

DOC20/811665-10

PENRITH CITY COUNCIL
601 High Street
PENRITH NSW Postcode 2750
Email: concurrence.referral@penrith.city

22 October 2020

Attention: Concurrence Referral

## Request Additional Information - Integrated Development - Tyrecycle Pty Ltd - DA20/0589

Dear Penrith City Council

Thank you for the request for General Terms of Approval (GTA) from the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) for Concurrence and Referral (CNR) No 12836, development application DA20/0589 at 1-21 Grady Crescent, Erskine Park 2759 in relation to a proposed facility to be operated by Tyrecycle Pty Ltd (Tyrecycle).

The EPA has reviewed the following documents:

- Statement of Environment Effects (v1.0) Element Environment Pty Ltd 16 September 2020
- Air Quality Impact Assessment Tyrecycle Erskine Park (v002) Todoroski Air Science Pty Ltd –
   4 September 2020
- Noise Impact Assessment Tyrecycle Pty Ltd (v002) Todorski Air Sciences Pty Ltd 4 September 2020

The EPA considers additional information about the proposed development to be necessary to its proper consideration of the GTA. It requests, under Clause 67 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, that the applicant provide the following information.

## Air Quality Impact Assessment -

## 1. Industrial and commercial receptors not included in assessment

The Air Quality Impact Aassessment (AQIA) should include the industrial and commercial receptors in the complete assessment of air quality impacts. Any predicted exceedances must be addressed, and proposed mitigation measures should be benchmarked against industry best practise.

### Background

The AQIA has only considered residential receptors in the assessment of impacts, with the closest receptor (R2) approximately 300 m north from the proposed facility. No industrial or commercial receptors have been considered.

The EPA advises that a sensitive receptor is defined in the *Approved Methods for Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW* as a location where people are likely to work or reside and that future sensitive receptors should be considered.

The contour plots for 24-hour PM2.5 concentrations (Figure C-1) and 24-hour PM10 concentrations (Figure C-3) indicate that the incremental impacts at nearby industrial and commercial receptors are above 7  $\mu$ g/m³ and 20  $\mu$ g/m³, respectively. Thus, it is possible that the cumulative impacts at the nearby industrial and commercial receptors, when assessed contemporaneously, could result in exceedances of the criteria. Therefore, the potential impacts from the proposal at the nearest receptors have not been adequately assessed.

## 2. Building emission stack controls

The AQIA should provide further information and discussion regarding the cyclone filters and justification for the modelled parameters.

## **Background**

The AQIA states that two cyclone filters would be operated and installed through the warehouse roof and have been included in the dispersion modelling as point sources. The cyclone filter stacks have been modelled with the parameters in Table 5-1, including an exit velocity of 22 m/s and a concentration of 10 mg/m<sup>3</sup>.

The AQIA has not provided any discussion or information as to the emissions the cyclones are capturing, the justification of the control technology, the location of the cyclones in the warehouse roof, the capacity and efficiency of the cyclone filters to capture and control those emissions and achieve the proposed emission velocity and concentration.

### 3. Clarification of operational locations

The AQIA to clarify which specific activities (eg. Table 5-2) and therefore which emissions are occurring indoors, and which are occurring outdoors.

## **Background**

The AQIA states that "most" activities at the site would occur within the warehouse but does not provide further clarification. Despite conservatively assessing all activities as being outside, the EPA cannot evaluate how conservative the assessment is and the risk level of the proposal without further clarification regarding the specific activities that are occurring outside the warehouse.

## **Noise Impact Assessment -**

#### 1. Proposed operating hours

The proponent should clarify the proposed operating hours to clearly delineate start and finish times for each operation during weekdays and weekend days.

## Background

The proposed operating hours for shredding operations in Table 2-2 of the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) are unclear, citing only a 7 am start on weekdays, and a 7 am finish on Saturdays. The EPA has conservatively assumed that all operations excepting container deliveries will occur during day/evening/night time periods under the Noise Policy for Industry (NPfI).

### 2. Revision of project intrusiveness noise levels

The project intrusiveness noise levels in Table 4-1 should be revised in accordance with the guidance in Section 2.3 of the NPfl so that the levels for the evening and night are no greater than for the day.

## 3. Classification of potentially affected residential receivers

The proponent should revise the NIA to adopt the 'suburban' amenity classification for potentially affected residential receivers, or alternatively provide strong justification for adopting the existing 'urban' classification with reference to the considerations in Section 2.4 of the NPfI. The NIA

should consider all feasible and reasonable noise mitigation measures to address any exceedances of the Project Noise Trigger Levels in the assessment.

### Background

The NIA has identified (in Section 4.1.2) the nearest potentially affected residential receivers to the north of the site as 'urban'. The EPA disagrees with this classification as the area is unlikely to be dominated by 'urban hum' and will not have through-traffic with characteristically heavy and continuous traffic flows during peak hours. The EPA considers that these receivers are in a suburban noise amenity area, which will attract lower amenity criteria than those adopted in the NIA and will apply during the evening and night-time periods, potentially changing the outcomes of the assessment.

# 4. Applicable road category

Table 4-5 of the NIA refers to both local and sub-arterial roads, and should be revised to identify the correct applicable road category and accompanying criteria and descriptors for the assessment.

## 5. Source of equipment

The source(s) of the equipment sound power levels in Table 5-1 of the NIA should be identified, whether from direct measurements or documented data. The NIA should also explain the sound power levels adopted for truck unloading (inside) operations and truck loading (outside) operations, given that loading outside is significantly (14dB) guieter than unloading inside.

### **EPA** requires further information

The EPA requires In order to provide GTAs, It is recommended that Tyrecycle provide additional information regarding the Air Quality Assessmet and Noise Impact Assessmet as detailed above.

In accordance with Clause 110 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, the assessment clock shall be stopped until two days after the requested information is provided to the EPA.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Kyle Browne on 9995 6107 or via email at kyle.browne@epa.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



LARA BARRINGTON
Unit Head – Regulatory Operations Metropolitan West