

NSW Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment Major Projects Locked Bag 5022, Parramatta NSW 2124.

SUBMISSION TO SSD10407 14 AND 16 KIORA CRESCENT, YENNORA SSD10407 STATE SIGNIFICNAT DEVELOPMENT APPLIATION YENNORA LIQUID WASTE TREATMENT PLANT

To Whom It May Concern,

Reference is made to the abovementioned State Significant Development Application (SSDA) (**SSD10407**) (the proposal), lodged with NSW Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment (DPIE) on 13 November 2020, which seeks development for the purpose of *the increase in the processing capacity of the existing Yennora Liquid Waste Treatment Plant to 110,000 tonnes per year.*

Ascendas REIT own 7 Kiora Crescent, Yennora located immediately to the west of 16 Kiora Crescent and 14 Kiora Crescent, Yennora (the Site). 7 Kiora Crescent, Yennora site is currently under construction and once complete will consist of a 13,000sqm warehouse with completion due mid-2021.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed land use is permitted with consent in the IN1 General Industrial zone, the expansion of the facility, from currently processing 900 tonnes per annum to 110,000 tonnes per year and increasing the maximum quantity to be stored at any one time to 477 tonnes, is not considered suitable for the Site and will have significant impacts on the adjoining property owners. These reasons, as explained further below, the proposal is not considered to satisfy the heads of consideration under Section 4.15(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) and therefore should not be supported.

1. SUMMARY

The key findings from the investigations carried out and the basis for this submission to the proposal are summarised as follows:

- 1. Traffic and Parking
- 2. Odour
- 3. Section 4.15(1) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
- 4. Overall Impacts

The ensuing sections of this advice provides further detail in relation to the above summary points.

2. MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

2.1 Traffic and Parking

SSD10407 has failed to provide proper consideration of the existing traffic and parking issues associated with the Site and the surrounding industrial properties. The Traffic and Parking Assessment Report submitted as part of the application is vague and shifts between the proposal being a warehouse, factory and landscape supplies distributor. The detail provided in the report is very basic and does not make a thorough assessment of the actual impacts the proposed expansion of the operations will have.

Initial referral comments from Cumberland Council (May 2020) state that *there is expected to be a considerable increase in traffic movements for the site (including outside current operational hours), and it is noted there are other transport/logistics businesses nearby and this is a dead-end street having one access point off Norie St. The individual and cumulative traffic & parking impacts of the proposal should be assessed as part of the detailed traffic & parking assessment*

The SSD application has failed to address the cumulative impacts of the development in terms of considering other nearby transport and logistics business as well as the Site being located in a dead-end street. Furthermore, the provided sweep path analysis still shows that the turning path of trucks encroaching into Council footpath and nature strip which was a key concern of Council as part of initial consultation. In addition, the Council consultation comments from May 2020 specifically required that trucks are to complete <u>no more than 3 movements</u> to enter the waste dock. It is apparent from the submitted sweep paths that trucks will need to complete a minimum of 4 movements and will also cut across existing car parking spaces on the Site.

The car parking rates used by the consultant are also confusing as they seem to refer to factory rates but then utilises the warehouse rate in the calculation. Whilst the proposed development may meet the required rate of car parking spaces as per the Holroyd DCP, which is based solely on GFA, the application has failed to acknowledge the intensification of development on the Site. The existing parking on site, being seven (7) spaces, may be compliant with the DCP rate but we question the ability to have cars parked in these spaces given the expected maneuvers trucks will have to undertake to enter and exit the Site (as shown on the provided sweep paths).

Furthermore, the proposal appears to rely on the operators of the facility utilising a leased site (49-53 Pine Road) to provide parking for the trucks associated with the facility and the EIS states that this <u>may change</u>, without any clarification as to where trucks will then be located if the lease is to finish.

The Traffic and Parking Assessment Report has not addressed SEPP Infrastructure, despite the proposal being considered a traffic generating development: *Schedule 3 – 'Waste or resource management facility' that involves with any size or capacity increase*. Whilst it is acknowledged that the application will be referred to Transport for NSW (TfNSW), there is no thorough assessment of traffic generation in relation to SEPP Infrastructure and the provided Traffic and Parking Assessment Report refers to the proposal being a 'landscape supplies premises' in the discussion under traffic generation.

In addition, the Traffic and Parking Assessment Report has not addressed:

- Future Transport 2056 and supporting documents;
- NSW Freight and Ports Plans;
- Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 12: Traffic Impacts of Development.

As per the Planning Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) and initial advice from TfNSW, the above policies are to be considered as part of the application. They are considered to be vital to the proper assessment of a development of this type where it is considered there will substantial impacts from truck movements and traffic generation not only on the immediate street network but further afield also.

The proposal will result in an increase in truck movements to 60 trucks per day, or 4 per hour, from currently 1 per hour, or 24 per day and relies on access from the driveway adjacent to 7 Kiora Crescent. Manoeuvrability of large rigid trucks onto the Site without disturbing neighbouring properties, blocking access driveways and impacting on-street carparking spaces appears to be almost impossible based on the

provided sweep paths. As such, further consideration needs to be given to the traffic control and the future 'controlled' access to the Site as it is surely almost impossible to not have trucks queuing along Kiora Crescent given only one unloading and parking area is provided on Site.

Currently, there is already a lack of on-street parking on Kiora Crescent for use of visitors to the industrial premises located on Kiora Crescent. Whilst the proposal is not reliant on the existing on-street parking to satisfy the DCP car parking rates, at current it is common for large rigid trucks to be queued along Kiora Crescent awaiting entrance into the Waste Treatment Plant, this is documented in the referral comments from the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) on the SSD file. The proposal will result in a significant increase in truck movements (from 24 to 60 trucks per day) associated with the expansion in operations with no further consideration on the proposed access and egress for the Site in terms of impacts to the road network and adjoining properties.

In light of the above, the proposal is deficient in information and justification in relation to transport and parking and should not be supported in this basis.

2.2 Odour Impact

The Odour Impact Assessment accompanying the application concludes that further odour controls <u>are not</u> necessary to be implemented at the Site. The existing development already emits a strong odour which radiates across surrounding properties, including 7 Kiora Crescent, being immediately to the west of the Site. It is questioned how such a large increase in the capacity of waste could not increase the odour impacts with no additional mitigation methods recommended.

The assessment provided is considered inadequate in terms of fully comprehending the impediments on odour impacts which is currently already at disturbing levels. It should also be noted, that the SSDA includes community consultation that has been undertaken. However, it is alarming that Ascendas REIT has not been included on the list and the applicant has failed to consult us as the immediately adjoining property.

In light of the above, it is considered the proposal warrants further assessment by the applicant and the EPA to determine the likely impacts in terms of odour neighbouring properties. We believe that given the existing circumstances and operations of the facility that any increase would certainly result in a negative amenity for the surrounding locality and therefore should not be supported.

2.4 Section 4.15(1) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

Section 4.15(1) of the EP&A Act sets out specific matters that the consent authority is to take into consideration in the assessment and determination of development applications. Whilst the EIS submitted as part of the application includes a brief assessment of the relevant heads of consideration, it fails to adequately address and satisfy those consideration in relation to environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, or the public interest.

As discussed above, the traffic impacts and increased odour from the expansion of the facility are considered to have significant consequences to not only our Site but also the entire Kiora Crescent industrial precinct. The proposal has failed to acknowledge that as a result of the size of the Site and location as a dead-end that increased truck movements associated with the expansion will cause cumulative impacts from increased traffic generation and manoeuvrability issues.

Furthermore, it is noted that the EIS submitted with the application indicated that the development application is in the public interest in accordance with Clause 4.15(e) of the EP&A Act.

However, given the unacceptable environmental and adverse impacts in relation to traffic and neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development, the application is not considered to be in

the public interest and thus has not adequately demonstrated how it satisfies Clause 4.15(e) of the EP&A Act.

2.5 Overall Impacts

It is considered that the overall impact of those matters described in this submission would negatively impact on the future use and amenity at our site at 7 Kiora Crescent and impact on the level of interest and investment return to be obtained for the future industrial development on the Site.

It is further considered that allowing the proposed development to proceed in its current form would create a poor industrial land use precedent, thereby creating unrealistic expectations on behalf of other businesses and landowners in the Yennora industrial area.

3. CONCLUSION

Due the nature of the proposed development sought and resulting expanded operations of the Site, the proposed development application **SSD10407** is not considered to result in a favourable outcome for the Site or the adjoining properties as it would likely result in traffic, parking and amenity impacts to the adjoining property owners and the locality as a whole. This is due largely to the extent of expansion proposed and the lack of suitability of the existing Site.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is not considered to satisfy the relevant heads of consideration under Section 4.15(1) of the EP&A Act as it is will result in unreasonable environmental impact, is not suitable for the Site; and is not in the public interest. Accordingly, it is recommended that this application be refused by DPIE. Should the application be amended or updated in response to public or government agency submissions, it is requested that it be re-exhibited to the public for comment.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

Ĥ

Chris Heck Asset Manager Ascendas REIT 0403 869 015 Level 22, 229 George Street, Sydney NSW 2000