

POINTS OF OBJECTION

As owners and residents of 82-116 Cowpasture Rd (aka 28 Trivet St), Horsley Park, the 5-acre lot directly opposite the intended site of development, we object to the establishment of the general industrial, light industrial and warehouse and distribution centre land uses in Lots 17-23.

Our reasons for objecting are as follows:

1. References to the site in the EIS are inaccurate

We think that the references in the EIS to the site's description and impact are misleading and ultimately inaccurate.

The Site Analysis beginning on page 11 details the site's proximity to motorways, existing industrial parks and agricultural land earmarked for orchards but nowhere is there mention of our 5-acre property which is directly opposite the proposed site on the east side of Trivet St where myself, my husband and my daughter, and until recently my disabled sister reside. Our family has owned this property since 1938. Our day-to-day lives stand to be dramatically affected by the proposed development and we find it rather misleading that our not-insignificant residential property and its proximity to the proposed site is not even mentioned.

Secondly, the EIS states that potential impacts of the development are acceptable and are able to be managed. We object to this and contend that the impacts of the development are highly unfavourable and unacceptable to us as residents of the property across the road, namely for points 3, 4 and 5 below.

2. The development does not satisfy the criteria it says it meets

On page 2 of the EIS, the selection reasons for the business hub include the following:

- "1. Land uses should generate an appropriate commercial return and add to the amenity of adjacent communities.*
- 2. Land uses must generate additional employment and training opportunities for local and regional communities.*
- 3. Development must be undertaken in a manner that will minimise the environmental impact of such development.*
- 4. The development of business hubs will only be permitted to occur on sites with low environmental and recreational values."*

(Extracted from page 2 of EIS)

All throughout the EIS, there is concern for the project being complementary to the Smithfield-Wetherill Park Industrial Area, however as a neighbouring land owner, we must query whether the proposed development is in any way at all complementary to our own property, considering it is only feet away from the Trivet St side of the site. The answer is, sadly, no.

I am no environmental scientist so I do not wish to object to the site's purported "low environmental value", however I do wish to dispute the project's

satisfaction of criterion number 1, specifically that the development will add to the amenity of adjacent communities. My family and I are undoubtedly an adjacent community, and this development is certainly not adding to our "amenity". In fact, we strongly believe that the development will make our lives more difficult and we anticipate more noise and light pollution, more traffic in our area as well as an unavoidable visual disruption when we look outside our windows every single day. How could this development possibly be characterised as an amenity to my family and I?

3. The development will have a detrimental visual impact

The visual impact is a huge issue as currently, we see a beautiful scenic view south and west from our kitchen, living space and bedroom and after this development project is completed, we fear we will instead look outside the windows each morning and see a concrete jungle.

We raised this issue with the WSPT when Mr Colless visited as part of a mandated consultation process. On page 25 of the EIS, it says that the difference in height levels and landscaping were explained and that a letter and other documentation was supplied. This is true, however we are still at a loss as to the actual extent of the visual impact we will be dealt with if or when this development goes ahead. The images sent to us were from an unmarked perspective as well as an unknown orientation, and as we live on top of a hill, it is very difficult to imagine what the impact will be unless there are more accurate visuals. We, only today, received an email from WSPT with an update about more specific images but we are yet to receive these and the deadline for submissions is only days away.

Further, the EIS requires that where amendments (made in response to concern raised by the consultation process) have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided. I cannot find any such explanation in the EIS as to why our concern about the visual impact (or our concern about noise and light pollution for that matter) has not been addressed by amendments to the EIS.

4. Noise pollution

Unfortunately, we are already encumbered with some noise pollution due to factories across the road from our place on the north part of Cowpasture Road. We do not wish to have even more disturbances, which is what the proposed development will almost certainly entail. This is of particular concern to me because my husband and I are retired and spend most of our days on our property, outside, tending to our garden. The noise pollution that the proposed development would add we believe would impact our quality of life and we think this is wholly unfair.

In fact, a recent Canadian study (published this year in the Lancet, a prestigious medical Journal, and reported on by Eureka Alert News) found that there is a link between living close to heavy traffic and the onset of major neurodegenerative diseases such as dementia. The study found that there is a 4% increase in dementia for those living 50-100 metres from a busy road. By adding to the

traffic and noise on Trivet St, WSPT could be placing my husband and I at a greater risk of developing dementia.

Of particular concern is that the applicant wants the proposed site to be approved for 24-hour operations. On page 25 of the EIS, it is suggested that these proposed hours of operation are consistent with other industrial neighbours. We find this justification hardly satisfying as there are many businesses in the Smithfield-Wetherill Park Industrial Area which operate during regular business hours.

We acknowledge the findings in the DA Acoustic Assessment (Appendix O) which are within the official range, but we also know that the figures that Acoustic Logic have provided are no guarantee of the actual noise we will suffer through if this development takes place. The Acoustic Assessment states that it only factors in noise created by cars entering and exiting the facility; light rigid and semi-trailer trucks entering and exiting the facility to the receiving/dispatch areas; and loading dock operations. The assessment does *not* include the noise from any machinery or mechanical plants inside the warehouses which will clearly add to the noise pollution predicted by the assessment.

Further, the predicted noise levels at night time (on page 16 of Appendix O) are equal to or only a few decibels under the recommended noise criteria. This is of particular concern to me as my husband is an insomniac and already has trouble sleeping due to the current noise at night time. The noise levels indicated in this assessment, and the near-certainty that in reality these noise levels will be higher due to likely operational noise, mean that our quality of life will be seriously impacted if this development proceeds.

5. In the interests of fairness

Although we have already spoken to Mr Colless from the WSPT about this concern, we remain at a loss as to why, when these lots were initially selected as business development hubs, we, as owners of the neighbouring lot were not informed. Until late 2016, we were under the impression that the lots subject to this development project were assigned to urban farming purposes (see page vii of *Western Sydney Parklands' Horsley Park Precinct Urban Farming Masterplan*, published in November 2012, where the site of the proposed development is earmarked for "orchards and groves").

As owners of land that forms part of the Western Sydney Parklands, we believe that WSPT owe a duty to keep us informed about the developmental changes of neighbouring lots particularly when a change in plans so clearly affects us, as well as a duty to ensure changes in the Western Sydney Parklands are in residents' best interests. We believe that acting in residents' best interests means that this communication needs to occur at the time when changes are planned and not when WSPT is almost ready to commence construction, as is the case in this situation, which further proves that our best interests were not even considered. We understand that the proceeds of the proposed development will help maintain and develop other more community-oriented aspects of the Parklands however no number of visits to Lizard Log will be able to repair the visual eyesore we will be waking up to every morning. This is the home I was

raised in as the daughter of proud Italian migrants who have contributed to the ethnic diversity and community of the area and to see the landscape so dramatically changed, without any meaningful consultation, is incredibly disheartening and undemocratic.

Not only do I think the choice of a business hub for this proposed area is personally unfair, but I also believe it is unjust to previous owners of lots 17-23. These owners sold their property on the basis that the land would only ever be open space parkland as agreed by WSPT (when it was under a different name), and not converted into factories. Thus, I believe that the conversion of this land to a business hub would mean that these owners did not receive the true monetary value of their property upon sale and had they known the area may be rezoned to accommodate factories and warehouses, their decision to sell may have been different.

Additionally, there seems to have been no serious attempt to find an alternative development site that does not impact permanent residences such as ours. Although 1.4.1 'Alternative Site Options' (page 4 of the EIS) is named as such, nowhere does it list or mention other alternative sites for the planned development. In fact, it refers to the *Western Sydney Parklands Plan of Management 2020* which itself, on page 62, includes the currently proposed development site as part of 'Precinct 9 – Horsley Park' and describes the desired future character of the precinct as:

"A centre of sustainable urban farming, featuring market gardening, community gardens, farmers markets, agri-tourism, and education programs."

Nowhere does this document mention any thought that this site would be suitable for a business hub, rather the opposite appears to have been envisaged. Why then was there a dramatic shift in objective? Why we were, as neighbouring residents not properly consulted during this change of plan? And why can there not be another change of plan and an alternative site for this proposed development which isn't so deleterious to mine and my family's way of life?

POINTS OF CONCERN

If and only if the Minister does not wish to refuse WSPT's application, rather than jeopardising this opportunity for comment, we seek to instead petition WSPT to consider and action the following points:

1. Aesthetic concerns:

(a) We would like to receive images detailing the view of the proposed development land from a standing point on our property. Our house faces towards Trivet St and our kitchen, living and sleeping space has three large windows which overlook the development site. We would like to be properly informed about the extent to which our view will be hindered due to this project which is why we have requested images of what the proposed site would look like from the top of our driveway, closest to our

home. The applicant has contacted me today via email with an update on this request.

(b) We would also request that big distracting signage (like the “Phoenix” sign facing north on the Stage 1 Horsley Park Development) be absent from this proposed development. It is bad enough that we will have to look at factories every day, but large branded signage on these factories would amplify the negative visual impact of this development.

(c) We request that more evergreen, fast-growing trees are planted along Trivet St to block the view of the factories once building is completed in an effort to minimise the visual impact of the future business hub.

2. Traffic

We are not convinced that there will only be a 20% increase in traffic on Trivet St and that the noise pollution from this traffic will remain within Council-accepted noise levels. The reason we remain unconvinced is because Trivet St already has a 'nothing over 5 ton sign', which is ineffective and not enforced at all. We consistently view and hear loud trucks far heavier than 5 tons travelling on Trivet St in violation of this sign.

To ensure that Trivet St is not overrun by traffic, we request:

- (a) In addition to further signage, the placement of speed barriers along Trivet St at close intervals to deter these huge trucks accessing Trivet St.
- (b) Bollards erected on Trivet St to more physically restrict heavy, noisy vehicles from accessing the road and to ensure that most of the traffic goes down Cowpasture Rd into Victoria St or the Horsley Dr.

This is the only way we can see traffic moderated from Trivet St and to prevent it from being used as a thoroughfare for trucks as it is already used as a thoroughfare for regular vehicles.

3. Noise pollution

As mentioned above, our concern over noise pollution and the impact on our day-to-day lives is a serious one.

- (a) We think that WSPT need to have a clearer idea about the sorts of businesses and operational machinery that will likely be in use on the development site, and then engage in another acoustic assessment with this renewed information.
- (b) The ‘private allotments’, which we understand to be the loading and unloading area for heavy vehicles, are currently planned to be on the east side of the factories (as per the ‘Landscape Plan – Lot 2’ in *Arcadia’s Landscape Development Application*). We request that these private allotments be moved to the west side of the factories or as far away as possible from our property so as to lower the levels of noise

and light pollution we hear from these unloading and loading activities.

- (c) As illustrated above, noise particularly at night time is a major concern for my family and I. We would thus suggest, in keeping with the operational hours of multiple businesses in the Smithfield-Wetherill Park Industrial Area, that the operational hours for businesses which will eventually lease the factories, be restricted to regular Monday to Friday daylight business hours instead of the 24 hour operations suggested in the EIS.

4. Light pollution

Due to the proximity of the proposed development to our property and due to the nature of our own property – our kitchen, living and our bedroom both face south west – we are concerned that there will be excessive light pollution particularly at night. We fear that during construction and during the operation of the factories, we will be kept awake, not only by loud noises but also by bright lights emitting from the development site.

We hope that these concerns are taken into account and responded to by WSPT if the Minister accepts this application.