

AMP Centre
Level 27
50 Bridge Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

P.O. Box R126
Royal Exchange NSW 1223
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9225 0200
Fax: +61 2 9225 1595
DX: 218 SYDNEY
www.bakermckenzie.com

Our ref: 85207471-5
Your ref: 2012STH026

Asia Pacific

Bangkok
Beijing
Hanoi
Ho Chi Minh City
Hong Kong
Jakarta*
Kuala Lumpur*
Manila*
Melbourne
Seoul
Shanghai
Singapore
Sydney
Taipei
Tokyo

**Europe, Middle East
& Africa**

Abu Dhabi
Almaty
Amsterdam
Antwerp
Bahrain
Baku
Barcelona
Berlin
Brussels
Budapest
Cairo
Casablanca
Doha
Dubai
Dusseldorf
Frankfurt/Main
Geneva
Istanbul
Johannesburg
Kyiv
London
Luxembourg
Madrid
Milan
Moscow
Munich
Paris
Prague
Riyadh
Rome
St. Petersburg
Stockholm
Vienna
Warsaw
Zurich

Latin America

Bogota
Brasilia*
Buenos Aires
Caracas
Guadalajara
Juarez
Lima
Mexico City
Monterrey
Porto Alegre*
Rio de Janeiro*
Santiago
Sao Paulo*
Tijuana
Valencia

North America

Chicago
Dallas
Houston
Miami
New York
Palo Alto
San Francisco
Toronto
Washington, DC

* Associated Firm

20 August 2013

Southern Joint Regional Planning Panel
23-33 Bridge Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Attention: Dean Hosking, Planning Officer, Regional Panels Secretariat

Dear Mr Hosking,

**Infrastructure - Resource Recovery Composting Operation
Premises: 92 Patterson Road, Gerogery**

We submit this letter on behalf of a number of objectors to the above development application. We note that the Southern Joint Regional Planning Panel (**SJRPP**) will consider this application at its meeting on 22 August 2013.

We **enclose** the following expert reports, for the SJRPP's consideration:

1. Report prepared by Mr Simon Leake. In summary, Mr Leake's report concludes that:
 - (a) the applicant's odour measurements greatly underestimate the odour strength likely to result from what the proponent is proposing;
 - (b) the odour modelling does not take into account certain likely major sources of odour specifically compost maturation areas and internal roadways;
 - (c) the proposed facility would be unlikely to be able to comply with the EPA's proposed licence conditions in relation to odour production and stormwater retention; and
 - (d) the water in the stormwater retention system proposed by the applicant is likely to be contaminated and should not be permitted to be released into the environment.
2. Report prepared by Mr Daniel Martens, stormwater expert. Mr Martin's report concludes that:
 - (a) the applicant's water quality modelling undertaken is flawed and grossly underestimates the quality of water reaching the sedimentation pond;

- (b) the sedimentation pond will not provide an adequate level of water quality treatment prior to discharge to downstream receiving environments; and
- (c) the sedimentation pond is not of a sufficient size to prevent downstream pollution events occurring.

Based on these conclusions, it would appear that:

- 1. the proposed development will have unacceptable impacts on the surrounding area; and
- 2. the applicant will be unable to comply with the General Terms of Approval formulated by the EPA, in particular:
 - (a) **Condition O1.1:** The licensee must not cause or permit the emission of offensive odour beyond the boundary of the premises.
 - (b) **Condition O4:** Stormwater/sediment control - Operation Phase.

As a result, we would suggest that the development application should be refused.

Yours faithfully



Jennifer Hughes
Partner

+61 2 8922 5619
Jennifer.Hughes@bakermckenzie.com

Ana Coculescu
Associate

+61 2 8922 5195
Ana.Coculescu@bakermckenzie.com

Encl