

Jeffery and Helen

RE: D492-17 Waste Recycling and Transfer Facility 52 Anderson Road, Smeaton Grange

Dear Sir / Madam

We object to the DA application for the resource recycling facility at Smeaton Grange on the following grounds.

(1) The impacts on the nearby residents and businesses such as Sporting Facilities, Dance Studios, Cafés, restaurants or the nearby Child Care Centre in Smeaton Grange have all been ignored.

(2) Proximity to local residents and noise - in today's modern society many people are required to work shift work. With a facility this close to residents the noise alone will create problems for those people trying to sleep before or after a shift, as well as the young families with small children trying to sleep. Currently we are able to hear the noise from the Coles Warehouse which will be adjacent to the proposed recycling plant. We hear the reverse alarms on forklifts and trucks as well as alarms from the Coles Building. To be able to comply with Australian Standard 4801 the equipment used must have appropriate alarms to alert workers of a machine starting. This noise along with the noise of material being dumped, moved around, crushed and the noise of the vehicles will be at an unacceptable level. The noise created by trucks unloading ballast, bricks, concrete, bitumen and other products at 10pm will not be reduced by the proposed dirt mounds and walls.

The opening and closing times that material will be accepted is totally unacceptable for a suburban environment. The operating times that are in the application are seven days a week, up to 16 hours per day. There is no guarantee that these times will be adhered to, if waste comes in after these times Benedict's won't turn the truck away as they will be losing money.

(3) Odour emissions - although Benedict claim that there will be no odour they will be accepting garden waste and soils. They do not readily decay under standard conditions however the local area gets very hot in the summer months and under these conditions there will be an odour as well as the possibility of a fire caused by spontaneous combustion, as has happened already at a similar facility in the Southern Highlands. If this was to occur the proposed facility is within a known bushfire prone area which again poses an unwanted risk to local residents.

(4) Effects on local traffic is another concern. Although Benedict has now amended its hours of operation the effect will be significant. With the additional vehicles, most of which being heavy vehicles, the extra traffic through Smeaton Grange during the morning and afternoon peak will cause concerns for an already busy thoroughfare. Already during peak times the traffic banks up from Camden Valley Way all the way back to the BP Service station on Anderson Road and beyond. With the additional traffic from Benedict's vehicles this will add considerably to the traffic congestion as it is the trucks that take so long to get onto Camden Valley Way due to the slight incline at the intersection with Anderson Road. This road is a vital thoroughfare for a lot of local residents and the additional travel time is not an acceptable outcome for anyone. The noise of these heavy vehicles as they apply their brakes at all of the roundabouts as they enter Smeaton Grange will disturb not only the sleeping children at the local Day care facilities, but also local businesses and sleeping shift workers. The other consideration here is where will the heavy vehicles park while waiting to unload? I have worked in the transport industry and know only too well that trucks are very rarely on time and you will always have a backlog waiting to be loaded or unloaded. Truck drivers while they wait will sit in their trucks and leave them idling so that they can keep cool and comfortable while they wait. This will add to the noise in the local area as well as block the roads for residents trying to get to and from work, sporting commitments or other business in the local area.

(5) The impact of dust to the local residents is unacceptable and was not addressed in the recent flyer put in the local residents mail box from Benedict. This is because they know they can't adequately control the dust. The storage and handling of the proposed materials will create significant levels of dust and due to the close proximity of the facility to residents this is an unacceptable risk. I have worked with many different materials in my time that create dust and there is no simple solution that adequately controls the spread of dust. Local residents are currently being covered in dust from the land developments that are a lot further away than the proposed recycling plant. This will stop shortly when all the houses are built but the recycling facility will be there

for a lot longer and subject residents to a health risk. Many of the local residents, including myself grow our own fruit and vegetables. Having this produce covered in dust from the recycling plant is an unwanted health risk that we should not be subjected to.

(6) Benedict's ability to control contaminants is unacceptable. They are proposing that each load is visually inspected prior to unloading and then a second inspection once unloaded. If there are contaminants found the material is to be reloaded and removed from site. If there are contaminants found during the second inspection that is too late. The contaminants are already airborne or spread by dust and wind, or if it is raining washed into the storm water system. The land that the processing plant is proposed on back onto the local creek. The increased residential developments higher in the catchment has added stormwater to the system. This has increased the potential of flooding more around close to the creek potentially including the Benedict site.

With the type of materials that are expected to come through the plant there will be the possibility of asbestos coming through in either the rail ballast or the building materials. No one can guarantee this will not occur. If this does occur with the close proximity of the facility to residents how can we be assured that firstly it is reported and cleaned up according to regulations, but most importantly residents are not put at risk. Recently the Bargo Waste Treatment centre was shut down due to an asbestos scare, which shows that it can happen and will happen at some stage.

(7) This proposal is simply in the wrong area. State Government and Camden Council should not accept this application due to its close proximity to residents. There are other areas that would be more suitable that are not in close proximity to residents. Benedict already have a facility at Chipping Norton that is only 28 minutes away and a newly opened site at Wollongong only 45 minutes away that they can utilise. If this development is allowed to go through it shows a total lack of respect for local residents and their concerns.

Benedict's are assuming/or have been guaranteed that this project will be approved. Below is a piece from their website stating that the facility will be open in 2018. How can this be when it is before the planning and assessment commission. No answer has been given either way, yet the arrogance of Benedict is shown clearly here by stating their new facility will open next year. Given the opposition from local residents and Council members it would be morally irresponsible for this proposal to be approved. There are many other sites that would be acceptable for this type of development away from residential areas such as the Erskine Park area where there would be little to no opposition to such a development.



Regards

Helen and Jeff