the west of the site, appropriate conditions should also be imposed requiring that post-approval noise level monitoring be conducted to ensure on going compliance with the approved of hours of operation in addition to the associated truck movements and crushing of materials on site.

State Environmental Planning Policy No.33 (SEPP 33) – Hazardous and Offensive Development - Overview

For development proposals classified as 'potentially hazardous industry', SEPP 33 establishes a comprehensive test by way of a Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA) to determine the risk to people, property and the environment at the proposed location and in the presence of controls.

Should such risk exceed the criteria of acceptability, the development is classified as 'hazardous industry'.

The EIS provides a list of hazardous substances proposed to be stored on-site, however, there is little mention of any adequate risk screening assessment or preliminary hazard analysis to determine whether the level of risk associated with the proposed facility will be acceptable.

As no adequate PHA has been provided, it is difficult to determine how the proponent will undertake an effective screening process to ensure that every truck laden with waste is completely free of potentially contaminating material. It, therefore, appears that the proponent has failed to provide or adequately outline a suitable recovery regime which ensures that every load carried to the proposed facility will be 100% free of any waste considered inappropriate in terms of having the potential to adversely impact the existing environment in this locality.

Further, as the applicant has failed to provide or outline a suitable recovery regime which ensures that every truck hauled to the proposed facility will also be screened free of any toxic waste, there is potential risk of contaminated groundwater having an adverse impact on the water quality and sensitive environs around the Bow Bowing watercourse.

Without suitable waste screening procedures, there is serious concern that any escaping leachate has the potential to contaminate the water quality and riparian areas around Bow Bowing Creek. It is envisaged that any compromise on water quality from this type of "industrial runoff" may have a hazardous effect on conserving the biodiversity and maintaining ecological processes within this catchment.

Until appropriate screening procedures have been determined, which satisfactorily address how all prohibited materials will be adequately removed from these loads, there remains serious doubt whether this facility will have the capacity to comply given the generic and fundamental nature of this requirement.

Stormwater and flooding

1. The subject property is a Flood Control Lot with respect to 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood due to overland flow from the local catchment traversing the property and due to flooding of Bunbury Curran Creek adjacent to the property.
   A Flood Control Lot is defined in the State Environment Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 - REG 1.5 as "a lot to which flood related development controls apply in respect of development for the purposes of industrial buildings, commercial premises, dwelling houses, dual occupancies, multi dwelling housing or residential flat buildings (other than development for the purposes of group homes or seniors housing).

2. The Site Earthworks Plan, completed by Martens & Associates Consulting Engineers, dated 26/06/2020 does not include chainages on the plan sections. This makes interpreting the information presented in the cross and long sections difficult. The changes should be labelled to facilitate more detailed review.

3. The proposed fill levels address flooding from BBBC.

4. Following review of Preliminary Flood Assessment: Minto Resource Recovery Facility 7 Montore Road, Minto, NSW by Martens Consulting Engineers dated March 2020 the following comments are provided:

a) Council would normally review modelling as well as the report. As no modelling has been provided, comments can only be provided based on the information contained in the report.

b) Council does not accept any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties in 1% AEP event, this proposal shows adverse impacts:

- The proposal shows fill in the overland flow path at the south of the property, which is adversely impacting 25 & 27 Pembury Rd.

- Council's flood modelling identifies an area of the subject property adjoining the walkway at the north of the property which is flooded in the 1% AEP and is proposed to be filled. It must be demonstrated no adverse impacts are occurring on 9 Montore Road and Montore Road as a result of this reduction in flood storage.

5. There are issues with the proposed pipe upgrade identified in Attachment D. Proposed Pipe Upgrade:

   a) This upgrade must be discussed with Council, as it may not be supported.
   b) Council has no plans to undertake the proposed stormwater connection. This proposal should not be shown on a plan with Council's logo when this detail was added after the fact by others. The report does not confirm who would be responsible for this upgrade and provides no details, other than the plan in the abovementioned attachment.
   c) The existing easement does not meet Council's easement width requirement for a 1200mm diameter pipe, as detailed in Campbelltown City Council Engineering Design for Development, Section 4.17 Drainage Easement. The easement width must be increased by 0.5m to accommodate this pipe, it does not appear 25 & 27 Pembury Rd can accommodate this.
   d) The proposed upgrade is a significant increase in pipe capacity, but there are no details demonstrating the provision of additional inlet capacity to charge the stormwater pipes. There is no demonstrated need for this pipe upgrade.

6. There are issues with stormwater connections. The two new stormwater connections to the channel are not supported by Council. High velocities occur in the channel, exceeding 3m/s in the proposed discharge locations. Works in the channel have the potential to alter flow behaviour and impact adversely on the channel. The site drainage must be connected to the stormwater pipe in the easement on 25&27 Pembury Rd and the stormwater pipe in the walkway between the subject property and 9 Montore Rd, prior to the pipes entering the channel to minimise the number of connections and reduce impacts on the channel.

7. There are issues with the flood modelling:
   a) Council does not agree with the methodology of blocking pipes except for the pit and pipe network in the easement to the south of the property and the road to the north. For the road to the north, does this mean the upstream sections of the pipe network were assigned 100% blockage until reaching the subject property. If so, this is not a conservative approach as mentioned in the report as it will add additional capacity to the drainage lines at the property where 25%

blockage has been applied. This needs further explanation and investigation using a standard blockage rates across the stormwater network. Council normally models these systems with 20% blockage applied to grade pits, 50% blockage applied to sag pits and 50% blockage applied to culverts with a diagonal dimension or diameter less than 3m.

b) As per point 5, the pipe upgrade in the drainage easement may not be implemented. The applicant should model the proposed development, with the existing pipe network in the easement and demonstrate the impacts as it is likely this will exacerbate the increase in flooding in 25&27 Pembury Rd.
c) An upgrade of the pipe in the easement to the south of the site may be required to allow additional capacity for the site drainage to be added.

Water Quality

The following general comments are provided:

1. The subject site sits on the interface with Bow Bowing Bunbury Curran Creek and needs to ensure the water quality is being protected.
2. The following needs to be addressed:
    a) Not all of the runoff is directed towards the sedimentation basins. Considering the use of the site, this is not acceptable and will lead to a high level or sediment being discharged
    b) The emergency overflow weirs have no treatment preventing sediment and other contaminants being washed from the site.
    c) Considering the nature of the site, all flows to be treated prior to discharge.
    d) The following water quality targets must be met:
        - Total Suspended Solids – 85% Reduction
        - Total Nitrogen – 45% Reduction
        - Total Phosphorus – 455 Reduction
    e) Appropriate pollutant generation rates for the development must be used to ensure appropriate pollutants are present in the modelling and the treatment devices are working accordingly.
    f) Only sedimentation basins are proposed, these are not sufficient to treat TN and TP.

Conclusion

By comparison to other similar operations, when measured as a function of site area to incoming tonnes per annum, it is questionable whether the proposed facility is capable of processing 450,000 tonnes of recyclable material per annum due to the operational issues associated with the intended incoming load rates.

There are also significant issues regarding migration of contaminated air, odour and detrimental noise sources emanating from the site which have not been satisfactorily considered in this application.

The proposed Resource Recycling Facility appears to extend beyond the site's capabilities and design parameters due to the highlighted traffic management and environmental concerns which have the potential to significantly impact on neighbouring and/or nearby premises in addition to the water quality and sensitive environs around Bow Bowing Creek.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the subject State Significant Development proposal and sincerely apologise for the delay in sending this response.

If you require any further information please contact Council's Senior Strategic Planner, Mr Stephen McDiarmid, on (02) 4645 4396.

Yours sincerely

Rana Haddad
Coordinator Central Business District

Campbelltown City Council
91 Queen Street, Campbelltown
PO Box 57, Campbelltown NSW 2560

campbelltown.nsw.gov.au
T 02 4645 4000
E council@campbelltown.nsw.gov.au

ABN: 31 459 914 087