

## Project Details

Application Number	SSD-8660		
Assessment Type:	State Significant Development		
Development Type:	Waste collection, treatment and disposal		
Local Government Areas	Central Coast		
Exhibition Start:	28/08/2020	Exhibition End:	25/09/2020

---

We write to object to the aforementioned proposed development located at 90 Gindurra Rd, Somerby mainly due to the impact of:

### Noise, Dust and Vibration...

- Neither the noise or dust generated can be contained within their site, heavily impacting on neighbouring properties. Not to mention the vibration that will no doubt be felt by neighbouring properties that sit on the same sandstone seam.

Our family property is zoned Rural/Residential and adjoins the proposed development site to the east.

An aerial view of the site clearly identifies residential homes are located within 91 metres, 131 metres and 201 metres away respectively. Concrete crushing machines will be located approximately 500 or so metres away from our homes (our residence is dual occupancy - which my 83 and 77 year old parents share with us). The remaining site will be storage areas and with extreme truck and tractor movements within the yard and surrounding roads.

This development as proposed is planned for the wrong location. It's as simple as that.





**Further reasons for our objections to the above mention state development application are set out as follows:**

**A precedent has already been set in Somersby – A previous application has been refused**

This current application proposed at 90 Ginurra Rd Somersby should be refused within the Somersby Industrial Zone on the same or similar terms as the Refusal of Davis' previous application for a Resource Recovery Facility at 168 Somersby Falls Road Somersby DA Number 40918/2011

Refer: Joint Regional Planning Panel No2012HCC014 refer copy attached or download Link

[file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Assessment\\_Report\\_2012HCC014.pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Assessment_Report_2012HCC014.pdf)

This current application is more or less the same as the above application that was refused by the Land and Environment Court.

**An excerpt of the refusal states:**

- *"The proposal is contrary to the objectives for the existing and proposed industrial zone and will detract from the character of the area due to visual impact, dust and noise generation".*
- *"The proposal may impact existing and future industrial development and result in the loss of employment and have an economic impact on the Somersby Industrial Estate".*
- *"The proposal will affect the local community by:*
  - *Increased heavy traffic on Somersby Falls Road;*
  - *Noise. The acoustic wall may not reduce noise and traffic noise will still be generated;*
  - *Dust. Crushing cement and other products will create health hazards and such dust is carcinogenic and a cause of silicosis;*
  - *Odour. Mulched timber and chicken manure create odours;*
  - *Rubbish. There will be problems with dumped rubbish along roads to the site as well as controls on excess or non-recyclable materials".*

***Please read the report in its entirety. This will establish even more reasons to object the proposed development (SSD-8660).***

**The proposed development does not fit in with the objectives outlined in the Gosford LEP – refer to highlights below. The proposal should be refused, if anything on this basis only.**

Zone IN1 General Industrial

**Objectives of zone**

- To provide a wide range of industrial and warehouse land uses.
- To encourage employment opportunities.
- **To minimise any adverse effect of industry on other land uses.**
- To support and protect industrial land for industrial uses.
- **To promote ecologically, socially and economically sustainable development.**
- To ensure that retail, commercial or service land uses in industrial areas are of an ancillary nature.
- **To ensure that development is compatible with the desired future character of the zone.**

**Nuisance**

If approved, the proposed development will interfere with our peaceful enjoyment of our own land and may interfere with the environment.

### **Previous Objections**

**One Thousand One Hundred and Fifty (1150) individual objections received to date cannot be ignored.**

Jackson in their report attached to the applicant's submission has dismissed these objections somewhat by stating "However, most of the respondents lived 1km or further from the proposed development".

**Further Comment:** The objections should be seriously considered in view of the proposed land use and its overall impact on the local area, and especially on the immediate neighbours.

### **Continuous monitoring of air quality (dust) and noise**

The applicant makes reference to "Continuous monitoring of air quality (dust) and noise at the site boundaries" to ensure all criteria are met. These measures are only proposed to keep the neighbours satisfied.

**Further Comment:** These measures would not be required if there was no threat of noise or dust emanating from the proposed site. These measures would not be necessary if the development was considered a "clean use" with no risk of dust and noise.

### **Studies & Modelling undertaken to date.**

The studies and modelling undertaken to date and presented in the application simply satisfy the requirements of the application, but cannot determine the true impact of the development. The studies tick the "right boxes" on the application.

**Further Comment:** The impact of the proposed development will be unknown until it is fully operational. We do not have faith in the authorities to shut the site down if approved and in operation, nor should we be required to do so, especially if the development can be stopped now.

---

Our reasons are as follows:

- The Current submission does not provide a realistic assessment of the likely impacts of or purpose a suitable design consistent with good or best practice. Air quality - Please see attached report from Todoroski Air Sciences - Air quality report.
- We are hugely concerned about the Noise and Vibration from the site. The (TAR) report attached makes several key summary points that need to be addressed.

Also on a personal level; During the first development of the shed and earthworks that have been completed, our property has sustained internal damage to Gyprock due the house continually vibrating for 4-6mths 5 days a week due to excavation and roller activity with vibration on. Davis and Mark Turner (Jackson Environment and Planning) after continued complaining and site checking that the machines affected our property, even with both parties agreeing on the issue they promised to ship the equipment from site so this could not happen again it has repeatedly happened and I have had to repeatedly ring Mark Jackson to investigate only to be told SORRY they did use the machine again by mistake it will not happen again or had to use the machine due to inclement weather predicted. We had to engage an engineer to survey the damage at our own cost prior to Davis acknowledging vibration issues. Davis to this date have fused to pay the bill or come to any agreement even after admitting the machines caused continual vibration to our house after



testing. This should have never happened as dilapidation reporting should have been done prior to any construction on the site due to our property sitting on the same sandstone seam. This is also a huge concern for our horses that we have on the property not to mention the affect the current building caused on our cat that was hospitalised for stress related urine infection from the trauma from having the house vibrate for such a long period. We have veterinary reports and bills to prove the impact on the cat.

Geotech reporting will show the formation of this sandstone seam. We seek that further investigation be done by the submitting parties as per the recommendations in the (TAR), refer to the attached Acoustic Report MAC201200-01LR1V1 Mac Muller Acoustic Consulting.

- The adverse affect of continual traffic of trucks, cars and b-double trucks not to mention the mine size machinery that is used all day in the movement of the materials. 200+ trucks per day travelling through the local roads past local's front doors.
- The New proposed development is not in keeping with the aims and objectives of the Somersby Business Park.
- Concerned re the concrete crushing machine, whilst this is situated within a closed building the hoppers are not. Which will give extra continued noise and dust issues.
- Destruction of land that houses endangered flora and fauna.
- The adverse effect of this development of this size will and has already impacted the property values dramatically, once a nice tranquil area will turn into a noisy, smelly, dust bowl of a place.
- It is situated close to many facilities - Frank Baxter Centre, Riding for the disabled, Mount Penang Gardens, Kariong Mountains Pre School, Naisda Dance College, Central Coast Sports College and Kariong Mountains High School.
- The 5m noise wall is of a concern in blocking out the afternoon sun. This may help with some sort of noise protection but the adverse effect of the sun on our properties will not been known till after it is built.
- The Smell that will be generated from the site from stockpiling industrial waste. We reside 130 metres from the WASH bay that will be used for cleaning the trucks that have brought this recycling material in.
- Having 200,000 tone per annum waste management and crushing facility boarding rural/residential properties and within 50m of family homes, horses and residential water tanks. Which is totally out of character for rural, tranquil living.

Our above comments objecting the proposal are not exhaustive. We as a family do not have the compacity to employ experts at huge personal expense to challenge the application and the reports contained withing the application, but we please ask the Department of NSW Planning, Industry & Environment take into consideration the above objections and the attached reports.

Yours Faithfully,



Sheryl Edwards  
10 Acacia Rd  
Somersby NSW 2250