

## Submission Summary - Public Submissions

### Overview:

- **Kaliwest Pty Ltd** does not object to the proposed works however submits that appropriate conditions should be imposed to ensure that emissions are monitored and do not interfere with the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties.
- **Cardno on behalf of Patrick Autocare** object to the proposed expansion of works at the subject site and are especially concerned about dust, odour and aerosol emissions impacting on air quality at its facility.
- **Private and Confidential Submission** The Objector is dissatisfied with and opposes numerous aspects of the proposed works.

Submission Number	Author Name/Organisation	Summary of Issue
1	Kaliwest Pty Ltd	<b>Emissions</b> Kaliwest Pty Ltd is concerned about air quality and dust deposition levels emanating from the proposed development.
2	Patrick Autocare Pty Ltd (PAC)	<b>Air Quality Assessment (AQA)</b> PAC is concerned about dust, aerosol and olfactory emissions emanating from the proposed development and identify a number of issues regarding the impact of the proposed development on air quality. PAC believes that the EIS and AQA does not adequately describe the air quality impacts on its facility and other properties to the south of the proposed development. Specifically, concern is raised in regards to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust, odour and aerosol emissions from the proposed development increasing in frequency, especially in spring and summer due to seasonal prevailing winds.</li> <li>• Damage to vehicle stock and higher cleaning costs.</li> <li>• Omission of maps from the AQA illustrating the predicted dust impact</li> </ul> PAC are especially concerned about dust from the proposed concrete crushing operations impacting staff and the continued viability of vehicle storage operations on site due to increased costs and risk to human health associated with chemical cleaning processes to remove concrete dust from cars. PAC are especially concerned by the omission of their facility from the AQA as a "sensitive receptor" given their proximity to the proposed development. PAC believe that the AQA does not meet the Director-General's requirements for the environmental assessment of this proposal and request that the proponent's Air Quality Assessment be expanded to model additional sensitive receptors within PAC's facilities at 66 West Dapto Road and 17 Reddalls Road.
		<b>Preliminary Risk Analysis</b> PAC believes that the Preliminary Hazard Analysis included with the EIS does not address the full range of risks and thus the proposal does not meet the requirements of SEPP 33 - Hazardous and Offensive Development. PAC are particularly concerned by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The release of PM<sub>10</sub> air pollution and contaminated dust from construction waste on human health.</li> <li>• Lack of contingencies related to the failure of mitigation measures proposed to reduce air pollution.</li> <li>• The potential for dangerous forms of waste to be accidentally introduced to the site in the course of its operation.</li> </ul>
		<b>Current and Future Land Use</b> PAC believe the proposal does not adhere to best practice design as required to be considered under SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 and this concern has not been adequately addressed in the EIS. Specifically, PAC is concerned that the proposed expansion of operations at the subject site will produce levels and types of dust and air pollution that will create a land use

Submission Number	Author Name/Organisation	Summary of Issue
		<p>conflict with PAC's operations in the area.</p> <p>PAC is also concerned that the EIS does not give due consideration of current and future land use in the vicinity of hazardous or offensive industry. PAC believe that the Preliminary Risk Analysis does not provide sufficient information for the consent authority to assess the development and its mitigation measures in the context of future land use.</p> <p><b>Current Unsafe Practices on Site</b>  PAC is concerned by current unsafe practices observed on the proposed development site. PAC believe that the current facility does not appear to be operating at an acceptable environmental level with regard to safety, with the associated risks likely to increase as a result of the expansion.</p>
1	Private and Confidential Submission	<p><b>Unlawful Development</b>  Objector believes the development footprint has been doubled and the approved throughput increased without obtaining development consent. Objector believes the application seeks retrospective approval for unlawful works and such approval cannot be lawfully granted.</p> <p><b>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act</b>  Objector believes the granting of development for the proposed development would be inconsistent with the public interest and relevant object of the EP&amp;A Act</p> <p><b>Wollongong Local Environmental Plan 2010 (West Dapto)</b>  Objector notes the proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the IN2 Industrial Zone and observes that the EIS does not justify those inconsistencies.</p> <p><b>Director-General's Requirements (DGs)</b>  Objector notes the EIS does not comply with multiple requirements in the DGRs.  Objector notes lack of evidence of consultation with the Environment Protection Authority.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b>  Objector is concerned about an increase in traffic and the ability of existing infrastructure to cater for the increase.</p> <p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>  Objector believes that emissions will be nine times greater than those for other facilities in NSW.</p> <p><b>Hours of Operation</b>  Objector is concerned about the impact of proposed Sunday operating hours on immediate residences.</p> <p><b>Noise and Dust:</b> Objector believes prevailing winds will blow dust and odour towards Farmborough Heights residences and increase noise impacts.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b>  Objector is concerned about impacts on State and Commonwealth listed species.</p> <p><b>Landuse Conflict:</b> Objector believes the Public Recreation zoning of adjacent land is inconsistent with the proposed heavy industrial uses. Objector is concerned by lack of buffer zone and close proximity of operations to immediate residences.</p> <p><b>Contamination</b>  Objector believes the subject site is potentially contaminated and a contamination assessment is therefore required.</p>