

APPENDIX A - CONSIDERATION UNDER SECTION 79C

The following assessment is based on the matters listed for consideration under section 79C(1) of the amended *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

The provisions of:

(i) any environmental planning instrument;

State Environmental Planning Policy No.1 – Development Standards		
1.	This Policy provides flexibility in the application of planning controls operating by virtue of development standards in circumstances where strict compliance with those standards would, in any particular case, be unreasonable or unnecessary or tend to hinder the attainment of the objects specified in section 5 (a) (i) and (ii) of the Act.	Clause 19(4) of the Great Lakes LEP 1996 limits residential dwellings on rural properties to two dwellings. The Applicant has applied for a SEPP No.1 variation with respect to this clause as the proposed development includes the construction of 4 additional dwellings. The Department has considered the Applicant's application (refer to section 4.5 of the report) and recommends the Minister vary this development standard.
State Environmental Planning Policy No. 14 – Coastal Wetlands		
1.	This policy applies to land identified on specified maps. Clause 7 of this policy states that a consent authority must not grant consent to a development without the concurrence of the Director –General with respect to the following works within SEPP 14 wetlands: a) clear that land, b) construct a levee on that land, c) drain that land, or d) fill that land.	Components of the proposed development would not extend into the identified SEPP No.14 wetlands, however the potential in-direct impacts of the proposal have been considered (Refer to section 6 of the report). The Department considers that the proposal would not generate any significant impacts on these wetlands, and believes that the restriction of cattle from the wetland areas as proposed by the Applicant would provide an opportunity for the ecological performance of these wetlands to be enhanced and recover from this constant disturbance.
State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development		
1.	This policy gives a number of definitions of 'potentially hazardous industry' and 'potentially offensive' industry, and requires consideration to be given to current circulars or guidelines published by the Department of Planning relating to hazardous and offensive industry. The policy classifies development as: ▪ Offensive if the development is in operation and all measures proposed to reduce or minimise an impact are employed, would still emit a polluting discharge that will result in a significant adverse impact in the locality or on the existing or future development on other land in the locality. ▪ Hazardous if the development is in operation and when all measures proposed to reduce to minimise its impact on the locality have been employed, would	Under this SEPP, the proposed development is classified as potentially offensive development as it requires a pollution control licence under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operation Act 1997</i>. However, if a license is obtained, then the development would not be classified as an offensive industry. Consequently, the proposal was assessed to determine if would be classified as a hazardous industry. It was concluded that the proposed development would not be classified as Offensive development as the impacts associated with the development would be minimised to ensure no significant impact on the locality. In addition, the DEC has issued it GTAs/environmental protection licence for the proposed development. The proposed development is below the thresholds for potentially hazardous development. Consequently, a PHA was not required for the proposal.

	pose a significant risk in relation to the locality: (a) to human health, life or property; or (b) to the biophysical environment.	
State Environmental Planning Policy No.44 – Koala Habitat		
1.	This Policy aims to encourage the proper conservation and management of areas of natural vegetation that provide habitat for koalas to ensure a permanent free-living population over their present range and reverse the current trend of koala population decline: - by requiring the preparation of plans of management before development consent can be granted in relation to areas of core koala habitat, and - by encouraging the identification of areas of core koala habitat, and - by encouraging the inclusion of areas of core koala habitat in environment protection zones.	Schedule 1 of <i>SEPP No.44 – Koala Habitat Protection</i> lists a number of local government areas in which this policy applies. As the Great Lakes local government area is included in the Schedule, the proposed poultry farm constitutes a development to which <i>SEPP No.44 – Koala Habitat Protection</i> applies. The proposed development site is devoid of vegetation that could be considered appropriate to support koalas. None of the appropriate feed tree species listed in Schedule 2 of <i>SEPP No.44 – Koala Habitat Protection</i> are located on or in the vicinity of the proposed development site. As such, the site neither constitutes "potential koala habitat" or "core koala habitat". The requirements of <i>SEPP No.44 – Koala Habitat Protection</i> have therefore been met.
State Environmental Planning Policy No.55 – Remediation of Land		
1.	The aim of this policy is to provide a state-wide planning approach to the remediation of contaminated land and to promote the remediation of contaminated land for the purpose of reducing risk of harm to human health or any other aspect of the environment.	Past landuse at the site and investigations conducted at the site indicate that no contaminated soils exist at the site, consequently, this Policy does not apply to the proposal.
State Environmental Planning Policy No.71 – Coastal Protection		
	SEPP No. 71 – Coastal Protection has been made to ensure: - development in the NSW coastal zone is appropriate and suitably located; - there is a consistent and strategic approach to coastal planning and management; - there is a clear development assessment framework for the coastal zone. The matters for consideration are the following: - the aims of this Policy set out in clause 2, - existing public access to and along the coastal foreshore for pedestrians or persons with a disability should be retained and, where possible, public access to and along the coastal foreshore for pedestrians or persons with a disability should be improved, - opportunities to provide new public access to and along the coastal foreshore for pedestrians or persons with a disability, - the suitability of development given its type, location and design and its relationship with the surrounding area,	The issues identified in the aims of the policy have been considered as part of the Department's assessment of the proposal and is provided in Section 6 of this assessment report. The Department's assessment concludes that the proposal is consistent with the aims of the policy. The subject land's north-western boundary borders the Karuah River. The site had previously been private land used for agricultural purposes and therefore had no existing public access to and along the coastal foreshore. Due to bio-security reasons and as private land, there is no intention to establish any access. The site is located in a rural agricultural environment, with some scattered rural residential properties to the north and east. The Department's assessment concludes that the proposal is unlikely to result in any significant

		environmental impacts, including on any private properties (refer to Section 6 of this Report)
e)	any detrimental impact that development may have on the amenity of the coastal foreshore, including any significant overshadowing of the coastal foreshore and any significant loss of views from a public place to the coastal foreshore,	Due to the substantial size of the proposed site and the distance of the poultry sheds from the Karuah River, the proposal will not cause any overshadowing of the foreshore and no views from any public place will be impacts.
f)	the scenic qualities of the New South Wales coast, and means to protect and improve these qualities,	The size of the property and height of the poultry sheds will not result in any significant impacts on the scenic quality of the coast.
g)	measures to conserve animals (within the meaning of the <u>Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995</u>) and plants (within the meaning of that Act), and their habitats,	Threatened species issues have been considered in accordance with Part 5A of the EP&A Act. The Department is satisfied the proposal is unlikely to significantly impact on any threatened species or their habitats.
h)	measures to conserve fish (within the meaning of Part 7A of the <u>Fisheries Management Act 1994</u>) and marine vegetation (within the meaning of that Part), and their habitats	The potential impact of the proposal on marine fish and vegetation were considered by the Department in accordance with Part 5A of the EP&A Act and it is satisfied no impacts will occur.
i)	existing wildlife corridors and the impact of development on these corridors,	The potential impact of the proposal on flora and fauna, including on any wildlife corridors, was considered and the Department concluded that the proposal is unlikely to result in any impacts (refer also to Section 6.7 of this Report).
j)	the likely impact of coastal processes and coastal hazards on development and any likely impacts of development on coastal processes and coastal hazards,	Due to the distance from the foreshore, the proposal will not result in any impacts on coastal processes or cause any coastal hazard.
k)	measures to reduce the potential for conflict between land-based and water-based coastal activities,	The Department's assessment has concluded that the proposal is unlikely to significantly impact on the Karuah River. Therefore, it is considered the proposal will not impact on any proposed water based coastal activities.
l)	measures to protect the cultural places, values, customs, beliefs and traditional knowledge of Aboriginals,	Aboriginal archaeology was thoroughly assessed as part of the DA. The proposal is likely to impact on one isolated stone artefact and require an approval from the NPWS. The NPWS advised the Department that they were satisfied with the assessment and that the proposal would not significantly impact on the aboriginal archaeology of the area.
m)	likely impacts of development on the water quality of coastal waterbodies,	Water quality issues were assessed by the Department, particularly its potential impacts on the Karuah River. The assessment concluded that through the proposed mitigation measures, the any proposed impacts on water quality will be adequately managed (refer to section 6 of the Report).
n)	the conservation and preservation of items of heritage, archaeological or historic significance,	Refer to the response to (l) above.
o)	only in cases in which a council prepares a draft local environmental plan that applies to land to which this Policy applies, the means to encourage compact towns and cities,	Not Relevant to this assessment.

	p) only in cases in which a development application in relation to proposed development is determined: (i) the cumulative impacts of the proposed development on the environment, and (ii) measures to ensure that water and energy usage by the proposed development is efficient.	Not Relevant to this assessment.
Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan 1996		
.	The site is zoned 1(a) – Rural.	Intensive livestock activities are permissible with consent under this zoning.
2.	Clause 8 sets out the objectives of each zoning that must be considered during the assessment of any development application. The objective of the Rural Zone is the restrict development to uses that are unlikely to: a) prejudice in a significant manner the agricultural production potential of land within the zone, and b) generate significant additional traffic, or create or increase a condition of ribbon development on any road, relative to the capacity and safety of the road, and c) have an adverse impact on the area's water resources, and d) create unreasonable or uneconomic demands for the provision or extension of public amenities or services.	The potential impacts of the proposed development can be adequately managed within applicable environmental performance measures and would not have an adverse impact on the use of land at surrounding properties. The proposed would also not impact on the agricultural function of this land in the long term due to its own agricultural function and continued use for cattle grazing. The proposed development is likely to generate 22 heavy vehicle movements maximum per day. Section 6 of the report considers the impact of these movements on road safety, performance and condition, and concludes that it would not generate any significant impacts. Nevertheless, the Applicant is proposing to upgrade The Branch Lane and provide section 94 contributions for the upgrade and on-going maintenance of this road. The Applicant is proposing to construct three dams and augment 2 existing dams to enable the proposal to be self-sufficient and not place additional pressure on any town water supplies. In addition, the proposal and recommended conditions provides for the enhancement of surface water runoff from the property to ensure the proposal does not generate any adverse impacts on the water quality of Karuah River. Due to the nature of the proposal, the development is unlikely to generate significant pressures on local services and amenities due to the low-levels of employment. Nevertheless, the Applicant has agreed to Section 94 contributions to provide for council amenities, road maintenance and upgrades and rural fire fighting services.
4.	Clause 19(4) states that in addition to a dwelling-house permitted under subclause (3), one additional dwelling may, with the consent of the Council, be erected where that additional dwelling is or will be actually occupied by a person employed or engaged by the owner of the land and where the agricultural use of the land can economically support such additional labour.	The proposed development would exceed this development standard. Consequently, the Applicant has applied under SEPP No.1 to vary this standard. Refer to section 4.5 of the report for the Department's consideration of this application.

- (ii) **any draft environmental planning instrument that is or has been placed on public exhibition and details of which have been notified to the consent authority;**

None.

- (iii) **any development control plan;**

Development Control Plan No.33 – Acid Sulfate Soils		
1.	The aims of DCP No. 33 – Acid Sulphate Soils are: ▪ to ensure that development located within an area of acid sulphate risk is identified; ▪ to provide guidance to landholders, consultants and the general community in regard to the procedures involved in the management of developments in areas affected by acid sulphate soils; ▪ to ensure that adequate preliminary assessment is undertaken to clarify the extent of risk; and ▪ to ensure, where necessary, that an adequate acid sulphate soil management plan or plan of management is prepared where the nature of the development poses an acid sulphate soil risk.	Refer to Section 6 of the report.
Great Lakes Council – Erosion and Sediment Control Policy		
1.	The aim of the Erosion and Sediment Control Policy is to minimise erosion and sedimentation in catchments, resulting from the disturbance of the soil surface associated with building works, changes in land use and urban development, the installation of services and road construction and maintenance.	The Applicant has proposed a number of controls to meet the requirements of this policy. Council has not raised any concerns with the proposed construction measures. Refer to section 6 of the report for the Department's consideration of these measures.
Great Lakes Council – Broiler Chicken Code		
1.	The Great Lakes Council Broiler Chicken Code 1979 sets out the requirements for these types of development as follows: a) <i>Location and position of sheds</i> – sheds must not be located within village areas or within 1km of any village boundary, within 200m of a main or trunk road, or within 100m of any other road, or within 500m of any dwelling not contained within the same property. b) <i>Landscaping</i> – visual impact and odour and dust should be reduced by the planting of vegetation screen trees. c) <i>Access</i> – road upgrading to be done to Council's requirements and Applicant's expense. d) <i>Litter removal and disposal of carcasses</i> – all litter is to be removed from the site and chicken carcasses are to be removed from the site or incinerated.	Complies. Complies Complies. Council has also issued its GTA's for the proposed road works, which have been incorporated into the consent. Complies
Bushfire Protection Guidelines 2001		
1.	Section 79BA of the Act requires development on bushfire prone land to conform to the requirements of <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2001</i> . The bushfire protection requirements under the Act only apply when bushfire-prone land is implicated.	The subject site has not been classified as bushfire-prone land.

- (iv) **any matters prescribed by the regulations that apply to the land to which the development application relates.**

None.

(b) the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality,

Natural Environment

Refer to Section 6 of the Assessment Report.

Built Environment

Refer to Section 6 of the Assessment Report.

Social and Economic Impacts

Refer to section **Error! Reference source not found.** of this report.

Amenity

The proposed development site has been selected in order to limit potential land-use conflicts as a result of potential impacts on amenity. The proposal is located on a large rural property (approximately 1,800 hectares), with the nearest residential receptor located nearly 2 kilometres. Nevertheless, the assessment for the proposal indicates that odour levels and dust levels (the key amenity issues associated with poultry operations) would be within applicable environmental standards and would not generate any adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. In addition, the Department has recommended a number of conditions and controls to ensure all facets of the proposed operations are effectively managed and operated to achieve the environmental goals of the proposal.

(c) the suitability of the site for the development,

The site is considered to be suitable for development. Although some components of the proposed development are located within proximity of the Karuah and Branch rivers, the Department considers that these components represent a low risk to these water bodies following the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and the recommended conditions of consent.

(d) any submissions made in accordance with this Act or the regulations,

Issues raised by the government authorities and Council in submissions are discussed in Sections 5 & 6 of this report, and summarised in Appendix B. It is considered that all the issues in these submissions have been satisfactorily addressed, and that there are no outstanding issues that would preclude the granting of development consent with conditions.

(e) the public interest.

The proposal is considered to be in the public interest, as the proposed development represents a significant contribution to the current national trend for the upgrade or transfer of poultry operations from natural to tunnel ventilation shedding. This upgrade to this technology provides several benefits to the public, with tunnel ventilation providing significant improvements to the economic, quarantine and environmental performance of the NSW poultry industry. Furthermore, the proposed location of the proposed development with respect to its relative isolation from heavily populated areas provides for the reduction in any current and future amenity conflicts – a serious issue facing poultry operations on the outskirts of major metropolitan regions. Consequently, it is considered to be in the public interest due to the beneficial flow-on effects to the environment and reduction of amenity impacts on the general public.

APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

No.	Authority	Issues Raised
1. (No. 8)	NSW Fisheries Mr Damian Ogburn Principal Manager, Aquaculture Private Bag No.1 NELSON BAY NSW 2315	- Does not object to the operation of the proposed broiler farm provided the claim that no chicken litter is stockpiled, held, stored or spread on the site is rigorously monitored and clear action identified for breach of this condition; - Does not object to the recommendations to manage the impacts of the development on the aquatic ecology, provided all buffer zone fencing and planting is extended upstream to include the constructed dams and the waterways, with off stream watering points provided for grazing livestock; - Suggests that a suitable monitoring scheme to determine potential impacts of runoff from irrigation water on surrounding waterways must be rigorously designed and implemented; - Water monitoring scheme must also monitor the levels, and potential impact, of any chemicals generated by the operation that may be found in the wash down water; and - States that throughout the operation of the farm, continued co-operation and liaison with the oyster industry and Safe Food is required due to the potential threat of contamination of water entering the Karuah River
2. (No.160)	NSW Agriculture RF Sheldrake Director-General Locked Bag 21 ORANGE NSW 2800	- Suggests that the proposed development will assist the continuation and further development of the meat chicken industry in the Hunter Region and thereby contribute significantly to the local and regional economies. - Recommends that management practices and stocking densities should comply with the <i>Australian Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals – Domestic Poultry</i> and requirements should be included for effective supervision and back up systems. - Notes that the separation distances between the proposed farms are adequate. - Recommends that the Environmental Management Plan should be revised in accordance with the <i>draft NSW Meat Chicken Farming Guideline (2002)</i>; include an additional section on odour management practices; include emergency response and contingency proposals; consider biosecurity; and include control and ongoing management of noxious weeds in relation to construction activities - Suggests that the Environmental Management Plan should be subject to periodic review. - Consent conditions should allow the catching and removal of poultry at night as it is less stressful for birds when light levels and temperatures are low. - Recommends that record keeping should include a complaints register and response procedure, a log of key activities on site and weather conditions. - Suggests that burial within the identified contingency area should be restricted to declared emergency management events in accordance with an Emergency Response Plan - Recommends clarification of potential dust, noise and odour impacts - States that in the event of an exotic disease outbreak, all five farms would be quarantined, and suggests that retaining common ownership and operation of all five farms is most desirable for effective biosecurity and disease control - Water Supplies - queries the total shed water requirements of the proposal - Flora and Fauna – concerns with need for baiting and potential impacts on non target species. - Suggests that tunnel ventilated sheds can help reduce odour impacts through drier litter and quieter birds generating less dust. - Supports the proposed use of incineration as the primary means of dead bird disposal, and supports the complete and immediate removal of litter off site at the end of each batch. - Requests clarification as to whether the proposed dams 3 and 5 adjoining ASS risk areas. - Queries proposed management procedures at irrigation sites with respect to importation of soil and substantial cultivation.
3.	Roads and Traffic Authority	Raises no objection to the proposed development provided a number of issues are addressed. This includes the

No.	Authority	Issues Raised
(No.171)	Mr Dave Young Manager – Land Use Development Locked Bag 30 NEWCASTLE NSW 2300	preparation of a traffic management plan to facilitate the movement of heavy vehicles to/from the Pacific Highway prior to the opening of the new interchange at The Branch Lane; approval is obtained for B-Double access on The Branch Lane from the Pacific Highway to the subject site; and that access across the property's common boundary with the Karuah Bypass is denied
4. (No.146)	Port Stephens Council Mr Paul Douglass PO Box 42 RAYMOND TERRACE NSW 2324	- Concerned due to the potential impact on water quality, ecosystems and the communities of Karuah and Port Stephens. - Requests a Commission of Inquiry into the proposed development. - Water quality impacts, specifically, proximity of components to waterways & wetlands, runoff impacts, soil and erosion measures, and inadequacies of water quality monitoring programs - Poultry litter - states that poultry litter must not be stored on the site and must only be removed under certain conditions. - On-site burial - concerned about the proximity of the proposed burial area to local waterways and the potential for leeching to occur, and that there is no indication in the EIS of when the burial area may be used. No on-site burial should be accepted. - Waste management – particularly during major stock loses. - States that water quality in dams must be monitored in case of overflows - Concerned about the cumulative impacts of disinfectants, antibiotics and chemicals in wastewater irrigated on the site on fauna in waterways and soil microbes. - Dust, particularly increased health problems and dust impacts generated by vehicles on site, and tank water supplies. - Disease Management and minimisation of potential spread of poultry diseases. - Flora and Fauna - diversity of trees should be increased, and consideration of potential introduction of pest species on the grey-crowned babbler - Odour - Notes that the incinerator will be a source of odour which has not been addressed and concerned about odour from the sheds being blown towards the town of Karuah - Aboriginal heritage impacts must be clarified. - Concerned about the loss of employment due to the closure of local chicken farms and the impacts on the community of Port Stephens - States that the proponent must consider the potential impacts on the environment and community of the use genetically modified grains - States that if land values are negatively affected by the development, compensation must be considered - States that due to the significance of the proposed development, increased services and infrastructure are likely to be required in the town.
5.	NSW National Parks and Wildlife Mr Brendan Diacono Manager, Conservation Planning Unit Locked Bag 914 COFFS HARBOUR NSW 2220	- Greater level of assessment is required for archaeological impacts; - Generally satisfied with the flora and fauna assessment, but states that details should be provided on bird control methods and consideration for raptors that may use the site. - Should consider potential impacts of the proposal on SEPP 14 wetlands. - Consideration of SEPP 71 must be undertaken. - Referral to Environment Australia. - Supports establishment of 150 hectares of buffer areas and establishment of the Grey-Crowned Babbler Conservation Area. However, plan of management should include 'crash' grazing by cattle in order to maintain suitable habitat for the species.
6.	Great Lakes Council	Does not support the proposal due to the impacts it will have on social displacement within the industry; the scale of the

No.	Authority	Issues Raised
(No.145)	Mr Roger Busby Manager – Strategic Planning Planning and Environmental Services PO Box 450 FORSTER NSW 2428	development; the location and impacts on the Karuah River; the absence of information on the amount of chicken litter produced; the lack of sufficient actions, strategies, protocols and regimes in the threatened species plan; the potential impacts on other industries including oyster, fishing and eco tourism; the absence of an indigenous survey; and the impact on the Greenhouse Effect - Concerns with the proposed waste disposal methods with respect to dead bird disposal, litter and wastewater. - States that the Environmental Management Plan should provide additional details in relation to objectives and standards to be achieved, auditing procedures, ongoing performance monitoring and reporting, and day to day and extreme event procedures - Suggests that greater opportunities for the rehabilitation of riparian areas and habitat corridors should be established so as to enhance overall environmental quality - Suggests that a committee should be established to monitor the ongoing performance of the development - States that additional information should be provided to demonstrate the proposal will not have any adverse economic impacts - Notes that a grade separated intersection should be provided at the junction of the Pacific Highway and The Branch Lane - Suggests that conditions be imposed including a requirement for licensing by Council of all domestic effluent disposal and management systems under s68 of the Local Government Act; the payment of a monetary contribution to Council in accordance with s94 of the EP&A Act and the Great Lakes Wide s94 Contributions Plan; payment of a monetary contribution prior to the release of the first Construction Certificate towards upgrading works in accordance with the s94 Contributions Plan for Branch Lane; - Need for on-going auditing of the proposal, should it be approved.
SECOND EXHIBITION PERIOD		
1. (No.20)	Roads and Traffic Authority Mr Dave Young Manager – Land Use Development Locked Bag 30 NEWCASTLE NSW 2300	No additional issues, other than the implementation of conditions outlined in first submission.
2. (No.27)	NSW National Parks and Wildlife Ms Nicky Owner A/Manager, Conservation Planning Unit - Northern Locked Bag 914 COFFS HARBOUR NSW 2220	- States additional information has sufficiently addressed flora and fauna issues raised by NPWS in its first submission. - Satisfied with additional archaeological assessment work undertaken, subject to the implementation of the recommendations of the heritage report .
3. (No.26)	NSW Agriculture Ms Glenda Briggs Agricultural Environmental Officer – Hunter Tocal Agricultural Centre PATERSON NSW 2421	- States additional information has sufficiently addressed most issues, and has recommended conditions for the proposal to deal with outstanding issues, should it be approved. - Recommends measures for noise, odour and dust management - Reiterated that socio-economic impacts raised by community is outside the direct impacts of the proposal, with job losses determined by factors beyond the approval of this project. States that it would help sustain existing processing facilities in the region and provide some alternative employment opportunities.
4. (No.13)	Port Stephens Council Mr Paul Douglass PO Box 42 RAYMOND TERRACE NSW 2324	- Questions if \$5000 would be sufficient for the water quality monitoring plan; - Irrigation areas – questions ability of buffer areas to regenerate. - On-site burial – concern over leaching and groundwater contamination; - Dust – suggests that a dust management system be installed to internalise dust management from sheds and seal internal

No.	Authority	Issues Raised
5. (No.8)	NSW Fisheries Mr Damian Ogburn Principal Manager, Aquaculture Private Bag No.1 NELSON BAY NSW 2315	- roads; - Environmental flows - Adequacy of vegetation screen plantings - Emissions from incinerator and greenhouse gas issues. - Supports implementation of monitoring plan for Karuah River, and requests copies be forwarded for the first three years; - Issues raised by it in first submission have been adequately dealt with, subject to reporting and contingency measures included in the consent.

PRIVATE SUBMISSIONS

No.	Position	Issues Raised
1	Did not state	- Requests that the exhibition period be extended - Suggests that the development should not proceed until a public inquiry has been held - Suggests that spent litter associated with the site represents a significant risk to the Karuah River and the local oyster industry
2	Did not state	- Requests that the exhibition period be extended - Suggests that the people of Karuah and surrounding districts have not been involved in any community consultation - Requests a public inquiry into the proposed development
3	Did not state	- Requests that a decision be delayed until after further community consultation - Concerned about the timing of the consultation period and the lack of information that has been provided to the community - Suggests that the proximity of the proposal to the Karuah and Branch Rivers will pose a devastating threat to the oyster industry which has only recently received the protection of a \$15 million sewerage system - Suggests that the ventilation system designed to tunnel air through the chicken sheds will continually deliver dust and contaminants into the air, endangering wildlife and the health and welfare of the community - Suggests the cost of the development may have been understated
4	Objects	- Concerned that the smell from the proposed development will have a significant adverse economic impacts on a tourist resort (rural cabins) which has been approved by Council - Suggests that The Branch Lane will need to be significantly upgraded, as the section of the road where the farms are proposed is heavily used and particularly bendy - Queries what guarantees can be given that the Karuah River will not be further polluted - Suggests that the proposal will cease the livelihoods of the local chicken farmers and therefore reduce jobs in the area rather than develop 30 jobs as the proposal states
5	Objects	- Suggests that the proposed farm would have enormous impacts on the surrounding area - Suggests that the proposed farm will result in job loss for at least 30 chicken growers - Suggests there is currently an over supply of grower facilities in the Hunter area - Notes that Stroud will suffer severely if the chicken growing industry vacates the area - Suggests that because the proponents of the development are a New Zealand based company, profits will be leaving the country and the Australian government will be required to support ex-farming families

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Queries what is being proposed for the remainder of the site purchased by the developer which is not being used for chicken sheds - Suggests that if any disasters occur on the proposed site, the company may not have the funds to rectify the problems - the broiler farms in very close proximity to each other will create enormous risks of major disease outbreaks - Concerned that the proposed sheds will be tunnel ventilated, requiring about three times the amount of electricity to produce a chicken compared with naturally ventilated sheds - Suggests a public inquiry into the proposal, and an extension of time for comment on the development application
6	Objects	- Concerned that Figure 8 Odour modelling results in Section 9.11.2 does not cover their residence (which is 3km from the first broiler shed) however the map indicates that the odour limit might be exceeded there - Concern that due to the terrain of the area, which is low lying and surrounded by mountains on most sides, and prevailing north westerly winds, the odour from the broiler farm would be directed toward their place of residence - Suggests that further odour studies be conducted
7	Did not state	Requests an extension of time for the lodgement of submissions
9	Did not state	Concerned about the adverse impacts the proposal will have on the large diversity of native birdlife that exists in the area
10	Did not state	- Suggests that the proposal will result in the closure of 30-35 efficient family farms having devastating impacts on families, staff and the townships of Stroud and Bulahdelah which have already been affected by changes in the dairy and timber industries - Suggests that the current guidelines set out by NSW Agriculture recommend a separation distance on new broiler farms of between 2-3 kilometres to further reduce the risk of disease - Suggests that a mistake by a complex as large as the proposed could wipe out the oyster industry in the Karuah River
11	Did not state	- Concerned about the potential effects of the proposed development on oyster farms - Concerned about run off from the development during heavy rainfall - Suggests that the oyster and tourism industries should not be exposed to the risks the proposed development poses
12	Objects	- proposed farm is not required as there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW - States that as current suppliers to Bartter enterprises, they have been informed that they will no longer be required after June 2004, which is in contrast to the statement by the ProTen chief executive that he did not believe the new farm would have an impact - Suggests that they have not been included in Bartter enterprises plans beyond 2004 because they would not bow to pressure to convert sheds to tunnel ventilation - Suggests that there will be employment loss, and negative consequences for families if the development proceeds - Suggests there will be environmental risk associated with the proposal as it would be particularly close to a major river - States that the area has already suffered economic hardship with dairy de-regulation and the shutdown of the timber industry
13	Objects	- Suggests there is a current oversupply of shedding in NSW - Suggests that 20 family farms will close in Stroud effecting of income and cash flow in Stroud and Bulahdelah - Cannot see any justification for the proposed development - Suggests that infrastructure which has received heavy investment over the years will be made redundant as it suits no other industry - Concerned that the scale and closeness of the sheds could result in a disease outbreak
14	Objects	- Notes that in the past few years the poultry industry has indicated a level of uncertainty for farmers as a result of potential deregulation of the industry; decreased returns to growers; high capital costs; potential poultry imports; and threats of exotic diseases - Suggests that the proposed development has the potential to wipe out the chicken industry - Suggests that there are environmental risks associated with the proposal - States that the current draft guidelines set out by NSW Agriculture recommend separation distances on new broiler farms of between 2-3 kilometres to reduce the risk of diseases - Suggests that the development is not required as there is currently an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW

No.	Position	Issues Raised
15	Objects	• Suggests there will be air pollution due to dust from 40 sheds • Suggests there will be water pollution as a result of chicken litter and run-off from the sheds, significantly affecting the Karuah River, local creeks and watercourses • Notes that significant land clearing will be required to accommodate all components of the proposal which will be to the detriment of the environment, animals and birdlife • Suggests there is currently an oversupply of sheds in the Hunter and Central, and a super farm of 40 sheds would create a 'massive' oversupply of sheds and chickens • States that NSW Agriculture recommends farms should be positioned two to five kilometres apart to minimise the risk of diseases such as Newcastle disease, Hepatitis and Salmonella • Queries where the chickens produced in the sheds will be processed • Suggests that the development of the proposed farm would result in the closure of approximately 35 farms resulting in unemployment • Queries what compensation would be offered to farmers as the 'QUOTA' they paid for their farms would be no longer recognised
16	Objects	• Suggests that the 340 extraction fans will create a massive amount of airborne dust • Notes that the proposed site extends on a river frontage of at least 8km to the Karuah and Branch rivers, and much of the fish nurseries, sea grasses, oyster beds and mangroves will be wiped out by an occurrence of extended rainfall as 30,000 cubic metres of litter is to be spread on the property annually • Concerned about the proposal to bury dead chickens on the property, and the potential for body fluids to ooze through the soil and into waterways, and the subsequent implications of a mechanical failure and the death of thousands more chickens • Suggests that if there is an outbreak of exotic disease in the sheds, the already threatened Grey Crowned Babbler would be wiped out by the virus itself or officers of the Department of Agriculture in an attempt to eradicate the virus • Notes that in the event of such a disaster, the disposal of dead chickens as well as spent litter would have devastating effects on the Karuah River and Port Stephens
17	Objects	• Concerned about the threat that the development poses to the unique environment of Port Stephens • States that there is a potential threat to birdlife • Suggests that an outbreak of Newcastle disease could spread to and decimate native wildlife • Suggests that residue and nutrients blown from the development could lead to algae blooms in the river and adversely affect the oysters • Notes that because the Karuah River flows directly into Port Stephens, polluted runoff could spread to other parts of the Port, endangering wildlife such as dolphins • Queries the possible impacts of constant truck movements, associated with the transportation of chickens, on local roads and traffic accidents • Suggests that despite all the precautions taken, dust, residue from droppings, and possible airborne diseases could escape from the sheds • Suggests that in heavy rain, sediment traps could overflow releasing runoff into the river & Port • Suggests there would be a loss of jobs and income for most of the local chicken farmers • Questions the benefits of the proposal to both the local community and the developers • Queries whether the safeguards put in place to protect the environment will be 100% effective
18	Objects	• proposed chicken farm would have devastating economic effects on Stroud & Bulahdelah • States that Stroud 20 farms will close in Stroud and five large farms in Bulahdelah • States that ProTen are incorrect in their DA stating that no farms will close, and the super farm is required to take up extra production • Notes that most of the farms in the area have been given notice of termination for 30 June 2004 when the super farm commences • Suggests that very few dollars will flow into Karuah as the proposal will employ few people and profits will flow back to New Zealand • States that the development is not appropriate for a sensitive coastal strip • Suggests that the 10 million chickens which would be produced on the one site are currently produced over a large area including Maitland,

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Cessnock, Raymond Terrace, Clarencetown, Stroud and Bulahdelah, and it makes more sense to spread the chickens out providing better bio-security so if there is an outbreak of exotic disease it can be confined to a small number of birds
19	Objects	• detrimental effect the proposal will have on the environment, eg contamination of waterways, dust, smell and disease risks • Concerned about the aesthetic impact of 40 large sheds • Suggests that the health of residents of Karuah and surrounding communities could be affected • Notes that home and land values could fall • States that Karuah and Stroud have recently been connected to expensive sewerage systems to eliminate contamination of the river, Port Stephens and the oyster industry • Suggests that no matter how much technology is employed, winds will always blow in the direction of Karuah bringing with them the dust and smells of the 40 sheds • States that a certain percentage of spent litter will end up in the waterways • Concerned about the potential for disease, and the potential economic and health ramifications • Concerned that the five proposed farms will be situated only half a kilometre apart • Concerned that 340 fans will be blowing contaminated dust into the atmosphere • NSW Agriculture recommends separation on new broiler farms of between 2-5 five kms • Concerned about noise from the extraction fans, and from trucks servicing the farms seven days and nights per week • Suggests that NSW has an oversupply of shedding • Suggests that the chickens ProTen will be growing will be at the expense of independent Australian family farmers who will have lost their contracts
20	Objects	• States that the development is not needed as there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW • Notes that there will be no employment gains from the development • Concerned that proceeds from the chicken industry in the area will longer flow back into the local community but be forwarded to New Zealand • States that the local communities are already struggling due to the reduced activity in the timber and dairy industries • Suggests that the proposal seems to go against current NSW Agriculture guidelines regarding separation distances on new broiler farms • States that separation is important to reduce the risk of bird based diseases • Suggests that there will be a heavy impact on the environment, including possible nutrient run-off, dust propelled by the extractor fans, possible overflow of sediment traps and spreading of spent litter over the terrain • Recommends rejection of the proposal
21	Objects	• States that there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW • Suggests that the proposal would be at the expense of existing small farms, possibly leading to the closure of between 30 and 35 farms • Notes that profits currently obtained by the local family farms are spent and saved within Australia, whereas those of ProTen will be returned to shareholders in New Zealand • Suggests that the close proximity of the proposed sheds has the potential to increase the risk of Newcastle disease, avian influenza, hepatitis and salmonella • Suggests that should disease occur and spread, it would cause the devastation of the farming communities within the area and surrounding communities
22	Objects	• Objects to the proposed development on environmental and economic grounds • Suggests that there are already enough farms in the area supplying chickens • Notes that the existing family farms will be made to close, resulting in the loss of jobs • Suggests that growing the chickens close together will increase the risk of disease • In consistent with Department of Agriculture's 2-5km separation policy for new developments • Concerned that Stroud and Bulahdelah have already experienced hardship as a result of the closure of the timber and dairy industry

No.	Position	Issues Raised
23	Objects	• Objects to the proposal on economic and environmental grounds • Suggests that the proposed shedding is too close to the Karuah River • States that the sheds are closer than the distance recommended by the Department of Agriculture to minimise the outbreak of disease • family farms in area currently supplying the industry will be closed resulting in the loss of jobs
24	Objects	• Notes that in contrast to what is stated in the EIS, 30-35 farms will be dispensed of in favour of the proposed farm • Suggests that the saleable value of their property has been halved as they are one of many growers who will be left without a contract as of June 2004 • Suggests that employees of local chicken farms will be affected, as will local businesses • Requests that the development be refused or subject to a public inquiry
25	Objects	• Suggests that the construction of the sheds could cause an environmental disaster • Queries where the water will come from to support 12 million chickens per annum • Suggests that during drought conditions there is barely enough water for the existing industries in the area, and the idea of the Karuah River having to support an additional load is ludicrous • Notes that the area consists of a very fragile environment which has been managed very carefully, primarily by local people, and doubts that the New Zealand proponent would care as much about the environment as the locals • Queries what is to become of the millions of chickens that will die each year • Suggests that the area is renown for power failures and in the proposed tunnel-ventilated sheds which rely on constant power generation for cooling and air circulation, thousands of chickens will die per minute of interruption • Queries how the thousands of metres of chicken litter produced each year will be treated • Suggests that the dust from the litter would be hazardous to the surrounding environment, polluting the waterways and encouraging the growth of bacteria • States that the waterways are not only supporting local industries in the area but also the Port Stephens tourism industry
26	Objects	• Concern that local farmers are being sacrificed to make room for an overseas company • Suggests that Karuah has not got the area to cope with the smell, pollution and dust associated with a farm the scale of the proposed • States there is a danger of waste running into waterways • Suggests that the development will not result in any employment gains for the area • Notes that many efficient family farms will be closed down • In consistent with Department of Agriculture's 2-5km separation policy for new developments
27	Did not state	• States that there will be considerable dust blown off the sheds • Concerned about the number of vehicle movements to and from the farm, spilling feathers, sawdust and litter along the public road • Suggests that material from the proposed farm will enter the Karuah River during heavy rain • Concerned about the disposal of dead birds • Suggests that the vehicle movements associated with a 24 hour 7 day a week development will add to the already overloaded Pacific Highway • Suggests that the tourism industry will be adversely affected as people will stop visiting the area and eating the local seafood
28	Objects	• Suggests there is an oversupply of chicken sheds in the Hunter Valley • Notes that family farms will be under threat as a result of the proposal • States that local growers have invested huge amounts of money over the years to upgrade sheds and equipment • Suggests that the loss of jobs will have devastating effects on communities like Stroud and Bulahdelah which have already been affected by the timber and dairy industry restructures • Concern about the numbers of chickens proposed to be grown on the development, the proximity of the sheds, and the implications for disease • Suggests that with the possibility of a high mortality rate as a result of disease, the whole broiler industry could suffer

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Concerned about the risk of native birds contracting or spreading disease - Concerned about the proximity of the proposed development to major waterways - Requests that the proposal be rejected
29	Objects	- Requests that the proposed development be stopped - Notes that because the proposed site has a river frontage of 10km, it has the potential to destroy sea life from the Stroud weir to Nelson Bay - Suggests that it would be impossible to stop the ooze from dead birds which have been buried, from flowing into nearby rivers - Suggests that despite the proposal to plant trees along the river foreshores to act as dust filters, contaminants will still enter the waterways - Queries how it is proposed to protect the threatened Wedge Tail and Osprey Eagles which scrounge around chicken sheds - Queries how other birdlife will be protected from chicken diseases - Suggests that the property will be dangerously overloaded with nitrogen, chemicals, phosphorus and antibiotics - Queries what consideration has been given to the thousands of acres of wetlands south-south east of the property - Suggests there is an inconsistency between the submission to Great Lakes Council which states that the proposal will have 50 employees, and the EIS which suggests 20 - Notes that there is no mention of the 38 family farms who will close down if the proposed sheds are built - Queries if the owners of the family farms will be compensated for their farms, loss of income, loss of business and suffering
30	Objects	- Suggests that it is cruel to farm a large number of chickens in a concentrated area, as well as being bad for the living environment of residents - States that it is unfair that existing family farms will have their contracts terminated
31	Objects	- Concerned that if the project is approved it will result in the closure of approximately 38 farms, having a devastating financial effect on Stroud and surrounding areas - Concerned that their income from the locals may be reduced as a result of the proposal, thereby affecting their ability to continue improvements to their club and attract tourists - Suggests that the proposed development would further affect a struggling community which has experienced hardship as a result of dairy deregulation and timber industry losses - Notes that because the development is by a New Zealand consortium, any profits gained by the proposal will not only leave the district but also the country
32	Objects	- Suggests that the proposed project would be an environmental disaster - Queries how the millions of chickens which die each year will be disposed of - Suggests that the area is renown for power failures - States that the growing of 12 million chickens each year will require vast amounts of water which is not plentiful in the area, and queries where it will come from and at who's expense - Queries if local farmers and growers will be forced to go without when water supplies run low during drought - Queries how the thousands of metres of chicken litter produced each year will be treated - Suggests that the dust from the litter would be hazardous to the surrounding environment, polluting the waterways and encouraging the growth of bacteria - States that the waterways are not only supporting local industries in the area but also the Port Stephens tourism industry - Suggests that the proposal be rejected
33	Objects	- Suggests there are risks of polluting the Karuah River and Port Stephens which could harm the already fragile oyster industry and fish numbers - Suggests that huge animal feeding operations such as the proposed have been responsible for fish kills, pollution incidents and other epidemics in the USA and Canada - Suggests that as the development appears to rely solely on dam water, this increases the risk of the chickens contracting a disease should the water treatment system breakdown

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Angry that the proposed development will result in the demise of family farms in the area, particularly after they have undergone expensive upgrades in recent years - Suggests that the technology proposed to be used in the development is expensive and to make it worthwhile the farms must be stocked at much higher concentrations, potentially having disastrous consequences in the event of a power failure - States that the proposed development is not an expansion of poultry production as the jobs already exist - Concerned that profits from the development would be diverted out of Australia - Concerned that the region has nothing to gain from the proposed development
34	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal would be an environmental disaster - Queries where the millions of chickens that could die each year would be disposed of - Suggests that power failures are abundant throughout the region, and would result in the death of chickens - Queries the details regarding the supply of water to the chicken sheds - Suggests that the issue of dust and tourism must be considered - Suggests that the development is too close to the waterways and may cause pollution
35	Objects	- States that the proposal is inhumane - Suggests that a development of this magnitude and nature would have long term ecological, social and health impacts - Suggests that the potential for the area to grow as a community and tourist destination negatively impacted - Concerned about the impacts of methods of disposing of dead chickens, - Suggests that dust of dry bird faeces will result in ground and water pollution and respiratory problems for more susceptible residents such as children and the aged - Concerned about constant noise from the extraction fans - Suggests that the movement of large trucks associated with the proposed farms will damage the local roads
36	Objects	- Concerned that the pollution and dust from 40 confined sheds could enter the Karuah River, causing great harm to the residents who rely on the river for tourism, oyster farming and general health - Concerned about the potential for an outbreak of Newcastle disease or any other disease in a 40 shed farm - Queries how an outbreak of disease would be controlled, how over 2 million birds would be disposed of and who would cover the cost - Concerned about the implications of the development on the environment, including wildlife and the greenhouse effect - Suggests there needs to be an extension of the submission date
37	Objects	- Suggests that the development is not required as there are sufficient chicken farms in NSW and the local area - Notes that the proposed development will not result in any employment gains, and will cause the loss of 30-35 efficient family farms in the area - States that the townships of Bulahdelah, Stroud and their surrounding districts have already been adversely affected by the changes to the dairy and timber industries - Concerned that if the development goes ahead profits that currently flow into the local area will be diverted to shareholders in New Zealand - Concerned about the environmental impacts of the development and the litter that will be spread, the sediment traps that may overflow in times of heavy rain, and the placement of so many sheds so close to the river - Concerned about the possibility of disease - In consistent with Department of Agriculture's 2-5km separation policy for new developments
38	Objects	- Notes that Stroud has already been economically affected by changes in the timber and dairy industries - Suggests that the loss of 30 chicken farms would take \$6 million/year out of Stroud's economy - States that the pollution from the proposed farm would be catastrophic - Requests assurance that sheds which are granted approval would be financially sustainable, or guarantees be sought for a minimum of \$100 million for environmental rectification should things go wrong

No.	Position	Issues Raised
39	Objects	• Requests a public inquiry into the proposal • Concerned about the negative health impacts that a development of this nature will have on the residents of the area, the fauna and flora, and the marine habitat of the Karuah River and Port Stephens • Requests clarification that the air released by the tunnel ventilation system will not contain elements harmful to health • Suggests that the EIS was very general and has not adequately investigated impacts • Queries the volume of chicken manure that will be associated with the proposal • Queries whether the applicants are prepared for the safe disposal of dead chickens • Suggests that the proposal presents the risk of an outbreak of Newcastle disease • Concerned about the effect of the development on the environment of Port Stephens, the local tourism industry, the ecology of the Karuah River and the oyster farming industry
40	Objects	• Concerned that many highly sensitive environments, such as SEPP14 wetlands, Karuah Nature Reserve and state forests are in close proximity to the proposed site, and runoff will enter the Branch and Karuah Rivers and eventually Port Stephens • Suggests that the development would not want migratory and local waterbirds nearby • States that the town of Karuah is close and many ailments, such as asthma and allergies are caused by airborne dust • Suggests that chicken farms produce significant odour, noise, dust and bio-aerosols, and winds from the north-east blow frequently in the area and would send all of these directly into town and surrounding areas • States that the Karuah River is a breeding habitat for fish and crustaceans and therefore pollution from the development is unacceptable
41	Objects	• Concerned that the proposed development will lead to pollution in the Karuah River and subsequent damage to the oyster and tourism industries • Suggests that native wildlife in the area will be at considerable risk as a result of the development
42	Objects	• Suggests that it could never be guaranteed that the proposed development would not pollute the Karuah River • Suggests that the proposed development would not benefit the local area
43	Objects	Form letter, see submission 41
44	Did not state	• Suggests that the proposal should be put before a Commission of Inquiry • Suggests that the EIS and the assessment of economic impacts do not adequately deal with issues of extreme sensitivity for the local and wider communities • Concerned that the proposal will significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions • States that the proposal defies the market as NSW has an oversupply of broiler sheds • Suggests that there will be no gain in downstream jobs as a result of the proposed development, but a net loss of 50 on-farm jobs in communities, such as Stroud and Bulahdelah, already affected by dairy deregulation and reductions in timber harvest • Concerned about the Karuah River, and the oyster industry • States that millions of dollars have been spent on new sewerage systems in Stroud and Karuah to avoid contamination of the Karuah River and impacts on oyster farming • Notes that a 40-shed, tunnel-ventilated, poultry farm will generate vast amounts of dust containing nutrients and antibiotic residues from poultry litter, and the proximity of the farm to the Karuah River will ensure these nutrients will be deposited in the river • Suggests that the impacts of the development could extend well beyond the immediate area and poultry industry, damaging the oyster and tourism industries • States that colonies of the threatened grey-crowned babbler are within 200 metres of the nearest proposed poultry sheds and the dust generated from the sheds and distributed by tunnel ventilation present an extreme risk of avian disease to native species
45	Objects	• Concerned that the proposed development will result in the closure of family farms • States that the existing farms in the locality are spread over the areas of Stroud and Bulahdelah therefore the risk of disease spreading through all of the farms is much less than in 40 sheds in a small area

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		States that Karuah and Stroud have spent millions of dollars on sewerage systems to protect the Karuah River and the benefits would not be recognised if it was to be polluted due to runoff from the site
46	Objects	- Suggests that the sheds are too close to the Karuah River and the township of Karuah - States that the dust, smell and trucks associated with the proposed development could have adverse affects on the oyster and tourism industries - Concerned that profits from the development will not stay in the area, and will instead go overseas to shareholders in New Zealand
47	Objects	Form letter, see submission 45
48	Objects	Form letter, see submission 45
49	Objects	Form letter, see submission 45
50	Objects	Form letter, see submission 46
51	Objects	Form letter, see submission 46
52	Objects	- Notes that the proposed shedding is too close to the River and the township of Karuah - Suggests that the dust and smell associated with the proposed development could have adverse affects on the oyster and tourism industries - Suggests that the development is not needed as there is currently an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW - Suggests that there will be no employment gains from the development, and there will be a loss of 30-35 efficient family farms
53	Objects	- Suggests that the proposed development would be an environmental disaster - Queries what will be done with the millions of chickens that die each year - Suggests that the area is renowned for power failures which would result in the failure of systems in the chicken sheds - Notes that the growing of 12 million chickens per year will require vast amounts of water, and queries where the water will be taken from and at who's expense - Queries how the thousands of metres of chicken litter produced each year will be treated - Suggests that the dust from the litter would be hazardous to the surrounding environment, polluting the waterways, which support local people and industries including tourism
54	Objects	- Notes that the site is directly linked to the entire Port Stephens waterway - States that there is no justification for the proposed development
55	Did not state	States that there will be no employment gains from the proposed development, and jobs will be lost due to the closure of 30-35 efficient family farms
56	Did not state	States that the Bulahdelah and Stroud communities have already been adversely affected by changes to the dairy and timber industries
57	Objects	- States that the Karuah and Branch rivers run into one of the cleanest and most attractive tourist ports - States that when environmentally controlled sheds fail, the whole flock dies, whereas when conventional sheds fail the loss is not of the same scale - Concerned about chemicals used for sanitisation, antibiotics, phosphorus, nitrogen, odours and dust
58	Objects	- Suggests that the storage of dead birds or litter on the site would have devastating impacts on the Karuah and Branch rivers - Suggests that there are always mechanical failures and human errors
59	Objects	- Concerned that the proposed development will have adverse social impacts, negatively affect quality of life, recreational activities such as swimming, boating and fishing; potential community growth; and health, including potential psychological implications - Concerned that the proposed development will have adverse economic impacts such as job losses in the oyster farming and tourism industries - Concerned that the proposed development will result in the closure of 38 family poultry farms in the region, and the loss of over 70 jobs, whereas the new development will provide employment for no more than 20 - States that in addition to battling the problem of drought, family farms in the region have been forced out of business by the deregulation of the dairy industry - Notes that Karuah has already lost their doctor and one service station, and suggests that other services and businesses will be under threat if there are no longer residents and tourists to support these

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Concerned about dust containing chemicals, chicken litter, bacteria, antibiotics and grain residue being constantly pumped out by the fans - Concerned about unavoidable odours near the new highway as well as odours being carried into town by prevailing winds - Concerned that pollution will affect the Karuah River and Port Stephens - Suggests that contaminated dust from the sheds will be deposited in the river - Concerned about the burying of chickens in shallow trenches near the river, and irrigation with treated effluent and the implications for runoff - States that the Karuah estuary is a breeding ground for a variety of species including prawns and baby octopus which are grown up river near the proposed development - Suggests that the river is regularly visited by dolphins who come up as far as the proposed farm site - Notes that green turtles also frequent the river and may be susceptible to disease carried by chickens - Suggests that there is a danger of blue-green algae as a result of pollutants - Concerned about the noise associated with the large number of chickens, and constant delivery trucks, machinery and fans - Suggests that the proposed development will pose a threat to native birds - States that stocks of fish and prawns could be seriously depleted by pollution of the breeding grounds in the river estuary - Suggests there is a danger of coccidiosis, which is carried by chickens, killing turtles and dolphins - Petition(457 signatures)
60	Did not state	Suggests that their property would suffer a loss in value of \$600,000, and queries whether the government would be compensate them
61	Objects	- Suggests that pollution from the proposed development would have adverse impacts on the river system - Suggests that the Port Stephens commercial fishing, oyster and tourism industries would be negatively affected by the proposed development - Requests that the proposal be rejected
62	Objects	- Suggests that the development would cause considerable damage to the fish stocks and general health of the river system - States that if the development is approved there will be no future for the Port Stephens commercial fishing industry
63	Objects	- Suggests that the gradual decline in the river system that has occurred over the last 30 years means that it cannot support the introduction of a large scale chicken farming facility in close proximity - Suggests that if the development is granted approval, the river system will be reduced to a state where there is no oyster or commercial fishing industry, thus adversely affecting the native wildlife and subsequently the tourism industry - States that that the proposal must be rejected
64	Objects	Objects to the development of a chicken farm in close proximity to the Karuah River, Port Stephens and an important oyster industry
65	Objects	- Concerned that the development will pollute the Karuah River and tanks storing water for consumption - Concerned that the development will be a health hazard for allergy sufferers - States that the oyster and tourism industries contribute to the waterways of Port Stephens - States that a waste water system has recently been implemented in the area to protect the waterways
66	Objects	- Notes that the proposed site is located too close to the river and township of Karuah - Concerned about the pollution, noise, increase in traffic and smell associated with the farm - Concerned about the damage that the farm would do to the fauna and flora of the area - Concerned about the impact the development will have on the health of people in the area
67	Objects	- States that the farm is located too close to the river and township of Karuah - Concerned about the pollution, noise, increase in traffic and smell associated with the farm
68	Objects	- Concerned about dust laden air and the implications for allergies and asthma - Suggests that odour from tunnel ventilation will be offensive - Suggests that increases in large vehicles on country roads will create health and safety issues

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Notes that soil types in the area are not deep enough to handle the burial of the large numbers of chickens that will die each year - Concerned that the proposal will be located within 250m of the Karuah River which is home to some of the best oysters and fish in NSW - Concerned about the high rainfall the area receives and the implications for runoff and leaching from the site - Concerned that native birds in the region may be susceptible to diseases carried by chickens, such as Newcastle disease - States that profits from the development will be leaving the country - States that 38 family operated chicken farms will close when the proposed super farm comes into operation - Notes that the chicken farms that will be lost currently create jobs for approximately 70 people, whereas the proposed farm will only offer 20 jobs - Suggests that the tourism industry of Karuah will suffer as a result of the proposed farm
69	Objects	- Concerned about the siting of the proposed farm in a sensitive water catchment area - States that the area near Stroud has been a long time chicken growing area and should remain as such - Suggests that it is absurd that the proposed farm would be situated within 250m of the Karuah River and that existing poultry sheds further up the river would be abandoned
70	Objects	- Concerned about the air-borne dust and micro-organisms from the exhaust fans causing pollution of the river and water tanks as well as health issues - States that Karuah is a local oyster growing area which has recently been afforded the protection of a new sewerage system and thus it would be a mistake to place it at risk of pollution from the proposed farm - Queries whether tunnel ventilation is the ideal method of chicken farming - States that tunnel ventilation uses large amounts of power and queries whether the proposal will have emergency back up systems - Concerned about the potential for ground pollution - Suggests there will be possible contamination of soil from manure and dead chickens - Suggests there is a danger of run-off from contaminated soil washing into the river system - Queries how chicken carcasses are going to be disposed of - States that chickens are prone to disease - Notes that power failures may result in excessive losses of chickens - Concerned about the impacts of human error - Concerned about a potential environmental catastrophe such as sick people and diseased wildlife - Suggests that employment opportunities associated with the proposal are small in comparison to the losses that will be experienced - States that migratory and local birds could be affected by chicken diseases - Suggests there is a need for an extension of time for the receipt of submissions
71	Objects	- Concerned about the contribution of the proposal to greenhouse gas emissions due to large electricity consumption - Concerned about pollution of the waterways of Karuah and Port Stephens - States that tunnel ventilation releasing dust into the air may cause asthma and other respiratory illnesses for residents in surrounding areas - Concerned about animal welfare due to overcrowding of stock in the proposed sheds - Concerned that the proposal will threaten the habitats of wild birds and endangered species - Concerned that the oyster and fishing industries will be at threat
72	Objects	- Suggests that the development would lead to pollution of the river; air pollution from dust particles; and odour - States that the development will affect the health of the residents of Karuah; the oyster industry; the tourism potential of the area; cause a loss of jobs in the chicken growing industry in the area; cause profits to be sent overseas; and endanger native birdlife
73	Objects	- Suggests that the development would affect the Karuah River, the oyster industry, birdlife, marine life and create health issues for the residents of Karuah and surrounding areas - States that dust extracted from the chicken sheds would be carried to Karuah

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Concerned that contaminated dust will end up in the many rain tanks in the area - Notes that inhalation of the dust will effect the entire community, particularly asthmatics, the elderly and those with breathing difficulties - States that the air and water quality of Karuah is being improved with the completion of the sewerage works and the Karuah Bypass
74	Objects	- States that the proposed development is not within the Worimi Local Aboriginal Land Council (W.L.A.L.C.) boundaries, as the EIS states, but is within the boundaries of the Karuah Local Aboriginal Land Council (K.L.A.L.C.) - Demands that a full archaeological survey should be conducted by an archaeologist employed by the K.L.A.L.C. before work commences - States that the site of the proposed development is historically and culturally significant as several artefacts have been unearthed in the area - Opposes the destruction of any Aboriginal relics - States that the K.L.A.L.C., the traditional owners and the W.L.A.L.C. object to the proposal
75	Objects	- Suggests that pollution from the proposed development will damage the oyster and tourism industries in Port Stephens - Suggests that dust from tunnel ventilation will end up in residents rain water tanks - States that native wildlife will be at considerable risk from the development
76	Did not state	Suggests that if the sheds are built, air and water pollution will increase resulting in the demise of Karuah's tourism industry
77	Objects	States that if the development proceeds, dust from the sheds will enter the local waterways, leaving the children of the area without places to swim
78	Objects	- States that the proposal will offer nothing but a few labouring jobs to the area - Concerned about odours, and environmental and health impacts
79	Objects	- Concerned about the impact of the proposal on the health of residents of Karuah - States that the dust and odours from the proposed farm will settle on the town of Karuah - Suggests that water tanks used by households will be polluted by fallout from the factory - Concerned about the impacts of the farm on asthma sufferers
80	Objects	Form letter, see submission 41
81	Objects	Form letter, see submission 41
82	Objects	- States that despite the safeguards proposed in the EIS, the poultry farm would be a potential source of pollution for the Karuah River and pose a threat to the Port Stephens oyster and tourism industries - Notes that Port Stephens has large areas of mangroves and sea grass beds which provide breeding grounds and nursery habitats for marine life - Suggests that damage to the marine environment could affect the food source for the Port's dolphin population - States that it is unlikely that the measures proposed to protect the three families of Grey Crowned Babbler located on the property could prevent airborne diseases - States that there will be increased unemployment in the area due to the closure of 38 local poultry farms - Notes that the Economic Impact Assessment contained in the EIS does not take into account that existing poultry farms will be made redundant - States that the Broiler Industry Biosecurity Code specifies that meat chicken farms should be located at least two to five kilometres from other farms to minimise the risk of disease spread, however the proposed development would have five farms of eight poultry sheds in an area of 240 hectares - Suggests that the proposal is a gross overdevelopment and inappropriate use of the site
83	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal is contrary to the principles of appropriate and sustainable development as enshrined in SEPP 71 - States the proposal contrasts the environmental integrity of the entire Port Stephens estuary - Notes that the proposed development is in contrast to the wishes and well-being of the Karuah community and the Karuah Land Council; the interests of the oyster producers of the estuary; and the interests of the chicken producers - Concerned about huge quantities of airborne dust being released into the atmosphere through the operation of the sheds and settling in the river, having long-term effects on its health - States that the proposal to spread manure from the sheds over the land will mean huge quantities of chemically contaminated material will be available to pollute the river

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Notes that there will be risks to the environment created by the disposal of large numbers of dead poultry, particularly in the event of a disease incident - States that vulnerable and endangered species exist in the locality - Concerned about the impact of water pollution on the breeding capability of a pair of Osprey - States that Karuah River is not only important to raptors but also to numerous wading birds, some of which have international significance - Suggests that the proposal would pose a threat to the dolphin population and the dolphin watch industry is more important to the economic well-being of the area than the contribution that would be made by a chicken processing industry - Concerned about the health impacts of the proposal, particularly asthma and other respiratory risks associated with airborne dust - Concerned about the impacts of odour on the local residents - Concerned about contamination of domestic tank water through airborne dust - Concerned about the failure of the applicant to carry out an archaeological assessment for evidence of aboriginal heritage - States that small communities such as Stroud, Bulahdelah and Seaham would experience adverse impacts as well as the 38 existing chicken producers who will be out of business - Notes that 40 sheds using tunnel ventilation will consume enormous amounts of electricity, resulting in increased greenhouse gas emissions
84	Objects	- Concerned that the development will pollute the Karuah River and local water tanks - Suggests that the native wildlife in the area will be at considerable risk due to the development
85	Objects	- Concerned that dust from the chicken sheds will be pumped into the air, potentially polluting the Karuah River and surrounding areas - Concerned that dust from the sheds will settle on the roofs of homes and be washed into water tanks which provide drinking water - Queries whether the chicken farm will have a licence to pump water from the Karuah River - Queries whether they will be compensated if they lose the organic certification for their property due to contamination from the chicken farm - States that that transportation of imported GE corn and GE and GM grain will inevitably lead to spillage along the route, contaminating the area from Newcastle to Karuah - States that the proposal will affect the livelihoods of many people in the region - Concerned about the impact of pollution on the Karuah Rivers' oyster and tourism industries - Queries how the chickens would be disposed of in the event of a disease incident - States that disease from the chickens could be spread to native bird species
86	Objects	- States that the proposal would create significant environmental hazards for the Karuah River and the waterways of Port Stephens - Suggests that the marine life of these waters, and adjacent waters, is the areas primary attribute and protection from harmful environmental impacts must be the main focus in managing development - States that it will be impossible to prevent the chemicals, antibiotics and waste associated with the proposed farm from entering the estuary systems and having devastating impacts
87	Objects	- States that the area is inhabited by up to one million ibis at any one time - Suggests that the breeding couples of the Osprey will be endangered by the development - Notes that 35 local poultry farmers will lose their livelihood
88	Objects	- States that a public meeting was held on 14 January 2003 by the Karuah Progress Association where objection to the proposal was unanimous - States that an advertised and organised community meeting should have been held by the developers - Suggests that ProTen has provided only limited information to the public on the proposal
89	Did not state	- States that a public meeting held on 14 January 2003 unanimously opposed the proposed development - States that the EIS has many deficiencies including the failure to explain employment impacts; the amount of dust that would be expelled from the sheds and the impacts it would have on the oysters and fish in Port Stephens; the impact on endangered and other bird species; and impacts on public health

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Requests a Commission of Inquiry into the proposal
90	Did not state	- Queries whether it is correct that 10,000 chickens will die each week on the proposed farm - States that Karuah does not have enough water capacity to supply 10 million chickens each year or produce enough feed - Requests that it be ensured, before approval is granted, that the proposed facility will cope with the regular long term droughts and heat waves of the area without straining the environment, causing death of chickens or requiring government support
91	Objects	- Concerned about the pollution that the proposed development would generate - States that dust dispersed by the fans would be carried by the wind over a very wide area - Notes that odours from the chicken sheds would affect the quality of life and the value of properties in the area - Concerned about the impacts of the development on the dolphins of the area - States that fishing in Port Stephens would be under threat as the estuary is a breeding ground - Suggests that the proposed development will have serious impacts on the town - States that because of the clay content of the soil in Karuah, which does not absorb water, runoff into the river would be inevitable
92	Supports	Supports the proposed development as it will provide potential employment for people in both the immediate and surrounding areas
93	Objects	- States that they rely heavily on their income from chicken growing to support their business and employees - Suggests there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW and therefore the proposed development is not required - States that the proposed venture would run in competition with family farms - Notes that Bulahdelah has already been affected by changes in the dairy and timber industries and the loss of local growers would heighten difficulties for businesses - States that the proposed development would result in income being removed from small country communities and transformed into profits for New Zealand shareholders - Notes that Australia has recently suffered a dramatic fall in exports and an import blowout due to widespread drought - Suggests that the centralisation of farms greatly increases the risk of the spread of avian diseases such as Newcastle disease, avian influenza, hepatitis and salmonella - In consistent with Department of Agriculture's 2-5km separation policy for new developments to reduce the risk of disease spread - Suggests that a disease outbreak in a farm the size of the proposed may require the slaughter of over a million birds
94	Objects	- Notes that the proposed development is not in a remote location as a statement used in a published notification implies - States that the proposed site is located on the river, is visible from houses on Riverside Drive and will have an enormous impact on the town
95	Did not state	- Suggests that the Karuah River will be in danger of sediment traps overflowing in times of heavy rain, and also due to dust carried from the 340 extraction fans - States that the risk of Newcastle Disease, Avian Influenza, Hepatitis and Salmonella are higher without good separation of sheds - Notes that the employment gains of the proposed development are negative because of the closure of the 30-35 efficient family farms - States that there is already an oversupply of broiler sheds in NSW
96	Objects	- States that the proposal is in an environmentally sensitive area - Notes that the proposal is close to the junction of the Karuah and Branch Rivers which are breeding habitats for fish and crustaceans - States that the proposed development is near the Karuah Nature Reserve and Wallaroo State Forest where many native and migratory birds are found - Notes that the proposed development site is surrounded by SEPP14 wetlands which provide wildlife corridors - Suggests that the proposed development would create dust and odour problems for Karuah - Notes that a tertiary sewerage treatment plant has recently been installed to service the town and remove effluent runoff - States that the proposed development would potentially pollute the waterways

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Suggests that the developers would want all birdlife kept out of the area because of the risk of cross infection - States that a development of this size and nature is not acceptable
97	Did not state	Suggests that there has been limited and inadequate consultation by ProTen with the community and limited opportunity for the community to ask questions of ProTen
98	Objects	- States that recent bushfires have highlighted the inability of local weather patterns to dissipate airborne pollution - Notes that air pollution will have unacceptable impacts on the elderly and those with respiratory problems as well as flora and fauna - States that the area is already subject to high noise pollution from military aircraft testing and training and heavy commercial vehicles - Notes that the Karuah River is already being impacted upon by pile-driving for the Karuah bypass and inadequate sewer facilities - States that increased runoff will have devastating impacts on oysters in the Karuah River - Concerned about the potential death of the Karuah River - Suggests that a new super farm will drive existing farms out of business and exacerbate pollution without compensating by increased employment - Suggests that the area frequently suffers power disruptions which would have inhumane effects on livestock dependant on power - Queries the environmental impacts of the disposal of deceased chickens - Queries if power supply to the proposed farm will be independent of the local grid - Queries if the proposal is to be powered by independent generators what will be their impact on the local environment - Suggests that the proposed development would be denied in most parts of New Zealand
99	Objects	- Concerned that the development would lead to pollution of the Karuah River and surrounding areas and adversely affect the oyster and tourism industries - States that a community meeting was organised by the developer's at such short notice that concerned resident's did not have the time to raise substantiated objections - Concerned about the dust and odours that would be associated with the proposed development - Concerned that diseases could spread to wildlife in the area - Concerned about the loss of employment for 32 chicken farmers and their employees that would occur as a result of the proposed development - States that the proposed development will only employ 20 people including managers which will be brought in from other areas - Suggests that there will be no benefits from the development for the local area
100	Objects	- Queries why the development is proposed so close to a major tourist industry - States that areas of the Port Stephens waterways provide habitats for marine life such as oysters, dolphins, fish and crabs - Concerned about a loss of jobs in established family chicken farms as a result of the proposed development
101	Objects	- Concerned that the development will have serious negative consequences for the NSW economy, the environment both nationally and locally, the residents of Karuah, the Karuah River and Port Stephens oyster and tourism industries, and chicken farms currently operating in the Hunter Valley area - States that the claims in the EIS that there will be no farms displaced by the development, and approximately 300 (or 600) processing jobs will be created, are untrue - Notes that 38 farms, employing 70 people, have been given notice that their contracts will not be renewed in July 2004 when the proposed farm is expected to begin operating - States that the 10 million birds to be grown on the proposed farm each year are already produced on the existing 38 farms and are supplied to the Barter Processing Plant currently operating at Beresfield - States that there is no other chicken processing plant in the Hunter able to take up the services of the 38 existing farms and they will undoubtedly have to close - Notes that there will be the loss of 70 jobs on existing farms and the creation of 20 jobs on the proposed farm - States that of the farms to close, five are in Bulahdelah and fifteen in Stroud, both of which are areas affected by dairy deregulation and contraction of

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		the timber industry - States that the existing farms in the area use naturally ventilated shedding whereas the proposed development would use tunnel ventilated shedding which uses 300% to 500% more electricity per bird, resulting in a massive increase in greenhouse gas emissions - Notes that the EIS did not acknowledge the increase in electricity consumption - States that 125 million cubic metres of nutrient laden dust, containing antibiotic residues, will be expelled from the 40 proposed sheds every 24 hours - States that tree or Hessian screens suggested in the EIS would not be effective in containing dust and it would still be deposited in the Karuah River either directly or as a result of runoff - Suggests that the e-coli and antibiotic residues in the nutrient rich dust will affect the oysters and contribute to blue green algae blooms which will effect tourism - Suggests that the EIS did not quantify the amount of dust to be expelled from the proposed sheds or its effects on the river - Notes that the EIS did not address the disease risk posed to colonies of Grey Capped Babbler from dust expelled from the proposed sheds - Suggests that the development will also have implications due to odour, noise, dead bird disposal, excessive water consumption and runoff - Suggests that if the development is not refused a Commission of Inquiry should be convened
102	Objects	- Concerned that the development will affect the ecosystems of the Karuah and Branch Rivers and Port Stephens, causing stress to the marine life, flora and fauna of these areas - Suggests that the destruction of marine life may result in the loss of the Port Stephens tourism industry - States that this type of farming devastates the environment due to its high use of antibiotics and chemicals
103	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
104	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
105	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
106	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
107	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
108	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
109	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
110	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
111	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
112	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
113	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
114	Objects	Suggests that the development would have devastating effects on the sea life of the Branch and Karuah Rivers, Nelson Bay and Port Stephens
115	Did not state	- Concerned about stocking densities in the chicken sheds - States that in hot climates the Ross Breed of chicken should not be stocked at a density exceeding 30kg per square metre - States that Bartters have greatly exceeded this recommended density on many occasions - Notes that the welfare of birds is being compromised - Suggests if the proposal is approved then a stocking limit should be set according to the recommendations in the Ross manual for growing their birds
116	Objects	- Concerned that the proposal is to be situated in close proximity to the Karuah River which feeds into Port Stephens from which hundreds of people earn their livelihood through oyster farming and tourism - Suggests that many people are moving to the area and will lobby strongly against the farm - Suggests that the proposed farm will cause many problems including increased trucks on a small one lane dirt road, and odours which will drift towards surrounding farms - Concerned that dams will overflow into the river in times of rain - States that proposed burial ground will be visible from three homes and the area is prone to localised flooding

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Concerned that incinerators referred to in the EIS will pollute the surrounding air - proponent will largely bring in its own employees, leaving few jobs for local people - Concerned that the proposal will result in the closure of many local chicken farms
117	Objects	- Concerned that the loss of dolphins in Port Stephens would severely retard the tourism industry - Concerned that dust and spent litter from the farm will runoff into the Karuah River adversely affecting the quality of oysters and fish
118	Objects	- the development is unwarranted as there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW - Suggests that the construction of a farm the size of the proposed would bring to a halt the upgrading of existing shedding - States that if the proposal is rejected, 30-35 efficient family farms will be saved and additional personnel employed as a result of further upgrades - Suggests that the proposed farm should be restricted to no more than six 400 foot sheds in any one group, with a minimum of three kilometres to the next group of sheds, and a minimum of three kilometres to the Karuah River and its tributaries
119	Did not state	- Suggests that the proposed development is not required because there is already an oversupply of shedding in NSW - Concerned that the development will leave a number of family farms without a contract after June 2004 - States that profits from the proposed development will be transferred out of Australia
120	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
121	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
122	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
123	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
124	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
125	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
126	Objects	Form letter, see submission 102
127	Objects	- Concerned that the development would have detrimental effects on the Karuah River and the township - Concerned that dust emissions and runoff from the chicken farm will pollute the river thus destroying the oyster industry and adversely affecting the Port Stephens tourism industry - Concerned about the effect of the proposal on air quality - Suggests that it will not be possible to control the odour from the farms - Concerned about the impact of dust on the health of children and the elderly
128	Objects	- Suggests that during the drought in 2002 the area subsisted thousands of semi aquatic species, large southern raptors and two mating osprey which could not be provided for if the proposed development was to proceed - States that NSW would suffer a great loss of migratory bird species
129	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal is too big for the site - Suggests that in the event of a catastrophe the Karuah River and Port Stephens could be devastated - States that daily functioning of the proposed development will pose a constant threat to nearby waterways
130	Objects	- Suggests that the EIS has a number of deficiencies relating to the fauna assessment; has failed to address a number of the key threatening processes listed on Schedule 3 of the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act, 1995</i> and under the <i>Fisheries Management Act, 1994</i>; failed to assess impacts to migratory species listed under the EPBC Act; the timing, methods used and areas surveyed for the terrestrial flora and fauna surveys are not included in the EIS; the eight part test does not assess any impacts to the species recorded or expected to occur on the site, except for the grey crowned babbler; a Species Impact Statement needs to be prepared for the grey crowned babbler; - Suggests that the construction of sheds in close proximity to the habitat of the grey crowned babbler will expose the species to various life-threatening chicken diseases - States that the EIS does not specify how the proponent plans to control wild birds

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Notes that water usage by other chicken growers in the area is five to six times the amount (per bird) suggested for the proposed development - States that none of the plans or technical specifications required by the DLWC for the issuing of a part 2 licence are provided - Suggests that there is no mention in the EIS of a part 3A permit required under the <i>Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act, 1948</i> for works within 40 metres of a watercourse - Notes there has been no attempt to assess the impact on the local hydraulic regime - Suggests there is an error in the size of the washdown pond sizes stated in the EIS - Queries the volume of washdown water - States that it would appear the size of the holding pond and irrigation area are insufficient, and in times of prolonged wet weather overflow may be directed into watercourses leading to SEPP14 wetland 703 and the grey crowned babbler conservation area - Notes that there is no mention in the EIS from where soil for effluent irrigation will be imported - Suggests that no allowance has been made for the lack of infiltration if there is a high antecedent moisture level in the infiltration pits - States that while UV pathogen removal and subsequent irrigation is proposed for washdown water, no treatment of the water is proposed - Suggests that the proposal to compact soil imported for irrigation disposal will reduce soil porosity and increase runoff potential - Notes that no details were provided in the EIS explaining how imported soils would be vegetated to allow subsequent irrigation - Suggests that the sites proposed for dams D3 and D5 should be tested for Potential Acid Sulphate Soils - States that oxidation of strongly pyritic soils so close to SEPP14 wetlands and the commercially and ecologically important Karuah River could have a devastating affect on macroinvertebrates, fish and shellfish - States that given the large volumes of effluent being irrigated on-site, a clear understanding of the local groundwater is necessary to adequately assess environmental impacts - Notes that no modelling of dust emissions was documented - Notes that the EIS states that dust from the sheds will directed onto the concrete washdown area, however does not indicate that these areas will always be wet - Suggests that the vegetative screens will not be fully grown for several years and the dispersion of dust using two metre high shade cloth barriers has not been proven - Concerned about the dust from sheds being blown into private water tanks - States that dust management section of the EIS appears to rely solely on 'local knowledge' for the assessment of wind patterns at the site - States that the odour assessment for the proposal addresses odours from the sheds, but not from any burial or incineration of birds, or effluent ponds and irrigation areas - Notes that it cannot be determined from the data provided what method of dead bird disposal has been assessed or would be used - Notes that the EIS does not identify that the proposed development is integrated - States that the proposed development will require a licence from the EPA under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act, 1997</i> - Notes that the EIS does not identify that the proposal is designated development under section 77A of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979</i> and schedule 3 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation, 2000</i> - Notes that there is no discussion in the EIS on how the proposal complies with the <i>Threatened Species Conservation Act, 1995</i>; <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974</i>; <i>Native Vegetation Conservation Act, 1997</i>; <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act, 1997</i>; and <i>Fisheries Management Act, 1994</i> - States that the proposed development is inconsistent with Great Lakes Local Environmental Plan, 1996; SEPP 15; NSW Coastal Policy, 1997; and the Draft NSW Meat Chicken Farming Guidelines - Notes that the EIS states that the mortality rate will be four percent, however, according to Bartter's records, average mortality is between five and six percent - States that using an average mortality rate of five percent, the limit of the animal carcass incinerator would be exceeded every day

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Notes that the incinerator is unlikely to be able to accommodate mortalities that may occur during the outbreak of diseases - Suggests that further consideration is needed to determine what measures should be undertaken to avoid the possibility of system failure in tunnel ventilated sheds - States that refrigerated dead birds must be kept separate and only sold as blood and bone - Notes that the environmental implications of burying 1.8 million chickens or one or two sheds of chickens would be significant and have not been adequately addressed - Notes that the depth of soil over the proposed dead bird disposal area and the majority of the site is less than one metre - Notes that the noise assessment should address both construction and operation - Suggests that the affect of meteorological conditions (temperature inversions and wind) on noise propagation should be considered - Notes that the report does not consider off site traffic noise impacts in accordance with the EPA's Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise - Notes that the proposed incinerator has not been considered in the noise assessment - States that greenhouse gas emissions and energy usage have not been considered - Suggests that the total energy consumed on site, particularly from ventilation and heating, should be considered - Notes that the proposed development will grow 10 million chickens in tunnel ventilated sheds that were previously grown in conventionally ventilated sheds, resulting in a significant increase in energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions - States that the proposal does not fully address the four ESD principles - States that the EIS does not include a comprehensive archaeological assessment in accordance with the NPWS requirements undertaken by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the Local Aboriginal Land Council - Notes that minimal community consultation was carried out by the proponent - Suggests that a Commission of Inquiry should be convened
131	Objects	- Concerned about the use of tunnel ventilated sheds due to the large amount of electricity they will consume and the implications for greenhouse gas emissions - Suggests that due to the high rainfall of the area there will be no way to control runoff into the Karuah River thus putting the oyster industry under threat - States that the Stroud and Karuah have recently received new sewerage systems which afford protection to the river, oyster industry and Port Stephens
132	Objects	- States that the proposal has no community support - States that jobs claimed to be generated by the proposed development already exist - Suggests that the development will only employ five permanent employees and 15 casuals and displace approximately 40 family farms which employ 70 people - Notes that the development will not advantage Australia or its people
133	Objects	- Concerned that the development of the proposed super farm will result in the closure of over 38 chicken farms currently operating in the area and the loss of 80-100 jobs - States that the proposed farm will employ 20 people - Notes that all the profits from the farm will go out of Australia - States that dust associated with the development will be a major problem and will pollute the Karuah River affecting both fish and oysters - Notes that dust will be deposited in rainwater tanks as it will settle on rooves and then be washed into tanks, thus polluting drinking water - Suggests that there will be constant noise from the farm, particularly due to the trucks, as well as continuous dust, odour and petrol/diesel fumes - Concerned about the disposal of dead birds, particularly in the event of a power fail and the death of all the birds - Concerned about the proposed use of tunnel ventilation, the consequent increased use of electricity and the implications for greenhouse gas emissions

No.	Position	Issues Raised
134	Did not state	- Suggests that the development of the proposal will significantly devalue existing farms - Suggests that due to the intensive nature of the proposed development, the impacts of the farm may not be borne directly or exclusively by the Applicant, but may be shared by neighbours, the local community and the environment - Notes that the Karuah River and Port Stephens are significant waterways for both environmental and economic reasons - Suggests that measures proposed may be inadequate to handle peak rainfall events - States that any dust, including antibiotic and detritus residues, that has settled on the ground will flow into the Karuah River - Suggests that any approval should be subject to an additional condition that raised earth bunds be constructed around the perimeter of the development - Questions the proposed use of new dams to slow sediment flows during peak rainfall - Concerned that waste water is to be held in small, shallow storage dams - Suggests imposing the requirement that one or two 'turkey nest' dams be constructed to enable pumping of excess water from reservoirs and wash down ponds when necessary - Notes that the EIS and Odour Level Assessment do not address odour levels at times of high mortality such as system failure - Concerned that odour modelling relies largely on wind speed and directional data from Williamstown rather site specific measurements - Concerned about southerly winds over the proposed Burial Area and westerly winds over the proposed farm areas - Suggests that the Burial Area be relocated and odour emission level conditions be strictly enforced by the EPA - Notes that the proposed Burial Area is located 0.8km from their property boundary and approximately 1.2km from their residence - Concerned that the proposed Burial Area will be clearly visible from their residence and potential future residences and the possible adverse affects on property values - Suggests if the Burial Area is not relocated and internal access restricted, significant damage to the Branch Lane would occur if road access to the Burial Area is required - Opposes the approval of the proposal unless the Burial Area is relocated - States that the traffic studies make no reference as to where feed is to be sourced and assume all traffic will come from the Pacific Highway end of the Branch Lane - Suggests that employees and heavier vehicles accessing the site may come from the northern end of the Branch Lane, especially with the replacement of the existing causeway over the Little Branch Creek, placing additional strain on the sub-standard road - Suggests that given the size of the proposed development and the traffic volumes it is expected to generate, the proposal to upgrade a 300m section of the Branch Lane seems inadequate compared to the s.94 contributions required of other land owners - Suggests that approval conditions should include an increase in the scope of capital works to be undertaken in respect of the Branch Lane, and the imposition of a royalty or levy based on heavy vehicle movements to assist in offsetting the cost of rectifying damage - Concerned that the proposed development may potentially have an adverse impact on the Hunter and NSW economies - Suggests that given the extent of community concern, the State Government should undertake an enquiry of Bartter's and review the economic multiplier assumptions supporting the EIS - Queries what will stop more sheds, processing plants, or subdivision of the land being undertaken once a development of this nature exists on the property
135	Objects	- Concerned that the development is proposed within 250m of the Karuah River - Concerned about the amount of dust expected to emanate from the development - Concerned about the contamination of tank water by dust - Suggests that wind tests should be carried out in the Karuah area - Concerned about the loss of business and employment due to the closure of existing chicken farms, and the impact the development will have on the oyster industry

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Queries how many jobs the proposed development will generate
136	Objects	Concerned about impacts on the environment and local waterways
137	Objects	- Notes that the proposed sheds will release waste into the local environment, polluting both the air and the waterways which produce some of the best oyster farms in NSW - Concerned about destruction of local and migratory birdlife and the impact of exotic diseases - Suggests that the soil profile and climatic conditions cannot cope with the excessive amounts of waste that the proposal will generate - Suggests there will be a massive increase in heavy vehicles on small country roads - Suggests that the proposed site has Aboriginal significance - Concerned about asthma and allergies due to dust expelled from the sheds - Concerned about odours in a small town struggling to reinvent its image - Concerned about the loss of livelihood for 38 families and 70 jobs - States that the proposed development will generate fewer than 25 casual jobs and profits will go out of the country - Concerned that operations at the Beresfield chicken farm may be moved to Karuah
138	Did not state	- Concerned about the impact of air pollution and odour on children - Concerned about the impact of the proposal on the local oyster farms
139	Objects	- States that it will be impossible to prevent the flow of pollution into the waterways, particularly during heaving rain - Notes that the oyster leases in the Port Stephens are extremely fragile and their overseas trade would be severely impacted if they became contaminated - Suggests that dolphins, fish, corals and other marine life would be devastated in the event of a catastrophe - Suggests that the proposed project will be at the expense of current breeders and result in the loss of hundreds of jobs - States that the proposal will employ very few staff - Queries whether profits will stay in Australia - Queries why the proposal needs to be located so close to waterways
140	Objects	- Concerned about the impacts of the proposed development on broiler farm growers - Suggests that the development is not needed as there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW - States that there will be no employment gains from this development and there will be a net loss due to the closure of 30-35 efficient family farms - Suggests that with no other processor in the Hunter to grow for, there will be a very limited opportunity to grow free range - Suggests that the communities of Bulahdelah and Stroud will be adversely affected - Concerned that money will be taken out of local communities and profits from the development will be sent to New Zealand - States that the proposal presents a risk of runoff, including spent litter, to the Karuah River - Notes that dust from the development will have a significant adverse impact on the Karuah River system - Notes that the communities of Stroud and Bulahdelah have recently received new sewerage systems which use treated water for irrigation rather than putting it in the river - Suggests there is a risk of Newcastle Disease, Avian Influenza, Hepatitis and Salmonella - Notes that the current Draft Guidelines of NSW Agriculture recommend separation distances on new broiler farms of between two and five kilometres - Concerned about the proposal to use tunnel ventilated sheds due to the increased electricity they consume and the implications for greenhouse gas emissions
141	Did not state	- Concerned about dust that will be generated by the proposed sheds and be blown in the direction of the Karuah River and the township of Karuah - Suggests that tunnel ventilated sheds use an enormous amount of water and electricity compared to conventionally ventilated sheds and do not grow better chickens

No.	Position	Issues Raised
142	Objects	- Notes that if the proposed farm was to be established, their chicken growing business would close affecting their families and the families of their employees - States that the development will not result in employment gains as the proponent states but will lead to the closure of 30 to 35 efficient family farms - Suggests there is currently an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW - States that the closure of existing chicken farms will affect many small local businesses - Notes that the communities of Stroud and Bulahdelah have already been affected by changes to the dairy and timber industries - Suggests that the proposed development presents a risk of runoff, including spent litter and dust from the site, to the Karuah River, the oyster farmers and fishermen - States that Stroud and Karuah have recently had their sewerage systems upgraded - Concerned about the proposal to use tunnel ventilated sheds due to the increased electricity they consume and the implications for greenhouse gas emissions - Notes that the current Draft Guideline of NSW Agriculture for separation distances on new broiler farms recommends between two and five kilometres - States that good separation is needed to reduce the risk of Newcastle Disease, Avian Influenza, Hepatitis and Salmonella
143	Objects	- Suggests that the development will have significant impacts on the Karuah River and the local oyster industry, and the proposed sheds would generate huge amounts of dust which would pollute the river - States that tunnel ventilated sheds use four to five times as much electricity as conventional broiler sheds, contributing to more greenhouse gas emissions - Suggests that there is already an oversupply of broiler sheds - States that concentrating forty sheds in one location will mean that if there was an outbreak of disease, it would take out a very large proportion of the local poultry industry - Concerned that if the proposal is developed 38 existing farms will be closed resulting in significant unemployment - States that the proposal should be refused or a Commission of Inquiry held
144	Objects	- States that there is already an oversupply of broiler sheds in NSW - Notes that the amount of electricity and water required to run the proposed sheds far exceeds that of conventional sheds - Concerned about the amount of dust that will be dispersed by 340 extraction fans, polluting the air and the Karuah River - Concerned that the proposed development will result in the closure of 30-35 family farms, including the submitter's own
147	Objects	- Concerned about the impact of the development on birdlife in the area, both migratory and permanent - Concerned about the effects of dust and runoff which will end up in the river, exposing plants and animals to diseases - Suggests that pollution from the proposed farm may have serious consequences for oyster farmers in the area - Concerned that the proposed chicken sheds will be developed at the expense of the many existing chicken farmers - States that there is a danger of airborne diseases such as Avian Tuberculosis and an increase in vermin - Concerned that the odour from the farm will directly impact the town of Karuah
148	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal has failed to demonstrate that the facility is both economically and environmentally sustainable - States that the approval of the proposed farm will cause a massive oversupply and undermine the viability of the chicken growing industry in NSW - Suggests that the EIS implies that there are a great number of jobs associated with the proposal when there will be a net loss of jobs - Notes that the statement that importation of chicken will occur if the proposal does not proceed is incorrect - States that the jobs created by the proposal will be mainly part time - Notes that the 38 farms which will be displaced by ProTen employ up to 70 people - Suggests that ProTen overestimates the potential earnings from beef which would be less than a quarter of that stated - Suggests that a number of areas of the site are unsuitable for cattle grazing and a 240 hectare chicken site may not be able to have cattle due to bio-

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		security issues - States that two of the proposed farms will be located just 250m from the Karuah River having a major impact on the river as dust that is exhausted from the sheds will be deposited in the river affecting oysters, other marine life and the tourism industry - Suggests that the control of dust emissions is glossed over in the EIS - States that the proposed development has far too many chickens concentrated on one site - Notes that the Department of Agriculture has guidelines that suggest separation distances for farms of between two and five kilometres to reduce the impacts of disease whereas ProTen proposes to build the farms just 500m apart - Suggests that an outbreak of exotic disease on the proposed farm would have crippling effects on those involved and the economy of the Hunter Valley - States that it is likely that the grey-crowned babbler will be affected by chicken diseases - Suggests that public consultation regarding the proposal was inadequate - Suggests that a Commission of Inquiry should be held - Concerned about the welfare of chickens in the proposed sheds due to the density at which they will be packed and the minimal supervision that will be provided - Notes that stocking density proposed is well above the recommendations of the company supplying the stock - States that tunnel ventilated sheds require much more supervision than naturally ventilated sheds yet ProTen proposes minimum staff - Suggests that the amount of water required has been grossly underestimated - Queries whether the birds will suffer because their isn't enough water - States that ProTen should be made to justify their consumption of electricity
149	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal fails to meet the intent of SEPP 34 - States that the development will be at the expense of jobs in sheds made redundant - Suggests there is no evidence that NSW has a short fall in chicken meat - Notes that the small towns in the Great Lakes and Port Stephens areas have already suffered due to other decisions made in the area - Suggests there is no evidence to suggest tunnel ventilated sheds are better than conventional sheds - Suggests that the complex would receive electricity at a reduced cost at expense to the community
150	Objects	- States that a chicken industry already exists in the area - States there may be collusion between ProTen and Bartter Enterprises to force existing chicken farmers to comply with ProTen production methods or leave the industry - Suggests that 30 existing chicken farming businesses would be sacrificed - Concerned that profits from the development would be siphoned off to New Zealand - Notes that due to the high rainfall of the area and the lack of absorption on the site, accelerated runoff would cause frequent dam and pond overflow and contamination of waterways feeding the Karuah River - Suggests that due to ventilation of the sheds and management of poultry litter, fine polluting dust would be deposited in the surrounding environment and eventually conveyed by runoff into waterways - States that odour from the sheds would be frequently carried to Karuah, interfering with the amenity of the township, prospective town growth and tourism potential - Suggests that burial of dead birds is not environmentally acceptable due to the topography and geology of the site - Notes that incineration of carcasses would further pollute the surrounding atmosphere - States that the EIS understates potential adverse consequences of very concentrated poultry farming on the adjacent sensitive environment, particularly native wildlife and some endangered species - Suggests that rodent baiting which is proposed around the perimeter of each farm is unacceptable in such a sensitive environment

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Suggests that due to the location of the proposal it could not be adequately monitored by the local council and perhaps not by the State Government
151	Did not state	- Concerned about the potential damage to local aquatic industries, tourism and health issues that may occur due to airborne pollution - Concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed method of disposal of dead and diseased chicken - Questions whether the proposal will create jobs for local people
152	Did not state	- Concerned about the potential damage to local aquatic industries, tourism and health issues that may occur due to airborne pollution - Concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed method of disposal of dead and diseased chicken - Questions whether the proposal will create jobs for local people
153	Did not state	- Requests an extension of the period of public exhibition - Queries whether a Commission of Inquiry will be held, and if not why
154	Did not state	Requests an extension of time for the lodgement of submissions
155	Objects	- States that 23 farmers in the Karuah area would have their income greatly affected if the development was to proceed - Suggests that the high rainfall of the area could result in contaminated dust being washed into waterways - Notes that pollution from the site could destroy the Karuah River, Port Stephens and oyster leases - States that the majority of employment in Karuah is related to the oyster and tourism industries - Notes that Karuah was sewered at great expense to ensure protection of water quality in the river
156	Supports	Supports the project only if all the estuarine environmental protection systems outlined in the EIS and included in conditions of approval are established and maintained.
157	Objects	- Concerned that spent litter from the site will significantly damage the Karuah River - Notes that the current draft guidelines by NSW Agriculture recommend separation distances on new broiler farms of between two and five kilometres - States that with the enormous number of birds being processed, there will be very little capacity to grow free-range birds - Notes that without good separation between the proposed farms there will be heightened risk of Newcastle Disease, Avian Influenza, Hepatitis and Salmonella - Suggests that the enormous New Zealand investment will ruin local businesses with profits leaving the country - States that the proposed development is not required as there is already an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW
158	Objects	- Concerned about the health of the Karuah River and Port Stephens - States that oysters need good water quality at all times and the Karuah River is extremely important as an oyster nursery - Notes that the Karuah River is very important to Port Stephens - Concerned about the amount of dust associated with proposed sheds - Suggests would settle and be flushed into the river following rain - Concerned about the impacts of the development on oyster farming, fishing and tourism
159	Objects	- Suggests that the information on the proposal is inadequate as it does not consider the total impacts on both the local and wider contract poultry industries within NSW - States that there is currently a substantial under-utilisation of shed capacity - Notes that drought has had a significant impact on grain costs and therefore on processors' costs of production - Suggests that poultry farmers are currently being pressured to invest in new technology - Supports policies that will lead to improvements in the long-term sustainability of poultry meat production in NSW, based on a fair return on investment for poultry producers - Refutes the assumption in the economic report that the cost of displacement of the existing farming enterprises is negligible or will be of no consequence to the industry - States that the economic report has not tracked the likely future demand for chicken meat, and hence the need for growth in capacity

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Notes that up to 38 of the 69 poultry producers principally growing for Bartter at the Beresfield plant expect to be without a contract in 2004 due to excess capacity - Suggests there will not be any industry or community benefits if a substantial percentage of existing farms are closed - Concerned about the level of over capacity developing in the industry and its impact in driving down returns on investment - States that while consumer demand for poultry meat is high, it is unlikely that this level of increased capacity could be sustained unless some production is taken over from other States in Australia or an export market is developed - Estimates that in 2003-4 between 80 and 100 producers could leave the industry - Notes that 43% of the 26-29 million chickens produced annually in the Hunter region are grown in Stroud and Bulahdelah - Estimates that there will be 70 direct job losses, or more than 38 farms, and a net loss of employment of 50 or more which will have multiplier effect of a further loss of 820 jobs - States that the producers in the Hunter region have limited ability to transfer their contracts to other processors due to distance constraints - Suggests there are few alternatives for producers given that broiler sheds are specialised infrastructure that cannot be easily converted to other enterprises - Notes that Stroud and Bulahdelah have already suffered due to dairy de-regulation and the contraction of the timber industry - Suggests that the proposed development will result in a total loss in the value of poultry sheds of at least \$17 million. - Concerned about the environmental effects on industries downstream of the proposed farms including a number of oyster leases - States that a high level of vigilance in disease prevention is required - Notes that it is essential that the proposed development comply with the forthcoming Department of Agriculture guidelines - Concerned about impacts of the proposal on local infrastructure and surrounding farms - States that a thorough assessment of dust impacts is required - States that there must be sufficient capacity for dead bird disposal - Suggests there is insufficient information on what reliance ProTen will have on additional power, water and road infrastructure - Notes that the water needs of the proposed farms appear to be underestimated - Suggests that there appears to be a contradiction between the EIS and ProTen's published prospectus with regard to the disposition of the remainder of the site - States that the extent of the relationship between the beef operation and the poultry farm, and interdependences need to be clearly spelt out - Suggests that a Commission of Inquiry be held
161	Objects	- Suggests that the proposal may not meet conservation goals or environmental standards and could possibly undermine the recent investments in water quality initiatives - Not satisfied that the possible threats to both terrestrial and aquatic environments, including threatened bird communities, have been satisfactorily addressed - States that the proposal will generate large amounts of dust that may contain a number of pollutants which will be deposited in the river having the potential to smother aquatic plants and promote the growth of algae, affecting the health of the river and Port Stephens - Suggests that contaminated dust pollution would also have the ability to affect oysters, fish, birds and Port Stephens' dolphin population - Concerned about the impacts on the region's oyster industry, commercial and recreational fishing, tourism industries and the economic development of Karuah and Port Stephens - Concerned that the recent upgrade of sewerage systems to improve the water quality of the area would be compromised by the proposed development - Concerned that the proposed aerobic ponds to hold waste from each farm shed may contaminate the underlying groundwater - Concerned about the potential impact of the development on native bird species, including threatened species protected by State, Commonwealth and International legislation

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- States that breeding pairs of Osprey, a community of Grey-crowned Babbler and numerous species of wading birds reside in and adjacent to the proposed site - Suggests that the proposal poses serious risks to these bird populations from airborne dust which may contain avian diseases - States that the proposed development should be reviewed under State Environmental Planning Policy – Coastal Protection (SEPP 71) and other coastal protection legislation - Suggests that the proposal is inconsistent with the <i>Coastal Protection Amendment Act</i>
162	Supports	- States that Bartter Enterprises intends to engage the operators of the proposed farm as contract broiler growers to supply the poultry processing plant at Beresfield - Notes that the use of tunnel ventilation technology improves bird quality and has a substantial effect on live bird cost through its effect on feed conversion and growth rate - States that the Bartter operation at Beresfield is relatively inefficient and the proposed farm is an integral element of a plan to modernise the operation and improve efficiency
163	Objects	- Concerned about the potential impacts of the proposed development on the Karuah River, its tributaries and Port Stephens - Notes that Port Stephens is one of the largest oyster growing ports in NSW - Concerned about the impacts of the development on the oyster farmers as well as professional and recreational fishing
164	Objects	- States that the proposed development will not cater for extra demand but will replace up to 37 farms currently operating in the area - Notes that they would have converted to tunnel ventilation had they been given guarantee of return on their expenditure and better bird performance - States that the areas of Karuah Valley and Stroud are too far from other processors to enable growers to transfer to them - States that individual farms are widely separated and thoroughly cleaned after each batch thereby reducing disease risks - Suggests that the proposed sheds will be in close proximity and each shed will house birds of differing ages allowing less control over disease - Concerned about odour from the sheds, dust affecting the river and the town of Karuah, increased truck movements, and changes in land values
165	Objects	- Concerned that the development will pollute the Karuah River and result in damage to the oyster and tourism industries - Concerned about the impacts of dust, for example on tank water - Suggests that native wildlife in the area would be a considerable risk as a result of the proposal
166	Objects	- States that it is totally unacceptable to place the proposed farm of the banks of the Karuah and Branch Rivers - Notes that Karuah has recently been sewered to protect the river - Concerned about air pollution as a result of the development - Concerned about odour associated with the proposal - States that Karuah River provides and income for local families through oyster leases, and is also an important wetland area and fish and prawn breeding area
167	Objects	- Concerned that the proposed development will ruin one of the world's best waterways - Requests assurance that pollution from the proposed farm will not kill marine life and ruin Port Stephens - Concerned that the development will pollute the drinking water of people in the district who use tank water - Suggests that the development will have no advantage to NSW or Australia
168	Objects	- Suggests that the proposed development would threaten their livelihood - States that they have invested \$950,000 in construction, updating and maintenance of their farm over 25 years and object to spending a further \$900,000 to increase the stocking density of their farm - Suggests that other issues such as pollution of the environment and the effect of the proposed stocking density on animal welfare need to be addressed
169	Objects	- Concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the Karuah River and the Port Stephens oyster industry - Suggests that an outbreak of Newcastle disease would run rampant through the proposed sheds

No.	Position	Issues Raised
170	Objects	- Concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the Karuah River and the Port Stephens oyster industry - Suggests that an outbreak of Newcastle disease would run rampant through the proposed sheds - Concerned about the impact of the development on the small chicken farms currently operating and the loss of employment for the farmers
172	Objects	- States that the dust dispersed into the atmosphere by the ventilation fans will pose a threat to the quality of the water in the Karuah River - Suggests that during wet weather runoff from the sheds and surrounding areas will also pose a threat to the quality of the river - Notes that Karuah depends on the river for the income generated through the oyster and fishing industries - Requests a guarantee that the quality of water flowing from the Karuah River is not affected - Concerned about the impact of the development on the Port Stephens tourism industry - Suggests that the proposed incinerators will not be able to cope with the quantity of chickens that will die each day and queries what will be done with the excess - Concerned about the smoke and ash that will be emitted from the incinerators and questions if the Clean Air Act will be complied with - Suggests that the EIS does not state the capacity of the proposed dams - Queries what will happen when the dam storing waste water overflows - Concerned that dust emitted from the sheds will contaminate rain tanks which supply drinking water to residents as well as possibly swimming pools in the immediate area - States that the spread of diseases to the native wildlife is highly probable - Concerned about the impact odours produced by the farm will have on the township of Karuah - Concerned that the chicken farm will have negative effects on the growth of Karuah - Queries what is planned for the land purchased by ProTen which is not to be used for the chicken farm - Concerned that the proposed development will result in the closure of 35 existing farms and will only generate 20 jobs - Concerned that income directly and indirectly gained by the family owned farms which helps support the local communities will be lost and profits from the proposed development will go directly to New Zealand
173	Objects	- Notes that the proposal received unanimous opposition at a meeting held on 17 February, 2003 - Concerned that the proposed development will have negative social impacts on the community of Karuah and negate improvements that are occurring in the area - Concerned about the offensive odour of intensive chicken farming, the health effects of dust contamination, the negative impact on property and business values, noise due to continuous truck movements, probable water pollution, and possible rat and mice infestation of homes - Notes that the local Aboriginal community has declared the site to be of importance which would be impaired by the proposed development - Concerned about the health impacts of the sheds and dust, stating that Salmonella, Listeria, Camplobacter and botulism all thrive in sheds - States that excretory ammonia fumes from nitrogen in decomposing droppings is harmful to both birds and workers - Concerned about the difficulties and health problems associated with the disposal of chicken manure, stating that the 250 tonnes of wet manure produced each day would contain large amounts of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium with excess nitrogen converting to ammonia and nitrates burning the fragile plant cells of land plants and toxifying ground and surface waters - Notes that concentrated poultry waste spawns excessive algae that consume aquatic nutrients and block sunlight for underwater grasses - Suggests that factory poultry manure also contains dangerous heavy metals including manganese, iron, copper, zinc and arsenic - Concerned about the health and pollution problems associated with the disposal of the 4 per cent of chickens produced which die prior to reaching slaughter weight - Notes that dead birds may also accumulate around the grounds becoming bacteria havens - Concerned about the effect of nitrogen pollution from the farm on vegetation and the consequences for the proposal to use trees as a barrier to stop dust pollution - Suggests that the centralisation of chicken farming would leave the industry highly susceptible to diseases such as Newcastle disease

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		- Concerned about the negative economic impacts on established chicken farmers whose contracts will not be extended, and the transfer of profits offshore - Concerned about the threat to the local oyster industry both from pollution and perceptions that the Karuah River will no longer be clean - Concerned about the threat to the Port Stephens tourism industry from actual and perceived water, odour and air pollution - Concerned about the threat to native birdlife from diseases at the proposed broiler farms - Suggests that the continued centralisation into massive intensive broiler farms also limits future alternatives to current practices - States that intensive broiler chicken production practices are unhealthy for consumers, people in surrounding areas and workers and are cruel to chickens
174	Objects	Suggests that the development will have significant potential to adversely affect the quality of the water in the river both in the immediate area and the Port itself
175	Objects	- Notes that their family have already suffered enormously with the deregulation of the dairy industry - Suggests that there is currently an oversupply of broiler shedding in NSW and the proposed development would have detrimental impacts on farms already in existence - States that approval of the proposed development will result in the demise of the farms currently in the area
176	Objects	- Concerned about pollution of the Karuah River and the enormous impacts on the local oyster, fishing and tourism industries - Notes that tourism is particularly important to the area due to the businesses and jobs that rely on it - Concerned about the effect the proposed farm would have on the smaller chicken farms in the area - Suggests that Karuah is already a disadvantaged town and the loss of employment which would occur as a result of the proposed development would have further negative impacts
177	Objects	- Concerned about the potential risk the development will pose to the Karuah River and wetlands of the area and suggests that it will be a possible threat to the oyster industry and local environment - Notes that Karuah has recently been given environmental protection through completion of an expensive sewerage treatment works which may be reversed if the development is approved
178	Objects	- Concerned about the impacts of dust on the Karuah River and local residents - Concerned about the impacts of tunnel ventilated sheds on greenhouse gas emissions, water consumption and chicken deaths due to malfunction
179	Objects	Suggests that due to the local feeling towards the proposed development, it be subject to the fullest inquiry and preferably that it not go ahead
180	Did not state	- States that members of the precinct expressed concern about the possible effects that the proposed farm will have on the local environment and the waterways of Port Stephens - Suggests that the disposal of large numbers of dead chickens will cause environmental problems and there is a very real danger of effluent runoff entering the Port Stephens waterways - Notes that an operation the size of the proposed will be using large quantities of chemicals and the risk of residues of these chemicals entering the waterways is unacceptably high
181	Objects	- Suggests that the proposed tunnel ventilated sheds will create massive amounts of noise pollution and dust which will be deposited on Karuah, the Karuah River and Port Stephens waterways - Notes that ProTen applied to build tunnel ventilated sheds in New Zealand but the application was rejected on environmental grounds - Suggests there are no cost advantages in favour of tunnel ventilation sheds over conventional sheds - States that tunnel ventilated sheds use a large amount of electricity and thus the proposal will further burden NSW supply and increase greenhouse gas emissions - Objects to the proposal to bury dead chickens due to the adverse impacts this will have on the Karuah River - States that pollution of the Karuah River will not be accepted by the community, fishermen, oyster growers or their customers - Concerned that the loss of 38 Hunter growers which will not have their contracts renewed will result in further unemployment in rural areas already

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		suffering due to the drought and primary production cutbacks • Suggests that that replacement of 38 existing farms consisting of 80 sheds with 40 sheds all on the one site will create a catastrophic situation in the event of an outbreak of a poultry related disease • Notes that the proposal calls for the employment of two managers and five casual labouring positions not the 600 jobs referred to in the media • Queries how many people are employed on the existing 38 farms and as drivers transporting birds to the processing plant at Beresfield • Objects to any future proposal to relocate a processing plant at the site • Queries the effects of the proposed development on the native bird population in the adjoining rivers and national parks • Notes that in 2002 Karuah had a sewerage system installed to stop possible pollution of the Karuah River and therefore it does not need to be exposed to any further sources of pollution • Queries what effect air borne pollution from the proposed development will have on the thousands of travellers who will use the Karuah Bypass each day, following its completion • Suggests that if the proposal is not rejected it should be subject to a Commission of Inquiry • Suggests that any pollution of the Karuah River will have devastating effects on the local marine life
182	Did not state	• Notes that chicken farmers in the area are concerned about the impacts that the proposed development will have on existing producers, local residents, jobs, traffic, dust, noise, water quality, the oyster industry, and greenhouse gases • States that the farmers are also concerned about the lack of time available to respond to the public display of the development application and requests a further extension
183	Did not state	• Concerned about the environmental and public health risks associated with the proposed development • Requests that the Government seek a security deposit from the developer of about \$10 million so that no problems at the proposed development site will impact on the local community or surrounds
184	Did not state	• States that the people of Karuah deserve a better chance at having some industry • Suggests that both the oyster and chicken industries must be able to exist in harmony • Notes that the lack of signs in oyster areas results in significant damage
185	Objects	• Form letter, see submission 41
186	Objects	• Concerned that air pollution will be harmful to animals and native vegetation in the area • Suggests that water pollution would affect fish and oyster farms in the Karuah River and downstream • States that there would be potential for disease with such a large number of chickens in close proximity and an outbreak of Newcastle disease would kill of all native birds in the area • Concerned about increased greenhouse gas emissions due to the additional electricity required to power tunnel ventilated sheds
187	No comment	• Stocking density meets set criteria. • Disposal of chickens during worst case scenario
SECOND EXHIBITION PERIOD		
1.	Object	▪ Air pollution – dust impacts on drinking water and sensitive habitats, particularly dust from incineration of dead birds; ▪ Odour impacts on Karuah township and camping reserves; ▪ Effluent – problems during periods of heavy rain ▪ Noise – levels exceed permitted levels; ▪ Visual ▪ Water supply during periods of drought ▪ Disease – impacts on local bird populations ▪ Believes processing plant will be installed next ▪ Animal welfare

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Community welfare – only international company will benefit
2.	Object	- No benefits to local community - Animal welfare - Water supply - Treatment of wastewater and subsequent contamination of Karuah River - Impacts on wildlife - Dust levels – human health and nutrient content of dust - Noise - Odour - Visual pollution
3.	Objects	- Proximity of components to Karuah River - Health impacts on community - Dust impacts and impacts on oyster industry - Greenhouse gas emissions - Groundwater impacts from irrigation practices - Water quality impacts from poultry manure and on-site poultry burial - Heavy vehicle movements – dust and air quality impacts - Disease impacts - Socio-economic impacts
4	Objects	- Water quality impacts - Water supplies during drought conditions - Wild bird control concerns - Impacts on raptors in area - Impacts on other industries as a result of pollution from proposal
5.	Objects	- Questions adequacy of air assessment - Odour – local weather conditions will transport odour level to township - Socio-economic impact
6.	Objects	Water quality impacts on Karuah River, and impact on aquatic flora and fauna.
7.	Objects	- Impacts on ecological values of the site, and potential for tourism industry in the region - Water quality impacts
9.	Objects	- Requests additional time to review additional information - Socio-economic impact - Questions that Applicant will subdivide land at the site - Odour impacts, and adequacy of the assessment - Animal welfare during power failure - Lack of community consultation.
10.	Objects	- Dust pollution and community health impacts - Water supplies and impacts on town water supplies
11.	Objects	- Water quality impacts on Karuah River and Port Stephens - Health impacts should water quality impact occur
12.	Objects	- Impact on oyster farmers - Contaminated dust transported to river during rainfall events

No.	Position	Issues Raised
		Impacts on tourism industry
14	Objects	- Contamination by GM or GE grain on organic certified operators - Dust impacts
15.	Objects	- Water quality impacts, and subsequent impacts on oyster leases - Odour impacts on township
16.	Objects	- Odour and water quality impacts - Socio-economic impacts
17.	Objects	- Proximity to waterways and township - Dust, traffic, odour, waste, pest introduction. - Dead bird disposal - Impacts on oyster industry
18.	Objects	- Cannot control nutrients and bacteria entering Karuah River - Manure management, with cleaning required every day and subsequent dust and spillage from these operations - Litter will be used by Applicant.
19.	Objects	- Impacts on dolphins and subsequent impacts on tourism industry - Water quality impacts on marine flora and fauna
21	Not stated	- Concerned with the lack of consultation - Attached minutes of community meeting
22.	Objects	- Socio-economic impacts - Odour impact assessment inadequacies
23.	Objects	- Air quality impacts and related human health and amenity impacts - Impact on native bird species - Disease management - Use of litter at the site and subsequent water quality impacts
24	Objects	- Water quality impacts - Impacts on native bird species - Inappropriate location
25.	Objects	- Impacts on quality of life - Impacts on tourism and oyster industries - Inappropriate location