

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The development is inconsistent with the provisions of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (ISEPP)* with respect to the significant adverse individual risk and societal risk that will result on the development from the hazardous facility and pipeline adjoining the site. In addition, the adverse impacts on the health of the users of the development due to poor air quality. [Section 4.15(1)(a)(c) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979]
2. The development is inconsistent with IN2 Light Industrial zoning provisions and objectives insofar as it will result in a development that is exposed to significant risk of hazard, air quality and potential adverse health impacts making it unacceptable and an inappropriate development for this site due to this locational/land use constraint. In addition, the mixed-use development, will result in land use conflict within the zone, particularly as it relates to existing and future operations on the adjoining facility. [Section 4.15(1)(a) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979]
3. Submissions received in response to public notification of the development application have raised issues of a nature and extent that establish that the development will result in unreasonable impacts in terms of unacceptable hazard risk associated with vapour cloud explosion resulting in unacceptable risk for both individual risk of fatality and societal risk and adverse health impacts of future users of the development due to air quality impacts. [Section 4.15(1)(d) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979].
4. The development is contrary to the public interest with respect to an unacceptable hazard risk associated with vapour cloud explosion resulting in unacceptable risk for both individual risk of fatality and societal risk on the proposed development, resulting from the proximity of the adjoining fuel terminal and pipeline. In addition, unacceptable air quality and health impacts on future users of the development site will result. [Section 4.15(1)(e) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979]
5. The application did not include sufficient information to satisfy that the risks associated with the location of mixed-used residential, commercial, retail and recreation area, is appropriately located given the adverse impacts the adjoining site will have on this mixed-use development.