

## **APPENDIX L**

---

### **Summary of Submissions from applicant**

**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 97 of the  
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979: DA 338-2015**

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
<b>Noise</b>	60 truck movements per day will create noise	<p>The Noise Impact Assessment predicted the increase in traffic noise levels from the proposal. Existing traffic noise levels are expected to be in excess of 60 dBA (L<sub>Aeq, 15hour</sub>) and 55 dBA (L<sub>Aeq, 9hour</sub>) during the day time and night time respectively.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment concluded that where all truck movements generated by the development occurred during the night time period, the predicted increase in traffic noise levels at the most affected receivers would be less than 0.1dBA. This increase is not perceptible to human hearing</p>
	Noise concern	<p>The revised Noise Impact Assessment completed as per Council and EPA's request in November 2015 included anticipated impacts to the resident at 1 Kealman Road and other nearby residential receivers. Response has been revised to incorporate this information, as well as the updates to the noise model (as detailed to Council in the letter from Wilkinson Murray dated 29 November 2015). The changes to the proposed development will not alter the predicted noise impacts.</p> <p>In addition, the General Terms of Approval issued by the EPA on 19 April 2016 state that the sensitive receiver identified at 1 Kealman Road is located within an industrial zoning. Section 2.1.1 of the <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> recommends that isolated residences within industrial zones, be treated as industrial receivers. In accordance with the <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i> the industrial amenity criteria of 70dBA would be applied to this residence.</p> <p>The Noise Impact Assessment projected a noise level of 60dBA to be applied to this receiver which meets the amenity criteria outlined within the <i>Industrial Noise Policy</i>.</p> <p>Further, modelling completed as part of the Noise Impact Assessment shows the proposal meets the EPA criteria for all residential receivers. However, review of the predicted L<sub>AMAX</sub> Operational Noise</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
		<p>Levels with the established sleep disturbance criterion found that they complied at receivers R1 and R2, and exceed the criterion by 1dBA at R3. A 1dBA is considered negligible and not perceptible to human hearing.</p> <p>In addition, EPA's General Terms of Approval also require ongoing periodic noise monitoring to confirm compliance with the EPL, which will ensure that noise impacts to the receivers within the Industrial Estate are minimised.</p>
	Noise concern	See above.
	Increased traffic will result in increased noise levels beyond which residents should have to live with	<p>The Noise Impact Assessment predicted the increase in traffic noise levels from the proposal. Existing traffic noise levels are expected to be in excess of 60 dBA (L<sub>Aeq, 15hour</sub>) and 55 dBA (L<sub>Aeq, 9hour</sub>) during the day time and night time respectively.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment concluded that where all truck movements generated by the development occurred during the night time period, the predicted increase in traffic noise levels at the most affected receivers would be less than 0.1dBA. This increase is not perceptible to human hearing.</p>
	Noise concern with 24 hour operation	Modelling completed as part of the Noise Impact Assessment shows the proposal meets the EPA criteria for all residential receivers. However, review of the predicted L <sub>AMAX</sub> Operational Noise Levels with the established sleep disturbance criterion found that they complied at receivers R1 and R2, and exceed the criterion by 1dBA at R3. A 1dBA is considered negligible and not perceptible to human hearing.
	Noise concern with 24 hour operation	See above
	Noise concern	See above
	Noise concern	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Noise concern with 24 hour operation	See above
	<p>Noise concern during construction and operation including exhaust brakes.</p> <p>Trucks to 'avoid peak periods' resulting in noise during quiet periods.</p> <p>Noise in CBD from increased truck movements</p>	<p>Construction and operational noise impacts, including exhaust brakes were considered as part of the Noise Impact Assessment. Transient noise sources such as pneumatic truck breaks were considered during the assessment of sleep disturbance impacts. These <math>L_{Amax}</math> levels show that all receivers meet screening criterion of 47dBA. However, receiver R3 showed an exceedance of 1 dBA. A 1 dBA is considered negligible and is not perceptible to human hearing.</p> <p>All other construction and operational noise impacts meet EPA criteria and would not impact on nearby sensitive receivers.</p> <p>Trucks would exit Queanbeyan via Canberra Avenue and would not pass through the CBD.</p>
	Noise concern from heavy vehicles and material handling	See above.
	<p>Noise concern – inadequacy of noise prediction and reporting</p> <p>Noise report not to be relied upon, incorrect data collection methods</p>	<p>The Noise Impact Assessment was completed in accordance with the following noise impact assessment guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSW Industrial Noise Policy (EPA, 2000)</li> <li>• NSW Road Noise Policy (DECCW, 2011), and</li> <li>• Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC, 2009)</li> </ul> <p>The assessment was also undertaken in accordance with the Director General's Requirements. Data collection methods, prediction and reporting meet the requirements of these guidelines and are considered appropriate and adequate to assess the potential impacts of the proposal.</p>
	No assessment of noise contribution to the local road	Background noise levels were obtained during unattended noise monitoring between the 27 June and 3 July 2014. The methodology recommended in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy was used to

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>network, or off-site generally from truck movements.</p> <p>No details of truck routes to be utilised in local or wider area.</p>	<p>collect background noise levels and as such are considered adequate to provide Rating Background Levels to determine predicted impacts.</p> <p>Trucks will exit the site via Kealman Road and use Canberra Avenue to collect waste from commercial customers. Waste collection from commercial customers within the Queanbeyan CBD would be consistent with existing waste collection procedures and would not increase traffic within the CBD.</p> <p>The removal of waste from the proposed site will be via Canberra Avenue, for further treatment, reuse or disposal within the ACT or will follow Canberra Avenue outside of Queanbeyan to other areas of NSW, including Woodlawn or Sydney.</p>
	<p>Traffic will increase noise levels beyond that which residents should have to live with</p>	<p>See above. Noise levels associated with truck movements are expected to be negligible.</p>
	<p>Increase in noise due to processing of waste and truck movements</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Increase in traffic noise</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Current noise levels in John Bull Street is disruptive, an increase in operations and traffic will have a negative impact on noise amenity in the area.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Noise pollution from trucks continuously entering and leaving the premises.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	24/7 operation will have a significant impact on these residences from trucks and beepers from machinery. The receptor at 228m distance away does not take account that some residences are much closer.	See above. Noise has been considered for both the nearest resident within the Industrial area, as well as those residents located between 210315m from the site. Noise is expected to meet the outlined noise criteria. However, as noted above, a 1dBA increase for those residents at Lorn Road. A 1 dBA is considered negligible and is not perceptible to human hearing.
	Do not think that the Noise study in its midnight to dawn modelling as taken into consideration surrounding sound and not the level from the empty site at present. Given that noise travels further and will be more audible during these hours it is considered that the study has not taken this into account.	See above. Unattended noise monitoring occurred over a week which included obtaining background noise levels over the night-time hours. Criteria for the project was obtained using these background noise levels. Thus, the noise impact assessment considered the lower noise levels experienced overnight and a lower noise criteria for night time periods was determined.
	The use of polycarbonate sheeting in the top portion of the walls will not have a good sound dampening effect.	Noted. The noise modelling showed that the operation of the proposal generally meets the noise criteria. Modelling was conducted with a worst case scenario. Thus, additional mitigation, such as noise walls or thicker building materials would not be required.
	EIS assumes fencing of 2.5m in height in some places this is only 1.9 m and it should be designed by an acoustic consultant.	The fencing of 2.5m has been removed from the modelling, and the worst case scenario has been modelled. This updated modelling shows that the proposal would meet noise criteria and further noise mitigation is not required.  Nevertheless a hard screening wall is proposed around the site in accordance with DCP requirements, and therefore actual noise impacts will be less than modelling predicts.
	No air-locks or air curtains are incorporated in the sorting shed and the doors are light and will spend more time open than shut. The creation of negative pressure by keeping the sorting shed doors	See above. Noise modelling incorporates the worst case scenario and shows that the proposal would meet noise criteria and further noise mitigation is not required.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	closed therefore serves no practical purpose.	
	Potential to include other materials such as metal and glass being processed at the facility in the future will inevitably result in more noise.	<p>The proposal the waste types consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General Solid Waste (putrescible and nonputrescible)</li> <li>2. Recyclables</li> <li>3. J120 waste, and</li> <li>4. K110 waste.</li> </ol> <p>Should any future waste types be proposed, additional noise modelling and assessment will be carried out to ensure ongoing noise impacts do not occur, and be subject to planning and regulatory approval.</p>
	Noise pollution will be a major disturbance to young families.	See above.
	Increase in noise levels will occur with trucks coming in and out of the area 24/7 and increasing in numbers from 30 to 80 daily.	See above. The noise impact assessment considered the increase in truck movements and concluded that minimal impact would occur.
	While site is zoned industrial most businesses operate 5 days and 8 hour days. This will be operating 24/7 and noise from more than 60 truck movements per day will be significant with air brakes and the opening and closing of large mechanical doors.	Noted. The Noise Impact Assessment considered the nearby resident within the industrial zone. The proposal would meet the noise criteria outlined for the industrial zone, and impact to nearby industrial businesses is expected to be negligible.
	Ratepayers living in residential areas in Queanbeyan should not have their lives and health negatively impacted by noise pollution.	See above. Noise modelling shows that potential noise impacts meet EPA set criteria and would not negatively impact on residential areas.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Air brakes from trucks Opening and closing of the large mechanical doors	Construction and operational noise impacts, including exhaust brakes were considered as part of the Noise Impact Assessment. Transient noise sources such as pneumatic truck breaks were considered during the assessment of sleep disturbance impacts. These $L_{Amax}$ levels show that all receivers meet screening criterion of 47dBA. However, receiver R3 showed an exceedance of 1 dBA. A 1 dBA is considered negligible and is not perceptible to human hearing.
	Noise from trucks and machinery	See above
	Noise throughout every day and night including weekends	See above
	Noise	See above
	Noise	See above
	Noise from 60 trucks per day.	See above
	Noise from 60 trucks per day 24/7	See above
	Noise and lights at night	See above. Lights will be directed onto the site only, consistent with current uses.
	Noise pollution	See above
	Increased noise due to processing and increased trucks movements in the area.	See above



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Further increase of traffic noise on Canberra Avenue which can be heard from the property at Munro Rd during transportation of the waste to and from the facility via front-lift trucks, packer loads and rear lift trucks, also from the trucks movement to and from the site in association with the operation of the facility.	See above.
	No assessment of noise contribution to the local road network from additional truck/vehicle, or off-site generally from truck movements.  No details of truck routes to be utilised in local or wider area.	Any truck movements within or around Queanbeyan associated with the collection of waste would be consistent with current waste pick-up regimes. Trucks associated with waste transfer from the site for further waste processing or waste disposal would leave the site and travel along Canberra Avenue towards the ACT or other areas of NSW such as Woodlawn or Sydney. Noise is considered consistent with existing traffic using Canberra Avenue. The Noise Impact Assessment assessed the traffic noise impacts of the proposal along Canberra Avenue. It assessed the noise from the traffic movements from the proposal as though all of the vehicle movements would occur over the night time period. The noise impact assessment concluded that where all truck movements generated by the development occurred during the night time period, the predicted increase in traffic noise levels at the most affected receivers would be less than 0.1dBA. This increase is not perceptible to human hearing.
	Lack of information regarding the proposed materials of the building means that noise impact study of limited value. Operation noise and truck noise impacts together not considered in noise consideration.	The proposed building will be constructed from typical industrial materials to meet design codes, facilitate cleaning and blend with the local area eg external polycarbonate sheeting. This has been incorporated into the noise modelling.  The noise modelling methodology is well established and regularly tested by EPA and industry to ensure the predicted outcomes are accurate and reliable.
	No assessment of noise contribution to the local road network from additional truck/vehicle, or off-site generally from truck movements.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	No details of truck routes to be utilised in local or wider area.	
	Lack of information regarding the proposed materials of the building means that noise impact study of limited value. Operation noise and truck noise impacts together not considered in noise consideration.	See above.
	Noise from trucks 24/7 and increased number of trucks, there may be additional noise due to increased traffic movements if the facility is open to the public.	See above. Note that the retail/public component of the proposal was formally withdrawn in February 2016 to allay concerns regarding queuing and traffic effects on Kealman St.
	Noise from reverse beeping alert, especially at night	The site has been designed to maximise all vehicles travelling and entering the property will be in a forward direction. Any reversing that may occur will be contained within the building, or spotters/broadband beepers used to ensure minimal noise. Reverse beeping alarms were considered in the L <sub>Amax</sub> measurements in the sleep disturbance criteria. These L <sub>Amax</sub> levels show that all receivers meet screening criterion of 47dBA. However, receiver R3 showed an exceedance of 1 dBA. A 1 dBA is considered negligible and is not perceptible to human hearing.
	Objecting to noise pollution that will potentially be generated by trucks continuously entering & leaving the site.	See above
	Extra noise is unwanted	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Noise levels will increase	See above
	Noise from traffic to and from complex at possibly different later hours when one normally expects peace and quiet which characterises the advantage of the area	See above.
	Increased noise from facility from transport of waste will add to noise from existing facilities. Increased noise has a cumulative impact and 24 hour operation will have an impact on the rest of residents at night. Noise assessment did not take cumulative impact into account.	See above. As noted previously, the assessment considered existing background noise levels which were obtained from unattended noise monitoring. These background noise levels include noises from existing facilities and roads. Thus, the cumulative impact has been considered.
	Noise will impact on Brethren school at Lorn Road	See above. Additional assessment was completed in November 2015 following Council's request for further information. The assessment included a review of potential noise impacts to the Brethern School at Lorn Road. The assessment showed that all noise criteria would be met and impacts are not expected.
	Noise impact from operations will be constant, 24/7. Although site is zoned industrial noise and impact from operations will be notices by residents who expect restrictions on times during which noise is expected and allowed.	See above
	Already a congested locale, the operational traffic noise (of up to an additional 60 truck visits per day) and the disturbance	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	associated with 24/7 business will have a huge detrimental impact upon local businesses and the standard of living of nearby residents.	
	Concerned about traffic and other noise caused by operation of the WMF at night.	See above
	Excessive noise.	See above
	Operation of heavy industrial machinery will create excessive noise impacts.	See above
	<p>Noise study not comprehensive enough. Impacts of operating noise on surrounding dwellings and businesses – particularly those within 228m of WMF – not addressed/ taken into account.</p> <p>Proposed construction materials and design will not effectively mitigate noise impacts.</p>	<p>See above. The noise impact assessment considers residents next to the property within the industrial zone (35m from the site) as well as residential areas located 210-235m from the site. The noise model includes a worst case scenario ensuring that predicted maximum noise levels are below EPA set criteria.</p> <p>See above.</p>
	Increased heavy vehicle movements will lead to noise impacts.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Already high traffic and operational noise levels in the area will increase as a result of the WMF.	See above.
	Proposed use of B-Double between midnight & 7.00am will affect noise level in the area.	See above.
	Noise pollution.	See above
	Noise pollution.	See above
	Noise pollution will be heard due to the proximity to residential areas within the early hours of the morning.	See above
	Increase local noise.	See above
	Increase local noise.	See above
	There will be an increase in noise from additional traffic created from the WTP.	See above
	Noise impacts from WTF.	See above
	Will be too noisy.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Noise impacts from increased traffic.	See above
	Noise generated by the WMF.	See above
	Noise will exceed at night the sensitive receivers, especially in combo with the existing noise from other industries within the area.	See above
	Noise from 24/7 operation.	See above
	Noise from 24/7 operation.	See above
	Noise from 24/7 operation.	See above
	Noise from 24/7 operation.	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise during construction from vehicles not adequately addressed.</li> <li>Noise impacts from construction on school children and nearby residents not considered and no</li> </ul>	<p>The Noise Impact Assessment assessed noise associated with construction of the facility (refer to Section 6.5). It was concluded that noise predictions would meet the criteria provided and impacts to nearby receivers would not occur.</p> <p>Following an information request from Council, noise impacts on the school were considered. Noise predictions meet the specified criteria and impacts would not occur.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>mitigation measures proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise impacts of proposal do not take into account the truck movements on Kings Highway, Gilmore Road and Lanyon Drive.</li> <li>Noise impacts from trucks braking on the Kings Highway (Canberra Ave?) and turning into Kealman Road.</li> </ul> <p>Noise impacts on the weekend likely to be more intrusive than during the week – not taken into account.</p>	<p>As noted above, noise impacts have considered noise from traffic movements (refer to Section 6.4).</p> <p>Noise impacts associated with truck movements have been considered in Section 6.4 of the Noise Impact Assessment. Braking on the Kings Highway/Canberra Avenue would be consistent with existing traffic movements.</p> <p>See above. The Noise Impact Assessment has considered noise impacts during standard hours, as well as outside of standard hours. Noise impacts are not expected.</p>
	<p>Additional noise on Lanyon Drive – This was not assessed in the EIS.</p>	<p>Noise was assessed for those residential sensitive receptors in proximity to the proposal. As noise criteria was generally met, the assessment of noise at areas greater than those residential areas assessed is not required.</p>
	<p>Likes to keep windows open at night time and with the additional trucks they feel they will be unable to as they will create additional noise.</p>	<p>Noted. The night-time noise assessment considers impacts that may disturb sleep. The predictions made in the Noise Impact Assessment meets the noise criteria.</p>
	<p>Increase in noise from machinery and trucks especially after people have finished work.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
<b>Hours of operation 24/7</b>	Detrimental impact on owner's life	The assessments completed as part of the EIS show that it meets the relevant criteria and is not anticipated to have offsite environmental impact.
	Waste going and waste coming – permanent odour issue.	Odour has been considered as part of the EIS. Since public exhibition, and following public concern, SUEZ are proposing to incorporate capacity for future installation of ventilation and odour treatment should this be required.. Predicted odour is well within odour criteria and odour impacts are not expected.
	Constant stream of traffic containing waste and associated odour.	Odourous materials will only be kept on site for a maximum 24hr period. This will ensure any materials being transported do not have enough time to emit offensive odours. Waste will also be transported in dedicated waste trucks, further mitigating the release of offensive odours.
	Request for activity curfew between 8pm and 6am	The assessments conclude that the impacts will be negligible and meet relevant criteria, hence a curfew is not considered to be warranted. Further, the proposed site is within industrial zoning that permits 24/7 operation.
	Oppose operating hours	See above
	Heavy vehicle movements around the clock	See above. The Noise Impact Assessment considered all vehicle movements to occur at night time and showed only 0.1dBA increase in traffic related noise.
	Adverse effect on residential amenity due to unacceptable noise produced by 24 hour 7 day a week waste management	See above.
	Noise from 24/7 operation	See above.
	Noise and traffic impacts from 24/7 operation	See above.
	The increased noise the traffic will create – 24/7!! I am a Registered Nurse required to work shifts. Increased noise throughout every day and night, including weekends will be very disruptive.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Hours of operation will impact on businesses and residential areas.	See above. The site will be operated under stringent controls, with further monitoring as required by an Environmental Protection Licence. This means that the site will be carefully managed to ensure negligible impacts.
	Concerned proposed hours of operation will have impact on surrounding areas.	See above.
	Machinery needed to operate outside business hours.	See above.
	Noise impacts on surrounding dwellings more severe given 24/7 operating hours.	See above.
	Concern with 24/7 operation.	See above.
	Concern with 24/7 operation.	See above.
	Concern with 24/7 operation.	See above.
	Concern with 24/7 operation particularly the noise from the operation and vehicle movements.	See above.
	Adverse environmental, noise and odour impacts from 24/7 operation of WMF.	See above.
	Objection – too close to residences for this scale of operation.	The facility is located within an Industrial Zone and is consistent with the purpose and the existing uses of an industrial precinct. The 'Handbook' allows for waste facilities to be within 250m of a residential zone if appropriate buffers are in place. An example provided in the handbook includes the sorting of waste within a building. The facility meets the requirements of the 'Handbook' and is considered to be in an appropriate location.
	Effect of additional noise on residents in the immediate area and of West QBN	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Additional noise due to traffic on Gilmore Road. If trucks head this way after peak hours this will impact the submitter when she is at home. Would like the residential side of Gilmore Road to be for residential vehicles only.	See above. Truck movements will not travel along the residential areas of Gilmore Road.
	Do not make it a 24/7 business.	See above.
<b>Amenity</b>	Devaluation of property.	The proposed facility is well sited within the established industrial area of Queanbeyan West. The assessment concludes that it meets all relevant criteria, and will have negligible, if any, impacts on the surrounding area.
	Detrimental impact on surrounding businesses.	See above.
	Visually unappealing - Minimal vegetation screening is proposed and will take years grow and adequately screen the site	The proposed facility has been designed to minimise visual impacts, and to meet all relevant design codes.
	Will result in poor amenity in area	See above.
	Unightly development as a Queanbeyan entrance as major gateway.	See above.
	Negative visual impact	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Impact on amenity and health. Impact on viability of local businesses no longer being compatible with the area – eg dance school.	<p>The stated objective of the industrial estate zoning is to allow for the operation of facilities that have the potential to cause environmental impacts such as noise or air, outside its boundary in areas away from sensitive receptors, and thus not impact such receptors. The proposal is considered consistent with the objectives of the IN1-General Industrial zoning as outlined within the Queanbeyan Local</p> <p>Environmental Plan 2012. In addition, the site would be operated in accordance with an Environmental Protection Licence (EPL) which would place further mitigation and requirements on the facility. This means that stricter controls, including additional auditing and monitoring requirements will ensure the facility meets NSW criteria.</p>
	No regard given by proponent to protecting amenity of existing residences within and close to the development.	See above.
	Situated at the entrance to our city right off a major road	The site is within a dedicated industrial zoning, surrounded by industrial land uses. It is not considered to impact on the gateway of Queanbeyan, with the building and site management consistent with surrounding sites.
	Three main entrances to our city are through unsightly industrial areas and to have the entrance from the capital city with garbage trucks coming and going carrying waste on our doorstep is not acceptable	See above. Stringent site management controls, including a certified Environmental Management System and an NSW EPA Environment Protection Licence. This means that the site would remain tidy at all times.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Canberra Ave is the main thoroughfare into Queanbeyan and should be welcoming. An ugly, dirty smelly rubbish tip is not welcoming and simply encourage further misrepresentation of Queanbeyan as a dirty 'struggle town'	See above. The site would consist of a waste transfer station and not a landfill or tip.
	Waste management at the main entry from Canberra doesn't send a positive message to residents. Reinforces notions of Queanbeyan as 'struggletown'	See above.
	Waste handling contradicts Queanbeyan's efforts to improve living quality	See above.
	Effect on character of neighbourhood due to additional truck movements and machinery operating at off peak times such as nights and weekends	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Queanbeyan to be used as Canberra's dumping ground	See above. Waste would be sourced both from the ACT, Queanbeyan and other south-western NSW areas.
	Canberra Ave is at the entrance corridor to Queanbeyan City and not an ideal place for a waste facility.	See above. The facility is located between Bowen Place and Gilmore Road, away from Canberra Ave.
	Positioning a waste facility at the entrance to Queanbeyan does not help its image as Canberra's 'poor relation'	See above.
	No knowledge of what environmental impacts it will have in the future.	See above. The EIS considers potential environmental impacts over the life of the operation of the facility. Negligible environmental impacts are considered.
	The proposal will lead to many public health concerns.	The EIS considered offsite and onsite public health issues. With the proposed mitigation measures, health concerns from odours or vectors are not expected.
	Visually unacceptable and impacts on the Kangaroos Club, sport fields and Queanbeyan West Primary School	See above. The proposed facility would not be visible from Kangaroos Club, sport fields and Queanbeyan West Primary School.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Too close to residential areas. This will affect the living standards.	The EIS considered offsite and onsite public health issues. With the proposed mitigation measures, health concerns from odours or vectors are not expected.
	Affecting public health because it is close to residential property.	The EIS considered offsite and onsite public health issues. With the proposed mitigation measures, health concerns from odours or vectors are not anticipated.
	Waste centre at the entrance to Queanbeyan – how could this be a good idea?	See above.
	Better consideration of effects on environment and quality of life.	See above.
	Concern for tip being the “gateway” to Queanbeyan as it is always considered as “struggle town”. Being ACT waste dump will send an affirmative message of this perception of Queanbeyan.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The proposed development will be visible from the side verandah of the house at Munro Rd. The house has a view towards the ACT and the view should not include a view of the proposed facility.	There is unlikely to be any adverse visual impacts from the proposed facility. Munro Road is on the eastern (other side) of Canberra Avenue.
	The proponent has failed to meet and provide for key planning statutory planning objectives as no regard given by proponent to protecting amenity of existing residences within and close to the development.	The EIS considered all relevant statutory planning documentation, guidelines and legislation. The EIS meets the relevant criteria and is consistent with relevant guidelines, planning documents and legislation.
	The proponent has failed to meet and provide for key planning statutory planning objectives as no regard given by proponent to protecting amenity of existing residences within and close to the development.	See above.
	Detrimental impact on surrounding residences and businesses	See above.
	Proposed development will affect quality of life	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Representors understand that they live in a residential area with semi industrial across the road but proposal is taking it to another level. They do not want to live around the corner from a solid waste tip.	See above. The proposal does not constitute a solid waste tip.
	Impact on amenity and current living conditions due to location of a dump next door	See above.
	Detrimental impact on existing character of the locality due to increased traffic flow, odour and noise. Locality has baseline qualities which should be preserve and a business which is detrimental to the current mix of structures and functions should not be allowed	See above. The proposal meets the relevant guidelines and criteria for noise, traffic and odour.
	The proposed land use is not compatible with the character of the locality and will result in a loss of amenity.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Concerned the facility will be an eyesore on main entry into Queanbeyan.	See above.
	Location on main entry to Queanbeyan detrimental to first impressions of visitors.	See above.
	WMF will tarnish work done to improve Queanbeyan's appearance.	See above.
	WMF will have visual impact.	See above.
	WMF will be visible from main entrance road to Queanbeyan from ACT. Makes a mockery of QCCs 'Country Living, City Benefits' slogan.	See above.
	WMF and associated garbage truck movements on main entrance to Queanbeyan unacceptable. Queanbeyan's reputation will be affected.	See above. Truck movements will be consistent with existing vehicle usage on Canberra Avenue.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Will be forced to look directly at WMF from elevated residential area.	The proposed facility is consistent with previous and surrounding land uses within the industrial area. Processing would be carried out within an enclosed building.
	Unsightly industrial areas and entrance from the city capital with garbage trucks coming and going carrying waste is not acceptable.	See above.
	Queanbeyan Council is investing a lot of money into play areas for Queanbeyan residents and attracting people from Canberra – this is counteracted by allowing a Waste Management Facility to be built where people enter Queanbeyan – How absurd?	See above. The proponent is not Queanbeyan City Council. The facility will be located within an industrial estate, and is consistent with the aims and objectives of an industrial zoning.
	Humiliated in advising visitors that I live near a tip – a tip only 1 street away.	The proposal does not constitute a tip. Best practice environmental controls and design will ensure offsite environmental impacts do not occur.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	We would like to see the implementation of the Waste Management Facility stopped. It is ludicrous to put a tip near a lucrative and beautiful – not to mention sought after street.	The proposal does not constitute a tip. Best practice environmental controls and design will ensure offsite environmental impacts do not occur. It is also located within an industrial zone and is consistent with the aims and objectives of industrial zoning.
	Don't put a tip in a nice place.	The proposal does not constitute a tip. Best practice environmental controls and design will ensure offsite environmental impacts do not occur.
	I do not want a tip near my house at all.	The proposal does not constitute a tip. Best practice environmental controls and design will ensure offsite environmental impacts do not occur.
	To approve the facility in this current location is not fitting and will be seen by all as an eye sore at the entry of the Queanbeyan/ACT border.	See above.
	This Waste Management Facility has no place in a residential area. The development will be clearly visible from Canberra Avenue leading into Queanbeyan from ACT.	The facility is to be located within an industrial zoning and not within a residential area.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	This Waste Management Facility has no place in a residential area.	See above.
	This Waste Management Facility has no place in a residential area.	See above.
	Existing facility has an impact on the amenity proposed facility will increase this impact.	See above.
	WMF will impact on surrounding areas e.g public school.	See above.
	Residents entitled to amenity which is being slowly degraded by the cumulative industrial developments within the area. The proposed WMF will increase these impacts on the amenity of residents.  Experiencing impacts already from large dust clouds and plant that are next door to the proposed WMF and frequent odour, the proposed WMF will increase these impacts on the amenity.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Already impacted by smell/odour which will be compounded by WMF.	See above. Odour modelling and the proposed air extraction and filtration system will ensure offsite odour impacts from the proposal would not occur.
	No amount of enclosing the site will minimize the unacceptable impacts from noise, smell and pollution that will impact on residents.	See above.
	No amount of enclosing the site will minimize the unacceptable impacts from noise, smell and pollution that will impact on residents.	See above.
	No amount of enclosing the site will minimize the unacceptable impacts from noise, smell and pollution that will impact on residents.	See above.
	No amount of enclosing the site will minimize the unacceptable impacts from noise, smell and pollution that will impact on residents.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Impacts will be felt widely by all people who frequent the area, users of the Kings Highway, and tourists.	See above.
	Detrimental effect on the amenity of the area and on businesses, schools, clubs and communities. Is debeautifying Queanbeyan.	See above.
<b>Air quality</b>	Truck movements result in pungent air quality	Odourous materials will only be kept on site for a maximum 24hr period. This will ensure any materials being transported do not have enough time to emit offensive odours. Waste will also be transported in dedicated waste trucks, further mitigating the release of offensive odours.
	Development will lead to poor air quality	Odour has been considered as part of the EIS. Predicted odour is well within odour criteria and odour impacts are not expected.
	Development will lead to poor air quality	See above
	Air quality will be reduced by odour	See above
	Air quality will be reduced by odour	See above
	Air quality concern	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Ratepayers living in residential areas in Queanbeyan should not have their lives and health negatively impacted by air pollution.	See above
	Ratepayers living in residential areas in Queanbeyan should not have their lives and health negatively impacted by air pollution.	See above
	Air quality will be affected and impact on surrounding businesses. Odour from the site will project an unfavourable image of Queanbeyan.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The uncontrolled air quality due to significant offensive odours and airborne emissions from waste processing, waste treatment, dust and airborne pathogens from up to 70,000 tonnes per year of general solid waste including putrescible, nonputrescible material, J120 waste liquids, diesel fuel and medical/clinical waste will be intolerable.	See above.
	Concerned about potential air quality impacts on nearby schools and day care centre downwind of site.	See above.
	WMF will cause air pollution.	See above.
	I don't want a tip in a nice place because it will smell very bad.	See above. As noted previously, a landfill or tip is not proposed at the site.
	Air quality will be transferred to residential areas via predominate westerly winds.	See above.
	WTF will pollute the air.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why has no site specific air quality monitoring data been obtained for the site?</li> <li>Impacts on air quality on two local schools (MET on Lorn Road and Queanbeyan West) from odour, dust</li> </ul>	<p>The air quality and odour assessment has been completed in accordance with the Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales (Approved Methods) (NSW DEC, 2005). This does not consider ambient air quality, and assumes that good air quality is seen at the site. Thus, only the expected PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and odour is considered from the proposal. The output of PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and odour from the proposal meets the EPA criteria and is not predicted to impact on air quality.</p> <p>The modelled scenarios used the nearest residential receptors to assess air quality impacts. These receptors are located closer to the site than the two local schools. As the predicted PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and odour outputs meet the relevant criteria at areas closer to the site than the schools, it is expected to meet the criteria at the schools.</p>
	<p>The facility will emit air pollution from the waste and the trucks. How will QCC ensure residents are safe from this?</p> <p>If there were to be a fire this would result in chemical air pollutions which will then have health impacts for residents surrounding the area,</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>A hazardous materials assessment was completed as part of the EIS. It was found that the proposal is not a hazardous industry and thus permissible under SEPP 33. Fire safety was also considered, and the design of the facility was considered appropriate. Offsite chemical air pollutants are not expected in case of fire, with chemicals being stored away from ignition sources, in dedicated storage containers. Changes since the DA do not affect the findings and conclusions of the PHA or FSS.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
<b>Air borne emissions</b>	No plan in place for monitoring emissions.	The EPL to be obtained from the EPA may contain additional odour/air quality monitoring requirements. EPA would be responsible for 'policing' the facility and ensure that it meets relevant criteria and standards.
	Potential for hazardous gas emissions.	A hazardous materials assessment was completed as part of the EIS. It was found that the proposal is not a hazardous industry and thus permissible under SEPP 33. Fire safety was also considered, and the design of the facility was considered appropriate. Offsite chemical air pollutants are not expected in case of fire, with chemicals being stored away from ignition sources, in dedicated storage containers.
	WMF will create smoke and fumes.	The burning of material does not form part of the proposal. Thus smoke and fumes are not expected.
	Proposal to be located within enclosed building, air borne odour will be transferred to residential areas by westerly winds.	The air quality and odour assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Approved Methods for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales (Approved Methods) (NSW DEC, 2005). Predicted odour is well within odour criteria and odour impacts are not expected.
	WTF will create bad smells.	See above.
<b>Competition/ Capacity</b>	Implications of facility for efficacy (capacity to produce a desired result or effect) of ACT proposed regulatory framework.	The site is located within NSW and as such, the ACT regulatory framework is not applicable. SUEZ have designed and operated similar facilities over NSW and Australia, with well designed and best practice operational procedures.
	Potential for loss of existing facility at Lorn Road.	The existing facility at Lorn Road is owned and operated by a different organisation. SUEZ have assessed the waste market in the area and believe there is compatibility for an additional waste facility.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
<b>Devaluation of property</b>	Development will result in loss of property values.	The proposed facility has been designed and assessed to meet design codes and all relevant criteria for the site zoning.
	Devaluation of land	See above
	Devaluation of land	See above
	Land values will be reduced and expect compensation by Council.	See above
	Decrease in property value	See above
	Devaluation of land – not considered in the EIS.	See above
	Devaluation of land	See above
	Devaluation of land – example of south Tralee and devaluation of property close to waste management facility.	See above
	Devaluation of land	See above
	Devalue our homes	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Drop in home values for 1,300 homes located within 500m or less from the proposed site is likely to be significant	See above
	Adverse effects to property values for nearby residents	See above
	Adversely affect property/land value	See above
	The values of both homes and enterprises can be markedly diminished by this proposal.	See above
	There is the risk of the land and properties close to the waste transfer facility suffering from a decrease in property value.	See above
	The EIS states that nearby neighbours had not expressed concern that property prices will be impacted. This may be because these neighbours were not advised at the time that highly offensive putrescible waste will be processed 24/7.	Noted and see above. The predicted air quality impacts meet relevant standards. Zoning permits 24/7 operation of businesses with the industrial area.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The location so close to West Queanbeyan and Crestwood would lead to a reduction of property values in the vicinity.	See above
	Impact on the value of properties	See above
	The perception and reputation of the whole of Queanbeyan will be affected will degrade the perception of our City even further to 'tip town'!! It will have a huge detrimental impact on our City.	See above.
	Loss of property values	See above
	Decrease in property value nearby	See above
	Financial impact on the valuation of the property due to close proximity to the waste facility and the odour. Decrease in value of property can be prevented by not establishing a waste facility at this location.	See above
	The proposed development will have detrimental effect upon the sale value of the property and nearby properties.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Concerns over property values	See above
	Concerns over property values	See above
	Impact on property values and issue of compensation of land owners	See above
	There are warnings from Real Estate Agents that any property near this waste management facility will be losing value and any houses will be more difficult to sell.	See above
	Objecting to a multinational company walking in and devaluing land, neighbourhood and community	See above
	There will be a reduction in property values of industrial sites as odour will turn people off working in the area	See above
	Living next to a dump will likely negatively impact on house prices	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Perceived loss of property values and its impact on residents	See above
	Perceived loss of value of the locality and detrimental impact on general value of the locality should be important criteria in the assessment	See above
	Presence of facility could adversely affect property and land values of business and residential properties.	See above
	WMF will lead to declining property values in nearby existing residential areas, including submitter's property.	See above
	Property values around development site will be affected by various environmental and amenity impacts.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Development will diminish property values and viability of businesses in surrounding areas.	See above
	Concerned about impact on property values.	See above
	Can QCC assure residents their property values will not be impacted? Who will want to buy into the area?	See above
	Property values will decline.	See above
	Real estate agents have informed submitter that property values will decline by 5-10% as a result of the WMF.	See above
	Devalues our home.	See above
	Decrease in property value.	See above
	Our property value is going to decrease.	See above
	Property decrease.	See above



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Property valuation decline in Crestwood and West Queanbeyan.	See above
	Impact on property values from proposed WTF.	See above
	WMF will devalue property.	See above
	Devaluation of property.	See above
	Devalue property.	See above
	Devalue property.	See above
	Nearby property will be devalued.	See above
	Drive tenants away currently renting and reduce likelihood of anyone else renting the property, leaving me with no income to cover the mortgage and making it difficult to sell. Resulting in my property values being devalued and plummeting property values across Queanbeyan.	See above
	24/7 facility will impact on property values.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	WMF will devalue my property.	See above
	Devaluation of property.	See above
	Decrease value of residential properties.	See above
	Can QCC guarantee that houses will not be devalued and if so can compensation be fought for?	See above
<b>Location</b>	Positioning of facility on the main thoroughfare into Canberra is not welcoming for residents or tourists and further misrepresents Queanbeyan as dirty 'struggle town'	See above. The siting of the facility within a dedicated industrial precinct is an appropriate location for a waste transfer facility.
	Alternative location should be found.	A number of options were considered as part of the EIS process. This site was ideal due to its location within an industrial precinct, size and opportunity for a long-term lease.
	Better sites elsewhere.	See above
	Inappropriate site.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Inappropriate site, locate away from residential areas.	See above. Residentially zoned areas are a minimum of approximately 200m from the site. With the buffer of buildings, design of the facility, and the buffer of landform, it is considered to be an adequate distance from residential areas.
	More appropriate locations available in Hume and Pialligo.	See above
	Select appropriate site outside of town – within ACT.	See above. As noted within the EIS a location within the ACT was discounted. The ACT government stated that any waste facility located within the ACT can only source and dispose of waste within the ACT. This is not suitable to SUEZ's economic vision or the purpose of the proposed facility.
	Not a suitable location, better suited to Hume or Mugga Lane.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Inappropriate location. Should be built further away from residential areas.</p> <p>Inadequate residential buffer zone.</p> <p>Limited space.</p> <p>Narrow access roads.</p> <p>Poor access to arterial roads.</p> <p>Limited support infrastructure.</p> <p>No similar facilities operating nearby.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Site selection process flawed.</p> <p>No public consultation, perfunctory analysis, scant regard to NSW government guidance on site selection.</p> <p>QBN West industrial estate and inappropriate location. It is no longer a general industrial area, more service and trades with retail element.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>The NSW government guidance on site selection: The Handbook for Design and Operation of Rural and Regional Transfer Stations (DEC, 2006) was considered. A summary of the Handbook and how the proposal complies with the Handbook has been carried out and included in the main body of this submission.</p> <p>The proposal complies with the aims and objectives of a general industrial zone and with the stringent proposed mitigation measures and controls, it is not expected to have an impact on the surrounding environment, including residential areas.</p>
	<p>Alternative site in a more industrial location</p>	<p>See above</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	There is already a facility in Stevens Road collecting recyclable material and waste oils	See above
	Sporting club, oval facilities and many residents in vicinity of development, more suitable site should be sought	See above
	Waste facility not a business that should be visible along a major commuter road.	The site is located between Bowen Place and Gilmore Road, fronting Bowen Place. Bowen Place is a cul-de-sac and is only accessed by vehicles using the Monaro Mix concrete batch plant.
	Waste facility should not be located in a prime position so close to town. Waste facilities should be positioned out of town so no impact on surrounding businesses and homes.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>The proposal is too close to approved residences. Many businesses and residences were established when the land was zoned "Light industrial/ Residential".</p> <p>Number 1 Kealman is adjacent to the site (30m away) and yet I the EIS the closest sensitivity receptor was 228m away.</p>	<p>See above. The area is zoned general industrial, and the proposal is consistent with the aims and objectives of the General Industrial Zoning. It is also permissible under the Infrastructure SEPP.</p> <p>The EIS and Noise Impact Assessment has been updated to include 1 Kealman Road. As noted by the EPA General Terms of Approval, noise impacts on residential receivers within Industrial Zones are to be treated as an Industrial receiver.</p>
	<p>It is located on the main entrance to Queanbeyan and its' siting makes a mockery of the Queanbeyan welcome sign – as living next to a waste facility can hardly be described as a 'benefit'. Unlike other towns which have the Big Pineapple or the Big Prawn – this will just be the Big Stink.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>It would be better to focus this type of facility at Hume close to other recycle centres in the event of any environmental disasters then it will have better access to assistance.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Locating in Queanbeyan does not benefit from colocate relationship.	
	The proposed site is a major entry point for tourists entering the town and should not be the first thing people see.	See above.
	There must be other locations away from residential and light industrial areas that are more suitable.	See above.
	The site is much too close to nearby residential dwellings in West Queanbeyan and Crestwood and the prime commercial /industrial premises along Gilmore Road.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Suggest that there are far more suitable sites elsewhere in the ACT and Queanbeyan which would be far less intrusive in the lives of people who live and work near the border including residents and employees of Harman Naval Base and commuters and people travelling to the South Coast.	See above.
	“Our rubbish at our front door! It makes a mockery of Council’s effort to improve the entries to our city”	See above.
	Its location at the entrance to our City – right off a major arterial road inside our City Limits”	See above.
	Undesirable in residential area	As noted above, the site is within an Industrial zoning.
	The adverse impact I will have at the entrance to our lovely city.	See above.
	Relocate to Mugga Lane/Hume - away from town	See above
	Move well away from residential areas to Captains Flat (already polluted with heavy metals) or ACT or Mugga Lane.	See above



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	No enough space for full centre. There must be a better location elsewhere.	See above
	Site selection process flawed. No public consultation, perfunctory analysis, scant regard to NSW government guidance on site selection.  QBN West industrial estate and inappropriate location. It is no longer a general industrial area, more service and trades with retail element. Not an appropriate location for this proposal	See above
	Waste facility is incompatible with neighbouring land uses	See above
	An appropriate buffer zone between the proposed facility and houses, sports club, sporting ovals and community parkland has not been provided. Site selection process and decision for this site are flawed and the guidelines set out in the Department of Environment and Conservation 2006 handbook for the design and operation of rural and regional transfer stations	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Site selection process flawed. No public consultation, perfunctory analysis, scant regard to NSW government guidance on site selection.</p> <p>Queanbeyan West industrial estate and inappropriate location. It is no longer a general industrial area, more service and trades with retail element. Not an appropriate location for this proposal</p>	See above
	Waste facility is incompatible with neighbouring land uses	See above
	<p>An appropriate buffer zone between the proposed facility and houses, sports club, sporting ovals and community parkland has not been provided. Site selection process and decision for this site are flawed and the guidelines set out in the Department of Environment and Conservation 2006 handbook for the design and operation of rural and regional transfer stations.</p>	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Better site could be chosen, away from residential homes and streets. Is this really the best site for the facility given the close proximity of existing families and businesses	See above
	Queanbeyan has many locations better suited for such development & Council is urged to reconsider granting the go ahead for this development	See above
	Residents will not contribute to waste going to the site, so why are	See above
	ACT sites not fully investigated before considering Queanbeyan. If no site can be found, it is suggested other sites be investigated.	
	Inappropriate location immediately off a major arterial road and on entrance corridor to Queanbeyan. Locality is inappropriate due to the high visibility along this road.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The location is inappropriate as a waste facility should not be located in a prime position, minutes from the heart of the town and on roads into the town. Such a facility does not require a central location as this is not integral to the needs of the business and should be located out of town.	See above
	Location proposed should be rejected as it is in close proximity of existing residential areas and there has been overwhelming objection from residents and local owners	See above
	Although the site is zoned industrial, it is elevated and has spectacular views at night. The land should be set aside for future and be considered for rezoning to high density residential as population pressure increases. It seems nonsensical not to capture natural advantage and value adding potential of this land and instead choose the site for a "smelly dump"	See above. The proposal does not consider future rezoning and is not applicable to this application.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The location of facility will not add value to the local area or existing business community. It is not synergistic and there is no imperative for a transfer station in this locality.	See above
	Facility will not contribute anything to amenity of existing residents, as it will only cater for commercial waste and not household waste.	See above
	Business should re-apply in a location that with a less significant impact on exiting residents and commercial businesses nearby.	See above
	Proposed development will change the locality and will have an adverse impact on the character of the locality. Although the proposal seeks to address all issues related to the impact on the character of the area it has not fully explored the character of the locality or impact on the businesses in the area.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Activity, stigma and presence of facility could adversely affect representor and his business.	See above
	Research has not been undertaken to prove that the activity of this facility will not greatly impact on value, activity and safety of surrounding residents and businesses.	See above
	Placement of the facility is not the best use for the site or in line with the future development and use of the area	See above
	Location is chose for convenience of company due to proximity of clients in the ACT. Queanbeyan's "front door" should not be a "dumpsite". Proposal will not only injure real estate values in locality but affect overall impression of Queanbeyan.	See above
	WMF should be located further away from residential areas.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Proposal better suited to industrial area with greater separation to residential areas.	See above
	WMF should be located away from other development to minimise impacts on built environment.	See above
	Facility should not be built within city limits.	See above
	No suitable location. Facility should remain in Hume or located on the rural fringes of the city.	See above
	Inappropriate location. Located at entrance of our city right off a major road. Suggest facility to be located away from residential properties.	See above
	Why place a tip in a beautiful residential area. Move "Waste Management Facility" elsewhere. Away from residents – not bordering industrial and residential areas.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Put it elsewhere – find a paddock or land elsewhere which is not next door to children & families. Away from residents – not bordering industrial and residential areas.	See above
	There is plenty of land elsewhere to place a tip.	See above
	Location is less than 500m to a residential areas. This type of facility should be located 3-5km from residential areas as within the ACT.	See above
	The proposed Waste Resource Management Facility is in an area which is too close to day care, schools, recreational facilities and sporting facilities.	See above



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The proposed Waste Resource Management Facility is in an area which is too close to day care, schools, recreational facilities and sporting facilities.	See above
	The proposed Waste Resource Management Facility is in an area which is too close to day care, schools, recreational facilities and sporting facilities.	See above
	Don't need a WTF in that location.	See above
	Location too close to residents.	See above
	Location inappropriate.	See above
	Plenty of land further away from town that would be a more acceptable option.	See above
	Other locations more suitable for proposed WMF.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Devalue property. 1300 homes located within 500m or less to the WMF will be devalued resulting in a loss of 2.3m dollars of rates annually.	See above
	Devalue property. 1300 homes located within 500m or less to the WMF will be devalued resulting in a loss of 2.3m dollars of rates annually.	See above
	Devalue property. 1300 homes located within 500m or less to the WMF will be devalued resulting in a loss of 2.3m dollars of rates annually.	See above
	Devalue property. 1300 homes located within 500m or less to the WMF will be devalued resulting in a loss of 2.3m dollars of rates annually.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will detract from the look of a main road going into the city.</li> <li>Too close to community and school facilities.</li> <li>Why can't the facility be located in Hume or the Beard Industrial Estate? These are far more suitable.</li> </ul>	See above
	Site chosen based on economic considerations. No other site given serious consideration.	See above
	Site area should not be near residential areas.	See above
	Should not be near a residential location.	See above
<b>Odour</b>	Unpleasant odour	<p>Odourous materials will only be kept on site for a maximum 24hr period. This will ensure any materials being transported do not have enough time to emit offensive odours. Waste will also be transported in dedicated waste trucks, further mitigating the release of offensive odours.</p> <p>Odour has been considered as part of the EIS. Since public exhibition, and following public concern, SUEZ are proposing to incorporate capacity for future ventilation/odour treatment if required. Predicted odour is well within odour criteria and odour impacts are not expected.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	North west wind intensifies problem	See above
	Smell	See above
	Poor air quality due to odour	See above
	Poor air quality due to odour emissions	See above
	Prevailing winds will spread odour	See above
	smell	See above
	Smell – time taken to remove waste	See above
	Odour affected by varying temperature, wind and weather. Composting can produce sulphur compounds, nitrogen compounds and volatile organic acids detrimental to health.	See above
	Smell from waste, parked trucks, diesel fumes. Odour spilling to Queanbeyan racecourse.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Odour concerns - odour footprint may have been underestimated.	See above
	Attention drawn to NSW Health findings re; odour for other DAs – Goulburn, Bywong and Wolumbia. Odour will escape from the building when the doors are opened. Risk of relying on engineering solutions that may fail. Sufficient buffer area between the development and residential areas not able to be provided.	See above
	Odours	See above
	Smell	See above
	Smell	See above
	Increase in and as well as consistent odour.	See above
	Omission of odours	See above
	Odours	See above
	Adverse effect on residential amenity due to odour emission	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Bad smells	See above
	Inspection of the building plans reveals that no scrubbers will be installed in the roof exhaust fans. Given that material may be already be quite putrid on its arrival there may always be putrescible material which will continuously be expelled into the surrounding area.	See above
	Odour will occur from the liquid and solid waste products with no knowledge of what can be used to minimise these odours and how harmful they are to both people and animals.	See above
	Putrescible waste is highly odorous and can be 7 days old by the time it is collected attracting flies and vermin. Although the EIS states a "Vermin control program will be designed "how do we know whether it is adequate and enforced?"	See above.  Vermin Control has been included in the sites Environmental Management Plan incorporating tried and tested vermin control procedures. The facility will be under strict control and surveillance by the EPA and Council, which will ensure all vermin control programs are appropriate.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	There is no mechanical ventilation in the fully enclosed shed. Not only will there be odour and potentially toxic fumes from waste there is also the exhaust fumes from vehicles that will need to be extracted. This will lead to odour issues for nearby residents.	See above
	The reuse of leachate and truck wash water for reuse at the nearby concrete batching plant is likely to have odour and public health impacts as it is not being disinfected and the proponents need to monitor the quality of the treated waste water.	Noted. Process water is not being re-used in the concrete batching plant. It will now be treated by a water management system and disposed of to sewer in accordance with a Trade Waste Agreement to be entered into with Council.
	It is understood that the grease trap waste which is highly offensive and J 120 (not defined) will be stored outside for extended periods leading to odour concerns with filling and emptying these storage vessels.	As noted within the EIS, J120 waste is water/hydrocarbon mixtures or emulsions in water. As also noted within the EIS, both grease trap waste and J120 waste would be kept in dedicated storage tanks, which are a completely enclosed system. Decanting these tanks into dedicated liquid waste trucks would also occur over a completed enclosed system to ensure that there are no spills or odours escaping.
	Odour modelling is based on the assumption of an enclosed shed but given that there will be 60 vehicle movements per day there is no guarantee that the shed doors will remain closed at all times.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	As with the Mugga Land Waste Management Centre the smell can be horrendous.	See above. Strict odour controls will be used on site at all times to ensure offsite odours do not occur.
	<p>“Putrescible waste from restaurant and markets is highly odorous, especially if stored at commercially premises for up to 7 days before collection”</p> <p>“The EIS refers to the storage of liquid wastes including grease trap waste (highly offensive) and “J 120” (not defined.” It is understood that these wastes will be stored outdoors for extended periods, and there are odour concerns regarding filling and emptying these vessels.”</p> <p>“Odour modelling appears to be based on assumption of an enclosed shed, but what guarantees can be given that the doors remain closed at all times”</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>See above.</p>
	Putrescible and grease trap waste have not been adequately addressed and these wastes can be particularly offensive.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Fumes produced by many trucks delivering the garbage	See above
	The horrible odour caused by rotting, decaying and decomposing waste it will bring in.	See above
	Comply with NSW EPA requirements – Odour Control Methods (need to be considered)	See above. The site will be controlled by an EPL which stipulates that offensive odours are not to occur.
	Smell & odours	See above
	Unhealthy and bad smells	See above
	Smells	See above
	Smell. People will no longer be comfortable outside.	See above
	Smell from organic matter & grease trap waste if wind blowing in the direction of where I live.	See above
	Smells drifting across to Queanbeyan Race Course and ruining race days for many people.	See above
	Smells	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Constant odour emissions from the waste, the waste treatment process and waste facility.	See above
	<p>The proposed development will detrimentally affect the property and surrounding properties as it will cause significant odour due to the amount of wastage being stored and processed on site.</p> <p>It is proposed that up to 95,000 tonnes of waste per annum will be processed on site and that putrescible and nonputrescible waste of approximately tonnes is anticipated to be processed at peak operations.</p>	See above
	<p>The property situated on an elevated position on Munro Rd will experience breezes and sometime very strong winds which would cause the odours travel towards the house. The odour will lead to the need to close the windows and doors which is not healthy environment. The house on the property has evaporate cooling which requires windows and doors to be open during its operation during summer. The odour will prevent the effective</p>	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	operation of the evaporate cooling on the property.	
	Unpleasant odour	See above
	<p>The poor site selection for this proposal result in numerous odour objections. Attention drawn to NSW Health findings re; odour for other DA – Goulburn</p> <p>Odour will escape from the building when the doors are opened.</p> <p>Concerns over ventilation and filtration systems.</p> <p>Risk of relying on engineering solutions that may fail.</p> <p>Sufficient buffer area between the development and residential areas not able to be provided.</p>	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>The poor site selection for this proposal result in numerous odour objections. Attention drawn to NSW Health findings re; odour for other DA – Goulburn</p> <p>Odour will escape from the building when the doors are opened.</p> <p>Concerns over ventilation and filtration systems.</p> <p>Risk of relying on engineering solutions that may fail.</p> <p>Sufficient buffer area between the development and residential areas not able to be provided.</p>	See above
	<p>Smell from green waste and smell from trucks when not in use, will trucks be washed out after use?</p> <p>Wholesale sleeper company – smell travels up reserve &amp; is quite strong, particularly on warm and noise echoes but at least they close at 5.30-6pm.</p>	See above
	<p>Concern about odour and undesirable smell from hazardous waste close to the family home</p>	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Odour could be considerable, as the prevailing winds (north west) would blow directly not just over the resident's home but the whole neighbourhood	See above
	The odour from the site will be worse than one can imagine. There will be up to 70,000 t/y of general solid waste. This will include rotting food, perishables and nappies producing terrible odour. Used nappies make up a quarter of rubbish dumped in Canberra. The odour will severely impact on the resident's amenity.	See above. Of the 70,000 t/y of general solid waste, approximately 50% would be putrescible.
	Concerns about odour from operations including odour from trucks, cleaning bays, waste on site at any given time/day/temperature and whether these have been taken into account.	See above
	Concern about monitoring odour and policing of odour issues	See above. The EPA's general terms of approval do not require ongoing odour monitoring, however it requires that offensive odours not occur.
	WMF will generate odour.	See above
	Concerned about potential noxious odours.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Odour of waste may have an impact on surrounding areas.	See above
	Odour created by putrefied material.	See above
	Concerned about being affected by odour.	See above
	WMF will create odour.	See above
	Impact of odour on submitters business will be significant given office only several metres from WMF site boundary.	See above
	Mechanisms to mitigate impact of odour caused by processing of putrescible materials on surrounding areas will be ineffective.	See above
	Odour created by putrescible waste unacceptable.	See above
	WMF will emit odour.	See above
	Will potentially create smell.	See above
	Cause odour.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Having the smell constantly – odour.	See above
	I will be affected by odour.	See above
	I don't want to smell a disgusting odour near my beautiful house.	See above
	I don't want to smell a yucky tip all day.	See above
	It will make the place smell.	See above
	Waste odour will be transferred via predominate westerly winds.	See above
	We do not want to walk outside and smell a rubbish bin each day without making the choice to be near one or not.	See above
	We do not want to walk outside and smell a rubbish bin each day without making the choice to be near one or not.	See above
	We do not want to walk outside and smell a rubbish bin each day without making the choice to be near one or not.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Concerned about the increased odour/smell from the proposed WTF	See above
	Proposed WMF will increase odour/smell to the area.	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	The smell from the proposed WMF.	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Smell from WMF	See above
	Odour concern	See above
	Smell from garbage and particularly from oil waste a concern.	See above



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Odour will escape from the building when the doors are opened.	See above
	The business is directly behind the proposed site where the public is in their front yard. This makes the submitter concerned about the smell the Waste Transfer Facility will bring	See above
	Does not want to be smelling the rubbish from their home. On a windy day this will become worse.	See above
	Noxious odours in	See above
	residential areas	
	Smell on warmer days and from trucks.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
<b>Dust and airborne pathogens</b>	Dust concern	The Air Quality Assessment assessed both PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> emissions from the proposal. It concluded that offsite dust impacts would not negligible (if any).
	Dust concerns	See above
	Dust concerns	See above
	Dust concerns (coming into house)	See above
	Omission of dust	The Air Quality Assessment considered PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> which are the assessable components of dust. The Assessment concluded that the proposal meets the relevant criteria relating to dust and would not have an impact on surrounding environment.
	Hazardous dust and chemicals	See above. Chemicals will be stored in dedicated storage containers, meeting the requirements of their relevant Material Safety Data Sheet, SUEZ's certified safety management systems and workplace health and safety requirements. Impacts associated with hazardous dust and chemicals are not expected.
	Pollution will affect many more residents, schools and businesses than shown on the pans. It could affect and cause health issues to	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	around 2,000 residents near the site.	
	Concern about odours and dust affecting houses in the vicinity, dust may affect representor's bronchial system and is an issue for visitors.	See above
	Concerned WMF may process concealed contaminated waste such as asbestos which may become airborne.	See above. The site will be operated in accordance with an EPL which requires ongoing audits and record keeping. The site would not be permitted to accept asbestos and any asbestos containing loads will be turned away from the site.
	Prevailing winds flow west to east. Client's property will therefore be affected by dust and debris.	See above
	WMF will create dust.	See above
	Westerly wind moving towards Queanbeyan will expose residents to airborne contaminants from WMF.	See above
	Transmission of waste and dust to neighbouring surrounds. Evidence as per ACT Mugga Lane transfer facility.	See above

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Our entire building and neighbours will be impacted by windblown hazards, odours, pathogens that will impact on our health and the health of neighbours.	See above
	Dust emissions during construction not adequately addressed. SUEZ under no compulsion to implement any suggested management measures.	See above. As noted previously, construction and operation of the facility is under the strict controls of the EPL, which considers the site environmental management plan. The site environmental management plan incorporates the mitigation measures outlined within the EIS, and as such, all controls would be implemented to ensure the facility complies with the EPL.
<b>Risk</b>	Increased truck movement create increased risk of children being seriously injured walking to and from school	All truck and vehicle movements will be required to comply with the road rules at all times.
	<p>Flammable properties of waste oil and grease trap and risk of ember attack to 400m downwind of fire source – attached report from CSIRO – Fire Report – and Fire behaviour evaluation and Chemical fire at Mitchell article 2012.</p> <p>Risk of asbestos contamination and plume drift due to prevailing wind and risk.</p>	<p>Oil and grease trap waste would be kept in dedicated and separate storage tankers. These tankers are fully enclosed and would not allow ember attach. In addition, they would be stored separately to other ignition sources such as paper and cardboard.</p> <p>Asbestos is not to be accepted at the facility. Any loads contaminated with asbestos would be turned away prior to entry to the site.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Concerns regarding a fire at the facility. Chemicals and fuels stored if ignited could explode. This could create toxic fumes and/or bushfires affecting not only the localised area but greater Queanbeyan	See above.
	Health risk and spread of disease	Medical waste, including cytotoxic waste does not form part of the proposal. In addition, a vermin control program would be implemented to ensure there is no risk to human health or the spread of disease.
	Will result in detrimental health impacts.	See above.
	Fire hazard from cardboard/paper.	The fire safety study modelled a number of scenarios and determined the risk of the proposal being a fire hazard was negligible. SUEZ has considerable experience in operating recycling facilities, and preventing fire risks.
	Fire hazard from oil, grease, chemicals and cardboard – toxic fumes.	See above.
	An increase in heavy vehicle movements is likely to increase the risk of children being seriously injured as they walk and ride to Queanbeyan West Primary School	All vehicle movements will be required to follow all road safety rules. As vehicles will adhere to road safety rules and drive within the speed limits, an increase in the risk of children being injured by traffic is considered minimal.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Adverse health impacts. Chronic sinus and allergic and non-allergic rhinitis sufferer, smells are a constant trigger	As noted above, odour impacts are not expected from the proposal.
	<p>Limited safe guards in place to adequately process contaminated waste, controlled wastes, prescribed waste, hazardous waste and medical waste, either now or in the future.</p> <p>How will contamination waste be dealt with, recorded and workers and neighbours protected</p>	<p>Medical or hazardous waste does not form part of the proposal and has not been assessed.</p> <p>Loads would be inspected by the weighbridge operator, and any waste loads contaminated with materials not permitted to be accepted at the facility would be turned away.</p> <p>The EPA's General Terms of Approval, and the EPL to be obtained for the facility will require ongoing waste tracking and reporting to ensure compliance of the proposal. Workers will undergo ongoing training to ensure the appropriate procedures and occupational health and safety requirements are implemented at all times.</p>
	Is there going to be ongoing monitoring to ensure acceptable levels are maintained.	See above.
	Work Health and Safety is not addressed in the EIS. The EIS says that putrescible waste will be manually sorted with provision of spraying deodorises which may have an impact on the health of the employee. There is no mention of PPE or decontamination showers.	The EIS explains the management systems that will be implemented, monitored and audited. These will also be regulated by NSW EPA and Council. All relevant environmental and Health & Safety (WorkSafe) regulations will be adhered to, including PPE.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>WHS is not addressed (document refers to OHS Act instead), health of employee and no mention of PPE or decontamination showers</p> <p>“Customers should be compelled to sort waste at source”</p> <p>No consideration for mechanical ventilation (toxic fumes within the</p>	<p>Refer above.</p> <p>Loads will be weighed upon entry, and inspected as unloaded. SUEZ has extensive experience operating similar Resource Recovery facilities, and will implement education programs for customer facilities.</p> <p>Refer air quality responses above.</p>
	<p>facilities)</p> <p>Treatment of waste water is not being disinfected, who monitor?</p> <p>The EIS states every load will be monitored (how and by whom?)</p>	<p>Waste water treatment will be implemented to meet Council’s Trade Waste requirements.</p> <p>Loads will be weighed upon entry, and inspected as unloaded. SUEZ has extensive experience operating similar Resource Recovery facilities, and will implement education programs for customer facilities.</p>
	<p>Does not appear to be adequate provision for air cleaning, washing and dispersion from within the shed and open yard areas</p>	<p>Waste sorting will not occur in the open yard areas and air cleaning, washing and dispersion is not proposed.</p> <p>All processing would be carried out within the proposed building. No adverse air quality impacts are predicted, as noted previously.</p>
	<p>Health concerns from pollution, toxins</p>	<p>See above. Offsite environmental impacts such as air quality, odour or noise are not expected. Best practice vermin control and waste management procedures will also ensure minimal offsite impacts.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Health concerns from the disposal of waste, toxins, smells etc permeating over a residential area and close to a popular club and primary school.	See above.
	Environmental concerns due to improper disposal of hazardous waste which can pollute the environment and pose a threat to human life.	See above.
	If the waste is unchecked there is a high chance of contamination & infectious diseases, this creates a health risk & burden to our area.	See above. Retail loads have now been withdrawn from the proposal. All unloading will be supervised and corrective/preventative actions taken should loads not meet acceptance criteria. Any contaminated waste would be turned away from the facility and the waste would not be accepted.
	Worries me health wise. Effect my children's health.	See above.
	There will be trucks all over the place and it is a high risk of getting hit.	All waste and staff vehicles are required to follow all road rules at all times.
	Harmful chemicals from WMF will impact on people's health.	All waste would be managed in accordance with an EPL and best practice environmental controls and waste management procedures. Health impacts are not expected.
	Toxic fumes from WMF will impact on people's health.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in large truck movements a danger to children walking and on bikes.</li> <li>• Fire and fumes risk concern.</li> </ul>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Fire Safety Study included in EIS predicted no adverse air quality public safety risks, with proposed controls and management systems.</p>
	<p>Fire Safety Study does not take into account the risk outside of “normal conditions”, such as extremely hot days and high winds. Fire risk concern.</p>	<p>Fire Safety Study included in EIS predicted no adverse air quality public safety risks, with proposed controls and management systems. Operating experience, during high wind and temperature days, has been incorporated into design and proposed management systems.</p>
	<p>How will liquid waste be safely transported and stored?</p> <p>In the event of a fire how will the public be informed of the event and health and safety measures?</p> <p>Has Council undertaken an independent risk assessment or hazard and site evaluation? If so are these documents open to the public?</p>	<p>Liquid waste would be transported via appropriately licenced waste tankers. Liquid waste would also be stored in dedicated and enclosed liquid storage tankers. The tankers include self-bundling and a spill kit located close by to ensure any spills are contained.</p> <p>In the event of a fire, the emergency response plan would be implemented. This would include the dialling of '000' to notify the emergency response department. In case of environmental issue, the EPA would be notified as soon as practicable. In the event of a health concern, NSW Health or WorkCover would be notified as soon as practicable.</p> <p>An independent risk assessment was completed as part of SUEZ's proposal and we cannot comment on Council's procedures.</p>
<b>Traffic/ Traffic Management</b>	Traffic noise	See responses above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Adverse traffic impact	<p>A Traffic Impact Assessment was completed as part of the EIS. The site was initially used as a storage and warehouse, with an estimated heavy vehicle movement of 105 trips generated per day. The proposal would initially constitute approximately 60 vehicle movements per day, with a maximum of 80 vehicle trips per day. With the existing 30 trips per day, it is a total of a maximum of 110 trips per day. This would equate to an additional 5 trips per day than the previous land uses and would thus not have an adverse impact on traffic.</p> <p>An updated Traffic Impact assessment, with amended routes to reduce impact, forms part of this submission.</p>
	Increased truck movements will interfere with resident access to and from their homes.	See above. Waste vehicles would enter the industrial estate, directly from Canberra Avenue, and would not enter into residential areas. It is not expected that resident access to and from their homes would be impacted.
	Poor traffic outcomes on Kealman Road and Canberra Avenue and Gregory Place intersection.	Vehicles using the site would be spaced out over the day time hours, and will generally occur outside of peak traffic times. This will ensure that minimal impacts to the intersection and surrounding roads.
	Traffic will increase noise and pollution.	See above.
	Increased traffic in area	See above.
	Increased traffic in area	See above.
	Traffic congestion	See above.
	Increased traffic, dangerous for families crossing Gilmore Rd to Qbn West public school.	All vehicles will be required to follow the road rules. As mentioned previously, traffic from the facility will not enter the site from the residential area of Gilmore Road, and impacts to families and children accessing the school are not expected.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Traffic congestion increased.</p> <p>Intersection of Kealman Rd and Canberra Avenue not designed for multiple heavy trucks.</p> <p>Intersection used by Nimmitabel Street residents to travel to Canberra.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Increased traffic</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Increased traffic.</p> <p>Existing road network not designed for traffic increase – improved road markings or roundabout at intersection of Kealman and Bowen place.</p> <p>Concern that frequency of vehicles will increase with time.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Discrepancy between anticipated vehicle movements in EIS and traffic report.</p> <p>Vehicle entry to Kealman Road dangerous.</p> <p>Trucks turning left onto Canberra Ave from Kealman road use emergency lane as a slip lane which is dangerous.</p> <p>Conflict between industrial and residential traffic.</p>	<p>Both the EIS and traffic impact study specify 60 vehicle movements per day. This is the expected initial volume of traffic. Traffic movements may increase to 80 movements per day. See above, with the existing vehicle movements of 30 per day, a total of 110 movements is expected. This is 5 greater than previous land uses, and is not expected to have an impact on surrounding roads or intersections.</p> <p>Any vehicles entering Kealman Road are required to follow road safety rules and are not considered to be dangerous. Swept Paths have been carried out for the revised traffic access arrangements, and include the use of Kealman Road then Gilmore Road for semi-trailers to access Canberra Avenue. It is concluded that full compliance will be achieved and adverse impacts are not anticipated.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Errors in traffic impact assessment which impact on the quality of data and recommendations.	As noted previously, trucks turning into Canberra Avenue will be required to follow road safety rules and are not considered to be dangerous. The trucks will be within an industrial zone and SUEZ are committed to being a good neighbour. SUEZ are committed to working with the industrial, commercial and residential properties in the area, to minimise any traffic impacts.
	The large volume of solid and recyclable waste will require a constant flow of large trucks 24/7 over and above those already using our small intersection used by domestic traffic	See above.
	Traffic using the intersection often carrying small children from an established swimming class	See above.
	Suez traffic assessment does not include an assessment of those streets that are partially or fully residentially zoned and, located less than 500m from the proposed site.	See above. Heavy vehicles will not enter residential areas.
	Traffic assessment refers to a removal company that has not operated at the proposed location for many years, so there has been less traffic visiting the proposed site than assessment suggest	Whilst the removal company has not been at the site for some time, it has been used to demonstrate that the proposal would be consistent with previous land uses.
	Increase in traffic on Kealman and Gilmore roads will impede residents and other business owners access to and from homes/businesses.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Increased traffic, underestimate of future truck movements, especially during peak hours	See above. Heavy vehicle movements would avoid peak traffic hours as much as practicable.
	Industrial area designed for heavy traffic.	Noted. The proposal is consistent with industrial uses.
	Legitimacy of proposed vehicles movements	The estimated vehicle movements have been gained through over 20 years' experience in the waste management sector and are accurate.
	Traffic blockages on Kealman, Bowen Place and Gregory Street	See above.
	Major commuter road, traffic generated from the facility may increase congestion on Canberra Ave.	See above. The revised Traffic Impact Assessment (Oct 2016) has included an assessment of the proposal on the surrounding road network, including Canberra Avenue. It is not expected to increase congestion on Canberra Avenue.
	Increased traffic movements will exacerbate the intersection at Canberra Ave/Kealman Road which is already extremely busy. An extra 80 truck movements will cause unacceptable congestion at this intersection.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The proposal will affect traffic in and out of Queanbeyan especially at peak times.	See above.
	Traffic impact during peak hours will worsen an already congested area and cause delays for commuters. The extra truck movements would only exacerbate the situation where current roads cannot cope, north and southbound at times of high demand.	See above.
	Increased traffic in the area	See above.
	Increased traffic from large trucks on nearby roads and "increase the potential for accidents"	See above.
	"The proposal does not contain sufficient scientific data. For example the size of vehicles to be used" Impact on road maintenance cost	See above. As noted in the Swept Paths for the proposal show the maximum vehicle size would be a B-double, and that compliance with road standards would be achieved.
	Traffic	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Increase traffic	See above.
	Effect on residents living nearby with extra traffic coming and going.	See above.
	Increase traffic	See above.
	Traffic congestion right on Canberra Ave – many problems for all commuters.	See above.
	This is a light industrial area but already the vehicle traffic in the street is quite congested.	See above.
	Significant increase in traffic congestion due to a significant number of waste vehicles beginning to operate in the area.	See above.
	Increase of trucks parked in surrounding areas will make it harder for other vehicles and trucks to move around the already congested area.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	The current significant traffic on Canberra Ave will be further increased by the traffic generated by the establishment and construction of the facility and the operation of the facility.	See above.
	Impacts on road network, estimates in increases in traffic movements resulting from the proposed development. Types of vehicles, rigid, articulated and covered or uncovered and the volume/frequency of these vehicles.	See above.
	Impacts on road network, estimates in increases in traffic movements resulting from the proposed development. Types of vehicles, rigid, articulated and covered or uncovered and the volume/frequency of these vehicles.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Traffic congestion increased in locality, particularly at intersections.</p> <p>Intersection of Kealman Rd and Canberra Avenue not designed for multiple heavy trucks. Intersection used by Nimitabel Street residents to travel to Canberra.</p>	See above.
	<p>Additional traffic will make access to Canberra Avenue &amp; John Bull St more difficult, stressful and time consuming, not to mention dangerous.</p> <p>Getting across the intersection to Canberra Ave at peak hour is risky as there are no lights or break in the traffic.</p>	See above.
	<p>Other businesses in the area will be affected by the additional traffic due to household trailers going to the site which will lead to traffic problems, including queues and traffic jams.</p>	See above. The retail component of the proposal has been removed.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	There will be increased traffic by up to 80 movements per day, 7 days a week, no rest. This will increase traffic congestion and impact on daily lives, particularly at Bowen Place	As noted within the EIS, the average of 80 movements per day would be restricted to Monday-Friday. 15 truck movements per day on weekends are expected.
	Road is a major commuter road for Queanbeyan Residents and it should not be congested further by such a large waste facility situated just off Canberra Ave.	See above. Trucks would be spaced out over the day and would have dedicated delivery times. Queuing on local roads are not expected.
	Excessive traffic and excessive road usage resulting in additional wear and tear on roads designed for lighter traffic flow	See above. The roads within the industrial estate and Canberra Avenue have been designed for heavy vehicle movement and the proposal is consistent with this use.
	Concern for personal safety of local children who have to watch out for trucks as they alight school buses and walk home	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Impact on traffic flow in the locality and increase in congestion particularly during peak hours. Onsite parking will be provided with 61 underground car spaces for employees	See above.  Parking for trucks will also be provided to avoid queuing on the road.
	Number of truck movements is not clear and no information is provided how the increase in activity will affect access, liveability, road safety and impression of the neighbourhood.	See above.
	Concerned about increased vehicle movements on surrounding road network and resulting traffic. Documentation shows trucks entering/ exiting the site on the wrong side of Bowen Place.	See above.  Revised swept paths have been completed which show the trucks entering/existing the site on the correct side of Bowen Place.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Development will increase traffic congestion in surrounding area causing inconvenience to existing users.	See above.
	Increased unregulated and unmonitored traffic movements outside business hours, particularly on Gilmore Road.	See above. All vehicles will be required to adhere to all road rules and would be under the control of Council, EPA, RMS and NSW Police.
	Roads already congested. Increased number of trucks on roads which may increase further as business grows. QCC paying for road repairs.	See above.
	Addition of 80 truck movements will cause congestion at the Canberra Avenue/ Kealman Road intersection and exacerbate already hazardous road conditions.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Increased heavy vehicle movements will increase congestion and potential for accidents on surrounding road network.</p> <p>Financial burden of maintaining surrounding road network will fall to QCC.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Proponent's traffic assessments appear to be outdated as they were taken in 2014.</p>	<p>Whilst the assessments were completed in 2014, the data and the guidelines used are current. The assessments are considered appropriate.</p>
	<p>Congestion at certain times on Canberra Ave – large heavy vehicles exiting &amp; entering Gilmore Road.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Due to large volumes of waste will require constant flow of large trucks using small intersection used by domestic traffic. Kealman Rd intersection is regularly used carrying small children from an established swimming class. Garbage trucks carrying waste on our doorstep is not acceptable.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Increase in traffic around my street – garbage trucks.	See above. Traffic movements will be restricted to the industrial area and Canberra Avenue. Any municipal waste trucks in residential areas would be Council municipal waste collections.
	Increase in traffic.	See above.
	<p>How will traffic management be managed within the industrial precinct that is very busy with the addition of 70,000 tonnes of general solid waste and 12,000 tonnes of other waste?</p> <p>Has a traffic management plan been completed with recommendations of any necessary upgrades to road network?</p> <p>Who will pay for repairs to road network?</p> <p>Why Queanbeyan ratepayers should be expected to fund this work when residents receive limited benefit from such a facility.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>No upgrades to the local area road network were found to be required.</p> <p>Nominal impacts to the local area road network are predicted.</p> <p>Suez will comply with Council contribution requirements.</p>
	Increasing truck movements.	See above.
	Increasing truck movements.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Objection-Increased truck movements, impact on safety of children walking across Gilmore Road.	See above.
	Increased traffic from WTF	See above.
	WMF will Increase traffic congestion.	See above.
	WMF will Increase traffic congestion.	See above.
	WMF will Increase traffic congestion and impact on safety of residents.	See above.
	Increased traffic congestion, which will impact safety of residents.	See above.
	<p>Impact on safety of children walking to school from increased traffic from WMF.</p> <p>Data in traffic study is inaccurate, doesn't include streets that are residentially zoned.</p> <p>Increase in truck movements to the sites interferes with resident's access to their homes.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>As noted above, trucks will not enter into residential areas and as such have not been assessed.</p> <p>See above. Noise impacts from truck movements</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Increased traffic will increase noise level to residents. Increased congestion from increased vehicle movements.	are not expected. See above.
	Impact on safety of children walking to school from increased traffic from WMF. Data in traffic study is inaccurate, doesn't include streets that are residentially zoned. Increase in truck movements to the sites interferes with resident's access to their homes. Increased traffic will increase noise level to residents. Increased congestion from increased vehicle movements.	See above.
	Impact on safety of children walking to school from increased traffic from WMF.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Data in traffic study is inaccurate, doesn't include streets that are residentially zoned.</p> <p>Increase in truck movements to the sites interferes with resident's access to their homes.</p> <p>Increased traffic will increase noise level to residents.</p> <p>Increased congestion from increased vehicle movements.</p>	
	<p>Impact on safety of children walking to school from increased traffic from WMF.</p> <p>Data in traffic study is inaccurate, doesn't include streets that are residentially zoned.</p> <p>Increase in truck movements to the sites interferes with resident's access to their homes.</p> <p>Increased traffic will increase noise level to residents.</p> <p>Increased congestion from increased vehicle movements.</p>	See above.
	Congestion concern, traffic lights should be installed on Kealman Road and Canberra Avenue.	See above. The upgrade of the intersection does not form part of the proposal. Semi trailers will now exit the site via Kealman/Gilmore Road.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Impacts and relationship with traffic outside of the site not properly addressed. No cumulative account of truck movements in and out of Kealman Road/Bowen Place.</p> <p>EIS incorrectly states that Canberra Avenue has a 60km/h speed limit. From Lanyon Drive roundabout to Gilmore Road it is actually 80km/h.</p> <p>Not clear about proposed routes to Woodlawn and Sydney.</p> <p>No alternative options for transporting the waste considered, such as by railway.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Routes would be via state roads.</p> <p>Alternative waste transportation options have not been considered. SUEZ transport will be used and the use of a railway to transport waste would not be viable.</p>
	<p>Traffic modelling is inaccurate in relation to noise and traffic.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Extra traffic on Kealman Road. Would like to know if there is any idea to put traffic lights at the intersection of Kealman and Canberra Ave due to the increased traffic.</p>	<p>See above. An upgrade of the intersection is outside of this proposal.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Increase in traffic on Canberra Ave	See above.
<b>Other</b>	Flawed process	The process has followed the requirements of the Director-General Requirements and NSW Planning legislation.
	Has not considered Class 1 dwelling and impacts from dwelling.	See above.
	Nearest receptor is 36m away from site.	Noted. This has been included within the EIS.
	Concern for possibility of leachate.	The proposal does not constitute a landfill and leachate is not expected. Process areas would be within a covered building, draining to a sump, treatment and sewer discharge. External hardstand would be concrete and hence would be impervious. Any process water would be transferred to a water treatment system to ensure waste is appropriately treated prior to being disposed of to sewer.
	Waste coming from ACT should be dealt with within the ACT.	See above.
	Poor entry to feature to Queanbeyan.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Size – exceeds the limit of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Waste recovery hall designed to take 90,000 tonne of waste, greater than the 70,000 tonne proposed.</p> <p>Contamination of stormwater.</p>	<p>The facility is designed to accept up to 95,000 t/a of waste. The 70,000 t/a of waste proposed consists of general solid waste (putrescible and non-putrescible). The remaining 25,000 t/a would consist of liquid waste and recyclables, as outlined in Section 5 of the EIS.</p> <p>Stormwater will be kept separate from process water and as such contamination is not expected.</p>
	<p>Not environmentally or socially sustainable.</p> <p>Site visible from RE1 zoned land – negative visual impact.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>The proposed building is consistent with surrounding industrial buildings and complies with the design requirements of the Council's DCP.</p>
	<p>No consultation during EIS process – scale exceeds what is socially and environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>100m from M.E.T School – sensitive use.</p>	<p>Consultation with several immediate owners, where possible, was undertaken during the EIS process. As the proposal was designated development, public exhibition was required. This was considered adequate consultation process.</p> <p>Wilkinson and Murray, at Council's request in February 2016, assessed the impacts of the</p>
	<p>Inappropriate location.</p>	<p>Proposal on the school. The assessment found that there would be no impacts on the school.</p> <p>The site has been sited within an Industrial estate surrounded by other industrial uses. The location is close to the waste market and transport. As such, it is considered an ideal location for the proposal.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Advice from NSW Health must be sought before any final conclusions are made.</p> <p>Reference to other waste transfer facility DA rejected by the JRPP – Sydney Road, Goulburn.</p> <p>Regard should be given to this DA.</p>	<p>Council has referred the EIS and proposal to NSW Health. All concerns have been addressed and additional information provided as requested.</p> <p>Reference to the waste transfer facility in Goulburn is unrelated to the proposal and has not been considered further.</p>
	<p>Council risks losing funding from rates if residents of properties move out of these properties</p>	<p>SUEZ is not able to provide comment or response.</p>
	<p>Employees parking in adjoining streets making the area a parking lot</p>	<p>On site car parking spaces are included within the proposal, in compliance with DCP requirements. No offsite parking in adjoining areas is proposed.</p>
	<p>Adversely affect business located in vicinity of proposed facility</p>	<p>See above. Offsite environmental impacts are not expected. The site would be tightly controlled by an EPL and NSW legislation and impacts to businesses are not expected.</p>
	<p>Recycling aspect of proposal used to gain public support, though this component of the proposed facility is small</p>	<p>The recycling component of the proposal has been considered against market demand and is deemed appropriate.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	As the population grows the facility to expand on the site to cope with increases in waste generation	This proposal relates to the expansion of the site to accept up to 95,000 t/a of waste. Waste acceptance beyond that limit is not part of this proposal, and is unlikely to be feasible due to the size of the site.
	Maintenance of facility – who checks on the proposed facility to ensure compliance	Ongoing compliance of the site, in accordance with the sites EPL will be conducted by EPA.
	Canberra's rubbish should be dealt with by Canberra in Canberra	As noted above, the facility will source waste from both the ACT and local area.
	Council's notification to premises that may be impacted failed to mention that 50% of the waste would be putrescible.	The EIS notes that 50% of the 70,000 t/a of general solid waste would be putrescible. This would equate to approximately 35,000 t/a of putrescible waste. This would constitute approximately 39% of waste to be accepted at the site.
	The EIS states that every truck will be monitored and transport operators will undergo continuing education. The submitter questions who will monitor the trucks and if independent companies access the facility there will be little or no control.	The waste will be monitored by operators at the site, as well as CCTV cameras. This is required to ensure waste reporting is accurate and strict compliance with the sites EPL.
	Land dispute, laneway	A laneway does not form part of the proposal.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Worried about the proposed facility will cause issues similar to issues cause by the Wholesale Sleeper in 1999 in the area such as noise, dust, trucks on the street 7 days a week, gutters and top of the roof full with topsoil, also the site looks like a garbage tip. Dust flies around like a cloud. In 1999 Council did not help us with the concerned matters.</p>	<p>As noted previously, the site would be under stringent site controls to ensure compliance with an EPL. This will ensure housekeeping and other environmental concerns such as noise, dust and odour are appropriately managed.</p>
	<p>The waste is apparently sourced from the ACT further re-enforcing the idea of Queanbeyan being an ACT waste dump.</p>	<p>As noted previously, waste will be sourced from both the ACT and local Queanbeyan area. The site is to be used for the temporary storage of waste, and will then be transferred to the ACT, Woodlawn or Sydney for further processing or disposal. Recycling and reuse is consistent with Council and NSW Government policies.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Concern of leachate, a mixture of water and dissolved solids, which is produced as water passes through waste and collects at the bottom of the landfill. While the extract composition of the leachate depends on the type of waste and its stage of decomposition, leachate may contain a variety of toxic and polluting components, in large or trace amounts. If managed inappropriately, leachate can contaminate ground and surface water.</p>	<p>The proposal does not constitute a landfill and as such leachate is not expected. The floor of the proposed building would be concrete, and fully enclosed to ensure water from process areas remains separate from soil and stormwater. Wastewater will be sent to the water management system for treatment prior to being disposed of in the Council sewer in accordance with a Trade Waste Agreement.</p>
	<p>Concern about the limited availability of the EIS – it is extremely difficult for working individuals to access the EIS if it is not available online and it is unreasonable that concerned members of the community should have to pay a fee of \$25 in order to receive a copy of the EIS.</p>	<p>The EIS has been on display over two public exhibition periods. This is above and beyond the requirements of the EP&amp;A Act and access to the document is in accordance with the requirements of the EP&amp;A Act.</p>
	<p>The entrance to city from</p>	<p>The site is to be located within an Industrial</p>



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Canberra Ave should be improved, not further denigrated by having the facility. The commercial district should be slowly reduced and moved away from the entrance to the city. The proposal should not proceed as this will have significant and detrimental impact upon the property, neighbouring properties and for the City of Queanbeyan.</p>	<p>Estate and is consistent to with the aims and objectives of the general industrial zoning.</p>
	<p>Advice from NSW Health must be sought before any final conclusions are made.  Reference to other waste transfer facility DA rejected by the JRPP – Sydney Road, Goulburn.  Regard should be given to this DA.</p>	<p>The application has been provided to NSW Health for consideration.</p> <p>This application is separate from the Goulburn facility and further consideration has not been given.</p>
	<p>Advice from NSW Health must be sought before any final conclusions are made.  Reference to other waste transfer facility DA rejected by the JRPP – Sydney Road, Goulburn.  Regard should be given to this DA.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Application was advertised in local paper in September 2015 and at the time no letter was sent to owners. Why were letters only sent in January 2016? Letters should have been sent to owners in Nimmitabel Street and further around the neighbourhood	The site has been publicly exhibited twice, with the second period extended. This is considered above and beyond the requirements of the EP&A Act.
	Poor entry to feature to Queanbeyan	See above.
	Concerned about road maintenance due to increasing truck movements.	See above.
	Problems will escalate if the volumes exceed what is permitted on the site.	See above.
	There could be an adverse impact on sporting grounds, school facilities and kangaroos Club	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Proposed tree planting will not make the facility look good as it will be years before they are fully grown. Even then residents will still see, smell and hear the facility.	See above.
	A waste facility right at the entrance to Queanbeyan will not enhance Queanbeyan's image. As the facility will cater for ACT waste a location in the ACT is more appropriate.	See above.
	Canberra Avenue streetscape – entrances to Queanbeyan should be improved and businesses encouraged to create visually appealing streetscape to attract new business to choose Queanbeyan as destination to locate their business.	See above. The facility is not located on Canberra Avenue and the building will be consistent with surrounding buildings. Also, the building will comply with building requirements outlined in the Queanbeyan DCP.
	The proposed waste or resource management facility is a State significant development as it relates management strategies which	Whilst the proposal relates to regional waste management strategies, the waste to be accepted at the facility is less than the State Significant Development threshold. Thus the proposal has been submitted as designated development.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	involve the ACT and other districts surrounding the ACT. There is no information about regional waste management to regional waste strategies in the EIS or detail about the growth of the region & the requirements for managing waste now and into the future.	As the development is designated development, the EIS is required to address the requirements outlined within a set of "Director General Requirements". Information regarding regional waste management strategies and detail about the growth of the region and the requirements for managing waste now and into the future did not form part of the requirements and as such was not included in the EIS. The purpose of the EIS was to assess the permissibility and the environmental impacts of the proposal.
	Representor submits that any comment for or against the proposal by a councillor or councillors does not represent a conflict of interest or a ground for exclusion from the joint regional panel	Noted. This is outside the requirements of the proposal.
	No information is provided on the relationship with any regional waste management strategies and/or relationships to other facilities in the area. No information is provided how the proposed development will accommodate increased waste management requirements and whether SUEZ facilities will expand with an adverse impact in the locality	See above.
	No information as to the exact expectation of the facility's impact on resident's properties and values.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	In terms of fire controls, will there be an independent & accountable analysis of all incompatible materials that are stored and processed on site? In the event of fire does Queanbeyan have adequate resources to mitigate against toxic plume & ash?	See above.
	Businesses and residents surrounding the site exist in a symbiotic & supportive relationship. Given that the proposed facility is unlikely to be a patron of or for any of these it is unlikely they will have an interest in the well-being of the residents.	SUEZ pride themselves in being a good neighbour. To date they have worked together with nearby commercial and industrial businesses to ensure ongoing noise impacts do not occur. SUEZ is committed to being an ongoing good neighbour.
	Presence and stigma of facility will negatively impact on property values & businesses will lose customers and relocated. Will Council compensate for loss of business or loss of value?	See above.
	Will area ultimately be rezoned to allow for more similar type businesses? Will the company be allowed to expand their footprint?	Rezoning of the industrial estate is outside of the current proposal and has not been considered.  The site is restricted to available land and will not expand into neighbouring properties.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	There has not been sufficient, cohesive and clear information on the proposal, particularly regarding operations and impact.	The EIS assessed the proposal and addressed potential environmental and community impacts.
	There is too much potential physical and financial risk that may be inflicted onto current businesses and residents who have spent many years investing into area & calling it home. Queanbeyan can do better in finding another business that actually accents and elevates the area while also positively advancing reputation, welfare & future of current Queanbeyan businesses and residents.	See above.
	Council pursued/ proposed WMF in first instance. Seem to be on side with applicant.	This proposal is independent of Council. It meets the requirements of the local planning instruments and NSW planning legislation. The EIS has concluded that the proposal would have minimal environmental impact.
	Potential for WMF to increase capacity/ range of materials processed in future. Doing so will impact on nearby residents.	The increase in waste is outside of the scope of this proposal. Any future waste changes or increased would be appropriately assessed as per NSW planning legislation.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Applicant did not clearly state their intention to receive 70,000 tonnes of general waste in discussions with submitter.	The waste to be received has been documented within the EIS which has been publicly exhibited three times. In addition, all public meetings and communications have been accurate and stated that 70,000 t/a of general solid waste is to be accepted at the facility.
	Who will monitor breaches of environmental standards? Responsibility should not fall to those residents affected.	The site will be monitored by the EPA and Council.
	Industry in area but does not mean that more is good.	The EIS concludes that the proposal would have negligible environmental impact.
	Proposal degrades our city	See above.
	Not only is QBN the subject of many negative jokes, but you are going to make it worse by putting in a tip!	See above. As noted previously, the proposal constitutes a waste transfer station. A landfill or tip does not form part of this proposal.
	This whole situation (re: Waste Management Facility) doesn't make sense.	See above.
	Stress from WMF will impact the community.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Development not properly designed for collecting, temporarily storing and transferring potentially toxic and harmful materials, particularly putrescible waste, waste oils, chemicals and heavy metals in solid waste.	See above. The site has been designed based on best practice and 20 + years' experience in the waste management facility. It has been assessed as appropriate in the management and temporary storage of the proposed waste types.
	The consequent impacts from WMF on the environment, traffic increase and safety impacts at the gateway to Queanbeyan from Australia's national capital, Canberra will damage Queanbeyan and the Council's reputation and force people to leave.	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Proposed vegetation screening inadequate as the screening will not be erected from mature/advanced stock and will highlight the WMF impacting on the number of visitors to Queanbeyan and perpetuating the representation of Queanbeyan as a dirty struggle town.</p> <p>Location of WMF so close to residential areas will increase costs and losses to the community that far outweigh the benefits that the proposal may bring</p>	See above.
	<p>Proposed vegetation screening inadequate as the screening will not be erected from mature/advanced stock and will highlight the WMF impacting on the number of visitors to Queanbeyan and perpetuating the representation of Queanbeyan as a dirty struggle town.</p> <p>Location of WMF so close to residential areas will increase costs and losses to the community that far outweigh the benefits that the proposal may bring</p>	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Proposed vegetation screening inadequate as the screening will not be erected from mature/advanced stock and will highlight the WMF impacting on the number of visitors to Queanbeyan and perpetuating the representation of Queanbeyan as a dirty struggle town.</p> <p>Location of WMF so close to residential areas will increase costs and losses to the community that far outweigh the benefits that the proposal may bring.</p>	See above.
	<p>Proposed vegetation screening inadequate as the screening will not be erected from mature/advanced stock and will highlight the WMF impacting on the number of visitors to Queanbeyan and perpetuating the representation of Queanbeyan as a dirty struggle town.</p> <p>Location of WMF so close to residential areas will increase costs and losses to the community that far outweigh the benefits that the proposal may bring.</p>	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Water pollution concern.	<p>See above. A water treatment system is proposed for all process water. This system will treat water to a standard to meet a Trade Waste Agreement to be entered into with Council. All treated wastewater would enter Council's sewer and not be released to the environment.</p> <p>Stormwater will remain separate from wastewater and would be reused on site wherever possible, or treated prior to sewer discharge in accordance with Council requirements.</p>
	<p>Excavation work associated with the current DA already being undertaken on the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the proposed 95,000 tonnes of waste is so close to the 100,000 tonne significant development threshold, SUEZ should treat the proposal as being significant development.</li> <li>Threats to local fauna, especially reptiles, from being attracted to the food waste.</li> </ul> <p>Facility not in keeping with the image of Queanbeyan Council is trying to promote, especially at entrances to the city.</p>	<p>Some excavation work has been carried out at the site. This is independent of SUEZ and this DA application. Minor additional excavation work is proposed eg water management system OSD tanks</p> <p>Under NSW Planning Legislation, the proposal constitutes designated and integrated development. An application to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure to obtain Director General's Requirements was obtained, and formed the basis of the EIS. It does not constitute State Significant Development and as such cannot be assessed as such.</p> <p>Food waste will be kept at the site for a maximum of 24 hours. This is not enough time to attract local fauna. Management systems will ensure no attraction to, or impacts upon, local fauna. The facility has been designed to be consistent with Councils DCP and the surrounding industrial businesses.</p>
	Proposal is not Ecologically Sustainable Development. QBN West Industrial Estate is not suitable for heavy industry.	The Infrastructure SEPP permits this type of development within areas zoned as General Industry. In addition, an Ecologically Sustainable Development assessment was undertaken as part of the EIS and has concluded that the facility meets the objectives and requirements of ESD.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	The community consultation has been unacceptable given the significant community impact. Also believes it was not notified far enough.	The notification and community consultation process included two public exhibition/notification periods. This exceeds the requirements of the EP&A Act and is considered more than adequate.
	Lack of community consultation.	See above. Additional community information program was carried out by SUEZ.
<b>Risks - flammable, explosives, toxic hazardous chemicals, and other</b>	Any waste processor has chemical accidents or spills	The site will be operated under an Emergency Response Plan, Pollution Incident Response Plan, Environmental Management Plan and Operational Management Plan. The procedures within these plans are to industry best practice and will ensure any chemical accidents or spills are immediately contained and cleaned before any offsite environmental impact.  Draft Plans have been provided as part of this submission, and will be finalised for review and
<b>dangerous goods</b>		approval prior to occupancy/occupation.
	Fire safety sufficient resources to deal with a toxic plume and potential contamination of storm water in event of a fire.	See above.
	Toxic effect of chemicals used to clean the facility and to keep vermin at the bay.	Toxic chemicals will not be used to clean the facility. SUEZ has operated numerous waste facilities in numerous communities across Australia. The existing vermin control practices have not had a toxic effect of chemicals.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Potential for exposure to increase volumes of methane, bioaerosols, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), endotoxins, aliphatic and aromatic hydrocarbons and other air pollutants that are produced by decomposing waste and during waste processing.	Waste kept on site will be for a very short period prior to being transferred to a dedicated waste processing facility for further processing and/or disposal. The purpose of this facility is to provide a central location for waste to be bundled/stored until a full load is reached. Once this load is reached it is then transferred for processing. These pollutants would not be released to the air as waste would be transferred prior to decomposition.
	Concerned that this site is possibly highly contaminated with asbestos from the destruction of the previous landscape business. At the time of demolition there were no warning or hazard sign displayed.	Noted. As outlined within the EIS a contamination study was completed prior to entering into lease negotiations (Robson Environmental, 2015). Minor amounts of asbestos (bonded) material were found, associated with previous buildings off Kealman Road, which were safely removed and disposed as part of a separate DA. In addition, the site has undergone extensive excavation since the contamination study was conducted, which would remove any possible contaminants at the site.
	WMF will store flammable fuels for extended periods. Risk to nearby residential areas, schools, childcare centres, and sporting / recreation facilities.	See above. A risk assessment has been completed which has shown that the site is not hazardous in accordance with SEPP 33.  Industry best practice and the implementation of tried and tested handling and storage procedures will ensure risks to nearby residential areas, schools, childcare centres and sporting/recreation facilities will not occur. PHA and FSS findings and conclusions unchanged as a result of minor site changes.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Fire is an inherent risk, could adversely affect residents.	See above
	WTF chemicals will be harmful.	See above.
	Risk from storage of high flammable fuels which could ignite and start a fire.	See above.
	Waste oil and grease trap waste pose a fire danger – possible explosion.	See above.
<b>Rubbish</b>	Will result in rubbish	SUEZ uses ongoing site management tools to ensure the site is kept clean and tidy at all times.
	Increase in litter	See above.
	Will result in rubbish	See above.
	Rubbish falling from trucks if not properly covered.	It is a requirement of NSW legislation (POEO Act) that trucks are covered at all times.
	Litter	See above.
	Litter will increase	See above.
	Increase in loose litter	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Waste paper and plastic being visible in the methods used to contain them wire fencing	See above.
	Spread of airborne litter on windy days to nearby residences, businesses and major entrance to Queanbeyan.	See above.
	Blown debris adjacent to the site.	See above.
	Will potentially create litter	See above.
	Increase in rubbish.	See above.
	Tip will bring rubbish near my house and around the streets.	See above.
	Objection about increased litter from the site.	See above.
	Increased levels of litter from WMF.	See above.
	Increased levels of litter from WMF.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Increased levels of litter from WMF.	See above.
	Increased levels of litter from WMF.	See above.
<b>Proximity to residential or other business nearby area</b>	Objects to scale of facility in proximity to residential area	The facility is to be located within an Industrial Area. The aims, objectives and purposes of an industrial area is to centre industrial uses in the one place. The facility is consistent with the surrounding land uses. An assessment of environmental impacts show that impacts to residential areas are not expected and as such, the location is deemed to be appropriate.
	Too close to residential area	See above.
	Too close to residential area	See above.
	Too close to residential area	See above.
	Facility will impact on surrounding businesses	See above.
	Objects to proximity to residential area	See above.
	Objects to proximity to residential area	See above.
	Too close to residential area	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Too close to residential area	See above.
	Too close to residential area	See above.
	Situated between and in close proximity to residential properties	See above.
	Proximity to Queanbeyan home owners and residents is unacceptable	See above.
	This type of business should be located well away from residential pockets	See above.
	The potential for any escaping odours moving toward the closely adjacent residential homes/units with the prevailing westerly winds should be considered.	See above.
	Proximity to family homes, recreational sporting fields, small business, schools and a day care centre.	See above.
	Close to residents	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Close to homes and primary school	See above.
	Extremely close to other businesses and residential areas.	See above.
	Close proximity to representors home and they already endure noise and dust from another business in the locality.	See above.
	Objects to proximity of WMF to existing residential area and nearby primary school.	See above.
	WMF does not belong so close to a residential area and should not go ahead.	See above.
	Development too close to established residential and business uses.	See above.
	Proposal should not be considered given its proximity to schools and childcare centres.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Proximity to residential properties.	See above.
	Proximity to schools and sports fields used by children.	See above.
	Proposal does not consider proximity to residential properties and businesses established when area was zoned light industrial/ residential.	See above.
	Proximity to existing businesses whose customers may be disadvantaged by impacts of WMF.	See above.
	Proximity to existing residential area, childcare centre, schools and sporting/recreational facilities.  EPA advises this type of facility should not be located within 3km radius of a residential area.	See above.  The guidelines state that the facility should be sited greater than 250m from residential areas, unless other appropriate buffers (such as landscape, landform or buildings) or procedures can be used to minimise impacts. With the storage and processing of waste inside the building, and the use of the proposed mitigation and treatment systems, the location is deemed appropriate and meets the guidelines.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Supports recycling but in an area well away from residential areas & not at main entrance to QBN from Canberra.	See above.
	Situated between and in close proximity to residential properties.	See above.
	The tip is located near my house.	See above. Please note that the proposal does not include a landfill.
	Having to endure the sight of it every day.	See above.
	This Waste Management	See above. The facility is located within an
	Facility has no place in a residential area.	Industrial Zone.
	Location too close to residential area.	See above.
	Shouldn't be carried out in close proximity to residences.	See above.
	WMF within 500m of residents not good town planning, other locations should be considered.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	Too close to residents Proximity to residents and school is unacceptable	See above.
	Too close to residents Proximity to residents and school is unacceptable	See above.
	Too close to residents Proximity to residents and school is unacceptable	See above.
	Too close to residents Proximity to residents and school is unacceptable	See above.
	Too close to residences	See above.
<b>Technical</b>	What are suggested guidelines for location of waste facility to residential area?	See above. The proposal complies with the "Handbook" requirements for regional waste management (see above).
	Land is not zoned for allow for use	The Infrastructure SEPP allows the location of Waste Management and Resource Recovery Facilities within areas zoned for General Industrial.
	Definition of general waste results in too much risk for site.	The definition of General Solid Waste complies with NSW Environmental Legislation.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Not permissible within IN1 zone under QLEP2012.</p> <p>Current facility also not permissible in IN1 zone.</p> <p>Proposed development is not an expansion of current operations and shouldn't be referred to as such.</p> <p>Discrepancy in applicant's statement that putrescible waste will be removed within 24 hours where documents indicate times of between 12-96 hours.</p> <p>Discrepancy between EIS and Traffic report in regards to anticipated vehicle movements and times.</p> <p>Not environmentally or socially sustainable and therefore in breach of EP&amp;A Act.</p> <p>Incorrectly advertised in QBN Age (Incorrect titling and mapping).</p>	<p>Please see above. The facility is permissible within IN1 – General Industrial under the Infrastructure SEPP which over-rides the LEP.</p> <p>The site would be run in conjunction with the existing facility, by the same company. It is an expansion on the current operations.</p> <p>The removal of putrescible waste within 24hours is a mitigation measure. Usually waste would be removed between 12-24 hours. The documentation does not state 96 hours.</p> <p>The EIS and Traffic Report state an initial volume of approximately 60 vehicle movements per day.</p> <p>See above, the proposal would have negligible environmental impact and has been deemed as ESD. It is permissible under the EP&amp;A Act.</p> <p>The proposal has been advertised and exhibited twice times. This more than meets the requirements of the EP&amp;A Act.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Lack of public consultation by the applicant in the site selection process.</p> <p>Not one residential property included in this process, only five industrial businesses.</p> <p>Late notifications.</p> <p>Community excluded from any form of consultation or participation in the planning and design of the proposed development.</p> <p>Developer wanting to avoid scrutiny.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Lack of public consultation by the applicant in the site selection process.</p> <p>Not one residential property included in this process, only five industrial businesses.</p> <p>Late notifications.</p> <p>Community excluded from any form of consultation or participation in the planning and design of the proposed development.</p> <p>Developer wanting to avoid scrutiny.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Minimal community consultation before the decisions were made to use the site for the proposed development. Should not proceed with the proposal and listen to the community members who are Queanbeyan Rate Payers.	See above.
	Community consultation.	See above.
	The communication received by residents suggested that this was a “fail accompli” with no community consultation. Stringent community consultation prior to the suggestion that this is a “done deed”. Consultation on effects this will have on health, environment, community perception and a realistic estimation of traffic changes and density.	See above.
	Concern about the transfer and processing of ACT waste at the NSW facility. How is the legislative requirements of waste transfer being managed? Can we be confident that this company will meet their legislative obligations? What are the process that Council will use to ensure the compliance of this company and facility?	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>Lack of public consultation by the applicant in the site selection process.</p> <p>Not one residential property included in this process, only five industrial businesses.</p> <p>Late notifications.</p> <p>Community excluded from any form of consultation or participation in the process of site identification, planning and design of the proposed development.</p> <p>Developer wanting to avoid scrutiny.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Lack of public consultation by the applicant in the site selection process.</p> <p>Not one residential property included in this process, only five industrial businesses.</p> <p>Late notifications.</p> <p>Community excluded from any form of consultation or participation in the process of site identification, planning and design of the proposed development.</p> <p>Developer wanting to avoid scrutiny.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	What happens if business moves from the site, will it remain zoned recycling business for a new business to be able to set up and then apply to expand?	See above. The rezoning of the area does not form part of the proposal.
	Concern that many poor, or non-English speaking residents in the area may not fully understand documentation and potential impact of the development.	See above. As noted previously, the proposal is not expected to have an adverse impact to the surrounding environment.
	Heavy traffic already causes damage to roads, will the company actually contribute to the Queanbeyan Community. All waste is coming from the ACT and the company is leasing the site and therefore not contributing to the Queanbeyan Community	See above.
	EIS is erroneous in asserting that closest sensitivity receptor is 228m away. Dwellings located as close as 3050m away.	See above. This submission, and updated studies, have been provided to include residents within the Industrial Estate. As noted within the EPA's General Terms of Approval, residents within an Industrial Zone are treated as Industrial receptors for noise criteria. The Noise Impact Assessment conservatively gave residents within the Industrial Zone a 10dBA reduction in noise criteria to assess impacts. The proposal met the reduced criteria and ongoing noise impacts are not expected.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	EIS states closest sensitivity receptor is 228m away. No consideration given to dwellings located within 228m of the site.	See above.
	EIS states closest sensitivity receptor is 210m away. Closest are actually 50m-150m away from WMF.	See above.
	Proposal for the handling of around 95,000 tonnes of material per a year conveniently under the 100,000 tonnes per a year that would trigger NSW SEPP clause 23 and require the proposal to be treated as State Significant Development. We expect this is deliberate. How will the development be monitored to ensure the proposed development keeps to the 95,000 tonne upper limit over time?	See above. All waste entering and exiting the site is required to be documented and recorded. All records are provided to the EPA in accordance with the site's EPL.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	<p>16 John Bull Street is closer to the development than the nearest sensitive receptor identified in the EIS (at 15 John Bull Street). The EIS also did not identify nearby residents living at 12,18,22,24 John Bull Street or at 8 and 10 Ogilvie crescent. Overall, we consider that the EIS is inaccurate and incomplete with the air quality, dust, odour, noise, traffic impacts on sensitive receptors seriously understated.</p> <p>Data used to model air quality wrong, affecting the accuracy of the air quality predictions.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Expect that WMF roller doors won't always be closed, will this be monitored?</p> <p>Will air be tested for airborne pathogens?</p>	<p>See above. The doors will be required to be closed for all waste sorting.</p> <p>The operation would be managed to meet all OH&amp;S (NSW WorkSafe) and environmental requirements.</p>
	<p>Want 24/7 truck noise and vibration from WMF to be properly taken into account and examined?</p>	<p>The proposal considered noise from the movement of trucks. It assumed all truck movements occurring at night. This is a conservative assessment as the truck movements would be spaced out over the day. With this worst case scenario modelled, the proposal still meets the relevant guidelines and criteria.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	Noise mitigation measures weak and will not be properly monitored by an independent agent. No analysis of future changes.	See above. As the noise impacts meet criteria, additional noise mitigation is not required to be implemented. The EPA's General Terms of Approval require the ongoing noise monitoring of the proposal.
	No indication whether they are going to handle radioactive/medical/clinical waste within EIS.	Medical/radioactive/clinical waste does not form part of this proposal and as such has not been assessed within the EIS.
	Isn't there environmental/health/safety regulations that prevent the WMF from being positioned in close proximity to residents?	See above.
	Taken awhile to be notified, process questionable.	The proposal included two public exhibition periods and additional community consultation. This is above and beyond the requirements of the EP&A Act and are considered more than appropriate and adequate.
	No evidence indicating that the impact will be minimal. No evidence as to how plans/budget will address significant increase from traffic on the road maintenance, safety and the economy. Planning, construction and operation of roads not taken into consideration the increase in 24/7 heavy haul truck movements.	The EIS included specialist studies completed by appropriately qualified experts. Modelling techniques used are based on the relevant environmental/government guidelines and have concluded that environmental impact would be minimal. The EIS assessed the construction and operation of the proposal and impacts to road users and the community. All vehicles will be required to utilise road safety rules, and pedestrian access to the facility. Safety of the community is not expected. Road maintenance is outside of the scope of this proposal.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
<b>Types of waste</b>	<p>Concern with type of solid wastes – could include tires, septic, scrap metal, latex paint, furniture, garbage, appliance vehicles, oil, anti-freeze, cans, gas cylinders, construction waste, asbestos.</p> <p>Municipal - putrescible, kitchen waste, kurbside collection of H/H waste, paper, garden.</p> <p>Commercial and industrial – metals, plastics, timber, recyclable products.</p> <p>Construction and demolition – timber, bricks, plaster, concrete, steel, excavated materials.</p>	<p>The regulations of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act, 1997 and the Waste Classification Guidelines provide strict guidelines as to what can be classified as General Solid Waste (Putrescible and nonPutrescible). The proposal will also require to be constructed and operated in accordance with an EPL which will also provide limits on the types and amounts of waste that can be accepted at the facility. Septic/wastewater, latex paint, furniture, appliances, vehicles, anti-freeze, gas cylinders, asbestos or excavated materials will not be accepted at the facility.</p>
	<p>No guarantee that nuclear or medical waste will not be accepted in the future.</p>	<p>Nuclear or medical waste does not form part of this proposal and has not been considered.</p>
	<p>Control measures over types of waste – dumpsters are being collected without inspection as to what types of waste they contain. In addition, dumpsters are not locked and can be used by third parties. This may result in unknown amounts of hazardous waste being brought into the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Waste entering the site would be inspected as it is tipped within the waste sorting hall. Any waste loads that are contaminated with waste not to be accepted at the facility, would be turned away and the client provided the appropriate training in the waste types to be accepted at the facility.</p>

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	If Suez is already accepting unknown amounts of questionable materials then how can they	SUEZ is currently only accepting paper and cardboard and fluorescent tubes. Waste acceptance will be fully documented and complies with the current development consent for the site.
	Representor questions how “negative pressure environment with an “odour treatment” systems will filter or contain all of the potential airborne contaminants or chemicals brought to the site. The opposite may be the case by concentrating and then dispersing the contaminants further into surrounding area.	Modelling carried out for the EIS, and operating experience from many similar facilities in Australia, indicates that there is no risk of airborne contamination. The site will be monitored in accordance with Council and EPA requirements.
	Term “liquid waste” – it is unclear whether this is domestic or industrial. What control systems are place and risk associated with transporting and storing such waste. Will facility have ability to fully and safely contain runoff, spills or washout in case of accident or fire?	As outlined within the EIS, Liquid Waste would be grease trap waste and hydrocarbon/water emulsions.  All waste storage and transfer would be in fully enclosed and licensed waste tankers. Storage tankers are fully enclosed and self bunding to contain any spills. A spill kit would be kept on site at all times.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	<p>Mixtures/ emulsions to be accepted by WMF. Type of emulsions not disclosed.</p> <p>Will medical waste be stored at WMF for extended periods?</p> <p>Where will runoff from contaminated waste be discharged? Stormwater system?</p>	<p>Mixtures/emulsions to be accepted at the facility will be restricted to J120 waste: Waste oil/hydrocarbons mixtures/emulsions in water. This is a waste classification of waste oil/hydrocarbons in water.</p> <p>Medical waste does not form part of the proposal.</p> <p>Any water captured from process areas would enter into the sites proposed water management system where the water will pass through triple interceptors. The treated water would then enter into Council's sewer system in accordance with the requirements of a Trade Waste Agreement to be entered into with Council. It will remain separate from stormwater.</p>
<b>Vermin</b>	Increased vermin into area	The facility would utilise an ongoing vermin control program to ensure vermin is not attracted to the facility. In addition, putrescible waste would be transferred out within 24 hours ensuring that waste that may attract vermin is regularly removed. SUEZ proposes to use vermin control methods previously used successfully at other waste transfer stations around Australia and internationally.
	Pests to area	See above.
	Pests and vermin to area	See above.
	Pests and vermin to area	See above.
	Pests and vermin to area	See above.
	Pests and vermin to area – health risk and risk to domestic animals.	See above.
	Attract vermin	See above.
	Increase in vermin	See above.



**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	No account has been taken of the potential for vermin such as flies and mosquitos and rodents.	See above.
	The proposal will attract rodents and other pests.	See above.
	Concern about vermin, odour and dust. Although the impacts of dust and vermin are difficult to measure, it is better to not take the risk by approving the proposed development	See above.
	Ensuing vermin will be intolerable.	See above.
	Concerned about potential for vermin.	See above.
	Potential increase of disease carrying vermin surrounding WMF.	See above.
	WMF will increase vermin.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

<b>Submission Topic</b>	<b>Submission Details</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>
	No consideration of potential for flies and mosquitoes. Conditions will inevitably attract vermin. Details regarding pest control measures are unclear and untested.	See above.
	Putrescible waste will attract disease carrying vermin to surrounding areas.	See above.
	WMF will increase vermin, insects & pests in surrounding area.	See above.
	Will attract vermin.	See above.
	Rodents.	See above.
	Increase in bugs and rodents.	See above.
	Having to endure smell of it every day.	See above. A specialist Air Quality Study has shown that offsite odour impacts are not expected. Operation will be stringently regulated by Council and NSW EPA.
	I don't want rats and other disgusting animals near my home.	See above.

**DA 338-2015 Waste or Resource Transfer Facility**  
**Summary and Consideration of Submissions Received Pursuant to Section 79 of the**  
***Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979***

Submission Topic	Submission Details	Applicant Response
	I don't want rodents around my neighbourhood.	See above.
	We have chickens and a dog that will be attacked by bugs and rats/mice.	See above.
	The proposed WTF will impact on health of residents (son has asthma).	See above.
	Unlikely site was planned even though in an industrial area to cater for 84 heavy haul trucks.	See above. As noted above, 84 heavy haul trucks are not expected.
	No indication of how the sorting hall floor will be cleaned, especially given that the facility is a 24/7 operation. Likely influx of "noisy, squabbling birds" and other vermin.	The sorting hall floor will be cleaned daily using specialist plant. Washdown water will be treated prior to discharge to sewer in accordance with Council requirements. See above.
<b>In Support of Proposed Facility</b>	ACT Gov – Environment and Planning  No specific concerns, in support of full resource recovery and carbon neutral waste sector. If there are opportunities to provide the proponent with advice keen to assist.	Noted.

NOTE: The applicant has not addressed the second phase of submission letters. They have argued that the same issues were raised and have been addressed in this document.