

# Final Report

---

## West Schofields Precinct Level 2/3 Odour Assessment

---

Document Control Number: AQU-NW-001-20975

Date: 17 July 2018

**Pacific Environment  
Limited** 

 Technologies  Consulting  Monitoring

[www.pacific-environment.com](http://www.pacific-environment.com)

**Project Name:** West Schofields Precinct Level 2/3 Odour Assessment

**Document Control Number:** AQU-NW-001-20975

**Prepared For:** Department of Planning and Environment

**Approved For Release By:** Jane Barnett

**Disclaimer & Copyright:** This report is subject to the copyright statement located at [www.pacific-environment.com](http://www.pacific-environment.com) © Pacific Environment Operations Pty Ltd ABN 86 127 101 642

Version	Date	Comment	Prepared by	Reviewed by
01	28/05/2017	Draft 1	Liza McDonough/ Francine Manansala	Francine Manansala/Jane Barnett
02	13/11/2017	Draft 2	Liza McDonough/ Francine Manansala	Francine Manansala/Jane Barnett
03	05/06/2018	Final	Liza McDonough/ Francine Manansala	Francine Manansala/Jane Barnett
04	17/07/2018	Final v2	Liza McDonough/ Francine Manansala	Francine Manansala/Jane Barnett



### Adelaide

35 Edward Street, Norwood SA 5067  
PO Box 3187, Norwood SA 5067  
**Ph:** +61 8 8332 0960  
**Fax:** +61 7 3844 5858

### Brisbane

Level 19, 240 Queen Street  
Brisbane Qld 4000  
**Ph:** +61 7 3004 6400  
**Fax:** +61 7 3844 5858

### Melbourne

Level 17, 31 Queen Street  
Melbourne Vic 3000  
**Ph:** +61 3 9036 2637  
**Fax:** +61 2 9870 0999

### Perth

Level 1, Suite 3, 34 Queen Street  
Perth WA 6000  
**Ph:** +61 8 9481 4961  
**Fax:** +61 2 9870 0999

### Sydney Head Office

Suite 1, Level 1, 146 Arthur Street  
North Sydney, NSW 2060  
**Ph:** +61 2 9870 0900  
**Fax:** +61 2 9870 0999

# Disclaimer

Pacific Environment acts in all professional matters as a faithful advisor to the Client and exercises all reasonable skill and care in the provision of its professional services.

Reports are commissioned by and prepared for the exclusive use of the Client. They are subject to and issued in accordance with the agreement between the Client and Pacific Environment. Pacific Environment is not responsible for any liability and accepts no responsibility whatsoever arising from the misapplication or misinterpretation by third parties of the contents of its reports.

Except where expressly stated, Pacific Environment does not attempt to verify the accuracy, validity or comprehensiveness of any information supplied to Pacific Environment for its reports.

Reports cannot be copied or reproduced in whole or part for any purpose without the prior written agreement of Pacific Environment.

Where site inspections, testing or fieldwork have taken place, the report is based on the information made available by the client or their nominees during the visit, visual observations and any subsequent discussions with regulatory authorities. The validity and comprehensiveness of supplied information has not been independently verified and, for the purposes of this report, it is assumed that the information provided to Pacific Environment is both complete and accurate. It is further assumed that normal activities were being undertaken at the site on the day of the site visit(s), unless explicitly stated otherwise.

## Executive summary

This assessment was completed to determine the potential for odour impacts on the West Schofields Precinct (the Project).

The Project is located in a semi-rural/residential area that currently comprises houses on rural properties. Commercial activities in the Project area include (but are not limited to) brick and paving businesses, plaster lining services, distribution services, drilling contractors, firewood suppliers and pet food and stockfeed suppliers.

Potential odour sources surrounding the Project study area include poultry operations, intensive piggeries, a meat rendering operation, a green waste recycling facility, mushroom farms and sewage treatment plants (STPs).

A Level 1 odour impact assessment was conducted (**Appendix A**) consistent with the *Technical framework: Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW (NSW DECC, 2006a)* and the associated Technical Notes (**NSW DECC, 2006b**). The Level 1 study found that a small number of poultry operations in the vicinity of the Project study area have the potential to individually impact on the proposed development area. These are largely around the northern, eastern and western borders of the Project area.

The seven poultry operations and recycling centre which were determined to have potential impacts on the Project have been assessed in detail in this report using a Level 2/3 odour impact assessment, and the results used to establish the likely area of potential odour influence.

The modelling results indicate that all poultry operations modelled do not cause an exceedance of the 2 odour unit (OU) criterion within the boundary of the Project. Modelling of the Northwest Recycling Centre does however result in an exceedance of the OU criterion within the middle-north western edge of the Project boundary. This is to be expected due to the recycling centre's location within the Project boundary however, this exceedance does not occur in proposed residential areas of the Precinct.

This report provides options to consider in the planning process in order to mitigate the potential odour impacts. The recommendations that have been provided for development control in this area incorporate an expectation that the measures would be revised, progressively, by the relevant planning body on the basis of more detailed specific assessments for future individual developments provided through the Development Application process.

# Table of contents

Executive summary.....	iii
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.1.1 Sydney’s North West Growth Area .....	1
1.1.2 Precinct Planning .....	1
1.2 Project description.....	2
1.2.1 Surrounding land use .....	5
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	5
1.4 Scope of work.....	5
<b>2. Odour legislation and guidelines .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Legislation .....	7
2.2 Guidelines.....	7
2.2.1 Odour impact assessment criteria.....	8
2.2.2 Peak-to-mean ratios .....	9
<b>3. Existing environment.....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Meteorology.....	10
3.1.1 Local wind data .....	10
3.1.2 Local climate .....	11
<b>4. Odour impact assessment .....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Approach .....	12
4.2 Odour sources.....	13
4.3 Assessment methodology .....	16
4.3.1 Introduction.....	16
4.3.2 Emissions Estimation .....	16
4.3.3 Dispersion modelling .....	19
4.4 Assessment of Impacts .....	25
<b>5. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1 Potential Development Control Plan provisions.....	28
5.2 Alternative measures.....	29
<b>6. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>7. References.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>1</b>

Appendix B..... 1

Appendix C ..... 1

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: West Schofields Precinct Project Study Area ..... 3  
Figure 1.2: West Schofields Draft Indicative Layout Plan ..... 4  
Figure 4.1: Hourly odour emission rates for the chicken sheds ..... 19  
Figure 4.2: Overview of modelling methodology ..... 21  
Figure 4.3: 99<sup>th</sup> percentile 1-second average odour concentration contours (OU) associated with the operation of the seven closest poultry farms ..... 26  
Figure 4.4: 99<sup>th</sup> percentile 1-second average odour concentration contours (OU) associated with the operation of the Northwest Recycling Centre ..... 27

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Odour assessment performance criteria ..... 9  
Table 2.2: Factors for estimating peak concentrations on flat terrain ..... 9  
Table 3.1: Temperature, Humidity and Rainfall Data for Richmond RAAF ..... 11  
Table 4.1. List of odour sources considered in the assessment ..... 13  
Table 4.2 Farm-specific parameters used within the chicken shed odour emissions model ..... 18  
Table 4.3 General parameters used within the chicken shed odour emissions model.. 18  
Table 4.4: Meteorological Parameters used for CALMET ..... 23  
Table 7.1. Recommended separation distances from other sources ..... 19

# 1. Introduction

In March 2017, Pacific Environment completed a Level 1 odour assessment for the proposed West Schofields Precinct (the Project), in West Schofields, NSW (**Appendix A**). The outcomes of that assessment concluded that an additional level of assessment was required in relation odour, as prescribed by the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (EPA).

The West Schofields Precinct is bounded by Eastern and Bells Creeks, Garfield Road West to the north and Railway Terrace, Townson Road and the Colebee subdivision to the south.

## 1.1 Background

### 1.1.1 Sydney's North West Growth Area

Sydney's North West Growth Area (NWGA) covers approximately 10,000 hectares, located within the Local Government Area (LGA) boundaries of The Hills, Blacktown and Hawkesbury. It will be supported by a major centre at Rouse Hill and will contain about 90,000 new homes. It is made up of 16 'Precincts', which are areas that will be progressively released over the next 30 years.

### 1.1.2 Precinct Planning

Precinct Planning is a detailed process which analyses the development potential of each Precinct in the Growth Areas. It will be carried out as a partnership between the NSW Government and the relevant Local Council.

Precinct Planning will involve detailed investigations into appropriate land use options, physical environment constraints (i.e. topography, vegetation, bushfire mapping, mapping of water courses etc.) and infrastructure requirements. The process looks at issues including riparian zones, conservation zones, locations of town centres, the mix and type of housing, and key transport routes. It does this at the Precinct level, saving the need to revisit many issues at Development Application stage.

The analysis will include extensive background studies including Aboriginal and European Heritage, land capability, contamination, noise, odour, transport, biodiversity, bushfire, economics and employment and community facilities and open space.

These studies help to form an Indicative Layout Plan which will be used to test the feasibility of development scenarios with State agencies.

Each Precinct Planning package will include:

- A Precinct Planning report.
- The draft Indicative Layout Plan.
- A draft Amendment to the Growth Centres State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) to facilitate rezoning.
- A draft Development Control Plan (DCP).
- Supporting background studies.

Further information about Sydney's Growth Areas and Precinct Planning has been prepared by the Land Release and Strategy team of the DP&E and is available at <http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/Plans-for-your-area/Priority-Growth-Areas-and-Precincts>.

## 1.2 Project description

The Project is located in the southern, central section of the North West Priority Growth Area and is wholly located within the Blacktown LGA.

The Precinct is bounded by Riverstone, Quakers Hill and Marsden Park, between the M7 (Westlink), Richmond Road, Garfield Road East and Old Windsor Road.

The Project currently consists of a mix of urban areas and farming lands.

**Figure 1.1** shows the location of the Project site, with proposed residential development areas shown in **Figure 1.2**.



Figure 1.1: West Schofields Precinct Project Study Area




Figure 1.2: West Schofields Draft Indicative Layout Plan

### 1.2.1 Surrounding land use

To the east of the Project area is the Alex Avenue Precinct. The area includes the suburb of West Schofields, a semi-rural area that currently comprises houses on rural properties as well as commercial activities such as livestock. A number of poultry farms are located in this area. To the west is the Marsden Park Precinct, which is a predominantly large, open rural area. To the south is the Colebee Precinct, which is largely open rural area. To the north and north-east of the Project is the Riverstone Precinct which contains a mix of urban areas, semi-rural residential and land uses including poultry farms and a piggery. The densely-populated town of Riverstone also lies to the north.

## 1.3 Objectives of the study

The study objectives are to:

- Investigate and identify any source or sources of odour on or in the vicinity of the subject land, including from any ongoing agricultural activities on the subject land.
- Investigate the implications of any existing odours for the staging of the development of the land.
- Recommend management strategies to maximise development opportunities under the existing odour situation and into the future.
- Make recommendations for controlling impacts from odour-generating activities in proposed residential areas and associated land uses.
- Develop land use recommendations that provide adequate buffers or transition zones between residential and employment/industrial areas, both proposed and existing.

## 1.4 Scope of work

The study was conducted in two stages. The scope of work required for Stage 1 of the study (already completed) included:

- Investigation of any potential sources of odour that may impact on future development, including from existing agricultural activities on the subject land and neighbouring areas.
- Develop an understanding of the nature of any odour producing activities identified.
- Conduct a Level 1 Odour Impact Assessment, as outlined in the then NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change (NSW DECC) Draft Odour Policy and associated Technical Notes, resulting in recommended separation distances. NSW DECC is now known as NSW Environment Protection Authority (NSW EPA).
- Prepare a report outlining the findings of the Odour Impact Assessment, including maps outlining where urban development would encroach onto the separation distances determined by the study, and make a recommendation for any Stage 2 work if required.
- Provide recommendations to control odour impacts from odour generating development on proposed residential development and associated land uses (including open space) as appropriate.

As part of this study an extensive visit of the area was conducted to collect relevant data on odour producing activities, the surrounding areas and meteorological conditions for input to the Level 1 Odour Impact Assessment.

As a result of the outcomes from Stage 1 of the study, the Stage 2 work was recommended. The scope of work conducted for Stage 2 includes:

- Conducting a Level 2/3 Odour Impact Assessment, as outlined in NSW DECC Draft Odour Policy and its associated Technical Notes, using CALPUFF dispersion model.
- Updating this report to:
  - Incorporate the results of the modelling and limitations of the data.
  - Review strategies for managing odour impacts.
  - Predict odour impacts on the future development of the site, considering management recommendations.
  - Provide recommendations for controlling odour impacts from odour generating development on proposed residential development and associated land uses, in the form of development control provision for inclusion in a development control plan.

Modelling was conducted using the CALPUFF dispersion model and based on a representative 1-year meteorological dataset.

## 2. Odour legislation and guidelines

### 2.1 Legislation

The three most important pieces of legislation for preventing and controlling odour are the:

- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act).
- Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act).
- Local Government Act 1993 (LG Act).

The EP&A Act deals with land-use planning, development, assessment and approvals.

The POEO Act requires that no occupier of any premises causes air pollution (including odour) through a failure to maintain or operate equipment or deal with materials in a proper and efficient manner. The operator must also take all practicable means to minimise and prevent air pollution (sections 124, 125, 126 and 128 of the POEO Act).

The POEO Act includes the concept of “offensive odour” (section 129) and states it is an offence for scheduled activities to emit “offensive odour”.

The LG Act gives local councils the power to deal with public nuisance, including odour emissions.

### 2.2 Guidelines

Odour is one of the most widespread and complex local air pollution problem in Australia. It accounts for the majority of complaints received by environmental authorities and can be a major source of annoyance and stress in affected communities.

In November 2006, NSW EPA released two guidance documents: *Technical Framework for the Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW* and its associated *Technical Notes for the Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW*. The discussion in this report draws extensively from those documents, which outline the NSW EPA’s proposed approach for the assessment of odour emissions, using a three-level system of odour impact assessment of increasing complexity and detail. Depending on the individual characteristics of a new development and its proposed location, a varying degree of investigation into the potential for odour impacts may be required.

- Level 1 is a screening-level technique based on generic parameters for the type of activity and site. It requires minimal data and uses simple equations to provide a broad estimate of the extent of any odour impact. It may be used to identify the potentially affected zone and site suitability for a proposed facility or new neighbouring development or expansion of an existing facility.
- Level 2 is a screening-level dispersion modelling technique, using worst-case input data (rather than site-specific data). It is more rigorous and more realistic than a Level 1 assessment. It may be used to assess site suitability and odour mitigation measures for new, modified or existing activities.

- Level 3 is a refined-level dispersion modelling technique using site-specific input data. This is the most comprehensive and most realistic level of assessment available. It may be used to assess site suitability and odour mitigation measures for new, modified or existing activities.

It is noted that for this project, site-specific meteorological and terrain data were used in the dispersion modelling. Where possible, site-specific data for emissions calculations (i.e. bird numbers and shed dimensions) will be used however, detailed information for each farm such as staging and life cycles are not available and therefore best and conservative estimates were made. In these respects, the Stage 2 assessment is considered a Level 2/3 odour assessment and will be referred to as such in subsequent sections of this report.

### 2.2.1 Odour impact assessment criteria

Odour impacts are determined by several factors. The most important factors (the so-called **FIDOL** factors) are:

- The **F**requency of the exposure.
- The **I**ntensity of the odour.
- The **D**uration of the odour episodes.
- The **O**ffensiveness of the odour.
- The **L**ocation of the source.

In determining the offensiveness of an odour it needs to be recognised that for most odours the context in which an odour is perceived is also relevant. Some odours, for example the smell of sewage, hydrogen sulfide, butyric acid, landfill gas etc., are likely to be judged offensive regardless of the context in which they occur. Other odours such as the smell of jet fuel may be acceptable at an airport, but not in a house, and diesel exhaust may be acceptable near a busy road, but not in a restaurant.

In summary, whether or not an individual considers an odour to be a nuisance will depend on the FIDOL factors outlined above and although it is possible to derive formulae for assessing odour annoyance in a community, the response of any individual to an odour is still unpredictable.

The NSW EPA framework documents include some recommendations for odour criteria. The criteria have been refined by NSW EPA to take account of population density in the area. **Table 2.1** lists the odour criteria, to be exceeded not more than 1% of the time, for different population densities.

The difference between odour criteria is based on considerations of risk of odour impact rather than differences in odour acceptability between urban and rural areas. For a given odour level there will be a wide range of responses in the population exposed to the odour. In a densely-populated area there will therefore be a greater risk that some individuals within the community will find the odour unacceptable than in a sparsely populated area.

The criteria assume that 7 odour units (ou) at the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile would be acceptable to the average person, but as the number of exposed people increases there is a chance that sensitive individuals would be exposed. The criterion of 2 ou at the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile is considered to be acceptable for the whole population.

Table 2.1. Odour assessment performance criteria

Population of Affected Community	Odour Units
Rural single residence ( $\leq \sim 2$ )	7
$\sim 10$	6
$\sim 30$	5
$\sim 125$	4
$\sim 500$	3
Urban ( $\sim 2000$ ) and/or schools and hospitals	2

Source: NSW DEC, 2006a, p.21

## 2.2.2 Peak-to-mean ratios

It is common practice to use dispersion models to determine compliance with odour criteria. This introduces a complication because Gaussian dispersion models are only able to directly predict concentrations over an averaging period of 3-minutes or greater. The human nose, however, responds to odours over periods of the order of a second or so. During a 3-minute period, odour levels can fluctuate significantly above and below the mean depending on the nature of the source.

To determine more rigorously the ratio between the one-second peak concentrations and three-minute and longer period average concentrations (referred to as the peak-to-mean ratio) that might be predicted by a Gaussian dispersion model, the OEH commissioned a study by **Katestone Scientific Pty Ltd (1995, 1998)**. This study recommended peak-to-mean ratios for a range of circumstances. The ratio is also dependent on atmospheric stability and the distance from the source. For this assessment peak-to-mean ratios have been applied to each source type accordingly. A summary of these factors is shown in **Table 2.2**.

Table 2.2: Factors for estimating peak concentrations on flat terrain

Source Type	Pasquill-Gifford stability class	Near field P/M60*	Far field P/M60
Area	A, B, C, D	2.5	2.3
	E, F	2.3	1.9
Line	A – F	6	6
Surface point	A, B, C	12	4
	D, E, F	25	7
Tall wake-free point	A, B, C	17	3
	D, E, F	35	6
Wake affected point	A – F	2.3	2.3
Volume	A – F	2.3	2.3

\*Ratio of peak 1-second average concentrations to mean 1-hour average concentrations

*The Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales (NSW DEC, 2005)* hereafter referred to as the 'Approved Methods') takes account of this peaking factor and the criteria shown in **Table 2.1** are based on nose-response time.

## 3. Existing environment

### 3.1 Meteorology

#### 3.1.1 Local wind data

Odour impacts in the Project study area will be influenced by local meteorology. Meteorological conditions, such as wind speed, wind direction and atmospheric turbulence, affect how often receptors are likely to be downwind of an odour source as well as how well the odour disperses in the atmosphere.

The closest meteorological station to the site is at the Riverstone STP, off Bandon Road, Vineyard. The Vineyard site was commissioned in February 1994 and is maintained by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). The following meteorological variables are measured at Vineyard:

- Wind speed, wind direction and sigma theta (the standard deviation of the wind direction),
- Ambient temperature.
- Relative humidity.

A representative meteorological dataset was chosen by analysing the most recent five years' worth of data from the OEH Vineyard site. Annual and seasonal windroses were compiled for five years from 2011 to 2015 and are presented in **Appendix B**.

The OEH Vineyard windroses show that wind patterns for years 2011 to 2015 are similar with dominant winds from the north and north-northeast.

During summer the wind distribution pattern is fairly similar for all directions from the north to the south-southwest. In autumn, the dominant wind directions are from the north and north-northeast, spring follows a similar distribution with elevated wind speeds. During winter, winds predominately occur from the north, north-northeast, and south. The 2013 and 2014 windroses show a higher percentage of winds from the western and eastern quadrants annually and notably, a high percentage of winds from the west in the winter months of 2014.

The annual average percentage of calms (wind speeds less than 0.5 m/s) is between 16.6 and 26.1% for all years. It is noted that 2013 and 2014 were between 5% and 9% lower than the other years.

The annual average wind speed (m/s) for the five years is between 1.3 and 1.6 m/s.

The year 2015 was chosen for dispersion modelling as it is the most recent set of data analysed and the wind patterns, annual average wind speed and annual average percentage of calms are similar to the majority of the data. It was deemed representative when compared to the previous four years of meteorological data collected at the OEH Vineyard site.

### 3.1.2 Local climate

This section describes the general climate in the study area to give a more complete picture of the local meteorology.

**Table 3.1** presents the temperature, humidity and rainfall data for the nearby Bureau of Meteorology site located at Richmond RAAF, approximately 12 km northwest of the site. Presented are monthly averages of maximum and minimum temperatures, 9 am and 3 pm temperatures and humidity. Rainfall data consist of mean monthly rainfall and the average number of rain days per month.

The annual average maximum and minimum temperatures experienced are 24.2°C and 11.1°C. July is the coldest month, with an average minimum temperature of 3.7°C. January is the hottest month, with an average maximum temperature of 30.2°C.

Rainfall data show that February is on average the wettest month, with a mean rainfall reading of 114.9 mm, over 8.1 rain days. July is the driest months with an average rainfall of 29.6 mm, over an average of 4.1 rain days. The average annual rainfall is 740.5 mm and the average number of rain days annually is 73.6.

Table 3.1: Temperature, Humidity and Rainfall Data for Richmond RAAF

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
Daily Maximum Temperature (°C)													
Mean	30.2	29.2	27.0	24.0	20.8	18	17.6	19.7	22.7	25.3	27.1	28.7	24.2
Daily Minimum Temperature (°C)													
Mean	17.7	17.8	15.8	11.6	7.6	5.2	3.7	4.5	8.1	11.0	14.2	16.1	11.1
9 am Mean Temperatures (°C) and Relative Humidity (%)													
Mean	22.1	21.3	19.1	17.0	13.1	10.0	8.9	11.4	15.4	18.3	19.2	20.9	16.4
Humidity	72	78	80	76	82	83	80	69	63	58	68	68	73
3 pm Mean Temperatures (°C) and Relative Humidity (%)													
Mean	28.5	27.4	25.8	23.0	19.7	17.0	16.5	18.7	21.5	23.5	25.2	27.5	22.9
Humidity	47	52	52	49	53	53	48	39	39	40	46	44	47
Rainfall (mm)													
Mean	84.4	114.9	80.1	60.6	47.5	54.3	29.6	33.9	46.1	47.4	79.5	69.7	740.5
Rain days (Number)													
Mean	7.9	8.1	8.0	6.4	5.4	5.7	4.1	3.6	4.7	5.4	7.6	6.7	73.6

Station Number 067105, Latitude: -33.60 South, Longitude: 150.78 East, Elevation: 19 m  
 Source: **Bureau of Meteorology, 2017**

## 4. Odour impact assessment

### 4.1 Approach

An investigation of the Project study area and the surrounding land was conducted to identify potential sources of odour that may impact future development and to develop an understanding of the nature of any odour producing activities.

Sources of information used to identify potential odour sources included aerial maps, Yellow Pages searches, internet research and previous assessments for Precinct Planning (**Benbow Environmental (BE), 2008a & 2008b; PAEHolmes, 2010; Renzo Tonin & Associates and Todoroski Air Sciences, 2016**). A comprehensive site visit was conducted to gather as much data as possible about the odour sources and other factors required for the assessment (outlined in **Section 4.2**). The information on bird and shed numbers were obtained from Blacktown City Council in 2010 for the Schofields Precinct Planning odour assessment (**PAEHolmes, 2010**). Blacktown City Council no longer maintains records of bird and shed numbers for individual farms, thus for the purposes of this assessment it has been assumed that the bird and shed numbers have not changed.

The data were used to assess areas of potential odour impact around each identified odour source using the Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology provided by *Technical Notes for the Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW* (**NSW DECC, 2006b**). Where Level 1 odour impact assessment methodologies were not published for particular potentially odorous sources, a recommended buffer distance was applied, based on alternative guidance. It should be noted however that the buffer distance approach is generally more limited than the NSW DECC Level 1 assessment as it usually takes no account of local factors or scale of operation.

Where the area of odour influence of local odour sources was predicted to either encroach on the area or be in proximity of the Project study area when assessed using a Level 1 assessment, it was recommended to further refine the assessment using a Level 2/3 odour impact assessment. Whilst a Level 1 assessment is a screening-level technique based on generic parameters for the type of activity and site, Level 2/3 assessment is a refined-level dispersion modelling technique using site-specific input data, including terrain and meteorological data. The predicted separation distances will vary in different directions around an odour source when based on a Level 2/3 assessment, as opposed to the uniform circle centred on the source provided by Level 1. The Level 2/3 assessment may be used to assess site suitability and odour mitigation measures for new, modified or existing activities and would provide a better appreciation for the locations within the Project study area that are likely to be most affected by odour.

## 4.2 Odour sources

Potential odour sources identified as part of the assessment include poultry operations (broiler, breeder and layer chickens and ducks), intensive piggeries, mushroom production, a green waste recycling facility, a meat rendering plant, an abattoir and wastewater treatment plants.

The sites investigated as potential odour sources for this study are shown in **Table 4.1**. **Figure 4.1** shows the locations of these sources in relation to the Precinct. Those sources identified as 'no longer operational' or further than 5 km away, have not been shown.

Table 4.1. List of odour sources considered in the assessment

Poultry Operations	Intensive Piggeries	Other Sources
100 Worcester Rd, Rouse Hill (layer farm)	Gordon Rd, Schofields (piggery) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational	A J Bush & Son, Riverstone Meat Rendering Operations (meat rendering)
181 Cudgegong Rd, Rouse Hill (layer farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational	101 Hambledon Rd, Schofields (piggery)	920 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park - Marsden Park Landfill
89 Schofields Rd, Rouse Hill (layer farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational	1200 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park (piggery) – this site is no longer operational	Quakers Hill STP (Sewage Treatment Plant)
68 Schofields Farm Rd, Schofields (layer farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational		132 Burfitt Rd, Richmond North West Recycling Centre (green waste recycling facility)
73 Boundary Rd, Schofields (layer farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational		Riverstone STP (Sewage Treatment Plant)
95 Tallowong Rd, Schofields (broiler farm)		Elf Mushroom (mushroom production)
20 Clarke St, Riverstone (broiler farm)		White Prince Mushroom (mushroom production)
16 Clarke St Riverstone (broiler farm)		496 Windsor Rd, Vineyard (mushroom farm)
54 Pelican Rd, Schofields (broiler farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational		Elf Farm Supplies (mushroom composting) – more than 5 km away
2 Pelican Rd, Schofields (broiler farm)		Rouse Hill STP (Water Recycling Plant) – more than 5 km away
93 Hambledon Rd, Schofields (broiler farm)		McGraths Hill STP (Sewage Treatment Plant) – more than 5 km away
98 Hambledon Rd, Schofields (broiler farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational		South Windsor STP (Sewage Treatment Plant) – more than 5km away
96 Hambledon Rd, Schofields (duck farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational		14 Hill View Rd, Kellyville (duck abattoir) – more than 5 km away
25 Schofields Rd, Schofields (broiler farm)		St Mary's STP (Sewage Treatment Plant) - more than 5 km away
26 Schofields Farm Rd, Schofields (broiler farm)		

34-36 Schofields Rd, Schofields (duck farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational

37-39 Boundary Rd, Schofields (layer farm)

47 Argowan Rd, Schofields (broiler farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational

45 Farm Rd, Riverstone (duck farm)

169 Clifton Rd, Marsden Park (layer farm) – site visit confirmed that this farm is no longer operational

138 Clifton Rd, Marsden Park (broiler farm)

1148 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park (broiler/layer)

264A South St, Marsden Park (broiler farm)

306 South St, Marsden Park (broiler farm)

1132 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park (layer farm)

14 Hillview Rd, Kellyville (duck farm) – more than 5 km away

31-33 Boundary Rd, Box Hill (layer farm) – site visit confirmed this site is no longer operational

466 Windsor Rd, Vineyard (breeder farm)

199 Stahls Rd, Oakville (broiler farm)

472 Windsor Rd, Vineyard (broiler farm)

205 Maguires Rd, Maraylya (breeder farm) – more than 5 km away

115 Wolseley Rd, Oakville (broiler farm) – more than 5 km away

372 Windsor Rd, Vineyard (broiler farm) – more than 5 km away

Dunns Rd, Maraylya (broiler farm) – more than 5 km away

22 Withers Rd, Kellyville (broiler farm) – more than 5 km away

23 Withers Rd, Kellyville (broiler farm) – more than 5 km away

28A Foxall Rd, Kellyville (layer farm) – more than 5 km away

421 - 427 Flushcombe Rd, Blacktown (Red Lea chicken abattoir) – more than 5 km away

291 Fairey Rd, South Windsor – more than 5km away

Pirovic Family Farms (egg layer), 138 Sixth Ave, Llandilo – more than 5 km away




Figure 4.1: West Schofields Precinct Project Study Area

Investigations have revealed that some operating facilities are located at a significant distance from the Project and are highly unlikely to have any impact. Potential odour sources that were found to be located more than 5 km from the Project area have not been included in the assessment.

Site visits identified that a number of facilities are no longer operating, largely due to extensive development in and around the West Schofields area and surrounds.

## 4.3 Assessment methodology

### 4.3.1 Introduction

As previously discussed, poultry operations in the vicinity of the West Schofields study area were originally assessed using a Level 1 odour impact assessment (**Pacific Environment, 2017**). The A J Bush & Son meat rendering facility, two piggeries, the Quakers Hill Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) and Riverstone STP, and a green waste recycling facility were also included in the Level 1 assessment provided in **Appendix A**. The conservative nature of the Level 1 assessment produced results for seven poultry operations that indicated an area of influence that encroached on some of the Project area. These sources were therefore modelled in the Level 2/3 assessment.

The STPs, meat rendering plant and piggeries did not show any impact on the Project area and were therefore not included in the Level 2/3 assessment.

The Level 2/3 odour impact assessment methodology, based on an advanced modelling system using the models TAPM and CALMET/CALPUFF, has been used in this study to model the dispersion of odour from the poultry farms and green waste recycling facility that were predicted to have an area of odour influence that either encroaches or is in proximity to the West Schofields study area. The model requires meteorological data (e.g. wind speed, wind direction, atmospheric stability and mixing height) together with emission rates from the sources. The meteorological data that were used are further discussed in **Section 4.3.3.1**.

### 4.3.2 Emissions Estimation

#### 4.3.2.1 Poultry Farms

Odour emission rates (OERs) for this assessment have been estimated using a modelling approach based on data from a variety of meat chicken farms in New South Wales and Queensland, as well as theoretical considerations. Details on the method can be found in **Ormerod and Holmes (2005)**.

The approach generates hourly varying emission rates from each shed based on the following factors:

- The number of birds, which varies later in the batch as harvesting takes place.
- The stocking density of birds, which is a function of bird numbers, bird age and shed size.
- Ventilation rate, which depends on bird age and ambient temperature.
- Design and management practices, particularly those aimed at controlling litter moisture.

The predicted OER from a shed at any given stage of the growth cycle is given by Equation 1:

$$\text{OER} = 0.025 K A D V^{0.5} \quad (1)$$

where:

OER = odour emission rate (ou.m<sup>3</sup>/s)

A = total shed floor area (m<sup>2</sup>)

D = average bird density (in kg/m<sup>2</sup>)

V = ventilation rate (m<sup>3</sup>/s)

K = scaling factor between 1 and 5 where 1 represents an extremely well designed and managed shed, i.e., state of the art.

Bird density (D) at a point in time is related to the age of the birds (from which their weight can be estimated) and the stocking density (i.e. the number of birds placed per unit area). It is common practice within the meat chicken industry to vary the stocking density with the time of year and market demands. Lower ambient temperatures during the winter months allow for higher bird densities.

The ventilation rate (V) used at any given time is a function of the age of the birds, wind speed and the ambient temperature and humidity. Given the lack of available data on naturally ventilated sheds it has been assumed that the ventilation requirements for a tunnel ventilated shed may be used to approximate those of naturally ventilated sheds. This is consistent with the conclusions of the Poultry Odour Modelling Workshop Outcomes (see RIRDC, 2012).

Farm-specific parameters used for the chicken sheds in the emissions model are shown in **Table 4.2** and general parameters applying to all farms are shown in **Table 4.3**

The parameters shown in **Table 4.3** are based on experience of typical values adopted for assessment of poultry farms. It was also assumed that all four farms would start their cycle on Day 1 which is a conservative approach as this would result in all farms having peak emissions at the same time.

Table 4.2 Farm-specific parameters used within the chicken shed odour emissions model

Parameter	2 Pelican Rd, Schofields	25 Schofields Rd, Schofields	138 Clifton Rd, Marsden Park	264A South St, Marsden Park	306 South St, Marsden Park	20 Clarke St, Marsden Park	45 Farm Rd, Riverstone
Birds per shed <sup>a</sup>	19,711	25,000	13,171	25,000	28,514	14,000	12,500
Number of sheds	2	3	4	3	5	5	6
Shed length (m) <sup>b</sup>	90	91	62	124	137	51	66
Shed width (m)	15	16	14	14.5	21	17	13
Shed Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	1,350	1,456	868	1,798	2,896	887	842
Density (Birds/m <sup>2</sup> )	14.6	17.2	15.2	13.9	9.8	15.8	14.8
Ventilation Rate	197,110	250,000	131,708	250,000	285,142	140,000	125,000
Maximum vertical velocity stack (m/s)	0.31	0.35	0.24	0.42	0.23	0.17	0.27

<sup>a</sup> Due to lack of detailed information, it has been assumed that the total number of birds is split evenly amongst all sheds.

<sup>b</sup> Taken as longest shed.

Table 4.3 General parameters used within the chicken shed odour emissions model

Parameter	Value
Assumed maximum ventilation (m <sup>3</sup> /hr/bird)	10
Assumed number of fans	10
K Factor	4 <sup>1</sup>
Total length (days)	55
Days cleanout	10
Thinning 1 - day 32 (% chickens remaining)	75
Thinning 2 - day 38 (% chickens remaining)	50
Thinning 3 - day 44 (% chickens remaining)	25

Hourly odour emission rates for the chicken sheds are shown in **Figure 4.2**, which were calculated using the inputs in **Table 4.2** and **Table 4.3** and the meteorological data for the modelling period.

OERs gradually increase over the 55-day growth cycle and peak towards the end of the cycle. OERs then decrease to zero once the chickens are removed and the sheds are cleaned ten days. OERs were predicted to be lower for the cycle starting around day 130 as this represents winter in which ambient temperatures were lower than the target temperature for the sheds and therefore less ventilation is required.

<sup>1</sup> A K factor of 4 was used to reflect that the farms are old. Testing at numerous farms over the last five years has shown that the K factor for a modern, well managed farm is typically equal to or below K=2.




Figure 4.2: Hourly odour emission rates for the chicken sheds

#### 4.3.2.2 Green waste recycling

The Northwest Recycling Centre is a green waste recycling facility at 132 Burfitt Rd, Riverstone. The waste is ground with a horizontal grinder and then stockpiled for approximately 5 weeks. Aerial imagery from Google Earth indicates that there are two sections of waste on the site. These include a section of fresh green waste on approximately half of the site towards the front of the property, and a section of older, shredded green waste further back on the site.

For modelling purposes, the site was divided into two area sources. The emission rates for these area sources were taken from odour measurements carried out at a similar facility on stockpiles of green waste of various ages (ranging from 1 week to 3 months). The results of this monitoring identified that the highest odour emission rates (OERs) were detected from the 1 week old green waste (0.236 ou.m<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>/s) and the lowest emissions were detected from the 3-month-old green waste (0.164 ou.m<sup>3</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>/s). For conservatism, the OER for approximately half of the windrow area was estimated to be equivalent to the 1 week old green waste and the other half of the site was assigned an OER equivalent to the 4 weeks old green waste.

A shredder was modelled on the south-western border of the recycling centre, closest to the centre of the Project site for conservatism and was assumed to run for 4 hours per day, based on the size of the operation.

#### 4.3.3 Dispersion modelling

The Level 2/3 Odour Impact Assessment used air dispersion modelling based on an advanced modelling system using the models TAPM and CALMET/CALPUFF. This system substantially overcomes the basic limitations of

the steady-state Gaussian plume models such as AUSPLUME. These limitations are most severe in very light winds, in coastal environments, and where terrain affects atmospheric flow.

The modelling system works as follows:

- TAPM is a prognostic meteorological model that generates gridded three-dimensional meteorological data for each hour of the model run period.
- CALMET, the meteorological pre-processor for the dispersion model CALPUFF, calculates fine resolution three-dimensional meteorological data based upon observed ground and upper level meteorological data, as well as observed or modelled upper air data generated for example by TAPM.
- CALPUFF then calculates the dispersion of plumes within this three-dimensional meteorological field.

Further details about the TAPM and CALMET/CALPUFF modelling system are provided in **Section 4.3.3.1**, **Section 4.3.3.2** and **Section 4.3.3.3**)

**Figure 4.3** presents an overview of the modelling system and the details on the model configuration and data inputs are provided in the following sections.




Figure 4.3: Overview of modelling methodology

#### 4.3.3.1 TAPM

The Air Pollution Model, or TAPM, is a three-dimensional meteorological and air pollution model developed by the CSIRO Division of Atmospheric Research. Detailed description of the TAPM model and its performance is provided in **Hurley, 2008**.

TAPM solves the fundamental fluid dynamics and scalar transport equations to predict meteorology and (potentially) pollutant concentrations. It consists of coupled prognostic meteorological and air pollution concentration components. The model predicts airflow important to local scale air pollution, such as sea breezes and terrain induced flows, against a background of larger scale meteorology provided by synoptic analyses.

Upper air data in the form of a 3-D.dat file were generated over the Project area using TAPM. The TAPM-generated data and observed surface meteorological data were then entered into the CALMET diagnostic meteorological model, which is discussed below.

#### 4.3.3.2 CALMET

CALMET is a meteorological pre-processor that includes a wind field generator containing objective analysis and parameterised treatments of slope flows, terrain effects and terrain blocking effects. The pre-processor produces fields of wind components, air temperature, relative humidity, mixing height and other micro-meteorological variables to produce the three-dimensional meteorological fields that are used in the CALPUFF dispersion model.

The hourly TAPM-generated data and observed data for the period of analysis were used as input to the CALMET pre-processor to create a fine resolution, three-dimensional meteorological field for input into the dispersion model. CALMET uses the meteorological inputs in combination with land use and geophysical information for the modelling domain to predict gridded meteorological fields for the region.

Terrain data has been sourced from the NASA Shuttle Terrain Mission dataset. The spatial resolution of these data is approximately 90 m.

Meteorological information collected at the Vineyard OEH monitoring station, Sydney Airport BoM station and TAPM-generated surface information were used as input into the CALMET model. The data were additionally supplemented with upper air data derived from TAPM simulations.

A summary of the data and parameters used for the meteorological component of this study are shown in **Table 4.4**.

Table 4.4: Meteorological Parameters used for CALMET

<b>TAPM (v 4.0)</b>	
Number of grids (spacing)	4 (30 km, 10 km, 3 km, 1 km)
Number of grid points	25 x 25 x 35
Year of analysis	2015
Centre of analysis	-33.42.5 S, 150.51.5 E
<b>CALMET (v. 6.334)</b>	
Meteorological grid domain	15 km x 15 km
Meteorological grid resolution	0.1 km
TERRAD	2 km
IEXTRP	-4
BIAS (NZ)	-1, -0.5, -0.5, 0, 0, 0, 0
R1	1 km
R2	1 km
RMAX1	2 km
RMAX2	2 km
Surface meteorological stations	<p>Vineyard OEH Monitoring Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wind speed</li> <li>- Wind direction</li> <li>- Temperature</li> <li>- Relative Humidity</li> </ul> <p>Sydney Airport AMO (Bureau of Meteorology, Station No. 066037)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cloud content and height</li> </ul> <p>TAPM (to supplement missing data only)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wind speed</li> <li>- Wind direction</li> <li>- Temperature</li> <li>- Relative humidity</li> <li>- Sea Level Pressure</li> </ul>
Upper air	Data extracted from TAPM

### 4.3.3.3 CALPUFF

CALPUFF is a multi-layer, multi-species non-steady state puff dispersion model that can simulate the effects of time and space varying meteorological conditions on pollutant transport, transformation and removal (**Scire et al., 2000**). The model contains algorithms for near-source effects such as building downwash, partial plume penetration, sub-grid scale interactions as well as longer-range effects such as pollutant removal, chemical transformation, vertical wind shear and coastal interaction effects. The model employs dispersion equations based on a Gaussian distribution of pollutants across the puff and takes into account the complex arrangement of emissions from point, area, volume, and line sources.

In March 2011, the NSW EPA published generic guidance and optional settings for the CALPUFF modelling system for inclusion in the Approved Methods (**TRC, 2011**). The model set up for this study has been conducted with consideration of these guidelines.

As with any air dispersion model, CALPUFF requires inputs in three major areas:

- Emission rates and source details.
- Meteorology.
- Terrain and surface details, as well as specification of specific receptor locations.

Further details on the CALPUFF model set up are provided in **Appendix A**.

### 4.3.3.4 Poultry farm source details

Traditionally, emissions from animal husbandry buildings have been modelled as volume sources (e.g. **Jiang & Sands, 2000**). In dispersion models such as CALPUFF, volume sources are not capable of incorporating thermal plume buoyancy. However, there are times when air vented from poultry sheds is significantly warmer than the ambient temperature, and at these times some buoyancy effect leading to plume rise might be expected. Even temperature differentials as small as 1-2°C may have a significant effect on near-field ground level concentrations (**Ormerod et al. 2005**). The effects of plume buoyancy on ground level concentrations of odour are generally confined to distances of less than 1 km or so from the sheds, under stable conditions with light winds. However, if there is significant vertical wind shear (change of wind direction with height) even a slightly elevated plume may end up being transported in a different direction than would occur without plume buoyancy included in the calculations (if a three-dimensional dispersion model is used).

The most recent research from the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation<sup>2</sup> (RIRDC) concluded that air exhausted from broiler sheds is frequently warmer than ambient air, and will therefore usually rise due to thermal buoyancy. Realistic emission temperatures should therefore be used during dispersion modelling rather than ignoring thermal buoyancy. On this basis, a conservative estimate of thermal buoyancy has been included in this assessment.

Emissions from standard tunnel-ventilated poultry sheds are directed horizontally, with no significant vertical component. Therefore, any plume rise will occur as a result of thermal buoyancy of the emissions only, with no plume rise component due to vertical momentum. To deal with the effects of thermal buoyancy for this study, each standard shed has been modelled as a single point source per shed (with no mechanically-generated plume rise) whilst maintaining the thermal mass of the plume (i.e. vertical momentum is switched off within CALPUFF by

---

<sup>2</sup> Separation Distances for Broiler Farms Verifying methods and investigating the effects of thermal buoyancy by Mark Dunlop, David Duperouzel and Lyle Pott. June 2010. RIRDC Publication No 10/073. RIRDC Project No. PRJ-002747.

using the rain hat options). This incorporates the effect of plume movement due to the initial horizontal momentum, and is separated slightly in the vertical.

Exhaust temperatures from the sheds have been assumed to be at or slightly above target temperature (see **PAEHolmes (2011)**). The target temperature is that which the farmer aims to achieve to optimise the bird growth. In reality, these temperatures incorporate wind chill in the sheds, thus the exhaust temperature is often well above these. By conservatively adopting the target temperatures, the influence of thermal buoyancy is reduced compared to the actual exhaust temperatures, which are often up to 10°C higher than the target temperatures (with wind chill included).

Emissions from the green waste facility were taken from measurements made on a similar source, as discussed in **Section 4.3.2.2**.

## 4.4 Assessment of Impacts

**Figure 4.4** presents the results of the Level 2/3 dispersion modelling for the predicted 99<sup>th</sup> percentile odour concentrations for the Northwest Recycling Centre and the seven most influential poultry operations in proximity of the Project study area. The 2 OU contour represents the OEH guideline value, which is applicable for urban areas (i.e. exposure greater than 2000 people (see **Section 2.2.1**)). The limited impact from the chicken farms is expected due to their relatively small size compared to the larger, modern farms which are located in rural areas.

The model results show a reduced area of influence on the Project study area when compared with the Level 1 assessment results (see **Appendix A**) and show that there are no areas of the Project that are predicted to exceed the 2 OU guideline as a result of the poultry farms.

It should also be noted that this Level 2/3 assessment is based on a conservative assumption that all chicken sheds are operating on the same cycle, i.e. the highest odour emission rates are being released from all of the sheds at the same time. In reality this scenario would be unlikely. This assessment is therefore considered conservative.

The model results for the Northwest Recycling Centre shows an exceedance of the 2 OU criterion in the mid-eastern border of the Project Boundary. This is due to the centre being located within the Project Boundary. This will not affect residential developments proposed for West Schofields due to the siting of housing away from the northern and eastern boundaries of the Project site (**Figure 1.2**).

Notwithstanding the above conclusions, recommendations to limit odour impacts are given in **Section 5**.




Figure 4.4: 99<sup>th</sup> percentile 1-second average odour concentration contours (OU) associated with the operation of the seven closest poultry farms



Figure 4.5: 99<sup>th</sup> percentile 1-second average odour concentration contours (OU) associated with the operation of the Northwest Recycling Centre

## 5. Recommendations

### 5.1 Potential Development Control Plan provisions

Whilst the odour assessment predicts no adverse odour impacts on the residential developments, the following are considered good practice development controls to manage the potential for odour impacts on the proposed development. Potential options applicable to both existing sources and potential future sources on the site are listed below for further consideration:

- Plan a transition of land use zones that locates sensitive uses in areas that are not adjacent to odour generating activities;
- Consider introducing specific zoning categories for odour-generating activities, e.g. agriculture, intensive agriculture, minerals/metal processing, waste industries;
- Ensure that sensitive (residential) uses are located outside the 2 odour unit buffer;
- Plan compatible land uses in areas closest to odour sources, e.g. car parks, industrial areas. Residential areas should be away from odour sources;
- Orientate buildings to provide adequate air flow, i.e. no dead end courtyards, long narrow spaces, or areas where air may stagnate. Design buildings to encourage air flow;
- Ensure that air intake to buildings is not from the direction of odour sources (however be certain to consider air intakes on the other side of the building to any major road also);
- Consider ventilation and air conditioning and design buildings so living and work areas of buildings do not face odorous sources;
- Build continuous dense landscaping around local odour sources or Precinct boundaries to assist in reducing odour by increasing dispersion;
- Consider removing a separation buffer and removing development restrictions if an odour source ceases operation and has no prospect of restarting;
- Implement new buffer zones where shorter separation distances can be determined for some odour sources, either with or without changing the operation of the source, for example, through further study;
- Evaluate whether the nature of a development is compatible with odour affected lands and if odour nuisance will be detrimental to the successful long-term function of the completed development; and,
- Purchase or long-term lease neighbouring properties to provide a secure buffer zone around a facility and increase the separation distance between the site of the odour emissions and existing or potentially sensitive use.

When odour assessment criteria are being exceeded at receptors despite avoidance and mitigation measures at the source or in the pathway, consideration could be given to measures that would manage the reaction of the receptors and increase their willingness to accept the odour levels.

The following approaches may also be appropriate before an activity begins operation if there is some degree of uncertainty about whether the proposed odour avoidance and mitigation strategies will achieve the required odour levels at receptors.

- Establish a communication strategy so that affected neighbours are kept informed about the operation of odour generating facilities and are consulted about aspects of these operations likely to result in odour;
- Investigate the feasibility of facilities entering into an agreement with neighbours regarding their acceptance of the odour impacts. Negotiated outcomes would need to be documented in licence conditions, particularly in relation to the “offensive odour” provisions of the POEO Act. However, negotiated outcomes would not normally flow to any new neighbours (should properties be sold) or apply in relation to any new land uses. As a result, such an arrangement would not provide a secure long-term mitigation strategy; and
- Investigate the practicality of providing the most affected receptors with air-conditioning or other measures to reduce the impacts of emissions. This option would normally only be considered in exceptional circumstances.

Council should also consider new odour sources in the future development of the Precinct. Commercial businesses that produce odour will need to be controlled if they have potential to affect sensitive zones or nearby businesses and residences.

## 5.2 Alternative measures

It is noted that in situations similar to this, when residential land zoning encroaches on existing odour sources, some local councils have placed encumbrances on the title odour affected lots in the form of Section 149, part 5 certificates. Such a certificate highlights (in the contract for the sale of land) to any prospective purchaser that the land may be affected by offensive odour. The form of the certificate would normally contain a plain English paragraph describing the source, nature and extent of the odour, and often a diagram. It is believed that individuals that are particularly sensitive to odour may avoid such land, and as the NSW OEH criteria are designed to protect sensitive receptors, it is less likely that dissatisfaction and odour issues would arise for future owners of the project land. Legislation requires such certificates to be made known to prospective purchasers, hence reducing the potential scope for complaint.

The Section 149, part 5 certificate may for example state the following:

### *“ODOUR INUNDATION*

*“This land is in close proximity to active chicken sheds and from time to time residents of this site may experience odour from the operation of these chicken sheds. You are further advised that the sheds have no intention to cease operation at this stage.”*

Such measures are applied favourably by Camden Council in exactly this situation to good effect.

Other measures to consider include notifying the local council (as regulator and planner) and the farm operators of the potential for future land use conflict early. This report provides an indicative assessment of the likely future impacts that may arise, and indicates that operation of the chicken farms is not likely to be compatible with the long term project land use. Re-zoning of the farm land to an urban or residential land use in time for the operators to economically re-locate prior to full occupation of the project land is seen as a potential planning option to avert likely future odour issues in the area.

## 6. Conclusions

An investigation has been conducted to identify and develop an understanding of potential sources of odour that may impact the future development of the West Schofields Part Precinct.

A Level 1 odour impact assessment was been completed for the West Schofields Part Precinct consistent with the Technical Framework: Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW (DECC, 2006a) and its associated Technical Notes (DECC, 2006b). The operations with potential to cause impact were further assessed using a Level 2/3 odour impact assessment.

The model results show that there are no areas of the Project that are predicted to exceed the 2 OU guideline as a result of the seven poultry farms included in the dispersion modelling. The model results for the Northwest Recycling Centre show that whilst there are impacts predicted as a result of the operation within the Project site boundary, these do not affect the proposed residential development areas.

This report also provides options to consider in the planning process in order to mitigate potential odour impacts. The recommendations for development control in this area that have been provided incorporate an expectation that the measures would be revised, progressively, by the relevant planning body on the basis of more detailed, specific assessments for future individual developments provided through the Development Application process.

## 7. References

- BE (2008a), Level 1 Odour Impact Assessment for Development of Alex Avenue Precinct, Blacktown, NSW, Growth Centres Commission. Report No: 17016\_rep\_v4, Benbow Environmental, 5 June 2008.
- BE (2008b), Level 1 Odour Impact Assessment for Development of Riverstone Precinct, Blacktown, NSW, Growth Centres Commission. Report No: 17017\_rep\_iss\_4, Benbow Environmental, 25 February 2008.
- Bureau of Meteorology (2017) Climatic Averages Australia, Bureau of Meteorology website, [www.bom.gov.au](http://www.bom.gov.au)
- DUAP (1989), Guidelines for Buffer Areas Around STPs, Circular No E3 (formerly DEP 148), Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, March 1989.
- EPA VIC (2015), Designing, Constructing and Operating Composting Facilities. Environment Protection Authority Victoria, March 2015.
- Hurley, P. (2008) TAPM V4. Part 1: Technical Description, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research Paper.
- Jiang and Sands (1998) Report on Odour Emissions from Poultry Farms in Western Australia – Principal Technical Report, Centre for Water and Waste Technology, University of NSW, Sydney.
- Katestone Scientific Pty Ltd (1995) The evaluation of peak-to-mean ratios for odour assessments Volume 1 - Main Report, May 1995
- Katestone Scientific Pty Ltd (1998) Peak-to-Mean Concentration Ratios for Odour Assessments.
- NSW EPA (2005) Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW, August 2005.
- NSW DECC (2006a), Technical Framework: Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW, Air Policy Section, Department of Environment and Conservation, November 2006.
- NSW DECC (2006b), Technical Notes: Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW, Air Policy Section, Department of Environment and Conservation, November 2006.
- NSW DECC (2008), <http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/mao/abattoirs.htm>, 20 October 2008.
- Ormerod, R. & Holmes, G. (2005). Description of PAE Meat Chicken Farm Odour Emissions Model, Brisbane: Pacific Air & Environment.
- Pacific Environment (2017) West Schofields Full Precinct Level 1 Odour Assessment, prepared for Department of Planning and Environment, 20 March 2017.
- PAEHolmes (2010), Level 1 Odour Assessment for Precinct Planning, Schofields Precinct, North West Growth Centre, Schofields, NSW. Prepared for the Department of Planning Growth Centres Commission.
- Renzo Tonin & Associates and Todoroski Air Sciences (2016), *Vineyard Precinct Stage 1, Noise and Odour Assessment*. Prepared for the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, November 2016
- RIRDC (2012)  
RIRDC Poultry Odour Modelling Workshop Outcomes, 2012.

Scire, J.S., Strimaitis, D.G. & Yamartino, R.J (2000a) A User's Guide for the CALPUFF Dispersion Model (Version 5), Earth Tech, Inc., Concord, MA, 2000

Sydney Water Corporation (1997), Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) Buffer Zone Policy, Development Services Branch, March 1997.

TRC (2011). Generic Guidance and Optimum Model Settings for the CALPUFF Modelling System for Inclusion into the Approved Methods for Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW, Australia. Prepared for NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water.

---

# Appendix A

## Level 1 Assessment

---

# Assessment Methodology

## Level 1 Assessment – Separation Distance Calculations

### Poultry farms

The Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology for broiler chicken farms, as outlined in the Technical Notes (**NSW DECC, 2006b**), is provided below.

All poultry farms that are included in the assessment have been assessed using the broiler farm Level 1 odour assessment methodology (**NSW DECC, 2006b**).

Recommended separation distances for broiler farms are calculated using the following equation:

$$D = (N)^{0.71} \times S$$

Where:

N = Number of standard broiler chicken shed units (SBCSU) (1 SBCSU is equivalent to 22,000 broiler chickens);

D = Separation distance in metres between the closest points of the broiler chicken sheds and the most sensitive receptor or impact location;

S = Composite site factor = S1 x S2 x S3 x S4 x S5. Site factors S1 to S5 relate to shed design, receptor, terrain, vegetation and wind frequency. The value of S depends on site-specific information pertaining to S1 to S5.

It is noted that all shed and chicken numbers for currently operating poultry farms within 5 km of the proposed development area were previously identified as operating in the Schofields Precinct odour study (**PAEHolmes, 2010**). The information on bird and shed numbers were obtained from Blacktown City Council in 2010. Blacktown City Council no longer maintains records of bird and shed numbers for individual farms, thus for the purposes of this assessment it has been assumed that the bird and shed numbers have not changed. For farms where the number of birds was unknown, these were estimated using a calculation based on the shed dimensions (as measured from Google Earth), and a typical bird number per shed (**NSW DECC, 2006b**).

### Shed factor (S1)

The shed factor (S1) depends on how the shed is ventilated. Factors for S1 are shown in **Table A.1.1**.

Table A.1.1. Shed Factor (S1)

Shed Type	Value
Controlled fan ventilation without barriers <sup>a</sup>	980
Controlled fan ventilation with barriers	690
Natural ventilation	690

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.21

- a. *Barriers defined as walls, berms and other structures designed to mitigate emissions from controlled fan ventilated sheds.*

The majority of poultry sheds investigated in this study operate under natural ventilation. An exception is the broiler chicken farm at 20 Clarke St, which is a tunnel ventilated operation. The shed factor for 20 Clarke St is 980.

## Receptor factor (S2)

The receptor factor (S2) varies depending on the likely impact area. It is determined based on criteria shown in **Table A.1.2**.

Table A.1.2. Receptor factor (S2)

Receptor Type	Value
Large towns, greater than 2000 persons	1.05
Medium towns, 500–2000 persons	0.75
Medium towns, 125–500 persons	0.55
Small towns, 30–125 persons	0.45
Small towns, 10–30 persons	0.35
Single rural residence	0.30
Public area (occasional use)	0.05 a

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.21

- a. *The value for public areas would apply to areas subject to occasional use. Higher values may be appropriate for public areas used frequently or sensitive in nature, such as frequently used halls and recreation areas. These should be assessed individually.*

The impact area being considered may be a neighbour’s house, small town or large town that may be affected by odour generated at the broiler chicken sheds. Any likely future receptor locations should also be considered.

For a town, the distance is measured from the closest point of the town boundary. For a rural farm residence, the distance is the closest part of the residence itself, excluding any yards.

Proposals for the future development of the Project are to consider capacity for greater than 2,000 people. The receptor factor for this assessment is therefore set to 1.05.

## Terrain factor (S3)

The terrain factor (S3) varies according to topography and its ability to disperse odours and is determined from **Table A.1.3**.

Table A.1.3. Terrain factor (S3)

Terrain	Value
Valley drainage zone	2.0
Low relief	1.2
Flat	1.0
Undulating country between broiler chicken farm and receptor	0.9
High relief or significant hills and valleys between broiler chicken farm and receptor	0.7

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.22

Flat is regarded as less than 10% upslope, 2% downslope and not in a valley drainage zone.

High relief is regarded as upslope terrain or a hill that projects above the 10% rising slope from the broiler chicken sheds. Thus the receptor location will be either uphill from the broiler chicken sheds, behind a significant obstruction or have significant hills and valleys between the sheds and the receptor.

Low relief is regarded as terrain which is generally below the 2% falling slope from the broiler chicken sheds. Thus the receptor will be downhill from the broiler chicken sheds.

Undulating hills comprise topography of continuous rolling, generally low level hills and valleys with minimal vegetation cover, but without sharply defined ranges, ridges or escarpments.

A valley drainage zone has topography at low relief with significant confining sidewalls.

Topographical features at the selected site may adversely affect the odour impact under certain circumstances. During the early evening or night time, under low wind speed conditions, population centres located in a valley at a lower elevation than a broiler chicken farm may be subject to higher odour concentrations as a result of down-valley wind or the occurrence of low-level inversions. Unless site-specific information has been gathered under conditions dominated by low wind speeds, the value for the factor S3 should apply.

Some of the poultry farms under investigation as part of this study were located on the other side of a low-level ridge line from the Project study area, and were therefore assigned a terrain factor of 0.9 for undulating terrain. For others, the assigned factor was 1.0 representing flat terrain.

## Vegetation factor (S4)

The vegetation factor (S4) varies according to vegetation density, as shown in **Table A.1.4**. The vegetation density is assessed by the effectiveness with which the vegetation will reduce odour by dispersion. Tree cover should be maintained, as far as practicable, for the life of broiler chicken sheds.

Table A.1.4. Vegetation factor (S4)

Vegetation	Value
Crops only, no tree cover	1.0
Few trees, long grass	0.9
Wooded country	0.7
Heavy timber	0.6
Heavy forest (both upper and lower storey)	0.5

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.23

Few trees, with long grass is regarded as open country with a permanent covering of grass or pasture of around 1 m or more in height and with a light scattering of timber which is distributed continuously across the buffer area. Topography would be predominantly flat to slightly undulating. Isolated clumps of trees would not be sufficient to attract this concession. Land being actively cropped would not attract this concession because of the extended periods when it is bare or carrying only very low ground cover.

Wooded country is regarded as open forest country with tree density not sufficient to provide a continuous canopy, but sufficiently dense to influence air movement. There would be little or no lower storey vegetation. The density needs to be such that the vegetation can be considered as a contiguous belt and isolated clumps would not attract this concession. The minimum tree height is 4 m and the minimum extent in the direction of the receptor is 400 m.

Heavy timber is regarded as tall forest areas with dense timber stands providing a continuous canopy.

There is limited understorey vegetation, mainly associated with regrowth. The minimum tree height is 4 m and the minimum extent in the direction of the receptor is 400 m.

Heavy forest, upper and lower storey is regarded as dense layers of taller timber with an interlocking canopy and with extensive amounts of lower storey vegetation of various species resulting in almost complete ground cover and a dense upper canopy. Examples are uncleared brigalow areas and dense eucalypt forests where little or no clearing or harvesting have occurred. The minimum tree height is 4 m and the minimum extent in the direction of the receptor is 400 m.

The values suggested for S4 should be used with care. No concession should be given for an intention to plant a barrier.

To improve visual amenity and odour dispersion, premises should be encouraged to plant and maintain upper- and lower-storey vegetation that would not cast shadows on the broiler chicken sheds.

The poultry operations considered in this study were assigned a factor of 1.0, representing no tree cover. There is some tree cover in the area, so this assumption provides a conservative approach.

### Wind frequency factor (S5)

The wind frequency factor (S5) is determined from **Table A.1.5**.

Table A.1.5. Wind frequency factor (S5)

Wind frequency	Value
High frequency towards receptor (greater than 60%)	1.5
Normal wind conditions	1.0
Low frequency towards receptor (less than 5%)	0.7

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.23

Wind speed and direction varies annually and diurnally (that is by the season and by the hour of the day). Although there is generally one direction that is the most frequently observed (prevailing wind), the wind direction usually blows from all directions at some time.

The wind can be classed as high frequency towards the receptor if the wind is blowing towards the receptor ( $\pm 40$  degrees) with a frequency of at least 60% of the time for all hours over a whole year.

The wind can be classed as low frequency towards the receptor if the wind is blowing towards the receptor ( $\pm 40$  degrees) with a frequency of less than 5% of the time for all hours over a whole year.

Local meteorology has been assessed (see Meteorology section) and winds are considered to be normal. All sites were assigned a wind frequency factor of 1.0.

### Intensive piggeries

The Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology for intensive piggeries, as outlined in the Technical Notes (**NSW DECC, 2006b**), is provided below. Recommended separation distances for intensive piggeries are calculated using the following equation:

$$D = \sqrt{N \times 50 \times S}$$

Where:

N = Number of standard pig units (SPU). A standard pig unit is defined as a grower pig of 26–60 kilograms live weight. **Table A.1.6** shows factors for converting other types and weights of pig to SPU.

D = Separation distance in metres between the closest points of the piggery and the most sensitive receptor or impact location.

S = Composite site factor = S1 x S2 x S3 x S4 x S5. Site factors S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5 are determined according to site-specific information relating to shed design, maintenance schedule, receptor, terrain, vegetation and wind factor.

### Standard pig units (SPUs)

Piggeries either have a range of pigs, from farrowing to finisher, or only one type of pig (e.g. growers). Larger pigs usually produce more manure and hence have a greater potential for odour production. For a piggery growing from farrowing to finishers, the number of standard pig units (SPU) can be estimated by multiplying the total number of sows by ten. **Table** can be used for more refined calculations.

Table A.1.6. Standard pig units conversion table

Type of pig approximate weight range (kg)	Number of standard pig units (SPU)
Lactating sows 160–250	2.5
Gestating sow 160–250	1.8
Gilt 100–160	1.8
Heavy finisher 100-125	1.8
Boar 100–250	1.6
Finisher 61–100 (75)	1.6
Grower 26–60 (40)	1.0
Weaners 8–25 (16)	0.5
Suckers/early weaners 1.4–8	0.1

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p. 30

Two piggeries were identified at 101 Hambledon Road, Schofield and 1200 Richmond Road, Marsden Park. At time of final reporting, it was found that 1200 Richmond Road was no longer operational.

SPUs were calculated for 101 Hambledon Road from data collected by Benbow Environmental (**BE, 2008a**). That study found that piggeries at 21 Gordon Rd, Schofields (no longer operating) and 101 Hambledon Rd each held lactating sows, gestating sows, and suckers.

Final pig numbers at 101 Hambledon Road, Schofields have been calculated in **PAEHolmes (2010)** from **Table** using the approximate live weight and type. Total standard pig numbers were calculated by multiplying the number of pigs in each class by the above conversion factors and then adding the totals.



The ratio of total shed size between 101 Hambledon Road, Schofields and 1200 Richmond Road, Marsden Park was used to calculate SPUs at 1200 Richmond Road. Shed sizes were identified based on aerial images and a ratio between shed sizes at the two sites was calculated.

The value of S to apply in the equation depends on site-specific information pertaining to the proposed shed design, maintenance schedule, receptor, terrain, vegetation and wind frequency. These are detailed below.

### Odour potential factor (S1)

The odour potential factor (S1) for each class of piggery, varies with the shed design and maintenance schedule. It can be determined from **Table A.1.7** by multiplying the factors together i.e. A x B x C x D x E. The S1 factor can be no lower than 0.5.

The reduction factor could be adjusted if there is a new technology that can be demonstrated and quantified to reduce the odour.

The odour potential factor S1 for this assessment is based on the data collected by Benbow Environmental (**BE, 2008a**). This study found that piggeries at 21 Gordon Rd (no longer operational) and 101 Hambledon Rd each held lactating sows, gestating sows, and suckers. One farm also had growers. Both farms had slatted floors with deep pits, limited ventilation by ridge and side-ventilator, anaerobic lagoons, and used conventional feeding.

Table A.1.7. Odour potential factor (S1)

Odour potential factors		Value
<b>A</b>	<b>Type of building</b>	
	1 Slatted floor and deep pit	1.0
	2 Partly slatted floor and shallow pit or open drain with regular flushing	0.9
	3 Partly slatted floor and sloping floor and regular flushing	0.8
	4 Partly slatted floor and 'pull plug' and recharge system	0.6
<b>B</b>	<b>Ventilation of buildings</b>	
	1 Limited ridge and side-ventilators (or side only) or limited forced (fan) ventilation	1.0
	2 Ridge ventilators which are at least 90% of the roof length and are at least 10% of the roof width and side ventilators are at least 90% of the length of the two long sides of the building and at least 30% of the side wall height, with roof and walls insulated	0.9
	3 Fan forced ventilated shed with well-designed uniform ventilation throughout shed	0.9

	Odour potential factors	Value
<b>C</b>	<b>Effluent collection frequency within all pig buildings</b>	
	1 Faeces, urine and other biological material removed from the confines of the buildings every 24 hours or less often	1.0
	2 Faeces, urine and other biological material removed from the confines of the buildings while essentially aerobic but in no case less often than 24 hours	0.9
<b>D</b>	<b>Effluent treatment system (within the piggery compound)</b>	
	1 Anaerobic lagoon(s) (including all inlet pipes/channels)	1.0
	2 Series lagoons anaerobic/aerobic (or facultative) and evaporation lagoons	1.0
	3 Facultative lagoon(s) (including all inlet pipes/channels)	0.95
	4 Aerated lagoon(s) (aerobic surface layer over entire lagoon)	0.75
	5 Aerobic lagoon(s)	0.6
	6 No effluent storage within at least 500 m of the piggery	0.6
<b>E</b>	<b>Feeding</b>	
	1 Conventional feeding	1.0
	2 Phase feeding	0.9
	3 Phase feeding with optimal protein	0.8

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.31

## Receptor factor (S2)

The receptor factor (S2) varies depending on the likely impact area. The receptor factor for intensive piggeries is determined in the same way as for broiler farms and outlined above, although the factors are different as shown in **Table A.1.8**.

Table A.1.8. Receptor factor (S2)

Receptor type	Value
Large towns, greater than 2000 persons	1.6
Medium towns, 500–2000 persons	1.2
Medium towns, 125–500 persons	1.1
Small towns, 30–125 persons	1.0
Small towns, 10–30 persons	0.6
Single rural residence	0.3
Public area (occasional use)	0.05 <sup>a</sup>

Source: NSW DECC 2006b, p.33

- a. The value for public areas would apply to areas subject to occasional use. Higher values may be appropriate for public areas used frequently or sensitive in nature, such as frequently used halls and recreation areas. These should be assessed individually.

The Project will house more than 2,000 people and therefore a factor of 1.6 has been used for S2 for piggeries.

### Other site factors (S3, S4 and S5)

The other site factors, i.e. terrain factor (S3), vegetation factor (S4) and wind frequency factor (S5), are assessed in the same way for intensive piggeries as for broiler chicken sheds.

For this assessment, the terrain factor S3 was set at 1.0 to represent flat terrain between the piggeries and the Project study area. S4 was set at 0.9 since the piggeries were located with a few trees between them and the proposed development area. S5 was set to 1.0 for normal meteorological conditions.

### Two odour sources in close proximity

Where two similar operations are located near each other, for example two broiler farms or two piggeries, the area of influence may need to be modified.

Where the operations are considered as separate entities, a 20% increase in separation distance may apply to the area that is predicted to be influenced by both. The two sources are assessed by adding 20% to the required separation distance of each operation and determining whether the two zones overlap. If the zones overlap, the added 20% applies to the separation distance. If the zones don't overlap, the normal separation distance applies.

## A J Bush & Son, Riverstone - Meat rendering operations

There is no Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology for meat rendering operations outlined by the Technical notes (**NSW DECC, 2006b**). However, NSW DECC has published recommended separation distances for these operations, as outlined below.

A minimum buffer distance to the nearest residence or residential area of 1,000 m is recommended downwind of a rendering plant. This depends on the prevailing winds and may need to be increased if effective and reliable odour control equipment is not installed (**NSW DECC, 2008**).

For the Level 1 assessment, a buffer zone of 1,000 m has been applied to the A J Bush & Son meat rendering operations.

## Sewage treatment plants

There is no Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology for sewage treatment plants outlined by the Technical notes (**NSW DECC, 2006b**). However, Sydney Water and the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning (DUAP, now the Department of Planning) have published guidance on recommended separation distances for these operations, as outlined below.

DUAP issued Circular No E3 (**DUAP, 1989**) which outlined a guideline for buffer areas about sewage treatment plants. This guideline states that:

*“Ideally, buffer areas should be created through local environment plans, and be at least 400 metres wide, but this may vary to suit local conditions. Meteorological advice should be obtained to work out the most likely movement of air flows so that the widest buffer areas can be established in that direction.*

*To obtain the most efficient use of land possible, buffer zone areas should also be used for compatible purposes. Possibilities include: flora and fauna reserves; grazing; agricultural use; forestry; commercial plant nurseries; recreation; effluent disposal; or public road reserves.”*

Sydney Water also has prepared a Sewage Treatment Plant Buffer Zone Policy (**Sydney Water, 1997**) that is intended to assist Sydney Water personnel as well as Councils and developers in assessing the suitability of land for different types of developments. Within this policy document the following discussion is made on the subject of the width of buffer zones:

*“It is generally agreed that the buffer width should be measured from the existing plant boundary. However, in many cases, adjoining development already encroaches on the 400 metre zone, if measured from the plant boundary. Several STPs have residential development, which was permitted prior to current policy standards, within 400 metres of their boundaries. The Corporation needs to avoid further encroachment into STP buffer zones to the extent possible.”*

The buffer zone is an area defined by DUAP and Sydney Water in which development is subject to additional controls. The logic behind this is that this area has the potential to be exposed to the additional risks of exposure to releases of chlorine from chlorination facilities, odour, noise and light from the normal and abnormal operation of the facility and dust from the handling of solids on the site. This potential for exposure to any or all of the noted

agents makes 24 hour per day use of this area by the public for, for example, residential or entertainment uses unsuitable.

The 400 m buffer zone has been applied to the nearby sewage treatment plants in this assessment to indicate whether there is any conflict between the proposed development land and the separation distance as recommended above.

## Mushroom Farms

There is no Level 1 odour impact assessment methodology for mushroom production outlined by the Technical notes (DECC, 2006b). Further to this, New South Wales does not currently offer advice on separation distances for mushroom farms. Further research was then conducted to determine a suitable separation distance for this source.

Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2002 recommends buffer distances for agricultural activities. It recommends 500 m for a composting facility and recommends that Council specify a buffer zone for mushroom farms. In gathering such data, Council were unable to provide such recommendation.

The Western Australia Environmental Protection Authority (WA EPA) has published the “*Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors (in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1986): Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses*”. This document recommends a separation distance of 500-1,000 m dependant on the size of the mushroom farm (WA EPA, 2005).

Therefore, for the Level 1 odour impact assessment, a conservative buffer zone of 1,000 m has been applied to the Elf Mushrooms/White Prince Mushroom farm and the Mushroom Gardens farm.

## Green waste facilities

Whilst the NSW EPA does not provide specific odour buffer guidance for green waste recycling facilities, the Victorian EPA does provide some information on recommended separation distances based on the type of facility and the size of the plant. This guidance is shown in **Table A.1.9** and **Table A.1.10**.

Table A.1.9. Recommended separation distances for green waste recycling facilities – reference facility 1

Types of feedstock	Technology being used	Size of the plant	Recommended separation distances (m)
Green Waste	Open air receival	1,200 tonnes per annum	>300
Vegetable organics	Enclosed aerobic composting with	14,000 tonnes per annum	>500
Grease inceptor trap waste	secondary odour capture and treatment equipment	36,000 tonnes per annum	>800
	Open air maturation	55,000 tonnes per annum	>1,000
		75,000 tonnes per annum	>1,200

90,000 tonnes per annum	>1,400
-------------------------	--------

Source: EPA VIC (2015).

Table A.1.10. Recommended separation distances for green waste recycling facilities- reference facility 2

Types of feedstock	Technology being used	Size of the plant	Recommended separation distances (m)
Green Wastes	Open air receival	1,200 tonnes per annum	>600
	Open turned windrow	14,000 tonnes per annum	>1,100
	Open air maturation	36,000 tonnes per annum	>2,000
		50,000 tonnes per annum	>2,000

Source: EPA VIC (2015).

The buffer distances used in this assessment for green waste recycling facilities have been based on the facility type, and plant size.

## Meteorology

Odour impacts in the Project study area will be influenced by local meteorology. Meteorological conditions, such as wind speed, wind direction and atmospheric turbulence, affect how often receptors are likely to be downwind of an odour source as well as how well the odour disperses in the atmosphere.

The closest meteorological station to the site is at the Riverstone STP, off Bandon Road, Vineyard. The Vineyard site was commissioned in February 1994 and is maintained by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). The following meteorological variables are measured at Vineyard:

- Wind speed, wind direction and sigma theta.
- Ambient temperature.
- Relative humidity.

Figure A.1.1 presents the annual and seasonal windroses prepared using data collected from Vineyard in 2015.

On an annual basis, the winds are predominantly from the south south-west to south south-east and north north-west to north north-east. This persists throughout the year with winds predominantly from these directions in

autumn, winter and spring. In the summer the wind directions are more frequently mixed from the south south-east, east north-east and north.

Annually, the lower strength winds (0.5 to 1.5 m/s) were most commonly from the north and south south-west.




Figure A.1.1: Annual and seasonal windroses for Vineyard (2015)

## Level 1 assessment results

### Poultry farms

A number of the poultry farms identified within in the vicinity of the Project study area, were discounted from the assessment due to distance from the study area. Any operations that were determined to have ceased or were more than 5 km from the study area, were excluded.

**Table A.1.11** provides the Level 1 assessment calculations for poultry farms relevant to the study. The distance of each farm from the study area and recommended separation distances are also presented. The recommended separation distances for the small number of poultry farms predicted to encroach on the Project study area are shown in bold.

The poultry farms identified as potentially encroaching on the Project study area are:

- 2 Pelican Road, Schofields
- 25 Schofields Road, Schofields
- 138 Clifton Rd, Marsden Park
- 264A South Street, Marsden Park
- 306 South St, Marsden Park
- 20 Clarke St, Riverstone
- 45 Farm Road, Riverstone

The recommended individual separation distances for these seven poultry farms which have the greatest potential influence on the Project study area are shown in **Figure A.1.2** to **Figure A.1.8**. The yellow circles indicate the recommended buffer distances for individual farms and the orange circles the buffer distances plus 20%, indicating when two farms influence the same area.

**Figure A.1.9** provides a prediction for the combined area of influence of all poultry farms in the region (within 5 km) around the Project study area. It can be seen from **Figure A.1.9** that only a small portion of the Project area is predicted to be influenced by odour, all of which originate from the seven poultry farms identified above.

The Level 1 separation distances of the majority of the poultry operations outlined in **Table A.1.11** do not encroach on the Project study area.

### Intensive piggeries

The operational piggeries in the surrounding region are not predicted to influence the Project study area.

**Table A.1.11** provides the calculations and **Figure A.1.10** presents the recommended separation distances for the assessed intensive piggeries.

## A J Bush & Son meat rendering operations

The recommended 1,000 m separation distance (**DECC, 2008**) has been applied to the AJ Bush & Son, Riverstone meat rendering operation, as shown in **Table A.1.12** and **Figure A.1.11**.

The suggested separation distance indicates that odour from the meat rendering operations is not predicted to influence the Project study area.

It should be noted that the recommended 1,000 m separation distance for meat rendering plants is a default buffer that does not account for site-specific data such as emission rates and control technologies, meteorology, terrain etc. It is acknowledged that the 1,000 m buffer is used in Australia as an acceptable default separation distance; however anecdotal evidence also suggests that some meat rendering plants can have odour impacts beyond this distance.

## Landfill operations

A search of NSW EPA Environment Protection Licences (EPLs) in the Schofields area and surrounds identified a potential odour source at the Marsden Park Landfill (EPL 11497). During a visit to the site, no waste could be observed on site and no odour was detected at the roadside. The facility was contacted on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and it was confirmed that no odorous wastes are accepted, including food or chemical wastes. The landfill is therefore not considered a potential odour source and has not been assessed any further.

## Sewage treatment plants

The Quakers Hill STP and Riverstone STP are located approximately 2,300 m and 3,200 m from the Project boundary respectively. Two further STPs (Saint Mary's and Rouse Hill) are located in the vicinity of the Project, however these are located greater than 5 km from the boundary and have not been considered further.

## Green waste recycling facilities

One green waste recycling facility, the Northwest Recycling Centre, was identified within the Project boundary, located at 132 Burfitt Road, Riverstone. The Centre's EPL (11620) allows for 0 - 5,000 tonnes of organics to be received. For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that the facility can be categorised as reference facility 2 shown in **Table A.1.10**. The buffer distance selected for use in the assessment is 1,100 m which assumes a highly conservative plant size of 14,000 tonnes per annum.

Table A.1.11. Recommended separation distances from poultry farms (Level 1 assessment method)

Address	Bird Type	Sheds	Total Birds	SBCSU	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	Separation Distance (m)	(+20%)	Distance from the Project (m)
100 Worchester Rd, Rouse Hill	Layer	4	32,000	1.45	690	1.05	0.9	1	1	851	1,021	4,100
95 Tallowong Rd, Schofields	Broiler	5	92,000	4.18	690	1.05	0.9	1	1	1,801	2,161	2,900
<b>20 Clarke St, Riverstone</b>	<b>Broiler</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2,106</b>	<b>2,528</b>	<b>2,386</b>
16 Clarke St, Riverstone	Broiler	2	10,000	0.45	690	1.05	0.9	1	1	373	447	2,360
<b>2 Pelican Rd, Schofields</b>	<b>Broiler</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39,422</b>	<b>1.79</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,096</b>	<b>1,315</b>	<b>1,130</b>
93 Hambledon Rd, Schofields	Broiler	3	53,000	2.41	690	1.05	1	1	1	1,353	1,623	2,400
<b>25 Schofields Rd, Schofields</b>	<b>Broiler</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,731</b>	<b>2,077</b>	<b>1,600</b>
26 Schofields Farm Rd, Schofields	Broiler	4	42,837	1.95	690	1.05	1	1	1	1,163	1,395	1,800
37-39 Boundary Rd, Schofields	Layer	1	8,000	0.36	690	1.05	1	1	1	353	424	1,930
<b>45 Farm Rd, Riverstone</b>	<b>Duck Farm</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,731</b>	<b>2,077</b>	<b>1,240</b>
<b>138 Clifton Rd, Marsden Park</b>	<b>Layer</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>52,683</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>1,616</b>	<b>200</b>
1148 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park	Broiler/Layer	7	60,000	2.73	690	1.05	1	1	1	1,477	1,773	1,800

Address	Bird Type	Sheds	Total Birds	SBCSU	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	Separation Distance (m)	(+20%)	Distance from the Project (m)
264A South St, Marsden Park	Broiler	3	75,000	3.41	690	1.05	1	1	1	1,731	2,077	1,400
306 South St, Marsden Park	Broiler	5	142,571	6.48	690	1.05	1	1	1	2,731	3,277	1,800
1132 Richmond Rd, Marsden Park	Layer	4	60,000	2.73	690	1.05	1	1	1	1,477	1,773	1,800
472 Windsor Rd, Vineyard	Broiler	3	10,245	0.47	690	1.05	1	1	1	421	505	4,200
466 Windsor Road, Vineyard	Broiler and Layer	3	10,502	0.48	690	1.05	1	1	1	429	514	4,219
199 Stahls Road, Oakville	Layer	5	28,615	1.30	690	1.05	0.9	1	1	786	943	4,743

Table A.1.12. Recommended separation distances from piggeries (Level 1 assessment method)

Address	Operation	Sheds	SPU <sup>a</sup>	S1 <sup>a</sup>	S2	S3	S4	S5	Separation Distance (m)	(+20%)	Distance from the Project (m)
101 Hambleton Rd	Piggery	8	403	1	1.6	1	1	1	1,606	1,927	2,550

a) Based on BE (2008a).

Table 7.1. Recommended separation distances from other sources

Address	Operation	Buffer Distance (m)	Distance from the Project (m)
1106 Windsor Rd, Riverstone	A J Bush & Son Meat Rendering Ops	1,000	3,000
Quakers Road, Marayong	Quakers Hill Sewage Treatment Plant	400	2,300
132 Burfitt Rd Riverstone	Northwest Recycling Centre	1,100	0 (within project boundary)
Bandon Road, Riverstone	Riverstone Sewage Treatment Plant	400	3021
61 Wallace Road, Vineyard	Elf Mushroom Farm	1000	3988
61 Wallace Road, Vineyard	White Prince Mushroom Farm	1000	3988
496 Windsor Road, Vineyard	Mushroom Gardens Mushroom Farm	1000	4001




Figure A.1.2: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 2 Pelican Road, Schofields



Figure A.1.3: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 25 Schofields Road, Schofields




Figure A.1.4: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 138 Clifton Road, Marsden Park




Figure A.1.5: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 264A South Street, Marsden Park




Figure A.1.6: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 306 South Street, Marsden Park




Figure A.1.7: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 45 Farm Road, Riverstone



Figure A.1.8: Level 1 separation distance for broiler farm at 20 Clarke Street, Riverstone




Figure A.1.9: Combined Level 1 separation areas for poultry farms around the Project study area




Figure A.1.10: Level 1 separation distances for intensive piggeries in proximity to the Project study area




Figure A.1.11: Recommended buffer distance for meat rendering operation in proximity to the Project study area



Figure A.1.12: Recommended buffer distances for sewage treatment plant operations in proximity to the Project study area




Figure A.1.13: Recommended buffer distances for green waste recycling operations (132 Burfitt Road, Riverstone) in proximity to the Project study area

# Appendix B

## Vineyard OEH Wind-roses (2011-2015)

---




Figure B.1.1: 2011, 2012 and 2013 annual and seasonal windroses for OEH Vineyard




Figure B.1.2: 2014 and 2015 annual and seasonal windroses for OEH Vineyard

# Appendix C

## CALPUFF Model Set-up

---

Table C.1.1.: Meteorological Parameters used for CALPUFF

Flag	Flag Descriptor	Value Used	Value Description
MCHEM	Chemical Transformation	0	Not modelled
MDRY	Dry Deposition	0	Yes for PM
MTRANS	Transitional plume rise allowed?	1	Yes
MTIP	Stack tip downwash?	1	Yes
MRISE	Method to compute plume rise	1	Briggs plume rise
MSHEAR	Vertical wind Shear	0	Vertical wind shear not modelled
MPARTL	Partial plume penetration of elevated inversion?	1	Yes
MSPLIT	Puff Splitting	0	No puff splitting
MSLUG	Near field modelled as slugs	0	Not used
MDISP	Dispersion Coefficients	2	Based on micrometeorology
MPDF	Probability density function used for dispersion under convective conditions	1	Yes
MROUGH	PG sigma y,z adjusted for z	0	No
MCTADJ	Terrain adjustment method	3	Partial Plume Adjustment
MBDW	Method for building downwash	0	No