

## **Southern Region Joint Regional Planning Public Briefing Meeting**

### **Goulburn Mulwaree Council**

#### **Public Briefing Meeting**

Time & Date:	Friday 28 October 2011, 1.30pm to 4pm
Meeting Location:	Goulburn Mulwaree Council Chambers
Project & DA No:	2011STH006 – Goulburn – DA 0271/1011 - Waste or Resource Transfer Station, Bridge Street/Sydney Road, Goulburn
Panel Members:	Allen Grimwood (Chair), Alison McCabe, Mark Grayson, Councillor Denzil Sturgiss, John Massey

The Chair advised that the meeting is a public briefing session only and that a determination will not be made. The purpose of the meeting is an opportunity for the Panel to listen to and understand the key issues and community concerns with the proposal.

#### **Presentations:**

##### **1. Peter Walker – Representative for the Denrith Pty Limited and the Divall's Family**

- Overview of the proposed development
- Responds to community needs and the current facility is outdated
- Commented on the proposed location having access to railway line being of benefit.
- Clarified that the proposed development was to be a Waste Transfer Station not a Processing facility
- The proposal is permitted in the zone
- Objectors concerns raised have been addressed and associated reports carried out in accordance.

##### **2. Robert Mowle- Laterals Planning Consultant**

- Prepared the Statement of Environmental Effects and associated development application documents for the lodgement of the Development Application.
- The facility is to cater to 20,000 tonnes of putrescible waste per annum and 8,000 tonnes pa of recyclables
- Addressed the meeting with an overview of the Development Application lodged.
- The 5 Key matters of concern addressed
  - Air Quality (odour)
  - Traffic
  - Visual
  - Water Quality
  - Noise and Vibration

- Outstanding concerns SEPP55 – developers have engaged an expert to prepare a report, to be finalised soon.
- *Clarification for the rail line at the proposed location for the facility being of benefit for future development, however not part of the current Development Application proposal.*

#### *Panel Questions*

- *Can sight distances be achieved for entry and exit from Bridge Road at the intersection with Sydney Road*
- *Number of trucks expected to and from the facility*
- *Timeframe for the turnover of the Waste – expected daily turnover, similar to current Endeavour Industry process.*
- *Putrescible Waste – expected daily turnover to be trucked to Woodlawn.*
- *Expected Odour appears to be of major concern – concerns addressed and levels have been expertly assessed and associated reports carried out for the expected odour.*
- *Air Quality Concerns addressed – Negative pressure controlled air environment with Filtration System, enclosed building within the building. Water Quality concerns – report from Sydney Catchment Authority outlines that general terms have been satisfied with relation to Water Quality.*
- *Operating hours – Mon to Fri 7am to 5pm, Sat & Sun 8 to 4pm (similar to that of the current tip facility).*
- *Traffic Concerns – Traffic movements to facility is expected to be regular throughout the day, Weekends expected more morning traffic. Traffic Engineer to comment further.*

### **3. Chris Stewart – Director of Planning & Community Services**

- Resolution from Council Meeting 18 October 2011 for a submission to be lodged to the Southern Joint Regional Planning Panel outlining the concerns issues. Provided the issues can be adequately addressed the proposal is to be supported by elected representatives
- Overview of Goulburn Mulwaree Council's current Waste Facilities, stating that Endeavour Industries have outgrown current facilities and that the Goulburn Mulwaree Waste Facility has an expected life of 2027.
- Perceived community conflict of Interest considering Council sold the block of land to the developers in 2008, and that Council currently has a contract with Endeavour Industries.
- The proposal complies with a regional waste strategy adopted by the South East ROC.
- SEPP (Infrastructure) prevails over the local planning scheme and permits the facility in the zone.
- Council has engaged an Independent consultant to assess the DA - Mr Paul Hume.
- Council is in support of the proposal and would continue to use the current waste facility to extend past 2027.

- The report to Council was prepared on 7 October based on the proposal at that stage which has since been modified. Additional information was received on 14 October concerning odour control and compartmentalisation of operations

#### *Panel Questions*

- *Details of community consultation that has taken place*  
*(the response was that a planning forum has been held and the DA has been exhibited twice)*

#### **4. Rodney Falconer - The Goulburn Group**

- Overview of the Goulburn Group being a not for profit organisation main aim to ensure social and environmental sustainability for Goulburn.
- Conflict Declaration – Not sure if there was a potential conflict of interest. The Goulburn Group are currently working on a Wetlands Project which involves conversion of a disused brick pit. The group has NSW Government Funding and have requested a quote for bulk haulage from Divall's Earthmoving.
- Long term planning considering Goulburn Mulwaree Council's current Waste Facility expectancy being 2027 – DA is timely.
- Local Visual Effect /Appearance – landscape thoughtful planning, The Goulburn Group have requested the use of local native species, to mask the sites appearance.
- The waste facility is to be located upstream so Monitored contamination has been reasonably addressed.
- Floodwaters may back up as far as the wetlands and questions whether climate change has been considered
- The site can be blocked off and stop liquids leaving the site.
- Current depot location is poor and the Goulburn Group are keen to see improvements in recycling for the community.
- Morally the Goulburn Group feel that the facility should be located up stream so that the consequences are dealt with by the township which is responsible for the waste.
- Traffic does not appear to be of major concern.
- Toxic Waste concerns from previous land use have been addressed.
- Odour and drainage appear to have been reasonably addressed.
- Creates employment opportunities for disadvantaged people.
- The Goulburn Club were satisfied from their enquiries from the developers, and feel concerns have been reasonably satisfied

*The Chair advised that although it is the speakers responsibility to ascertain whether he has a conflict of interest, but because he is not involved in decision-making in relation to the DA that it is not an issue*

#### **5. David Humphreys – President of Board of Endeavour Industries**

- Overview of Endeavour Industries Company – employs 58 disabled people providing them with work and giving them value within the community.
- Endeavour Industries is in support of the proposed development. Their current premises are at total capacity, and would be unable to support an increase in recycling, that is dramatically needed in Goulburn, report states likelihood for percentage of recyclable waste to triple and proposed facility could support such an increase. Existing recycling approx. 22% of waste where as Sydney at the same time recycled approx 68% of waste.
- Contract with Goulburn Mulwaree Council expires in 2012.
- OHS matters have been addressed
- If we don't have recycling facility, recycling will go out of town to another centre. Carbon tax would affect the community if current facility was unable to maintain workload and recycling was taken out of the town, as well as job loss.
- The facility is needed by council, the employees, the community and ratepayers.

#### *Panel Questions*

- *Clarification of statistics for recyclable waste, GMC 22% Sydney 68% (regional town such as Wagga also much higher than 22%).*

#### **6. Margaret Cunningham – on behalf of staff of Endeavour Industries**

- Endeavour Industries have outgrown their current site which suffers from poor infrastructure. Have been in same location for 42 years.
- Viability is under strain with current working conditions.
- Donations from Visy & Amcor for the new facility would assist with recycling processes.
- Endeavour Industries is in support of the proposed development.

#### **7. Warren Matthews – NSW Health**

- Outlined Concerns regarding;
  - Location of the facility
  - Staff handling putrescible waste as well as recyclables at the same facility. Unaware of any other facility processing both wastes.

- Fumes, e.g. from vehicles, odours, noise and dust all associated with the type of proposed development (unsure that technology to be used is proven)
- Nature of the proposal attracting rodents/vermin and flies to the area causing associated health issues.
- Building Location in relation to wind direction which may cause the funnelling of air and release of odours and litter through doors at either end.
- Modelling insufficient to demonstrate effectiveness of odour control measures.
- Advised applicants to seek an alternative location for the proposed development

#### **8. Paul Alessi – Neighbouring resident (250m from Proposed Facility)**

- Support the concept but not the location
- Concerns relating to
  - Location - close proximity to other neighbouring residents, some only 30m from proposed facility.
  - Visual Impact, e.g. from lounge room
  - Operating Hours (proposed 66 hours /week, 7 days per week)
  - Noise – ‘highly noise affected’ report taken from his front gate, reversing beepers and affect on train noise with position of building.
  - A request has been received by council to receive asbestos and other dangerous materials at the facility

#### **9. Vanessa Kelly – Neighbouring Resident 1867 Historic Home (120m from the site)**

- Questioned the development still being assessed under Part 3A as state significant development
- Concerns regarding
  - Truck Pollution
  - Associated noise and dust
  - Visual Impact – had plans for a Bed & Breakfast at their residence, proposed facility would affect that plan.

*The Chair clarified the process for assessment by Council and determination by the JRPP for regional development.*

#### **10. Kevin Watchirs – Local School Teacher**

- A positive proposal in the wrong location, the location being 650m from Masonic Retirement Village, less than 500m from a motel and caravan park, close proximity to many neighbouring residents less than 200m and the river.
- Flood levels provided with relation to the location considered to be misleading.
- Personal petition carried out indicated 99% of the Goulburn community approached were against the locality.
- Opposed to the proposal

#### **11. Richard Orchard – North Goulburn Action Group (resident 300m ‘downwind’ of the proposal) Trained Emergency Risk Management Officer**

- Against the location of proposed development
- Careful planning in relation to the development; however Council should be setting the lead for community waste management as it is a community problem.
- Concerns regarding perceived LEP ‘loophole’ for this type of designated development and the lack of public consultation. This is a breach of trust
- A petition has been prepared. Consultation did not occur until opposition to the proposal ramped up
- Possibility of ‘imported’ waste using the railway facilities.
- Possibility of flooding and associated contamination with regards to the location and proximity to the river.
- The proposal is radical and provocative.
- Council does not have a long term waste strategy.
- Complaints to ICAC regarding the tendering process, the circumstances of the contract and the environmental impact assessment process. The tender process and waste strategy were not considered before the DA was lodged.
- As an emergency management officer, concerned about fire and explosion, toxic fumes and flooding

#### **12. Marjorie White – Neighbouring Resident at Masonic Retirement Village diagonally opposite the site**

- Recycling is an important aspect within the community; however the location is not suitable for the development.

- Concerns for impact on homes in the area being devalued as a result of odour, noise, wind blown paper, dust and rubbish , vermin and increased traffic all associated with the proposed development
- Opposed the development

### **13. Meave Ramsay - Neighbouring Resident**

- Dissatisfied with the need to justify the development once lodged.
- No exploration of alternative sites after the concept began. There are better sites such as the old Caltex fuel depot site
- Concerns for the employees working conditions that would be associated with this type of facility (noise, air quality, and materials to be received) however difficult to object to development on basis of environmental impact when the proposal will provide for a disadvantaged workforce
- Opposed to the development

### **14. Stella Friend – Neighbouring Resident in Bridge Street**

- Unaware the development was to be a Waste Transfer Station – misinformed by applicant
- Concerned about number of trucks using the facility each day
- Opposed the development

*Stella was advised by the Chair to hand in a written submission to the development outlining her concerns, and this would be considered in the assessment process by the Southern Region Joint Regional Planning Panel.*

### **15. Martin Davenport - SLR Consulting (Noise Report Consultant)**

- Noise and Vibration report assessment carried out worst case scenario levels and found criteria within the relevant levels
- Construction Noise – there was some exceedence which is quite typical within the highly affected category.
- The results fell within the permissible requirements.

### **16. Martin Doyle – SLR Consulting (Odour Quality Report assessor)**

- Under worst case modelling scenario, odour control measures have been satisfied with monitored door opening mechanisms and putrescible waste being in an internal building within the proposed facility with air filtration as well as louvers in the ceiling. The wind-tunnel effect would be minimised by the door opening mechanism to allow truck entry for 20 seconds
- Based on design specifications used in Europe and proposed in Perth.

#### **17. Benny Chen – ML Traffic (traffic assessor)**

- Intersection acceptable to service traffic volumes and satisfactory for sight distances for entry and exit - meets AUSRoads specifications.
- Report reviewed by RTA – no objection received.
- Traffic count in accordance with the policies and guideline requirements.

##### *Panel Questions:*

- *Period and duration of traffic counts undertaken for the traffic management study*

#### **18. Tony Egan**

- Waste Transfer Facility an absolute need for the community however this proposal is in the wrong location.
- There is no room in modelling for recycling processes – all projections are based on current loads
- Size of the facility may also become overwhelmed with population growth. Goulburn is being promoted and a population of 50,000 is realistic. Therefore all estimates could be doubled
- Suggest a roundabout at the intersection to accommodate traffic entering and exiting the site
- OHS concerns for workers - type of training to be provided considering recyclables and putrescibles waste to be received at the same facility.
- Suggested alternative sites for consideration – Murrays Flat which has been designated as a tip hub, old Caltex site at Sloane Street, the wool scour. All three sites have rail access and are not subject to the effects of strong winds, e.g. from the north-west
- Odours from putrescible waste will carry due to the light easterly winds and sea breezes

#### **19. Matthew Kelly - Neighbouring Resident 1867 Historic Home (120m from the site)**

- Conflicting statistics with the number of trucks to and from the facility contained in the Heggies Report to what has been presented at today's meeting.
- Questioned the applicant the following;
  - Is the location to be used as a concrete recycling facility, if so how will noise (crushing) and dust be controlled?
  - Will the location be receiving asbestos?

*The Chair request additional information from the applicant.*



*Robert Mowle responded: the proposal is for a Waster Transfer Station, no processing to be carried out on site and no asbestos to be received on site*

**20. Ron Beaver – Resident in Long Street since 1950**

- Questioned the traffic report and has concerns for the intersection and roads being able to service the increased traffic. Believes slip lanes are required on both sides of Sydney Road.
- Opposed to the location of the Proposed Waste Transfer Facility

**21. John Newton – Resident**

- Raised concerns that loss of asset value and market value for neighbouring properties has not been considered in the proposal.
- Opposed to the location of the Proposed Waste Transfer Facility.

**22. Conway Bogg - Resident**

- Raised concerns about the impact of the truck route to Woodlawn and suggested that it be considered in the proposal, following comments from Council for many years regarding the number of trucks along Sloane Street, Goulburn, and concerns for the safety of road users and the flooding of Tarago Road.

*The Chair thanked attendees for their time and the opportunity to understand the issues raised by the community. He advised that a report that summarises the day's proceedings will be prepared and placed on the JRPP website. It will also be provided to the consultant engaged by Goulburn Mulwaree Council for consideration in the assessment report.*

*A determination meeting, where the JRPP will make a decision on the application, will be scheduled once the assessment report has been completed. There will be another opportunity to present to the Panel at that meeting. A public notice will be issued when the date of the determination meeting has been set.*