

Department of Planning

Light Horse Waste Management Facility

Summary of Public and Agency Submissions:

Proponent: Submission 29

Residents: Submissions 1 to 107 (excluding no. 29)

Agencies: Submissions A to K

Name		Type of Submission
PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS		
1	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Asbestos, Proximity to Residential Areas and Community Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Resident believes the proposal is outrageous given the likely asbestos and carcinogenic substances that would be tipped 500 from homes, sporting fields and a local primary school. <p><i>Community Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Resident believes there has been a lack of community consultation undertaken by the proponent. Resident also identifies consultation was only undertaken with residents during the original application two years ago. <p><i>Similarities to Original Application</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Resident believes this is the same application as submitted to the Department in 2006 and that this was strongly objected to by Blacktown City Council, DECC and Minchinbury Residents.Resident identifies Blacktown Council expressed environmental concerns over the closeness of homes to the waste fill. The Department had at the time required the proponent to produce a further assessment of the issues. The resident believes none of these have been actioned and the original application has again been submitted.
2	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><u>(1st submission)</u></p> <p><i>Similarities to Original Application</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Resident believes this proposal is the same proposal/documentation as 2006.Resident believes the proponent still has not complied with the requirements set by DECC, DoP and

		<p>Blacktown Council as requested in 2006.</p> <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes there has been no community consultation with the exception of a glossy brochure being provided by the proponent to residents. • Resident believes the proponent has intimidated the [Minchinbury] Community Action Group's website leading to it having to be shut down. <p>Air and Dust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes air and dust would be a serious problem <p>Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident is worried about the smell of the 'tip' despite classification of 'green waste' being non-putrescible, it produces significant odours. • Resident is aware the proponent is having odour complaints at the existing facility. <p>Asbestos and Contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident is particularly concerned about asbestos and contaminates used onsite. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the proposal will reduce the value of their property. <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes there will be health implications associated with the proposed development, particularly in regards to their asthmatic child. • Resident is also concerned about diseases brought by vermin and birds likely to be attracted to the proposed facility. <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident questions how dumping would be policed; including how monitoring would occur if organic material enters the landfill. <p>(2nd submission)</p> <p>Dust – Allergies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident identifies having allergies and asthma. They note they need to keep dust to a minimum. • Resident believes (for existing medical conditions, the proposal would exacerbate their medical requirements and this would be costly). • Resident questions how the proponent intends to keep dust to a minimum with stockpiles of crushed concrete. • Resident believes there has been no environmental assessment of this issue. <p>Asbestos and Hazardous Materials – Proximity to Homes</p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the proposition of asbestos and hazardous material being stored 500m from their home. <p>Similar Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions why the landfill needs to accept asbestos. Resident identifies Eastern Creek already has a registered asbestos 'tip'. Resident raises question of how many asbestos accepting 'tips' there would eventually be in Minchinbury. <p>Noise and Operating Hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the operating times expressed are ridiculous as residents would be able to hear the audible beacons of machines, crushers and trucks from the proposed site at 6am on Sundays. Resident believes the 'tip' will operate 7 days per week – 6am to 10pm and that this breaches Blacktown Council's and DECC's noise pollution guidelines. <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions the monitoring and wrapping procedures to be used to control contaminated loads coming onto the site and the airborne asbestos fibres coming from trucks. <p>Smell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies visiting the proponent's website and seeing that they accept plants and garden waste. Resident believes this will cause smells, insects, vermin, ibis, seagulls and disease carrying pests and identifies garden waste is putrescible waste. <p>Biodegradable Materials Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes a small volume of biodegradable materials could be land filled producing odours over time given the active face in the landfill, the leachate trench in the pit and the composing of green waste within windrows. <p>Leachate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the landfill will rise above the elevations within the surrounding groundwater system, leading to the discharge of leachate into the perched aquifer system. Resident believes this increases the potential for adverse environmental impacts from water discharging from the aquifer into the surrounding environment. <p>Quality of Life and Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will destroy the quality of life of local residents and lower property values. This is confirmed by a local real estate agent. <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the resubmitted application does not address community concerns as the proponent has not consulted with the community. Resident identifies a glossy brochure had been provided to residents by the proponent outlining only the employment benefits of the proposal. Resident is outraged by statements in the EA that the community is not viewed as a priority and their
--	--	--

		<p>concerns do not hold as much sway as economic and political interests.</p> <p>(3rd submission)</p> <p><i>Site Permissibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is not permissible on the site and does not believe the “engineered landfill” meets the relevant definitions defining permissibility. <p><i>Assessment Report</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the section of the assessment report “impact on property values” (page 121) refers to section 17.8.3, but this section does not exist. No considerations is given to impact on property values. <p><i>Community Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there was a lack of community consultation and does not consider publishing glossy brochures is community consultation. Requests a forum where residents can have their say. <p>(4th submission)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the assessment report is incomplete as it is missing sections 16.3, 16.3.4, 16.8.2, 17.8.2, 17.8.3 and 17.9.3. Resident believes the areas of huge concern are the issues being dealt with by each missing section. <p>(5th submission)</p> <p><i>Asbestos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes asbestos wrapping may not remain intact when excavators mix up the landfill with a wide steel toothed bucket. Resident believes the plastic wrapping would be broken, exposing asbestos fibres which become airborne. <p><i>Health Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will expose their family to health issues including lung cancer, mesothelioma and other asbestos related diseases. Resident identifies their son has asthma as are many other residents and this could be intensified by the proposal. Resident believes lead based products and battery acid may break down and become a sulphuric acid dust affecting the health of residents. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Amenities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there are 3 operating landfills in the area and no justification of the need for another. Resident believes there is also no justification to have an asbestos landfill so close to dwellings, sporting grounds, primary school, child care facility and small businesses.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Act 1997 notes that it is inappropriate for a landfill to be within 250 metres of a residential zone or school; however the closest home to this boundary is 120 metres. <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there has been no two way consultation. Resident identifies asking the proponent if he would attend a community forum, but they declined stating the community would be “squawking” at them, indicating an unwillingness of the proponent to discuss the issues the community has about the proposal. <p>(6th submission)</p> <p>Consultation, Dust and Hours of Operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies that Councillors have expressed concerns due to the lack of public consultation, the excessive dust at the current St Peters site and the hours of operation. <p>Assessment Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the assessment report is incomplete and is missing sections 16.3, 16.3.4, 16.8.2, 17.8.2, 17.8.3 and 17.9.3. <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proponent’s assessment report does not take into account wind levels or wind direction and noise assessments were made during the day and not between 6pm and 1pm or 2am on weekends (hours of operation). <p>Health, Lifestyle and Financial Loss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will cause emotional stress, health issues, lifestyle and financial loss. <p>Putrescible Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes despite the definition of green waste not being putrescible in NSW, residents have found a definition in a response to a discussion paper prepared by WSN Environmental Solutions that includes green waste as putrescible. <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is a current class action being undertaken against Casey Council in Victoria by residents who live 30 metres from a landfill and that the current proposal is less than 120 metres away from Minchinbury residents.
3	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p>Hazardous Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the kind of materials going into the landfill - particularly if they are hazardous. <p>Dust and Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the level of dust and odour.

		<p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident wonders how the project would be monitored. <p>Leachate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is worried about leachate going into the groundwater.
4	TraceyLee	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Resident Notification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believed the Department has not sent out all the information to some residents and not all residents affected by the 'tip' were notified. Resident mentions 1000 response petition of residents likely to be affected. Resident believes Blacktown Council provided the Department with list of all residents and asks the Department to notify all residents living on the M4 side of Minchinbury from Archibald Road down to Pinegrove Cemetery. <p>Noise, Dust and Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the level noise, dust and odour from proposed 'tip'. <p>Proximity to Local School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes whole community has concerns, even those who do not live near 'tip', as many have children attending Minchinbury Public School – less than 500m from proposal. <p>Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident mentions asbestos as an issue.
5	Anonymous	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Weighting of Submissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the community has not been viewed as a priority and their opinions are not given weight. <p>Notification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they did not receive any information in regards to the proposal from the Department.
6	Peter Calil	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes their home will possibly be devalued as a result of the landfill proposal. <p>Hazardous Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about hazardous waste. <p>Proximity to Homes – Conflicting Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes this is a conflicting land use placed next door to the long established residential area of Minchinbury.
7	Anonymous	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident was not sure who the proponent of the proposal was and questioned what an ACN is. <p>Inability to Download Exhibition Documents</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified that they were not able to download documents that were on exhibition on proponent's website.
8	Jim Parker from Allens Arthur Robinson on behalf of Jacfin Pty Ltd	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibited development, misleading exhibition notices, inadequate particulars of the development proposal, Director-General's Requirements, inconsistency with the NSW Waste Policy, no "justifiable demand" for a large landfill, consequences of a lack of demand, an inadequate consideration of project alternatives, stormwater and leachate management, absence of a proper landfill lining system, odour emissions, dust, landfill gas collection and treatment deficiencies, asbestos, traffic and roads, noise, greenhouse gas emissions, post closure risks and costs. Refer to full submission from Allens Arthur Robinson.
9	Erica & David Brooks	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Project Assessment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions why this application is not being assessed as one project with the other proposed facilities as identified on page 50. <p><i>Clarity of Proposal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned over the lack of clarity of what the proposal entails. <p><i>Asbestos and Hazardous Materials – Health Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned over the potential health impact associated with asbestos and other hazardous materials. <p><i>Noise and Air Quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned over noise and air quality impacts associated with material handling, crushing and grinding. <p><i>Groundwater</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned over the potential for groundwater impacts from land filling <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned over the potential for odour impacts.
10	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Houses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal, being 500m from the residential estate of Minchinbury is too close to houses and people and would rather see such a facility be at least 5km away from residences. <p><i>Noise and Vibration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the noise and vibration generated by the proposed facilities heavy vehicles will be unacceptable and a disturbance to Minchinbury residences. <p><i>Proximity to Open Spaces - Children</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposed facility is too close to open spaces where many children play including Minchinbury's public school, numerous parks and pre-schools. <p>Dust and Air Contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about dust generation that may contaminate the quality of the air. <p>Lead, Contaminated Soil and Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about lead, contaminated soil and asbestos that will fill the quarry. <p>Flora and Fauna</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will damage native flora and fauna. <p>Cockroaches, Mice and other Vermin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes populations of cockroaches, mice and other vermin will increase in the area. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes house and land prices will noticeably decrease as a result of the proposal. Resident believes there is an unwanted stigmatisation of being close to a dump. Resident has concerns regarding the cumulative impact of so many 'tips'.
11	Anonymous	<p>Query:</p> <p>Waste being Approved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident asked what kind of waste would be going into the site if approved. <p>Support:</p> <p>Jobs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they could see the benefits of the proposal in terms of jobs <p>Standard Building Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they can live with standard building waste e.g. glass, bricks and dirt, but is concerned about the hazardous waste. <p>Objection:</p> <p>Hazardous Waste, Proximity to Homes and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident was concerned and strongly objects to the hazardous materials to be dumped 1km from his home if the proposal is approved, mainly because of the health concerns for their family. Resident believes hazardous waste should be at least 20km from residential properties. <p>Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident alludes to controversy regarding James Hardy and Asbestos in schools sand does not want such a facility near their home. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will devalue is home <p>Cumulative Impacts of other Waste Facilities</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident was concerned the neighbourhood was becoming a “waste capital” of Sydney with other ‘tips’ down Wallgrove Road and the Cemetery adjacent with a cremation facility.
12	Mohammad Khan & Saira Khan	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Noise, Dust, Dirt, Fumes, Odour and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the development will cause noise pollution, dust, dirt, fumes and odour could be devastating for their family, residents of Minchinbury and people suffering from asthma. <p><i>Air Quality and Health Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the health impact due to the danger of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to them and the residents of Minchinbury. <p><i>Community Reputation, Property Values and Responsibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the good reputation of area and property prices will be affected? Resident believes the impact on valuation of their property in future should be assessed. Resident questions who will be responsible if their property is affected by the proposal. <p><i>Stigma</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there is a negative stigma of an enormous landfill holding tonnes of degrading and rotting waste including council waste, asbestos, tyres, asphalt and bituminous materials, ferrous and non ferrous materials, scraps and other waste. <p><i>Community Consultation and Communication</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident recommends extensive consultation and communication with Minchinbury residents is undertaken.
13	Cengiz Sahin	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Notification</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they have not received any information about this project. <p><i>Environmental Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified they is worried about the environmental impact. <p><i>Dust and Cancerous Material</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions if they are subject to any dust or cancerous material.
14	Vinko Karatovic	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><u>(1st submission)</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Homes and Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proximity of the project to residential homes at Minchinbury is too close and the proposal will create an undesirable odour. <p><i>Appeal of Area, Buyer Interest and Value of Property</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal reduces the appeal of the area, will reduce buyer interest and reduce real

		<p>estate values.</p> <p><u>(2nd submission)</u></p> <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes odours will emanate from recycling of vegetation and other organic material. <p><i>Airborne Materials, Asbestos and Lightweight Rubbish</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes hazardous airborne materials such as asbestos will escape from the proposed site Resident believes papers and other light weight rubbish will escape due to the wind. <p><i>Property Values and Stigma</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proximity of the waste depot to residential homes will result in falling real estate values. Resident believes the selling of real estate may be difficult even at reduced prices due to the unappealing nature of living near waste projects. <p><i>Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes airborne dust; despite dust suppression being implemented, cannot be totally eliminated.
15	Anthony & Eileen Logan	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Suburban Areas and Smell</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the facility should not be constructed so close to suburban areas due to the likely smell produced. <p><i>Health, Odour and Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes families' health (including children) would be affected by odours and fumes emanating from the site (as with the existing suite opposite the M7 Motorway at Eastern Creek). Resident believes many schools around the Eastern Creek location will adversely affected by smell and sound. <p><i>Value of Property and Compensation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes value of real estate will decrease with no compensation from the Government. <p><i>Alternative Materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes alternative materials should be used to raise the level of the quarry such as excavated soil from construction sites rather than bio material (similar to the quarry rehabilitation at Prospect). <p><i>Alternative Sites</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes alternative sites should be investigated if there is a requirement for a resource recovery facility. Resident believes the facility should not be near established suburbs.
16	Nigel Van Houten President - MRAG	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Access to Proponent's Reports</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Party identifies during the time the DA was on exhibition on the Department's website the proponent's external link was taken offline. This made necessary reports, environmental assessments and other important documents unavailable to interested stakeholders, losing considerable amount of time to interested stakeholders. <p><i>Exhibition Period</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Party believes the Christmas/ New Year DA lodging makes it very difficult for the community to organise public meetings and attend Council meetings to discuss the matter. Party says he and residents have a right to attend public meetings and other stakeholder communication which is impossible at this time of year. Party requests on behalf of Minchinbury residents to extent the time frame for public comment closing on the above development due to the above issues.
17	Carl	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Hazardous Materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The resident is concerned about the hazardous materials proposed to go into the landfill.
18	Lucinda & Steven Myles	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Dust, Noise and Dirt</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes dirt and dust will affect residents even once site is filled. Resident also believes there will be increase in noise and dust during operation. <p><i>Putrescible Waste - Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions if site will deal with any putrescible waste and if so will create offensive smells for residents. <p><i>Access Roads – Traffic and Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident questions if Archbold Road was becoming an access road to the site and if so believes this to be unacceptable based on an increase in heavy vehicle traffic, noise and a danger to local children and residents. <p><i>Standard of Living, Health and Future Lifestyle</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will affect their standard of living, health and future lifestyle.
19	Michelle Jurd	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><u>(submission 1)</u></p> <p><i>Multiple Facilities in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there are already 4 landfills in immediate vicinity. <p><i>Cumulative Impact of Multiple Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is worries about the cumulative impacts of the 5th 'tip' in their local area.

		<p><i>Odour and Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about odour and the close proximity of the site to residents. <p>(submission 2)</p> <p><i>Multiple Facilities in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there are already 4 landfills in immediate vicinity. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Community Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes future residential areas will be affected and school numbers will drop. Resident believes the quarry is already next to an opposed site. <p><i>Odour, Health Problems, Rodents and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the proposal will result in odour and health problems, rodents and insects and reductions in land values.
20	Tim McCallum Principal – Erskine Park High School	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Odour, Hazardous Materials and Wind</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objector is concerned about the odour and hazardous materials spills could be sent to their schools site via wind. <p><i>Organic Waste</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objector believes organic waste should be denied. <p><i>Wind and Community Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objector believes wind generation and the impact on community will need to be addressed.
21	Mr & Mrs Formby	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there should be unannounced, random noise monitoring carried out by an independent body for the life of the site with remedial action being instigated to rectify problems, partially noise and vibration. <p><i>Complaints Hotline</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there should be the creation of a telephone hotline where residents can report dust/noise or any other unforeseen problems with appropriate guidelines and procedures in place to rectify these problems. <p><i>Assessment Report</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there is no such thing as an independent assessment of a proposal when commissioned by a company proposing the development. <p><i>Proposal and Final Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are concerned so many projects over the years have ended up nothing like what they have initially

		<p>promised with a large amount of remedial work needing to be undertaken as a result eg. M5 Motorway Tunnel.</p> <p>Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are concerned about asbestos being dumped at the site and would like assurance there will be no asbestos related problems for local residents. <p>Dust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the dust suppression techniques being implemented by the proponent need to be considerably better than merely adequate, especially when wind is blowing from the South.
22	Wissam Abdallah	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas and Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site is too close to a young family residential estate and notes there is a high population of young families and children who permanently reside in the area and contains a primary school for young children between the ages of 5-12. <p>Resurfacing of Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the control of landfill waste is difficult as waste may resurface 50 years later. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the suburb will be less appealing and there will be reduced property values. <p>Rodents and Disease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be increased rodents, insects and infestations in the area causing diseases like Leptospirosis, salmonella, typhus and ringworm. <p>Long Term Health Problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is anecdotal incidents of higher levels of clusters of illness and disease have included several health problems in people living near a landfill and these include cancer, miscarriages, multiple sclerosis, asthma, skin disorders and identified pre-term both (<37 week gestation). <p>Noise, Reactivity of Materials and Fire Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the landfill will be noisy, with increased traffic and smell and wind blown waste and some materials may be reactive during the deposition process. Resident believes landfills are a fire hazard including biodegradable material may produce carbon dioxide and methane during the process of decomposition and methane is potentially explosive and can cause fires. <p>Air, Water and Soil Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes materials may be released into air, water and soil, including an off site mitigation of gases, dust and chemicals bound to dust affecting, locally grown food and consumed food produce. Resident believes there may be soil and open air drain contamination may lead to high risks to human health and may also leach into ground water or stormwater, contaminating local surface water, drinking water

		supplied water for recreational use.
23	Collette Avery	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Odour, Contamination of Groundwater, Local Ecology and Creeks</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be odour and the smell of fermenting trash, contamination of groundwater, the likely effects on the local ecology and the pollution of Ropes Creek. <p><i>Cumulative Degradation of Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes Erskine Park is being degraded via Industry (built to South); particularly over the last few years and a close 'tip' will add to this. Believes area is becoming big landfill and industrial wasteland regardless of how residents feel about their homes, community and health. <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identifies they have health issues and are housebound, not being able to leave the house and when home having to keep the house shut up due to the Wallgrove Road Landfill. The proposal will exacerbate this situation.
24	Edgardo Dela Fuente	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Interruption to Daily Life and Harm to Children</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will affect their daily lives and harm the lives of their children.
25	Leonne Young	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their street is the closes to this site and they are worried their property value will decrease significantly if the project is approved. <p><i>Asbestos and Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about asbestos and odours coming from the site.
26	Adam Brook	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the area already smells of industrial waste near the proposed site and wants the waste facility placed elsewhere.
27	Blaguna Apoleska (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Environment, Vermin, Odour, Control of Waste being Disposed and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be substantial environmental and health impacts and local communities as a result of the proposal. Resident believes there will be infestations of rodents, odour, limited control of waste being disposed as what is claimed to be disposed may not be the case and increasing events of cluster diseases including cancer, asthma, skin disorders and miscarriages.

28	Tome Apoleski (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Environment, Rodents, Odour, Control of Waste being Disposed and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes there will be substantial environmental and health impacts and local communities as a result of the proposal. • Resident believes there will be infestations of rodents, odour, limited control of waste being disposed as what is claimed to be disposed may not be the case and increasing events of cluster diseases including cancer, asthma, skin disorders and miscarriages.
29	Ian Malouf, Managing Director Lighthorse - Proponent	<p><u>Support:</u></p> <p><i>Odour, Dust, Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent believes residents fears of odour, dust or noise, whilst understandable in their context, are nevertheless groundless. <p><i>Intrusiveness of Use, Builders Waste, Asbestos and Soil</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent believes the proposal is to replace a heavy duty quarry operation that has been operating for the last 40 years. • Proponent believes the proposal is a less intrusive plan to refill the quarry with unrecyclable builders waste, asbestos waste and soils and allows an opportunity to dispose of asbestos safely. <p><i>Benefits to State</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent believes the project will provide jobs in a diminishing job market, promote the development of designated employment lands, supply infrastructure and contribute to the NSW Treasury almost <u>\$1Billion</u> over twenty years in waste levies (pursuant to s88 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act).
30	Carol Adams	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Operating Houses and Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident opposes the landfill site and objects to it will operate 24/7 so close to their home. <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident has concerns for their family's and community's health. <p><i>Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident identifies they has not been consulted despite being hugely affected by the proposal.
31	Zac Adams	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Similar Site in Close Proximity and Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident identifies there is already another dump in the area (Wallgrove Road Site) and this is impacting upon them. • Resident believes another proposed site 120m from their home is not acceptable.
32	Peter Camilleri	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Asbestos and Experience</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned plastic used to wrap asbestos may be comprised when it is being compacted or run over by trucks, excavators or dozers. Resident is also concerned the proponent has not suitably dealt with what they will do to ensure asbestos will not become airborne when seals are broken. Resident is concerned when asbestos is broken up, fibres may be released into surrounding soil/concrete/bricks and there are no mechanisms to deal with this situation other than burying it. Resident believes the proponents existing site is not an asbestos dump and as a result, residents cannot rely on the proponent experience to accommodate their asbestos dumping proposal in Minchinbury. <p><i>Dust – Operating Hours and Researched Levels</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned dust management may does not look at dust management outside of normal operating hours, even though residents may be exposed to dust 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Resident identifies proponent is using dust levels gained from a St Mary's monitoring station during the construction of the M7 when no dust control measures were adopted and is concerned the proponent is using these levels to support higher levels of dust in area and their increased effect in the area. <p><i>Company Numbers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned regarding the company numbers of the proponent in main application not matching the name state and believes this would raise concerns to the hidden purpose behind these false statements. <p><i>Consideration of Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proponent has not given the factors affecting the surrounding areas the respect they deserve.
33	Stephen Napret	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Green Waste Treatment – Smell and Others in Surrounding Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identities they do not agree with a green waste recycling facility component as there is already one at the waste management plant on Wallgrove Road, they smell and another is not needed. <p><i>Property Values and Compensation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified the value of the houses in the area [Minchinbury] will go down and who will compensate them [affected residents].
34	Alan & Jeanette Foster	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Exhibition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the public exhibition of documents during the Christmas break and holiday period is suspect. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Buffering</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the quarry is 500m from Minchinbury homes and believes 6 lanes of M4 motorway which separates the quarry from Minchinbury is a considerable distances and is still far too close to the residential

		<p>area.</p> <p>Operating Hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the operating hours are against a December 2006 query letter regarding the operating hours written by Mr Chris Biggs – Group Counsel & General Manager for the proponent. <p>Dust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the activities proposed will create a lot of dust during construction and operation and the mist spraying seems a temporary measure. Resident believes there will be an increased level of dust on windows and outdoor furniture as a result of the development and dust may be carried to Minchinbury homes by Westerly or Southerly Winds. <p>Resident Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the communication process has been poor with little information given by either the proponent or local MP. <p>Community Focus Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the focus group of 18 people out of over 5000 residents was not adequate community consultation. <p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the anticipated onsite workforce of approximately 49 could hardly be considered a great employment opportunity for residents.
35	Otto Stichter & Associates on behalf of Sargents Charitable Foundation Pty Ltd	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Odour, Noise, Pollution, Traffic, Contamination from Leachate Dams. Landfill Levels, Height of Archbold Road, SEPP 59 and Draft Western Sydney Employment Hub SEPP. Refer to full submission from Otto Stichter & Associates.
36	O'Keefee Family	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Health Issues, Property Values, Odour, Noise and Sanatory Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the proposal will cause a number of health issues, loss of value to their homes, odour, noise and sanitary issues due to increased wildlife. <p>Odour, Noise and Dust – Health Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there will be an increase in irritants and allergens from odour, noise and dust from concrete, contaminated soil, road millings, green waste, sand, virgin excavated natural materials, asbestos and lead affecting the families and neighbours health. Residents identify watching father, mother and son fight cancer and do not want anyone else to suffer from illness due to the operations from this facility Residents believe there will be floating particles from asbestos and contaminated soil, leading to

		<p>respiratory problems and therefore will require medical treatment from the NSW Health Department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe scavenger birds will congregate in the landfill areas and these will carry disease as they fly over their homes and excrete disease infested faeces into their homes, creating a strain on the NSW Health Department. Residents identify the proponent's St Peters premises have had numerous complaints due to the amount of odour emanating from the plant. Residents believe the landfill activities occurring until 6pm will contribute to noise while residents are trying to relax with their families. Residents identify Minchinbury residents and surrounding areas suffer from the odour of the WSN Environmental Solutions Site at Eastern Creek, Enviroguard at Erskine Park, M4, M7 and Great Western Highway. Residents believe houses backing onto Archibald Road will hear the trucks rumbling down the road, will collect dust and when it rains form a concrete slurry covering roads and property. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe they will lose the value of their homes and refer to a British study in 2003 claiming properties near landfill decreased by 7% due to their reduced attractiveness from dust, smells and noise. <p>Communality Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify they or any other resident they have contacted have not been approached to participate in consultation by the proponent <p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are concerned particulate liquids, contaminated medical or chemical wastes will be dumped there and asbestos will not be disposed of incorrectly by contractors ignoring the guidelines for the disposal of such products. Residents are concerned materials may leachate from the proposed site and damage local waters. <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify living within 120 m from the boundary of the proposed site.
37	Glen Clarke	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Dust, Noise and Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the 'tip' must not go ahead as there will be unbearable dust and noise and their house price will go down.
38	David McDonald	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Amenity, Health, Dust, Noise and Emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident opposes the development based on amenity, health of the local community, dust, noise and other emissions.

		<p><i>Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes dust levels including silicates have greatly increased over the past few years; likely from the considerable industrial development has proceeded north of the Prospect Water Pipeline between Mamre Road and Eastern Creek. • Resident believes dust may be generated through the transportation of materials to and from the site which will be increased by trucks carrying loads uncovered, covered dusty loads and wet materials drying and becoming dusty. • Resident believes they are entitled to live free from dust particles consisting of silicates, asbestos and cancer causing contamination. <p><i>Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes noise will exceed levels enough to wake residents at night, do not take into account the frequency spectrum of noise, reversing signal noises and sound of dump tipper trucks emptying their noise. • Resident is concerned the site being half the distance of Hanson's, the volume of noise will be around quadruple of Hanson. <p><i>Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the proposal will add to the existing congestion on the M4, Wallgrove Road and M7. <p><i>Leachate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes ammonia, TPH, PAH, metals, BTEX, chloroform, fluoride, Phenols, Chlorinated Phenols, Nitro-Benzene and other toxins/dangerous chemicals used on site may leachate as a result of dust control measures. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Schools and Hospitals</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the proposal is too close to residences, schools and hospitals. <p><i>Alternative Use for Site</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes site should be blasted and landscaped to create a gentle depression with a lake or wetland. • Resident believes the shallow wetland would provide a means to clean leachate from the site and potentially provide a habitat for wildlife. <p><i>Endangered Flora</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident identifies the proponents of the development found large Cumberland Plain land snail on the site and believes there may also be Grey Headed Flying Foxes in the area as familiar to residents and other wildlife (including rare) may have been missed.
39	Peter Macallef	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Noise, Dust, Health Problems, Obnoxious Gases and Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the proposal will be detrimental to their community due to increased noise, dust and health

		<p>pollution, obnoxious gases and odour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there are obnoxious odours from current waste disposal area forcing their family to remain indoors. <p><i>Harm and Inconvenience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will be harmful and inconvenient to the community and will destroy their area.
40	Ernie Apostolas	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies having health concerns in regards to the materials being dumped. <p><i>Noise, Smell, Dust and Debris</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the environmental impacts with regards to noise, smell, dust and debris. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is worried about the possibility of declining property values. <p><i>Alternative Use</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site could be better served by turning it into a nature reserve and value adding to the area.
41	Helen Agoroudis	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Homes and Health Risk</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is located too close to their homes and poses a very real health risk. <p><i>Traffic, Noise and Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident also believes there will be an increase in traffic, noise and dust.
42	Jodie Tyburski	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Asbestos, Noise, Vermin and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they are concerned about asbestos, noise created by trucks, vermin and the decrease in the value of their properties.
43	Paul Ramos	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health and Wellbeing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states they object to the proposal based on the health and well being of their family.
44	Martin Nikic	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health and Wellbeing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states they object to the proposal based on the health and well being of their family. <p><i>Property Value, Dust, Traffic and Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states they are also concerned about depreciation of property value, dust, traffic and noise generated by the facility.
45	Deborah McDonald	<p><u>Objection:</u></p>

	(Form Letter)	<p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Schools</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they do not need a waste facility where they live and where their children go to school. <p><i>Other Waste Facilities in Close Proximity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies a waste facility under construction and one at Eastern Creek in Industrial Zoned areas and not residential.
46	Richard McDonald (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Schools</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they do not need a waste facility where they live and where their children go to school. <p><i>Other Waste Facilities in Close Proximity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies a waste facility under construction and one at Eastern Creek in Industrial Zoned areas and not residential.
47	Anthea Ord	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health, Lifestyle and Financial Impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states they are strongly against the project for health, lifestyle and financial reasons.
48	Robert Wilson	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Quality of Life, Noise, Dust, Health Problems and Vermin</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will reduce their quality of life with noise, dust, causing health problems and vermin. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they have worked hard for their home and believe the project is too close to their home.
49	Gary Borg (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health, Lifestyle and Value of Property</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes application will result in a detrimental effect on their family's health, lifestyle and property value.
50	Daria Walker (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health, Lifestyle and Value of Property</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes application will result in a detrimental effect on their family's health, lifestyle and property value.
51	Joseph Surace	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Cumulative Impact of Waste Facility in Close Proximity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the area already has a waste facility within 3km of the proposed site. <p><i>Smell and Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they do not need another stinky and noisy waste site in the area. <p><i>Traffic and Impact on Surrounding Transport Infrastructure</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies Wallgrove Road is already chocked with trucks destroying road surfaces are not maintained by local council to a satisfactory condition. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes land values in the area are already dropping due to bad council maintenance and this construction will add to the problems.
52	Ian Numan	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Dust, Asbestos and Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states he does not want his suburb to be filled with dust, asbestos and noisy machinery, etc <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident states he does not want this in his own backyard so close to Minchinbury.
53	Mr Zennett	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Value of Property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they he has lives in area for more than 50 years, is believes they are being treated like dirt and if approved, the value of his property will be reduced.
54	Mr Travenzano	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies he lives very close to the M5 and the proposed 'tip' <p>Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the 'tip' will produce a terrible smell.
55	Imelda Palces	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they live in close proximity to the proposed landfill site. <p>Health, Lifestyle and Financial Position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will greatly affect the health, lifestyle and financial position of residents. <p>Long Term Medical Problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their sister was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2005 and is on continuos medications. Other residents are also known to have cancer. Cement ashes and asbestos may not help her recovery and might act to aggravate their conditions and increase incidents of illness.
56	Carlos Habibeh	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the proposal is relatively close to their place of residence. <p>Odour and Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will have a profuse scent, lead to increase machinery noise and interrupt them as they work from their home.

		<p><i>Health Risks and Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there is a health risk accompanies this development and various dust diseases. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will decrease the value of houses in their area.
57	Robert Nad	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health, Noise and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the increased health risks as a result of the proposed landfill, increased noise and a decrease in property values.
58	Mary Bonello	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Similar Facility in Area and Smell</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a similar facility in Eastern Creek and believes the land fill will create an awful smell on most day.
59	James Wonson	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposed facility should not be allowed so close to a residential area. <p><i>Noise, Dust, Odour and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the impact of the proposal includes noise, dust, odour and decrease in property values within the Minchinbury Area.
60	Elizabeth Palombo	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they need to look after the needs and well being of their family and does not want them developing cancer as a result of the proposed development.
61	Rachel Esler	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Primary School, Residential and Commercial Buildings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is very close to the primary school, residential and commercial buildings in the area. <p><i>Health Hazards</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there are health hazards associated with the proposal as many including children could easily inhale chemicals. <p><i>Value of Property and Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes other issues include the value of property and strong smell of chemicals which both attributed to the proposal.
62	Romeo Cayabyab (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be substantial traffic and noise from the landfill given its proximity 120m from homes, operating 24/7 360 days per year, with trucks entering the site, cars and trucks of employees causing disturbance, machines crushing concrete and other machines placing waste in the quarry. <p><i>Dust, Health and Rodents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the dust from the proposed site will be of a health issue to children and the population at large. Insects, rats, mice and landfill birds are also contributed to the proposed site and being of a source of possible health concerns. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes house values near landfill will depreciate and house values have already depreciated causing concern to residents in Minchinbury and nearby areas. Resident draws reference to the Stevenson Road Closed Landfill in the City of Casey, Victoria where the government found negative impacts as a result of landfill including house values.
63	Andra Vultureanu	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Smell</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the smell of the already built garbage collection point next to the Eastern Creek racing course is already affecting residents. <p><i>Dust, Noise and Hazardous Materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the dust, noise and hazardous contaminating waste are major reasons for their concerns. <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies as a mother of two young children who attend the local school, she feels responsible for their future as well as the rest of the family. <p><i>Alternative Sites</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal could be relocated.
64	Angela Heckenberg	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes too many of the solutions or suggestions for reducing dust, odour and noise from this project rely on the operator following the suggested measures without question and they believe this does not always happen. <p><i>Asbestos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies Camden and Belrose landfill reject Asbestos products as a security waste but questions why it is allowed to happen here. <p><i>Health and Financial Costs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the community will face a rise in respiratory diseases as a result of the proposal and related concerns and wonders if the proponent will cover their health costs of the Australian Government.

65	Lubomira Selever	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Children, Hazardous Material, Asbestos and Lead</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they strongly object to the siting of the dump adjacent to the Minchinbury residential area, which has mostly families with young children, which is intended for toxic materials such as asbestos and lead etc. <p><i>Asthma, Allergies, Autism, Dust, Rodents, Flying Insects, Scavenging Birdlife</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies many children already have respiratory diseases (asthma), allergies, autism, dust, rodents, flying insects, scavenging birdlife activity and the proposal will increase health hazards. <p><i>Noise and Neurological Problems</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes noise in the area from the larger dump trucks and bulldozers 24/7 would interfere considerably with amenities for the children could result in neurological problems and will downgrade the environment for local residents.
66	Wendy Adams	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they are worried about the smell of the proposal, as there is another smelly dump nearby and the smell becomes particularly bad in the summer and they have to close their windows. <p><i>Asbestos and Value of Property</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the dumping of asbestos outlined by the proposal and the possible devaluation of their properties of up to 20% as a result of the proposal. <p><i>Blasting and Fires</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified they were worried about blasting and fires during the operation of the proposed development. <p><i>Operational Period</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident was worried that the proposed development would be operable for 20-25 years.
67	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Asbestos and Monitoring</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the proposal is within 120 metres of the Minchinbury housing estate and they have witnessed first hand the dangerous methods of asbestos removals by home manufacturers. Resident is concerned littered pieces of asbestos would be taken too the Dial-A-Dump site and gone unnoticed by their trained staff.
68	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they already have a rubbish 'tip' nearby and when there are Easterly breezes they have bad odours and resident is concerned the proposal will intensify this in the form of [smelly] Southerlies.

69	Anonymous	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Asbestos and Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes asbestos as part of the proposed development will leak out and become airborne along with cement dust. <p><i>Odour, Fumes and Dust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes odour, fumes and dust will be a hazard as a result of the proposed development and will affect the health of young children, the elderly and the unborn. <p><i>Rock Quarry in Area, Similar Facility in Area and Previous Proposal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they already have a rock quarry in the area producing dust, they already have a garbage 'tip' and this proposal was rejected in 2006 and wouldn't make a difference in 2009. <p><i>Scale of Development and Future Scale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal was too large and too close to residential housing and may grow to an uncontrollable scale in the future.
70	Maria Rosorrun	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is too close to the residences of Minchinbury.
71	Miss B Conyard	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Area, Health and Sense of Place</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is too close to Minchinbury, they have severe asthma and they moved to the area as it was a clear, green oasis and they do not want to have to move away.
72	Dion Huet	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the 4 hour a day operations means their family and lifestyle will be affected by noise. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Property Value and Asbestos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their property is the nearest to the 'tip' and they will experience the full effects. Resident believes their property value will decline due to its position in relation to the proposal and that asbestos should not be dumped so close to a residential area. <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their son is very unwell and do not want anything may further jeopardise his health.
73	Vanessa McDonald	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health. Dust and Asbestos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will affect the health of their family and young daughter due to dust, air born silicates and asbestos. <p><i>Noise</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be increased noise as a result of the proposal and identifies being woken by trucks at night operating at Hanson's whilst in their front room. <p><i>Cumulative Impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the neighbourhood already has one 'tip' and questions how they will contend with another.
74	Kirsten Lester	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Lifestyle, Health and Financial Position</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal if it goes affect will affect their current lifestyle and future health and financial position.
75	Laura Wentworth	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Properties and Schools, Health, Financial Position and Lifestyle</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the waste facility is in very close proximity to their homes, schools and families, posing a risk to health, financial position and lifestyle.
76	Ryan Sicat	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Properties and Schools, Smell, Health and Asbestos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they live about 2km from the area of the proposal and is concerned about the smell, health hazards from airborne asbestos and different kinds of chemicals very close to residential properties and the many young kids at Eastern Creek Public School.
77	Trent Adams	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Property Values, Disease, Toxic Fumes and Runoff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes their house value will decrease and there will be an increase of germs, diseases, toxic fumes and airborne diseases spreading due to the elevated area, strong southerly winds and rainwater runoff. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes placing the proposal no more than 2km away from residential areas being within 700m is not smart.
78	Diane Holcroft	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes they are treated like lower class citizens; the proposition does not take into account the health risks of the proposal on the young families living in the area. <p><i>Odour, Noise and Dust – Cumulative Impacts</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identifies there are smells coming from the tips already present in the surrounding suburbs, noise from the Eastern Creek Raceway and dust blowing in from the freeway and highway. <p><i>Appropriateness of Location</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the area of Minchinbury should not have been zoned residential given the level of

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about dust which may be again exacerbated by Southerly winds. <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident highlights their child has life threatening health issues and does not want anything to jeopardise their child's health.
81	Theo Alexandrou	<p>Objection:</p> <p><i>Sense of Place, Noise, Dust, Hazardous Waste, Vermin and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they have a family and they believe the proposal will completely destroy the atmosphere of the suburb, leading to increased noise, dust, hazardous waste, vermin and adversely affecting the value of property.
82	Erikar Eco	<p>Objection:</p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Suitability of Location</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is too close to homes and there are plenty of other places where the proposal could be placed away from residential areas.
83	Josefina Cayabyab (Form Letter)	<p>Objection:</p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be substantial traffic and noise from the landfill given its proximity 120m from homes, operating 24/7 360 days per year, with trucks entering the site, cars and trucks of employees causing disturbance, machines crushing concrete and other machines placing waste in the quarry. <p><i>Dust, Health and Vermin</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the dust from the proposed site will be of a health issue to children and the population at large. Insects, rats, mice and landfill birds also contribute to the proposal being a source of possible health concerns. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes house values near landfill depreciate and house values have already depreciated causing concern to residents in Minchinbury and nearby areas. Resident draws reference to the Stevenson Road Closed Landfill in the City of Casey, Victoria where the government found negative impacts as a result of landfill including house values.
84	Anonymous	<p>Objection:</p> <p><i>Proximity to Properties and Hazardous Materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned the proposal is too close to properties, the hazardous nature of materials accepted e.g. asbestos and lead and the hours of operation i.e. all day/night operational nature. <p><i>Asbestos, Contamination, Vermin and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the wrapping of asbestos as stated in this proposition may not be sufficient as the packaging used may deteriorate releasing particles and contaminating the soil. In addition, asbestos may be

		<p>hidden in other normal waste and be exposed to the elements creating dust particles causing lung diseases in residents and problems to wildlife and plants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes there will be an increased presence of vermin such as mice, rats, termites. • Resident is concerned about the health and wellbeing of people with allergies as a result of the proposal e.g. dust and the environment. <p><i>Maintenance of Site</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents believe problems can arise when steps used to measure safety become damaged by the elements and no measure can be completely safe. Another Issue raised is how will these measures and wastes in the case of a plant shutdown or becomes non operational. <p><i>Unmeasurable Factors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes there will always be unknown and unmeasurable factors to be considered. <p><i>Sense of Place and Stigma</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes these negative feelings will stay with residents and undermine their individuality and sometimes it is a part of themselves and the only thing some people have. • Resident believes other residents would not be happy if their estate and surrounding areas were thought of as a "Waste Dump". <p><i>Odour and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes many waste facilities are not placed in areas due to odour and property values even though there may be land for such a site.
85	Kerry Bradbury (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the site is very close to their house and many other houses in the Minchinbury estate. <p><i>Allergens, Dust and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident is concerned about the allergens and dust travelling over the M5 and be spread by cars and trucks and the impacts these will have on the health of their child. <p><i>Leaching</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident is concerned about contaminates leaching into local creeks and damage this will cause to the environment. <p><i>Groundwater</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident is also concerned about the groundwater supply if collection and pumping of groundwater seepage and rainfall infiltration is not correctly maintained. <p><i>Road Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident believes the road leading into the site is not adequate and the intersection of Old Wallgrove Road and Wallgrove Road is dangerous at present.

		<p><i>Another Similar Facility in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a 'tip'/waste recycling facility on Wallgrove Road and this development emits disgusting odours and is further away than this proposal. <p><i>Community Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they have not been consulted, nor has anyone they know including the Minchinbury Public School P & C which they are on.
86	Bob Hayward AAP Corporation Pty Ltd on behalf of Sumy (Tesrol Holdings)	<p><u>Objection:</u> Right of Carriageway, S94 Contributions, Existing Access Handle, Noise, Drainage and Final Landform. Refer to full submission from AAP Corporation Pty Ltd.</p>
87	Nazir Khan	<p><u>Objection:</u> <i>Noise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believed noise was already an issue to Minchinbury residents because of the M4 and noise from trucks, particularly early in the morning and believed the proposal would add to this. <p><i>Asbestos and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believed asbestos was an issue, having health impacts and would place a burden on an already struggling health system. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believed property values would decline in Minchinbury as a result of the proposal. <p><i>Odour</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believed the proposal would smell and this would be unbearable and drew reference to putrescible sites around the local area.
88	Craig Stanford (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u> <i>Dust, Dirt, Noise and Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will lead to increases in dust, dirt, noise and pollution and does not want their children growing up beside this. <p><i>Asbestos and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about asbestos and other building waste which they believe could affect the health of thousands of people. <p><i>Infestations, Contamination and Accumulation of Toxins</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about on the onset of rodent, mice and insect infestations as a risk, the contamination of soil and vegetation and the accumulation of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to the residents of Minchinbury.

		<p><i>Reputation of Area, Property Values and Standard of Living</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the reputation of the area will suffer and this will reduce property prices and their standard of living.
89	Ryan Stanford (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Dust, Dirt, Noise and Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will lead to increases in dust, dirt, noise and pollution and does not want their children growing up beside this. <p><i>Asbestos and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about asbestos and other building waste which they believe could affect the health of thousands of people. <p><i>Infestations, Contamination and Accumulation of Toxins</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about on the onset of rodent, mice and insect infestations as a risk, the contamination of soil and vegetation and the accumulation of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to the residents of Minchinbury. <p><i>Reputation of Area, Property Values and Standard of Living</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the reputation of the area will suffer and this will reduce property prices and their standard of living.
90	Yvonne Stanford (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Dust, Dirt, Noise and Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will lead to increases in dust, dirt, noise and pollution and does not want their children growing up beside this. <p><i>Asbestos and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about asbestos and other building waste which they believe could affect the health of thousands of people. <p><i>Infestations, Contamination and Accumulation of Toxins</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about on the onset of rodent, mice and insect infestations as a risk, the contamination of soil and vegetation and the accumulation of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to the residents of Minchinbury. <p><i>Reputation of Area, Property Values and Standard of Living</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the reputation of the area will suffer and this will reduce property prices and their standard of living.
91	Rachael Lay (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Dust, Dirt, Noise and Pollution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will lead to increases in dust, dirt, noise and pollution and does not want their

		<p>children growing up beside this.</p> <p>Asbestos and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about asbestos and other building waste which they believe could affect the health of thousands of people. <p>Infestations, Contamination and Accumulation of Toxins</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about on the onset of rodent, mice and insect infestations as a risk, the contamination of soil and vegetation and the accumulation of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to the residents of Minchinbury. <p>Reputation of Area, Property Values and Standard of Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the reputation of the area will suffer and this will reduce property prices and their standard of living.
92	Tenneille Stanford (Form Letter)	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Dust, Dirt, Noise and Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will lead to increases in dust, dirt, noise and pollution and does not want their children growing up beside this. <p>Asbestos and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about asbestos and other building waste which they believe could affect the health of thousands of people. <p>Infestations, Contamination and Accumulation of Toxins</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about on the onset of rodent, mice and insect infestations as a risk, the contamination of soil and vegetation and the accumulation of toxins accumulating and carrying through the air to the residents of Minchinbury. <p>Reputation of Area, Property Values and Standard of Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the reputation of the area will suffer and this will reduce property prices and their standard of living.
93	Tony Carny	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes noise will be an issue with the proposal operating 24/7 360 days per year with trucks entering the site, machines crushing concrete and other machinery processing waste and identifies they can easily hear the cars racing at Eastern Creek which is further away than the proposed site and therefore believes they will be able to hear any noise generate from the proposed site. <p>Dust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified Blacktown City Councillors at Dial-A-Dump's St Peters site was extraordinary and identifies the proposed development is only 120m as the crow flies from the closest Minchinbury home.

		<p><i>Dust, Vermin, Hazardous Materials and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes increased dust, vermin, hazardous waste materials such as asbestos and lead based products as a result of the proposal, may cause health issues particularly to young children and questions how the proponent can guarantee health could not be compromised. <p><i>Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies research undertaken by the Minchinbury Residents Action Group has proven their property values will decrease by at least 20% as a result of the proposal. <p><i>Similar Facility in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they already have a rubbish 'tip' in nearby Eastern Creek and questions, if the proposal is approved, why they be penalised by another.
94	Gayle Gurney	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Similar Facility in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is a similar facility to Wallgrove Road and smell associated with this. <p><i>Air Pollution, Insect Populations and Property Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal would lead to increased air pollution and insect populations reduced property values. <p><i>Sense of Community, Dust, Noise and Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identified they moved to Minchinbury 9 years ago because it was beautiful, quiet and community based and they believed kids will not be able to run outside, play or walk to school due to increased dust, noise and truck traffic. <p><i>Asbestos and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal will bury asbestos underground and this could lead to cancer clusters. They draw reference to a cancer council link supporting this argument.
95	Debbie Robertson	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Houses and School</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is too close to Minchinbury, being 500m from houses and a school. <p><i>Operational Times</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the operational times as part of the proposal would have an adverse affect on the quality of life for people in the Minchinbury area with noise arising from diesel motors operating the plant, increased volume of trucks and the crushing plant. <p><i>Toxins and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there are health and environmental issues as a result of the proposal, due to the materials being uses as landfill including airborne toxins, contaminates soils and plants which because the land is upward, residents would be subjected to increased airborne dust coming from stockpiles, trucks and

		<p>crushing. They believed this would lead to respiratory illness.</p> <p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes employment opportunities have been grossly overrated as part of the proposal. <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there has been a lack of property consultation with residents as part of the proposal and incorrect publishing of the final plan meaning the public has not had an ample time to review. <p>Alternative Facilities in Area and Elsewhere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the existing facility at Eastern Creek as part of the proposal could easily accommodate green waste in a different manner and other materials could be despised of at other sites. <p>Waste Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there is no waste management plan as part of the proposal. <p>Runoff and Leachate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the leachate containment system as part of the proposal is inadequate. Resident believes adjoining the site does not get the runoff and a major concern relates to the leaching of toxins.
96	Minchinbury Residents Action Group	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p>(submission 1)</p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the proposed location is too close to the residential suburb of Minchinbury and thousands of families. Residents believe the proposal falls into the definition within 'Environmentally Sensitive Areas' as referred to in Schedule 1 of the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> and is inappropriate as it is covered by "Part B: Residential Areas" - a landfill site within 250 metres of a residential zone or a dwelling, school or hospital not associated with the facility. Residents refer to Drake & Ors; Auburn Council v Minister For Planning And Anor; Collex Pty Ltd [2003] NSWLEC 270 as a similar case brought by a group of residents against a new waste facility. Residents refer to the Clyde Waste Transfer Terminals consent granted by the Minister and was subject to more than 130 stringent conditions imposed by the Minister after wide consultations with the local community about their concerns regarding the proposal. <p><i>Operational Times</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the operational times of the proposal do not reflect the current NSW DECC noise pollution control guidelines for work. Residents believe the proponent's assessment report does not take into account wind levels or wind direction

		<p>and noise assessments were made during the day and not between 6pm and 1pm or 2am on weekends (hours of operation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify the application has raised sleep disturbance as a potential issue and for working residents this is a major concern. <p>Property Prices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify they have already suffered as a result of the global economic slide and have obtained information from a Real Estate agent who has advised Minchinbury residents their property value will decrease significantly if the NSW Government approves this landfill in close proximity to residential areas. Residents refer to various national and international case studies dealing with methane affected homes and compensation, reduced attractiveness based on dust, smell and noise and 10%-25% reductions in home values. <p>Dust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe dust will be increased with the deterioration of truck driving racks, increased concrete stockpiles, increased level of landfill and increased levels of pollution from the trucks entering the plant and on site operations. Residents believe the sprinklers used to suppress dust will at times fail and there are no backups identified. <p>Leachate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there is no evidence in the proponent's assessment report to support an open quarry base. Residents believe the statement 'clogging can be prevented by good system design' does not give a guarantee to the community. Residents believe whether or not the base is porous and required lining must be determined by third party stakeholders. Residents believe the stench produced by 'garbage juice' would be intolerable. <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify many construction and demolition employees have advised the Action Group they always throw their food waste into the skip bins with other construction/demolition waste and over many months, this food waste will accumulate to high levels. Residents question how the proponent intends to monitor putrescible waste when it enters the landfill site and who will monitor, separate the waste and regulate whether the site will become putrescible Resident believes the current land fill at St Peters attracts many ibis and this facility is not approved as a putrescible landfill. Residents question how general food waste will be taken off site and who would be able to police and regulate this promise? Residents believe the NSW Government should take into account Clause 51 of the Protection of the
--	--	---

		<p>Environmental Operations (Waste) Regulations 2005 in the assessment of this proposal.</p> <p>Asbestos and Demolition Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are concerned about the asbestos fibres present at three major landfill sites and are worried asbestos wrapping will be broken due to mixing which involved an excavator mulching the landfill. Residents believe the plastic wrapping encasing asbestos will deteriorate when placed in the landfill through holes exposing fibres into the air. Residents identify WorkCover NSW has completed a guide for industry on asbestos in soils and believe they are working on a new guide for industry which deals with the ongoing issues connected with asbestos in recycled construction materials and believe any building materials contaminated with asbestos are not to be reused unless they are decontaminated. Residents identify Veolia (Collex) at Horsley Park, Brandown at Kemps Creek and SITA at Elizabeth Drive all accept asbestos and other hazardous waste and have not reached full capacity. <p>Green Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe despite the definition of green waste not being putrescible in NSW, residents have found a definition in a response to a discussion paper prepared by WSN Environmental Solutions that includes green waste as putrescible. Residents believe only certain types green waste will not produce odour and most will produce leachate, methane, carbon dioxide and other obnoxious gases through the decay process of green waste. Residents believe if the process of phytocapping is not created by choosing correct plants and solid depth, then the green waste will cause a foul odour. Residents believe Biomagic is a new product and this system has not been proven over a long period to neutralise odour created by rotting green waste. Residents believe adequate methods of sorting food waste products from construction and demolition skips must be addressed and documented in the final report with regular environmental assessments carried out to ensure these sorting methods are in place for the life of the development. <p>St Peters Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the adverse impacts relating to this proposal cannot be compared to their St Peters Site. Residents then identify Dial-A-Dump has told Sydney City Council their St Peters Site receives asbestos. Residents also identify that the proponent has not notified WorkCover NSW that asbestos is being received at the St Peters Site. Residents identify the current landfill operator has had complaints lodged against them by Minchinbury residents in relation to beacons and plant creating noise outside DECC permitted times, blasting when not permitted and diverting the creek that has destroyed habitats. <p>Employment</p>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the original application submitted to the application stated 120 jobs would be created and the assessment report states only 30 would be created. This could change again. Residents believe there would be no more than 10 direct employees employed from the current landfill recycling operations in NSW and in line with the current economic as one plant operator can operate numerous pieces of plant as required. Residents believe the contractors currently engaged would not increase the number of employed persons in NSW as they would come from the building/constriction and recycling industries with the majority of those people employed currently anyway. Residents believe there is a low percentage of unemployment in their community and operators and drivers are the lowest placed occupations in Minchinbury. As a result the residents believe the occupational classification of Minchinbury residents do not fit the requirement for these positions vacant. <p><i>Assessment Report, Community Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents identify they have had key concerns for the past 3 years and believe a selection of 18 residents from a population of over 5000 does not address the DG's requirements for community consultation as required in correspondence with the Department on 25.06.2006. Residents also identify there has been no community consultation with the neighbouring Erskine Park who will also be affected by this proposal. Residents believe the assessment report is incomplete and is missing sections 16.3, 16.3.4, 16.8.2, 17.8.2, 17.8.3 and 17.9.3. Residents believe pg 305 of the assessment report indicates there is no information relating to Minchinbury employment is available from the 2006 census. However, this information is available from the ABS website for public download. Residents believe the proposal does not protect and preserve bushland within urban areas as required by SEPP No 19. Residents believe Dial-A-Dump staff members have sabotaged their community website and they were politely moved from the site and this cannot be considered consultation. <p>Refer to full submission from the Minchinbury Residents Action Group</p> <p>(submission 2)</p> <p><i>Similarity to Last Proposal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the application in it's original form has been resubmitted to the Department for approval and none of the concerns raised by the local member Ron Moore or DECC have been addressed. <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas and Community Facilities</i></p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe there a lack of environment systems and the fact that the development is less than 500 m from homes, sporting field and local primary school. <p>Asbestos and Hazardous Material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents are concerned about asbestos and other carcinogenic substances. <p>Amenity and Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents believe the proposal will spoil the amenity of residents and potential purchases.
97	Christopher Nathan (Received Late)	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise, Odour and Rubbish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their property is one of the closest to the proposed site and noise, smell and other pollutants may carried through the air towards Minchinbury. <p>Rubbish, Property Values, and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the types of rubbish and materials to be dumped in the proposed site and believes land values in the area will drop significantly along with the potential health hazards for their family and neighbours.
98	Tara and Steven Farrugia (Received Late)	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Asbestos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned the proposed site would handle asbestos and identifies their grandfather died of asbestos related cancer 6 months ago. <p>Property Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they purchased their home in August 2008 and are unnerved by the possibility of yet another factor that could be detrimental to their homes value. <p>Allergies and Heath</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies many members of their family have allergies and are worried the proposal may accentuate respiratory problem, allergic reactions and other health problems. <p>Odour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies the smell of the Eastern Creek 'tip' is on some days unbearable and the proposal being a 'tip' would smell. <p>Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies on a quiet night they can hear the trains at Mt Druitt station, cars at the Western Sydney International Raceway and believes they will be able to hear the machinery working at the proposed 'tip'. <p>Alternative Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The resident believes a more useful way of using the quarry would be to turn it into a reservoir for rain water.

99	Verma Cayabyab	<p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proximity of the landfill to residents will kill residents and community life. <p>Possible Alternative Use for Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes a consideration of alternative environmental planning measures, policies and laws that would not impinge on the health of human beings and animals would be appropriate.
100	Levy Zapanta (Form Letter)	<p>General Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident objects to the proposal.
101	Romy Cayabyab (Form Letter)	<p>Size of Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident objects the size of the proposed development - "2 million cubic-feet landfill and tip".
102	Bob Hutton	<p>Proximity to Residential Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they live approximately one and a half kilometres west of the quarry and believe they will be adversely affected by the proposal. <p>Awareness of Proposal and Submission Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes few of their neighbours are aware of the proposal and as it has been put forward during the Christmas holidays, there were few people who had the opportunity to comment. <p>Hazardous Materials, Air Quality and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies their son is a cancer survivor, a paraplegic and has reduced lung function. They are worried the reduction in air quality from the introduction of hazardous materials. <p>Rodents, Odour, Noise and Property Value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes there will be increasing numbers of rodents, odour, noise and a possible reduction in their property value. <p>Inability to Relocate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies it will be difficult to relocate given the need for wheelchair friendly access and the fact they are low income earners receiving the carers pension.
103	Alison Osmon	<p>Proximity to Residential Areas, Air Pollution and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the proposal is too close to homes and may cause air pollution that may affect the health of their child. They question whether the Government can guarantee their child's health and safety will not be at risk.
104	Pritika Manocha (Form Letter)	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site is very close to their house and many other houses in the Minchinbury estate. <p>Allergens, Dust and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the allergens and dust travelling over the M5 and be spread by cars and trucks and the impacts these will have on the health of their child.

		<p>Leaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about contaminates leaching into local creeks and damage this will cause to the environment. <p>Groundwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about the groundwater supply if collection and pumping of groundwater seepage and rainfall infiltration is not correctly maintained. <p>Road Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the road leading into the site is not adequate and the intersection of Old Wallgrove Road and Wallgrove Road is dangerous at present. <p>Another Similar Facility in Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a 'tip'/waste recycling facility on Wallgrove Road and this development emits disgusting odours and is further away than this proposal,
105	Kim Esmaili (Form Letter)	<p>Objection:</p> <p>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site is very close to their house and many other houses in the Minchinbury estate. <p>Allergens, Dust and Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the allergens and dust travelling over the M5 and be spread by cars and trucks and the impacts these will have on the health of their child. <p>Leaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about contaminates leaching into local creeks and damage this will cause to the environment. <p>Groundwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about the groundwater supply if collection and pumping of groundwater seepage and rainfall infiltration is not correctly maintained. <p>Road Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the road leading into the site is not adequate and the intersection of Old Wallgrove Road and Wallgrove Road is dangerous at present. <p>Another Similar Facility in Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a 'tip'/waste recycling facility on Wallgrove Road and this development emits disgusting odours and is further away than this proposal. <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they have not been consulted, nor has anyone they know including the Minchinbury Public School P & C which they are on.
106	Kristina Fava	Objection:

	(Form Letter)	<p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site is very close to their house and many other houses in the Minchinbury estate. <p><i>Allergens, Dust and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the allergens and dust travelling over the M5 and be spread by cars and trucks and the impacts these will have on the health of their child. <p><i>Leaching</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about contaminates leaching into local creeks and damage this will cause to the environment. <p><i>Groundwater</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about the groundwater supply if collection and pumping of groundwater seepage and rainfall infiltration is not correctly maintained. <p><i>Road Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the road leading into the site is not adequate and the intersection of Old Wallgrove Road and Wallgrove Road is dangerous at present. <p><i>Another Similar Facility in Area</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a 'tip'/waste recycling facility on Wallgrove Road and this development emits disgusting odours and is further away than this proposal. <p><i>Community Consultation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they have not been consulted, nor has anyone they know including the Minchinbury Public School P & C which they are on.
107	Liahne Papworth (Form Letter)	<p><u>Objection:</u></p> <p><i>Proximity to Residential Areas, Noise and Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the site is very close to their house and many other houses in the Minchinbury estate. <p><i>Allergens, Dust and Health</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about the allergens and dust travelling over the M5 and be spread by cars and trucks and the impacts these will have on the health of their child. <p><i>Leaching</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is concerned about contaminates leaching into local creeks and damage this will cause to the environment. <p><i>Groundwater</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident is also concerned about the groundwater supply if collection and pumping of groundwater seepage and rainfall infiltration is not correctly maintained. <p><i>Road Infrastructure</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident believes the road leading into the site is not adequate and the intersection of Old Wallgrove Road

		<p>and Wallgrove Road is dangerous at present.</p> <p>Another Similar Facility in Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies there is already a 'tip'/waste recycling facility on Wallgrove Road, this development emits disgusting odours and is further away than this proposal. <p>Community Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident identifies they have not been consulted, nor has anyone they know including the Minchinbury Public School P & C which they are on.
AGENCY SUBMISSIONS		
A	Blacktown City Council	Refer to full submission from Blacktown City Council.
B	Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee Roads and Traffic Authority	<p>1. Access across the M4 boundary is denied</p> <p>2. The applicant will be required to enter into a future planning agreement for appropriate contribution towards regional road/transport improvements and level of funding is to be agreed to prior to the issue of a construction certificate.</p> <p>3. Prior to the release of the construction certificate, the RTA requires the current land owner to enter into and execute a deed/planning agreement with the RTA for the contribution towards regional road improvements.</p> <p>4. The applicant should also into a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) either with the Department of Planning or Blacktown Council (or both) as may be appropriate to fund future local infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Note: The RTA understands the cost of future signalisation of Old Wallgrove Road and the Right of Way (Private Road) or the road which replaces it will be included as part of the costs encompassed by the above-mentioned VPA or pending Section 94 contributions.</p> <p>4. The Department of Planning is to ensure the existing Right of Way (ROW) is only to be used until such time as an alternative Precinct Plan road is constructed through the Australand property.</p> <p>When the alternative Precinct Plan road is constructed, the applicant will be required to create and construct any new vehicular connections to the Precinct Plan road.</p> <p>5. The Department of Planning is to ensure the proponent will keep and maintain the current road as a two lane carriageway and will seal it with bitumen, line mark it with a centreline and provide appropriate signage until the Precinct Road is constructed.</p>

		<p>The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including driveways, grades, turn paths, sign distance requirements, aisle widths, and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS2890.1 – 2004 and AS 2890.2 – 2002 for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>7. Parking provision to the Department of Planning's/Councils satisfaction.</p> <p>8. All works/regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development shall be at no cost to the RTA.</p>
C	Sydney Catchment Authority	<p>The Sydney Catchment Authority (SCA) does not consider this project is likely to impact on any of its assets including the Prospect Reservoir and the Warragamba Pipelines. Consequently the SCA will not be making a formal submission for this project.</p>
D	Hazards Branch Department of Planning	<p>A special DECC licence for the site is likely to be required to landfill asbestos. Other safety requirements for asbestos would most likely be in the DECC regulations and WorkCover regulations.</p> <p>Possible condition:</p> <p>1. "Receiving, handling and landfilling of asbestos shall be in accordance with the requirements of DECC and WorkCover".</p> <p>The proposal refers to unacceptable waste such as chemicals etc being quarantine on site until an adequate quantity is collected and then removing it offsite for responsible disposal.</p> <p>Suggested conditions:</p> <p>1. The quantity of any quarantined waste retained on site can be classified as a dangerous good under the Australian Dangerous Goods Code should be kept to a minimum. If the quantity is likely to exceed the threshold quantities set out in the Department's publication, <i>Applying SEPP 33</i>, the applicant must notify the Director-General and lodge an application to modify the conditions of approval.</p> <p>2. Prior to commencement of construction, the Applicant must consult with the NSW Fire Brigades with regard to the proposed fire fighting measures and implement any recommendations made by the Fire Brigades.</p>
E	Transgrid	<p>TransGrid has no right or interest in the land or any other TransGrid Board-approved proposal which would affect the land. Therefore, no comment will be offered nor any objection raised.</p>
F	Sydney Water	Wastewater

	<p>There are currently no wastewater services to the site. Sydney Water has no plans to construct any wastewater services to the site within the next 5-10 years.</p> <p>The site drains to St Mary's Sewage Treatment Plant (STP). To connect this wastewater system the proponent would be required to carry out detailed investigations and modelling to develop a sewer servicing plan for Sydney Water endorsement. As a result, amplification and augmentation of the system may be required.</p> <p><i>Sydney Water Servicing</i> Sydney Water will assess the impact of the proposed development when the proponent applies for a Section 73 Certificate. This assessment will enable Sydney Water to specify any works required as a result of the development and to assess whether amplification and/or changes are applicable. Sydney Water requests the Department continue to instruct developers to obtain a Section 73 Certificate from Sydney Water.</p> <p>The developer must fund any adjustments needed to Sydney Water infrastructure as a result of a development. The developer should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator to get a Section 73 Certificate and manage the servicing aspects of the development. Details are available from any Sydney Water Customer Centre on 13 20 92 or Sydney Water's website at www.sydneywater.com.au</p> <p>The proponent will need to provide a detailed water and wastewater servicing strategy for Sydney Water's approval when they apply for a Section 73 certificate. The servicing strategy must include potable water, non-potable water, domestic and trade water requirements, and any impacts the development will have on Sydney Water easements or assets.</p> <p><i>Asset Protection</i> Protecting public health, maintaining water quality (including ground water) and managing flows are critical issues for Sydney Water and form part of Sydney Water's Operating Licence requirements. The following comments relate directly to the protection of Sydney Water assets.</p> <p><i>Existing Infrastructure</i> Adequate provisions need to be made to protect any key infrastructure from the adverse impact of the proposed development during road construction, pipeline crossings and earthworks.</p> <p>During the construction of any new infrastructure, the passage of heavy construction vehicles and machinery over the existing mains will need to be appropriately managed. All affected mains, in particular those under road crossings, must be encased in reinforced concrete to ensure that services are not disrupted.</p>
--	--

		<p><i>Sydney Water Pipeline Easements</i></p> <p>For any existing and future water pipeline easement, the proponent must meet the following minimum requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pavements and driveways an not be made of concrete, asphalt is acceptable- Trees must not be planted on any part of the pipeline easement, shrubs are acceptable- The surface level of the easement must not be changed. <p><i>Landscaping Requirements</i></p> <p>Certain tree species can damage Sydney Water pipes and other infrastructure. These species have significant biomass and/or invasive root systems that can cause cracking or blockage of pipes. Pipe damage increases the risk of sewage overflows, and increases maintenance costs. Enclosed is a list of tree species of concern to Sydney Water that developers should avoid when landscaping the site.</p> <p>Water Conservation Measures</p> <p>Sydney Water encourages the developer to consider the water saving measures: Installing 3 star WELS rated water efficient showerheads, 6 stat WELS rated water tap outlets, 5 star WELS rated urinals and 4 star WELS Rated toilet cisterns to all amenities in the proposed development. The performance criteria for the WELS rating are listed below:</p> <table><tr><td>Shower heads</td><td>9 litres or less per minute</td></tr><tr><td>Basin tap outlets</td><td>4 litres or less per minute</td></tr><tr><td>Urinals</td><td>1 litre per flush</td></tr><tr><td>Dual flush toilet suite flush equivalent</td><td>4.5/3 litre flush cistern or approved dual flush equivalent</td></tr></table> <p>Further information of water conservation measures can be found on Sydney Water's website.</p>	Shower heads	9 litres or less per minute	Basin tap outlets	4 litres or less per minute	Urinals	1 litre per flush	Dual flush toilet suite flush equivalent	4.5/3 litre flush cistern or approved dual flush equivalent
Shower heads	9 litres or less per minute									
Basin tap outlets	4 litres or less per minute									
Urinals	1 litre per flush									
Dual flush toilet suite flush equivalent	4.5/3 litre flush cistern or approved dual flush equivalent									
G	Ministry of Transport	<p>It is understood that the small number of future employees to the site will be located within walking distances to bus Route 739, which provides a 30 minute all-day service between Mt Druitt Station and Minchinbury. This service is proposed to be maintained under the draft integrated network plan for Region 1, which includes the subject site.</p> <p>It is understood that the proposal is consistent with planning for Eastern Creek Precinct, having regard to the future road network. Given that the proposal is not a significant employment generator and has access to frequent public transport services, the Ministry has no objection to the matter proceeding.</p>								
H	DECC	Refer to full submission from DECC.								

I	DWE	<p>The DWE still has concerns about the assessment for the proposal, as it has not addressed the protection and rehabilitation of vegetated riparian corridors on the site, or potential groundwater licensing, as part of the proposal.</p> <p><u>Protection of Watercourses and Riparian Lands</u></p> <p>Figures 1.2 and 1.6 of Table 6.2, in the Environmental Assessment (EA) indicated that parts of the Upper Angus Creek and Ropes Creek catchments are located within the subject site.</p> <p>The Department recommends the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The above watercourses be remediated and/or reinstated as a natural system (not hard engineering) with fully vegetated riparian corridors. • A Works Plan be required which includes details on all stream remediation and/or reinstatement and a vegetation Management Plan for the rehabilitation of fully vegetated riparian corridors. <p>The EA does not address this issue, and ignores that the riparian corridors on the site are to be protected and enhanced in accordance with the adopted <i>SEPP 59 – Eastern Creek Precinct Plan (Stage 3)</i> which includes the following relevant controls 5.6.1 (e), 8.3.5 (b), 8.4.3 (d):</p> <p>5.6.1 (e) Development adjoining riparian corridors and trunk drainage channels (including detention basins and wetlands) must include a 10m buffer zone consisting of a landscaped open space area that can tolerate occasional flooding.</p> <p>8.3.5 (b) When measured from the top of the bank on either side of the creek, development consent shall not be granted, except for development associated with the protection enhancement and management of the riparian corridor, on land within the precinct that is within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 m of Ropes Creek Tributary or • 10 m of Upper Angus Creek. <p>8.4.3(d) APZ's are to be located wholly within the development site, outside of any conservation area or riparian corridor.</p> <p>The riparian corridors should be protected and rehabilitated with fully structured local native riparian vegetation (trees, shrubs and groundcover species) at a density that would occur naturally.</p>
---	-----	--

		<p><u>Groundwater</u></p> <p>The EA does not include any requirement for existing and proposed groundwater monitoring bores to be licensed by DWE under Part 5 of the Water Act 1921 or that any water extraction, from the existing groundwater resources on-site, for reuse or disposal, is likely to require a licence under Part 5 of the Water Act.</p>
J	Department of Planning - Sydney West Regional Team (Received Late)	Refer to full submission from Sydney West Regional Team.
K	Penrith City Council (Received Late)	Refer to full submission from Penrith City Council.