

Agenda
Proposal Application SSD 7424
Smeaton Grange Resource Recovery Facility

Friday 22nd July 2016, 9.30am
52 Anderson Road, Smeaton Grange

Attending:

Contact Planner for project Kate Masters (Department of Planning & Environment)

Environmental Protection Authority TBA
Benedict Resource Recovery Facility TBA

Currans Hill Resident	Chris Harris
Currans Hill Resident	Kaylene Eid
Currans Hill Resident	Andrew Wardle
Currans Hill Resident	Bob Crowe

CC:	Chris Ritchie (Director of Industry Assessment)
CC:	General Manager Camden Council
CC:	Chris Patterson MP
CC:	Councillor Warren
CC:	Councillor Fedeli
CC:	Councillor Fisher
CC:	Daniel from the Macarthur Chronicle

Apologies

To be confirmed

On the 16th July 2016, approximately 50-60 residents attended a residents meeting to discuss the Resource Recovery Facility application. Only a few homes were advised by flyers being placed in the mailbox, therefore the community gathered to seek additional information.

Please refer to the following 10 questions:

1. What will be the maximum height of this facility?
2. As per the environmental impact statement, we can not see information on Odour, such as the Technical Framework: Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW (DEC). Will residents be able to smell the similar sour stink as reported by Terrey Hill residents regarding Kimbriki Resource Recovery Centre and the smell similar to Spring Farm Recovery Centre that can often be smelled in Curran's Hill?

3. The Environmental Impact statement Section 79C(1b) of the EP&A says in Act Table 7.1 says as part of their mitigation measures that no processing (ie sorting and screening) between 10 pm and 6 am. Will residents be able to hear truck noise in the middle of the night? How will residents be compensated for having their peace disturbed?
4. A noise impact assessment (NIA) was prepared by EMM (refer to Appendix F). The assessment was undertaken in accordance with the Industrial Noise Policy, Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) and Road Noise Policy (RNP). The assessment considered impacts to 22 representative assessment locations most likely to be affected by the proposal (refer Figure 6.1)". It confirmed residents would be affected, how will the residents be compensated by having their peace disturbed?
5. The EIS must include all relevant plans, architectural drawings, diagrams and relevant documentation required under Schedule 1 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000. However, we can not see a locality/context plan drawn at an appropriate scale indicating significant local features such as heritage items; the location of schools, childcare, recreation facilities, and other nearby buildings, shopping, and employment areas, and traffic and road patterns, pedestrian routes and public transport nodes. Residents request that the application be rejected based on being 120m from resident homes. Residents request that the application be rejected based on being within 1km (as the crow flies) to two schools, swimming pools, childcare centres, children entertainment services.
6. 6.1.2 Traffic and transport impacts says that the existing traffic volumes the intersections of Hartley Road/Narellan Road were surveyed on Friday 11 December 2015 and historic tube traffic counts undertaken by RMS were also used (Table 6.1). A SIDRA analysis of the intersections of Hartley Road/Narellan Road found that the intersections are currently operating at near **capacity** during peak hours. Since that report Camden Valley Way has fully opened and traffic has significantly increased on Hartley road since December. Currans Hill has only two entrances/exits. By allowing this extra traffic created by the facility, how will this be managed to allow emergency vehicles such as fire services and ambulance have access to Curran's Hill residents via Hartley Road?

7. The report appears to treat the heritage listed Kenny Creek as a drain. They have not undertaken a study as what wildlife exists in the corridor such a birdlife and native animals or aquatic life. Local residents have seen platypus, echidnas, wallabies, turtles, native ducks, water fowls, snakes, kookaburras, varieties of native birds etc among the Cumberland Plain Forest Remnant and along Kenny Creek. What pests will be attracted to the facility such as termites in stored timber, rats, mice, crane birds ect that will compete with native wildlife?
8. Residents wish to start the process of re-zoning in Smeaton Grange. We request for Camden Councils Strategic Planners to review the zoning for Smeaton Grange to change from IN1 General Industrial and IN2 Light Industrial, to just IN2 Light Industrial and to maintain the height of 11m. Reason being is the impact on surrounding properties by General Industrial.
9. Why did the Minister of planning advise that a public hearing should not be held?
10. The applicant has a history of providing misleading information, such as the application process to Camden Council when Benedict did not identify the purpose of the facility. Council requested they resubmit and identify the use of the facility in with their application. On a separate occasion Benedict Recycling was fined for misclassifying waste material around the quality of their Envirosoil as reported on 13th March 2015. Therefore resident trust in Benedict is low and the emphasise on using the law to protect the rights of residents is high.

Compiled by C. Harris (resident of Curran's Hill).

