

ATTACHMENT A

Review of additional information received July 2015 – Kings Park Waste Metal Recycling Facility, Kings Park

Council section	Response to applicant's additional information
Environmental Health	<p>Site Contamination</p> <p>The Source-Pathway-Receiver linkages within the Conceptual Site Model are noted. Therefore, the <u>revised proposed conditions of consent</u> highlight the potential SPR linkage that may occur during excavation works where soil testing will dictate how to control and manage unexpected contamination.</p> <p>2.4 Site Contamination (revised)</p> <p><i>2.4.1 A Stage 2 Detailed Site Investigation must be prepared by a suitably qualified contaminated land consultant BEFORE any excavation works are conducted. The detailed site investigation shall provide information about the extent of contamination and the risks of the contaminants to health and the environment The report shall be submitted to principal certifying authority and a copy to Council for its records for review and concurrence. The investigation shall be in accordance with:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Environment Protection Authority (EPA) 'Contaminated Sites - Guidelines for Consultants Reporting on Contaminated Sites'; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) Managing Land Contamination Planning Guidelines SEPP55 - Remediation of Land</i></p> <p><i>(c) National Environment Protection Council "National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure" (2013)</i></p>
Drainage Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A <i>Supplementary Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> dated 30 June 2015 by Renzo Tonin and Associates has been provided that continues to include a sound wall along the eastern boundary contrary to Council conditions 2.19.2.▪ A <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> dated June 2015 prepared by ERM has been supplied in support of the application. This Plan contains a numerous errors.▪ Under section 4.2.1 of the <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> rainwater tanks must be used to supply toilets for all new facilities. When modelling in MUSIC allow for only 80% of the actual rainwater tank as usable storage as per Council conditions 2.19.4.▪ Under section 4.3.3 of the <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> the way the site stormwater is managed needs to be significantly revised. The setting of a certain retention volume and thereafter an uncontrolled weir overflow needs to be amended. The maximum retention storage volume once set is to have above that a detention volume that will allow control of the discharge to Breakfast Creek in accordance with Council conditions 2.15 and 2.18.2. Detailed volumes, flow rates, plans and operation need to be provided.▪ Council condition 2.19.2 <i>The proposed sound wall along the eastern boundary is unacceptable as it will restrict the overland flow and cause an adverse impact to the upstream properties. Any fencing to the eastern and southern boundaries of the site is to have horizontal louvers or palisade style fencing to a minimum of 0.5 m above the 1 in 100 year ARI flood level. Solid panelling is permitted above. Revised details are to be provided.</i>

Council section	Response to applicant's additional information
	<p>Comment: The <i>Supplementary Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> section 8.1 second dot point states “An acoustic fence 4 m in height shall be constructed in place of the proposed colourbond and electric fence along the new eastern boundary.” This contradicts condition 2.19.2. If the sound wall is implemented as proposed, it will severely restrict flood flows potentially raising flood levels on the adjacent upstream properties. This rise may be very significant. There is no supporting information within the <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> to justify this position. A flood study would be required to support the use of the sound walls, however it is likely that the sound walls would lead to an increase in flood levels in excess of 0.01 m which is considered unacceptable. Details of Council's requirements for a flood study can be supplied on request. Either the sound wall along the eastern boundary is to be deleted or a flood study submitted showing a maximum increase in flood level of 0.01 m or less.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council condition 2.19.3 Part of this condition refers to the originally proposed treatment devices as a Humeceptor and a bioretention basin. However section 5.2.3 of the <i>Stormwater Management Plan</i> refers to a new arrangement without discussing with Council including an Ecoceptor under primary Treatment. This device is NOT approved for use in Blacktown and the proposed removal rates are unrealistic. Under secondary treatment the Stormceptor is approved for use in Blacktown, but at significantly lower removal rates i.e. 55% TSS, 15% TP and 0% TN. Under section 5.2.6 Tertiary Treatment the SPEL Hydrosystem-1500 is NOT approved for use within Blacktown Council. Consequently under the treatment train proposed the single approved device WILL NOT achieve the minimum pollutant removal for this site and the applicant should return to the original treatment devices supported by a MUSIC model to Council requirements. Where a Stormceptor is used to capture hydrocarbons the treatable flow rate needs to be increased to a minimum of the 6 month flow. Where alternative pollutant removal systems that are approved by Blacktown Council are proposed using approved Council MUSIC nodes the treatment train would need to be assessed and amended conditions will need to be provided.