

1: Odour pollution.

We, along with other residents in the immediate and surrounding area have had to endure high levels of odour pollution for several years now and the addition of a further noxious industry is unacceptable. There does not need to be high winds to cause drift of odours over a wide area as reported to and documented by, DERM, GCCC and Qld State Government.

According to documentation regarding this MCU, there are proposed to be numerous types of material processed by this plant that can only further add to the pollution already produced. The very large volume proposed to be processed is also of great concern.

2: Regulated Waste Recycling:

Refer Response 31, page 3, extract as follows:

"It is the intention of PPR to receive commercial packaged hazardous goods such as solvents, acids, alkalis and wastes from schools, universities and hospital laboratories for the purpose of storage consolidation OR blending and on-sending to facilities that can lawfully accept such wastes."

Ref Response Part 32 page 2, extract as follows:

"It is proposed the facility will receive, store and process 300,000 litres of flammable (class 3) liquid and 300,000 litres of toxic or infectious substances per annum"

This should not be given any consideration, it should be rejected totally. This aspect, storage, process and handling of up to 600,00 (litres) of extremely hazardous material as proposed here is extremely dangerous. The residents in this area of the YEA can not be subjected to these dangers. This type and scale of activity should be confined to areas away from ANY residential and recreational areas.

There have already been several accidents in the industrial area. One occurred in a waste plastic storage area on Lahrs Road that produced vast quantities of toxic and dangerous smoke requiring the evacuation of all surrounding buildings. This occurred with a small quantity of waste in comparison with that in this proposal.

It is, in our opinion, totally inappropriate to allow such an activity on this scale to be conducted at this site.

3: Crushing, Milling and Screening:

Ref DERM additional information request Part 3, extract from page 2 of file as follows:

"PPR propose to crush and screen concrete and green waste at the site. These activities pose a significant risk of causing noise and dust nuisance at neighbouring properties. The proposed dust controls of the crushing, milling and grinding activities such as using on-site water truck and water sprays have proved inadequate at a number of sites on the Gold Coast and hence are considered inadequate in areas where the activity may impact neighbouring premises"

We are in total agreement with DERM's concerns with these activities.

The statement in response by PPR regarding wind, as follows:

"During windy conditions, when the wind speed in the direction of sensitive receivers is in excess of 15km/hour, on-site mixing and movement of odourous waste materials will be lowered to a minimum or cease entirely to prevent release of odour that may under these conditions travel offsite and have potentially unacceptable impact in the vicinity of sensitive receivers" may be all well and good, however it is common knowledge that odours have travelled around this area to the detriment of residents, when there has been little or no wind occurring. These times of very low to no wind also mean that odours settle and remain in the area for extended periods.

4: Proposed Biomass Power Generation Plant.

Ref application documentation, part 30 page 3, extract as follows:

"The plant will initially consume 75,000 tons of waste (we understand this to be shredded native hardwood and soft wood shavings and green waste that is not suitable for composting). This will potentially double over the life of the facility"

Ref application documentation part 51 page 14, extract as follows:

"As per section 2.2, the appropriate noise criterion for the assessment of noise emissions that may occur 24 hours is 38dba external to surrounding residential dwellings' Residents should not have to endure this sort of constant noise for 24 hours a day.

Further to this, on the same page in table 2, it is also noted that another noise source will be the chimney stack which is to be 30 metres above ground level. This is not only another noise pollution source it is also proposed to operate 24 hours a day causing unacceptable background noise.

5: Conservation Linkage.

Ref information request 0g/02/2010, pages 5 & 6 extracts as follows:

The applicant is requested to provide a revised site plan which illustrates the provision of a 40 metre wide rehabilitated conservation corridor to the conservation area adjacent the northern boundary of the site! Will this be dedicated to the public open space and to Council as park" etc. The north east corner is identified as sustaining a state referable wetland area and requires a buffer distance of 100 metres (not just 40 metres).

From information *response* part 13 pdf-page 7:

It is noted on the site plan "that in lieu of the 40M requested for northern boundary, 20M has been allowed; in N/E corridor a variable 70/100M buffer has been allowed in lieu of the 100m requested; western and southern boundaries ~10~ in lieu of 20M buffers, which would have resulted in 40M wide linkage corridors between neighbouring properties.

This is the 4th (fourth) consecutive MCU application seeking to reduce the already small green space in the *conservation* area map LAP 29.3. Reliance is placed on these maps by residents proposing to relocate to these areas and, as such, Council adherence is expected.

6: MSW Facility.

It is noted that PPR has withdrawn its proposal to conduct sorting, segregation and recycling of municipal waste. However we also note that PPR intends to submit at a later date a new application surrounding the operation of the MSW sorting, segregation and recycling facility.

We consider that the type size, size and scope of this facility to be most unsuitable for the proposed location so close to residential land bringing with it increased heavy road traffic, noise and odour pollution, heightened danger from hazardous and toxic waste potential for a major disaster such as fire and/or explosion from stored and processed flammable liquids, this proposed facility is simply not acceptable so close to residential estates.

There are already many problems associated with existing heavy industry in this area such as the quarrying activities and to add another of such magnitude would be intolerable to residents. We therefore ask that Council seriously consider rejecting this *proposal*, insisting that the applicants locate to a far more suitable location that will not impact so much on residents.