

APPENDIX G

JRPP PUBLIC MEETING REPRESENTATIONS

15 MARCH 2016

Prior to the meeting commencement Kevin Prescott, Tamara Rosisnanyi and Jamie Cregan said they had not received notification of the meeting and the start time was inappropriate for people who worked.

1 Warren Matthews - Against

- Were other sites considered by SUEZ
- 24/7 operation is out of character for the area
- No specific list of the types of waste that will be processed
- Waste may already be old and smelly when it arrives at the site
- Vermin control
- Deodorisation chemicals could be a WHS issue
- Fumes a WHS concern for workers
- Leachate issues
- Who and how will monitoring take place
- Property valuations of concern
- Reconsider site location

2 Wendy Ellis - Against

- Lives less than 500m from the site
- Size of facility is too large
- Objects to the location, too close to housing
- Disregard by the applicant for the community and residents

3 Peter Ellis - Against

- SUEZ have recently been fined by the EPA at another facility
- Queanbeyan buffer zone is less than 250m
- The noise data is limited and lacks credibility
- Residential traffic will be impacted
- Traffic data stats are incorrect, road is 80km not 60km as stated in report
- Flawed research
- Environmental Impact Statement is incorrect

4 Les Sherd - Against

- Medical waste a concern
- Site in ACT was offered to SUEZ, but not taken up as Queanbeyan location is a cheaper option
- Increase of flies, vermin and odour
- Air quality concerns, increase in sickness
- Accidents do occur and this location is too close to house

- 5 Guy Verney - Against
- No justification for the proposal
 - EIS doesn't address any regional issues
 - Locality concerns
 - Cumulative noise impact from trucks
 - Odour and vermin
 - EPA guidelines state shouldn't be closer than 3km to residents
 - Flawed proposal
- 6 Sue Ball - Against
- Opposed to the location
 - Adjacent to main entrance from Canberra
 - Have other sites been considered?
 - 24/7 noise and odour concerns
 - No account taken of the proximity of residents
 - Noise from trucks and roller doors opening and closing
 - No effective management measures for odours
 - Maintenance expense for odour controls
 - Larger buffer zone required
 - No controls in place for vermin
 - Increased traffic
 - Potential for increased capacity and additional types of materials
- 7 Roger Alcock - Against
- Total failure to comply to the Rural Waste Transfer Facility guidelines
 - Inadequate community consultation
 - Site size indicates expansion in the future
 - Requests the JRPP to review the Goulburn decision
- 8 Travis Masters - Against
- Lives 500m from the facility
 - Ridiculous location
 - No regard for the Queanbeyan community or residents
 - Adverse impact on local businesses
 - looking after big business not Queanbeyan
 - Who wants to live next to a tip?

- 9 Janet Maliganis - Against
- No research undertaken into availability of greenfield sites
 - Stealth proposal, no consultation
 - Commercial gain
 - EIS doesn't address noise issues
 - Requests the JRPP to reject the proposal as in Goulburn
- 10 Christine Hillbrick-Boyd - Against
- EIS inconsistencies with different site plans in the report
 - Proposal should be considered as significant and as such extra controls put in place
 - Queanbeyan doesn't have any heavy industrial estates and this proposal does not fit with light industry
 - Numerous feel good statements made by SUEZ with no guaranteed benefits for Queanbeyan
- 11 Tracey Quinn - Against
- Decreasing land values
 - Noise and odour issues
 - Similar facility in Sydney fined for breaches of odour
 - Decrease of living standards due to odour
 - Poor quality noise data
 - Truck movements under estimated
 - Traffic noise already constant and problematic
 - SUEZ should look for another site
- 12 Damien Hanley - Against
- Lives in a caretaker cottage as 1 Kealman Road which is 36m away from the proposed site
 - Current zoning allows for caretaker cottages
 - EIS does not identify 1 Kealman Road as residential
 - Substantial increase in noise levels
 - Sleep disturbance will be increased
 - Increased waste volume
 - Noise impact statement flawed as 1 Kealman Road was not included in the modelling
 - What course of action will residents have in the future

13 Ian Jones - Against

- Resides 109m from the proposed site in a caretaker cottage
- Prevailing winds will take the smell to Queanbeyan/Harman/Oaks Estate
- Wrong development in the wrong location
- Ill-conceived proposal

14 Connee-Colleen - Against

- Inappropriate location
- Doesn't fit with Queanbeyan's history

15 Tom Lee - Against

- Who wants a rubbish tip at the entrance of our city?
- Environmental issues
- Odour/Smoke/Vermin
- What happens to the water used at the site? Where does it go?
- Residential and child care facilities too close to the site
- 24/7 operation will be disruptive to sleep
- How many trucks, including B doubles, will there be?
- Who will maintain the roads? How expensive will the up keep be?
- Will SUEZ be ratepayers?
- Increased noise and odour pollution

Comments made at the end meeting:

- Determination hearing date not available yet
- All future meetings will be held in Queanbeyan
- Concerns with the starting time will be taken on board
- No minutes will be available from this meeting
- Public notification of the next meeting will take place
- The assessment report will be available on the JRPP website 2 weeks prior to the determination meeting
- The JRPP makes the final decision
- The applicant can speak at the determination meeting
- The applicant can appeal the JRPP decision
- Request that Council place information regarding the application on the front page of Council's website