

DP/14/00039 – APPENDIX 3

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

A full copy of each submission is attached at Appendix 3A.

Main Points <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 211 (+ 1 late) submissions received• 210 (+ 1 late) objections received• 1 supporting letter from subject land owner• 1 petition received containing 1,372 signatures (590 York ratepayers and 782 from surrounding towns and visitors)
Main reasons for objections are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal is not consistent with any State, regional and local strategic plans and policies, including the Town Planning Scheme, Local Planning Strategy and Community Strategic Plan.• Use of prime, productive agricultural land for a landfill.• There will be no benefits for the York community as a result of the proposal.• There is no strategic context for the proposal. The State government should be responsible for managing Perth metro's waste.• The proposal will impact on amenity, heritage and lifestyle.• The proposal will contaminate and pollution land, water, air and surrounding farms, nature reserves and National Parks.• Concerns that the liner integrity cannot be guaranteed and it will rupture and leak.• The site is located in the catchment area that will result in pollution of drinking water and ground water.• Impacts on natural disasters and local weather events, including earthquakes, high winds and flash flooding on infrastructure.• Impacts of additional large trucks using the Great Southern Highway• Impacts on nearby farms, particularly on stock, stock water supplies, bio-security and organic status.• Impacts on tourism – road users, such as motorbikes and vintage cars and perception by tourists.• Impacts on flora and fauna as a result of clearing, increased vermin and pests.• Lack of ability for local volunteer emergency services to respond to incidents.• Concerns that the size and/or classification of the facility will be modified in the future.• Concerns regarding inconsistencies in documents provided to the Shire, EPA and DER.• Better alternative sites available utilising rail for transport and existing mine pits.• Landfill technology is out of date and there are better alternatives.• Concerns for legacy and impacts for future generations.

NAME, ADDRESS & SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION
1. L Brent-White, York <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strong objection• Community opposes• Environment• Traffic impacts and risk and road condition• Affect lifestyle• Use rail• Alternative location• Economic decision
2. J.M Adams, York <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Food growing area• Land pollution

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground water pollution • Liner leakage and rupture • No Metro waste • Support for wind farm
3. V Bertrand, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Tourism • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Environmental • No metro waste • SAY NO • SAVE YORK
4. W & A King, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong objection • Ground water pollution • Surface water pollution • Pollution of Thirteen Mile Brook and catchment • Liner leakage and rupture • Earthquake risk Zone • Air pollution • Disturbance of habitat • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Impact on local economy • No benefit to York community
5. M Fitzgerald, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Risk to road users
6. G Walker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises concerns • Type of rubbish • Size of facility • Impact on farming • Ground pollution • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition
7. J & K Oliver, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demands application be placed on hold • Requests strategic state waste management plan • Opposes EPA failure to assess • Supports objectives of Town Planning Scheme • Supports Policies and Guidelines (Federal, State and Local) that oppose the destruction of prime agricultural land • Supports development of a state wide policy and practices for waste management • Impact on tourism, farming • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Supports local knowledge of Geology and Hydrogeology • Opposes removal of kaolin • Opposes broadening scope of proposal • Supports nearby landowners • Supports Landcare and conservation • Supports the community of York
8. J Barnard / Lambert, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I wish to strongly protest against the proposal • Road Issues

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthquake risk Issues • Liability
9. Y Dols, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong objection • Opposes the purchase of prime farmland for a toxic industry • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Proximity to catchment areas • Earthquake risk • Dust pollution • Noise pollution • Loss of amenity • Impacts on local drinking water quality • Lifestyle impacts • Impacts on wildlife • WHO WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE for any impacts • Leachate ponds drying • Requests strategic state waste management plan • Proposal TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE • REJECT this proposal.
10. D O'Hara, Saint Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes Metropolitan waste • Environmentally sensitive farming land • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Earthquake risks • Pollution of 13 mile Brook • Pollution of drinking and stock water • Opposes overflow of effluent into the 13 mile Brook. • Air pollution • Impacts on organic farmers • Impacts on Mount Observation • Potential damage to flora and fauna • Danger to animals • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Inappropriate site • York is an Agricultural and tourist town, not a metropolitan rubbish tip.
11. A C Dodds, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in favour of proposal • Forrest is designated as a "Water Catchment Area" • Pollution to waterways • There is always the possibility of a major disaster!
12. J & B Marwick, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Emissions • Dust Emissions • Odour Emissions • Noise Emissions • Light Emissions • Discharge to water • Discharge to Land • No recycling plan • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition
13. P Findlater and A Hucker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally against proposal • Requests Councillors do not support proposal in any form • Proposal is against why people live in York • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Will affect York's reputation if pollution occurs • Impacts on tourism • Fire risk • Earthquake risk • Liner leakage and rupture • Air pollution • Odour • Please represent us (and the silent majority).
14. F & B Schreuder, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Express deep concern about the proposal • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Impact on environment • Earthquake risk • Ground water pollution • Surface water pollution • Air pollution • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Impact on economy • Metro waste has become a State problem • Better alternative sites available • Use of rail for transport, including Tier 3 railway lines • Recycling opportunities
15. F & E Parker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95% of the Shire is not in favour of the proposal • Approval will unquestionably result in the York Community feeling powerless • Consequence an approval will have on Councillor/resident relationships • Detrimental effect on community morale and pride • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition
16. G Cail, Northam
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deeply concerned about two landfill proposals – Toodyay and York • Unique heritage towns – preserved and enhanced to develop tourism • Impacts on tourism • Impacts on agriculture • Surface water pollution • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Suggests rail transport • Decrease land values • Suggests SITA could purchase additional 'buffer zone' hectares to help minimise the impact on local residents. Conditions to revegetate these buffers.
17. B Jordan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Register complaint about proposal on pristine farmland • Alternative sites available • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition
18. B Harffey, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally against proposal • Don't want elected representatives support proposal in any way • Effect on entire community's quality of life • Effect on heritage significance • Proximity to National Park • Water catchment area • Landfill is an act of pollution • Urges not to support this armageddon • Stand up for the community

19. K Edis, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes proposal • Earthquake risk • Soil pollution • Water pollution • Land contamination • Dust pollution • Proximity to 13 Mile Brook • Odour • Fire risk
20. R Paton, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns against proposal • Earthquake risk • Liner leakage and rupture – Government Policy against landfill on coastal plain • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy • Incorrect information provided by SITA • Risk to 13 Mile Creek and ground water • Flash flooding • Extreme weather affects • Air pollution • Breach of the Rights in <i>Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> • Pollution from leachate ponds • Breaches by SITA • Air pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna • Impacts on revegetated waterways • Impacts on food production area • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition
21. Talbot Brook Land Management Association Inc. (Attn: C Cable)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on revegetated waterways • Location undermines the Department of Water Strategic Statement 2007 • Hydrologists, geologists and engineers conclude proposal is risky • Questions amount of research carried out by applicant • Impacts on tourism • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Landowners have the right to live in an area unpolluted • Pollution of drinking water
22. T Saunders, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with objectives of State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Impacts on tourism • Alternatives to handballing the metro waste problem to York • Suggests use of rail for transport
23. T Burbridge, Mundaring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mundaring Residents & Ratepayers Association Inc. against proposal • Too close to catchment boundary • Pollution of water supply • Earthquake risk

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire risk • Air pollution • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Truck movement estimates appear conservative • No restriction to daytime operation; could add a night shift and double truck movements • Metropolitan Local Government Review Panel recommended all Perth waste be transported only by rail.
24. O Van Mechelen, Talbot
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly objects to proposal • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Location of the site too close to creeks and water catchment. • Earthquake risk • Air pollution • No benefit to York • Unrealistic expectations for local business opportunities • Concerns of future expansion accepting highly toxic waste • Fire risk • Questions capability of local volunteers to respond to incidents • Air pollution
25. F Hughes, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with objectives of State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land. • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
26. K & J Andrews, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Pollution of the environment – no guarantees • Groundwater pollution • Air pollution • Fire risk • Impacts on wildlife • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Suggests rail transport • Alternative sites available • Proponents to accept full responsibility, if not facility should not be approved.
27. J Oliver, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research on reuse and recycling at Murdoch Uni. • Allawuna is a mistake. • Inconsistent with State government policy to reduce to zero
28. C & M Chipper, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal should not have got this far? • No benefits to our community. • Stop it ever happening. • Submitted to DER strongly objecting to proposal. • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Proximity to National Park and Water Catchment area • Landfill is outdated. • Cheapest option for SITA • Air pollution • Dust pollution • Water pollution • Liner leakage and rupture

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthquake risk • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Cheapest option for SITA • Questions SITA's record • Suggests alternatives available to landfill
29. W & J Durbin, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Affects lifestyle and reasons for living in York • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Effect on organic farms nearby • Cheapest option for SITA • Suggests alternative sites available
30. K Famlonga, V & N Langlands, Saint Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly objects to proposal • Affects lifestyle and reasons for living in York • Effect on farming activities • Visual impact • Odour • Air pollution • Ground and water pollution • Water availability for Fire risk fighting • Affect population growth and economic development of York • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Decrease in new farming opportunities • Suggests alternative solutions • Majority of York residents and visitors against proposal • Council members should not allow a change in zoning
31. K Shannon, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes proposal • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Air pollution • Groundwater contamination • Loss of amenity • Earthquake risk • Fire risk
32. V & P Kopke, Peppermint Grove (York landowner)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Air pollution • Land contamination • Pollution of water supplies – drinking and stock • Liner leakage and rupture • Earthquake risk • <i>Biosecurity and Agriculture Management Act 2007 (BAMA)</i> – threatens quality of produce and potential fines for farmers. • Fire risk • Limited resources of volunteers responding to incidents • Water catchment area • Suggests alternative solutions available • Suggests alternative sites available • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Impacts on heritage significant of York • Acknowledge community's strong objection to proposal and not grant an approval

33. S & S Preece, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against proposal • Liner leakage and rupture • Earthquake risk • Water pollution • Air pollution • No recycling proposed • Fire risk • Landfills damage our environment • Effect on health of people, livestock, pets and bird life
34. Chairman of the River Conservation Society Inc., York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Society opposes proposal • Earthquake risk • Liner leakage and rupture • Leachate dams fail • Surface water pollution
35. T Moffat, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes proposal • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Road upgrade required
36. L O'Hara, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes proposal • Proximity to Mount Observation • Proximity to Mundaring Water Catchment area • Proximity to Wambyn Reserve • Impacts on birds and animals • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Impacts on lifestyle • Air pollution • Odour • Pollution of drinking water • Pollution of ground water • Liner leakage and rupture • Fire risk • Capacity of volunteers to respond to an incident • Earthquake risk • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Increase in feral animals • Noise pollution • Questions SITA's record
37. P & H Green, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal should be denied planning approval • Inappropriate to allow proposal in an environmentally sensitive and fragile area. • Inconsistent with main pursuits in York i.e agriculture, tourism and recreation • Inconsistent with the Wheatbelt Region Plan (2010-13) • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Impacts on adjoining properties • Visual impacts • Water pollution • Air pollution • Odour • Noise pollution

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No economic benefit for the majority • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Site has been chosen in response from a directive of the former DEC • Figures about employment are clearly over stated. Suggests employees will not be located in York.
38. K Davies, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution • Dust pollution • Ground and surface water pollution • Pollution of drinking and stock water supplies • Land contamination • Impacts of leachate
39. C Luelf, Talbot Brook
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very opposed to proposal • Decrease in land values • Air pollution • Leakage • Traffic impacts and risk
40. J Barrett-Lennard, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
41. Mr & Mrs W Borthwick, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme • Opposes use of agricultural land • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill will destroy environment for future generations • No benefit to community • Traffic impacts and risk
42. A Clements, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to York • Detrimental to rural activities, tourism and road safety • Do not allow proposal to proceed • Do not leave a rubbish legacy for future generations
43. G Dean, President Mt Helena Residents & Ratepayers Association (Inc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Proximity to water catchment area • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Traffic impacts and risk • Failure to address recycling and waste management

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is a commercial venture by SITA • Fails to address metro area waste problem
44. A Theelen, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly objects to proposal • Inconsistent with objectives of agricultural area • Impacts on tourism • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to the community • Requests proposal to be stopped
45. L Christmas, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Proximity to water catchment area • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Proximity to St Ronan's and Wambyn Nature Reserves • Proximity to 13 Mile Brook • Air pollution • Fire risk • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Impacts on natural resources and environment • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Impacts on farming capability and food production • Impacts on flora and fauna • Air pollution • Surface and ground water pollution • Noise pollution • Traffic impacts and risk and road condition • Dust emissions • Earthquake risk • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Inappropriate land use in water catchment area • Impacts of asbestos burying • Leachate impacts • Inadequate buffers • Environmental impacts not properly assessed • Questions depth and permeability of clay • Impacts on agricultural potential of site • Management of bushland by proponent • Suggests strategic approach and alternative sites, including use of rail • Odour emissions • Risks of chemical storage • Impacts on tourism • Impacts on local farming activities, including organic farmers • Potential disillusionment and distrust with the Shire if approved • Majority of community against proposal • Suggests recycling could be a solution • Alternative sites more suitable • Precautionary principle should be applied
46. K Oliver, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totally opposes proposal • Lack of careful consideration of environmental issues • Risk of contamination of water, air, etc • Earthquake risk • Traffic impacts and risk • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts • Impacts on tourism • No economic benefit • Support research to find more viable sites and solutions • Seen opposition to proposal. • Councillors duty bound to represent community to stop proposal.
47. J Wykes, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises concerns about proposal • Traffic impacts and risk • Water pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna • Impacts on nearby farms, especially organic farms • Earthquake risk
48. A Dougall, Ascot (Landowner Talbot)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with priorities for agricultural land • Traffic impacts and risk • Odour • Dust emissions • Litter • Impact on amenity • Impacts on tourism • No economic benefit to York • Earthquake risk • Proximity to drinking water catchment and potential pollution
49. A Rowland, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Will adversely impact our lifestyle and business • Airborne emissions • Fire risk • Earthquake risk • Liner leakage and rupture • Flood risk • Surface and ground water pollution • Introduced horticultural pests e.g. fruit fly • Effects on wildlife • Application has many inaccuracies, incorrect assumptions and omissions • Proposal has a series of risks, many of them unacceptable risks • Shire should respect the rights of the community and reject the proposal • Proposal poses significant and uncertain dangers to the health and lifestyle of residents and business.
50. K & B McRoberts, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Construction and siting untenable from environmental point of view • Ground and surface water pollution • Earthquake risk • Proximity to national park • Effect on native fauna • Liner leakage and rupture • Unacceptable risk, no guarantees • Landfill technology outdated • Traffic impacts and risk

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire risk • Impacts on tourism • Proposal is an insult to people of York • 99% of the community against proposal • No guarantee jobs will go to people of York • Please listen to the overwhelming majority of York residents and reject proposal.
51. R Paton, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not want the landfill • Earthquake risk • Liner leakage and rupture • Land contamination • Proximity to 13 Mile Brook and water catchment area • Litter • Water pollution • Odour • Fire risk • Air pollution
52. L Bashford & C Meadmore, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly object to proposal • Impacts on lifestyle and farming operations • Proximity to Mundaring/Helena Catchment • Odour • Drinking water pollution • Air pollution • Noise pollution • Dust emissions • Visual impacts • Traffic risk and impacts • Fire risk • Capacity of and risk for volunteers responding to incidents • Increase in flies and other vermin • Lowering of water table from extraction of groundwater • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Will result in a population decrease due to impacts on lifestyle • Impacts on economic development and business • Will pursue compensation if approved as a result of loss of amenity and property devaluation
53. R McColl, Bunbury (Landowner St Ronans)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme • Opposes use of agricultural land for non-agricultural uses • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Landfill destroys our environment for future generations • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • No benefits to York • Impacts on tourism • Pollution of water at St Ronan's Well • Odours • Air pollution • Dust emissions • Ground water pollution • Vast major of community do not want the landfill
54. G & V Bertrand, York

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • No consideration of flash flooding impacts • Earthquake risk • Surface water pollution • Dust and particulate pollution • Pollution from leachate dams • Traffic risk and impacts • Risk of future expansion • Impacts on tourism • People will die, tourism will die, York will die • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Diminishes agricultural activity • Non-rural use that is detrimental • Adverse effects on adjoining land and local amenities
55. B Sinnatamby, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area and 13 Mile Brook • Earthquake risk • Traffic risk and impacts • No benefit to York • Should not be allowed in historic town
56. B Fallon, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity and should not be on agricultural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but destroys environment for future generations • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Health risk to residents, animals and flora • Dust pollution • Noise pollution • Traffic risk and impacts • Storage of chemicals risks
57. J & P Boston, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Traffic risk and impacts • Fire risk • Capacity of local volunteers to respond to incidents affected by issues such as inadequate mobile phone coverage • No benefit to York community • Should not be allowed in historic town
58. A Scargill, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Inappropriate to allow a noxious industry in an environmentally sensitive and fragile area • Inconsistent with main pursuits of York, ie. agriculture, tourism and recreation • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Shows no benefit to the district • Is detrimental to the natural and rural environment

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on amenity • Odour pollution • Noise pollution • Visual impacts • Impacts of truck movements • Impacts on reputation of heritage town and on tourism • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • SITA will attempt to use more of the farm than stated • Landfill will affect future generations • Impacts on tourism, businesses and economic development • Details of economic advantages for York are missing • Truck drivers will be located in Perth • Development will not benefit York, economically or aesthetically • Dust emissions, including toxic particles • Water pollution • Liner leakage and rupture • Proximity to water table, underground water and catchments • Drinking water pollution – requests assurances and will seek compensation • Traffic risk and impacts
59. L Burrows, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Inappropriate to allow a noxious industry in this environment • Inconsistent with main pursuits of York, ie. agriculture, tourism and recreation • York is an agricultural Shire and all documents say is for this to continue • Risk of contamination and gaining organic status • Air pollution • Attraction of vermin • Contamination of dams • Landfill is not an agricultural use and will damage the rural and natural environment • Impact on lifestyle. Lifestyle will be ruined. • Odour • Noise pollution • Will decrease property values by an estimated 20%. Local real estate agents already indicate property value has decreased. • Lot of documentation stating site is unfit for landfill from an environmental point of view • Landfill leakage risk • Risk of contamination • Fines don't deter big companies from polluting • No apparent advantage for York • Why should a heritage town take Perth's rubbish • Impact on tourism • Retirees will not continue to find York attractive to live • Landfill should not go ahead
60. J Darr, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Wrong to allow landfill in this environment • Inconsistent with main pursuits of York, ie. agriculture, tourism and recreation • Supports partner's (No. 59) submission. • Put forward my no vote.
61. K Hack & P Mossop, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operate an organic farm and registered as a sensitive site by Dept of Agriculture • Believe Shire and Government should support agriculture and tourism enterprises and not support a damaging proposal. • Toxic dust emissions

- Fire risk and impacts
- Odour and noise pollution
- Earthquake risk
- Precautionary principle should be considered.
- SITA commented proposal is not expected to impact nearby organic farming.
- What happens to loss of property values?
- Loss of organic certification will have very serious consequences (quotes Steve Marsh case)
- Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
- It will compromise recreational use of Mt Observation
- Effects on adjoining residents have been ignored
- Rural character will be destroyed
- This is farmland not industrial land
- Traffic risk and impacts
- Community may never recovered from being turned into a rubbish town
- Visual impacts on rural character
- EPA commenced on unacceptability of the present 'ad hoc' approach to siting of landfills
- More suitable site needs to be found
- Massive error in SITA's groundwater level data
- Visual impact
- Data shows paleochannels flow into Helena drinking water catchment
- No way to handle refuse in 21st century

62. M Fleay, York

- Opposes proposal
- Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area
- Will approval set a precedent for similar use of agricultural land?
- Ground water pollution
- Liner leakage and rupture
- Proximity to 13 Mile Brook
- Pollution of drinking and stock water supplies
- Air and noise pollution
- Odour
- Earthquake risk
- Traffic risk and impacts
- Impacts on nearby nature reserves
- Landfill could jeopardise nearby rehabilitation initiatives
- Proposal is due to lack of forward planning by State government
- Few benefits to York will be outweighed by long term damage and effect on town and Shire

63. F Davies, York

- Proximity to water catchment and impacts on drinking water supplies
- Concerns regarding toxins and poisons leaching into groundwater
- Impacts on flora and fauna
- Traffic risks and impacts
- Earthquake risk

64. J Davies, York

- Oppose proposal
- Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
- No benefit to York, its community or its natural environment
- Landfill is not an agricultural activity
- Will impact neighbouring properties
- Does not provide for tourism
- Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan
- Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy
- Landfills have been documented for their noxious effects on the environment
- Proximity to water catchment area

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Proposal has caused enormous amount of stress, deep concern and conflict within the community • Detrimental impacts on agriculture and tourism • Site is bot illogical and unsuitable • Traffic risk and impacts • No water and power to the site • Air and dust emissions • Fire risk • Capacity of local volunteers to respond to incidents • Pollution of drinking water and stock water • Ground contamination • Liner rupture and leakage • Earthquake risk • Noise pollution • Litter • Flash flooding impacts • Precautionary principle should be used
65. K Schekkerman, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alleges misleading and incorrect information in SITA's documentation, particularly concerning the absence of environmental documents. • Shire should have received documents regarding new bores. • Important environmental information missing that could affect State's water supply. • Alleges various hydrology reports are incorrect. • Department of Water need to be involved. • Alleges AHD levels incorrect with regards to height of landfill. • Visual impacts • Inconsistent with the draft State Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Avon Sub-Regional Strategy • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • No benefit to the community. Negative elements outweigh the positives. • Ground water pollution. • Impact on nearby organic farms. • Leachate leakage and spillage potential. • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Earthquake risks • Odour • Need for landfill not demonstrated • Consider precautionary principle • Social and ethical implications • Urged to change York Town Plan to prohibit landfills • Impact on amenity and common law rights • Community should be indemnified in case of pollution • Shire should reject the application
66. G Lehmann, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
67. W Lehmann, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic risks and impact • No benefit to the community • Should not be allowed in historic town
68. D Davies, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
69. Antonia, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Ground and water pollution • Traffic risk and impact • Impact on wildlife and attracts feral animals • Air pollution • No way it can create jobs for York • Definite no for me
70. Whelans Town Planning on behalf of P Tilli (Developer/landowner Daliak Precinct)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Difficult to establish a clear, statutory town planning characterisation for proposal • Inconsistent with prevailing planning instruments • Geographical affects have not been considered in the proposal • Traffic risks and impact • Proponent acknowledges a 'risk of fatality' increase • Inconsistent with draft State Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy • Local Planning Strategy indicates more planning for traffic required • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme • Town Planning Scheme in need of review and makes no reference to waste management facilities • Application cannot be definitely claimed as consistent with the objectives of the zone • Should be considered as a Noxious Industry rather than Use Not Listed • Integrated plan for the region is required • Proposal is not consistent with orderly and proper planning, it is ad hoc
71. R & H Heinrich, Bindi-Bindi (former residents)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution • Impact on tourism

72. B Parker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact
73. R Karafil, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact
74. M Gibson & R Taylor, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Traffic risk and impacts • No benefit to York
75. P Ratcliffe, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
76. C Brown, Merredin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
77. J Thompson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
78. J Brewster, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
79. WA Davidson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Traffic risks and impact • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Should not be allowed in historic town
80. B Hill, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Use is consistent with “the type or class of activity of any other use”, therefore rezoning is required to special use zone requires as in many other planning schemes • Impact on visual amenity of landscape and rural character • Development likely to impact on natural environment • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Land use may not be compatible • Inaccuracy of hydrological calculations regards to permeation of leachate, found to be 13 years not 178 years as SITA states • Earthquake risk • Will result in soil erosion and degradation • Groundwater contamination • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the draft State Planning Strategy – proposal does not meet criteria identified for waste management sites • Inconsistent with Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy • Scheme Amendment No. 50 is not gazetted and has no place in consideration • Planning report fails to address most of the crucial issues regarding environmental impact • Landfill will be seen from nearest neighbours and will tower 25 metres above the ground • Impact on flora and fauna • Dust and particulate pollution • Odour • Noise pollution • Gas emissions • Litter • Impacts on groundwater and surface water quality • Liner rupture and leakage • Leachate leakage will equate to 2 x 44 gallon drums tipped into 13 Mile Brook daily • Consideration of precautionary principle and common law • Impact on amenity of nearby properties • Request application be refused
81. L Lee, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Environmental impact • York is a farming area, that should be left as a farming area
82. S Lee, Mount Helena
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Impact on native animal habitat • Water pollution
83. J Cornwell, E Brown & M Paunola, Mundaring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
84. I & S Mackenzie, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
85. G & K Davies, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Landfill is detrimental to the environment and has no benefit to the area. • Proposal has already adversely affected adjoining landowners • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • A landfill does not preserve or sustain it pollutes and destroys • Proximity to water catchment • Landfill will devalue surrounding properties • Landfill will contaminate Allawuna and the St Ronans area for hundreds of years • Impact on cultural significance of St Ronans Well • Impact on tourism • No guarantees tenders will be won by York businesses • Covenant on Allawuna to protect environment • Landfill located in a tributary of 13 Mile Brook • Water pollution • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy and Wheatbelt Land Use Planning Strategy • Landfill does not improve agricultural land but treats it as insignificant and unimportant • Landfill will not benefit the region • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Landfill has cause major conflicts within all sectors of the York community • Will cause contamination and degradation of agricultural land and loss of food producing land. • Members of Parliament have visited the site and have stated it will have an effect on scenic value. • Traffic risk and impacts • Noise pollution • Odour • Land use conflict

- Fire risk and impacts
- Capacity of volunteers responding to incidents
- Gas emissions
- Power generation into grid unlikely due to age of power lines
- Dust emissions
- Concerns regarding burying of asbestos
- Water supply not available
- Concerns regarding extraction of groundwater
- Impacts of flood events
- Concerns regarding location of bores and accuracy of data
- Too many unknown factors applicant has not addressed
- Liner leakage and rupture
- Impacts on fauna
- Earthquake risks
- Recommends indemnify insurance for Council. Residents may take legal action.
- Consideration of precautionary principle due to lack of extensive and conclusive information
- Not correct and orderly planning but ad hoc
- Reject proposal

86. J Ferro, York

- Oppose proposal
- Alternative sites than prime farm land
- Proximity to water catchment
- Pollution of food source
- No demonstrated need – other landfills could cater for metro waste
- Viable rail alternative
- Traffic risk and impacts
- Alleges lies, half-truths and omissions in submitted information
- Impacts on individuals, families, organic farmers, tourists
- Concerns regarding future expansion over the site
- Concerns regarding acceptance of hazardous waste
- Liner rupture and leakage
- Questions SITA's records regarding spills and leakage
- Proposed stormwater management will result in changes to flows and volumes downstream
- Impacts on previous regeneration projects
- Impacts of local flooding
- Toxic dust emissions
- Can Shire guarantee funds set aside for management of site for 40 years?
- Amenity impacts
- Impact on native plants and animals
- Proposal will have major ramifications for bio-security
- Threat of transmission of Salmonella and infecting people and stock
- Concerns regarding tree clearing
- Impact on flora and nearby nature reserves
- Alleges landfill will be sitting in the water table
- No economic or employment benefits to York
- Impacts on tourism
- Alleges facility will be a Class III landfill
- Metro waste should not become the liability of York
- Inconsistent with the Wheatbelt Regional Plan 2010-13
- Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan
- Fire risk and impacts
- Capacity of local volunteers responding to an incident
- Earthquake risk
- Impact on economic development
- Must consider precautionary principle

87. T & R Davies, St Ronans

- Landfill will impact farming property
- Water pollution
- Land and air quality
- Impacts on flora and fauna
- Government should protect farm land
- Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
- Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan
- Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy
- Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land
- Inconsistent with the Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy
- Local government has been instructed to include landfill as a prohibited use on agriculture zoned land. Application should have been rejected.
- Proximity to 13 Mile Brook
- Groundwater pollution
- Location is in a large paleochannel water recharge area
- Conflicting information from SITA with regards to use of water and water sources
- Impacts on revegetation projects and initiatives
- Pollution of drinking and stock water supplies
- Concerns regarding data used by SITA to design and construct dams and leachate ponds
- Impacts of local flooding
- Landfill leakage, suggests permeable reactive barriers required
- Ground and surface water monitoring should occur with Continuous Turbidity monitors
- Concerns about contamination and bio-security levy and fines.
- Impact on area being considered clean and green for food production
- Avon Valley now being included in WA Planning Strategy 2050 for food projection
- Impacts on national parks and nature reserves
- Proximity to catchment area
- Impacts of altered weather patterns
- Concerns regarding weather impacts on clay liners
- Who will monitor compliance of the site?
- Concerns regarding leakage and no mention of monitoring wells by applicant
- Earthquake risk
- Dust emissions during construction and from truck movements
- Odour
- Noise impacts
- Fire risk and impacts
- Gas emissions
- Unlikely power generated will benefit due to age of infrastructure
- Visual impact
- No demonstrated need
- Traffic impacts and risk
- Impacts on tourism
- Concerns regarding mistruths and misleading information
- Going to be affect for not only the 40 years, but for ever.

88. Gail D'arcy, York

- Object to proposal
- Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
- Landfill not an agricultural activity
- Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy
- Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan
- Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment
- No benefit to York
- Traffic risk and impacts
- Pollution of drinking water

89. F Dols, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Pollution of drinking water • Impact on flora and fauna • Air pollution
90. P Jenkinson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact
91. A Aamot, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution
92. D Steed, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Fine example of natural bush and farming land, worst place to start a large dump.
93. P Hendy, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impact on heritage and tourism • Water pollution • Traffic impact and risk

94. H Fuller, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution
95. C Grieves, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Bad for water and roads
96. B Francis, Gilgering
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution
97. L & R Howieson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution
98. J Wilkinson, York (Gwambygine Resident)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Air pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna • Proximity to Mundaring catchment

99. B Davies, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
100. R Martin, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Proximity to water catchment area • Traffic risks and impact
101. D Thornton, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
102. J & P Muller, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Proximity to water catchment area • Environmental disaster
103. D Black, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Proximity to water catchment area
104. J Russell, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic impact and risk • Water and environmental pollution
105. G Bond, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impacts on farming stability • Good farm land is scarce • Opposes land being used for landfill instead of food production
106. P Atkins, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Traffic risk and impact • Environmental pollution • Impact on flora and fauna
107. E Alman, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impact on wildlife
108. I Benaddi, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Water pollution
109. S Lister, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
110. G & C Screaigh, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impacts on tourism and economy • Water pollution • Proximity to catchment area • Environmental impacts • Impacts on flora and fauna • Traffic risk and impacts • York does not need the landfill and the community does not want it.
111. W Bloxsome, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes proposal • Leachate contaminants in heavy rain • Proximity to water • Odour • Increase in vermin • Liner rupture and leakage • Earthquake risk • Alternative sites and solutions, including rail transport and using existing pits • Impact on tourism • Reduced quality of life • Traffic risk and impact • Issue will have long term environmental, economic and personal impacts
112. L Giles, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risks and impact
113. H & N Giles, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Object to agricultural land being used for other purposes • Proximity to water catchment • Traffic risk and impacts • Odour

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feral animals and vermin
114. S Dyer, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts
115. H Wright, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impacts on lifestyle and reason for moving to York
116. R Davis, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impacts on lifestyle and reason for moving to York
117. M Bateman, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Project is endangering cultural respect for the homes and habitat of the Black Cockatoo, vegetation and living of farmers • Christmas trees that grow in the area are significant to Aboriginal culture • Aboriginal children are taught water streams and creeks are important to survival • Impact on tourism • Alternative sites, including mining holes • Earning a living from the land is important for future generations
118. S Paskett, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Impact on tourism and associated employment • Water pollution
119. I Hepton, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose proposal • Traffic risk and impact

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on motoring tourism
120. I Crombie, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Water pollution • Proximity to catchment area • Air pollution • Dust emissions • Vermin impacts • Concerns regarding chemical storage • Leachate leakage • Fire risk • Odour and noise emissions • York is a primary agricultural region • Traffic risk and impacts • Impact on heritage • Impact on town vibrancy • Devaluation of nearby properties • Devaluation of houses and businesses in York • Impact on tourism
121. P Olsson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Proximity to water catchment area • Traffic risks and impact • Drinking water pollution • Lack of planning • Impacts on tourism • Closure of Tier 3 rail
122. K & E Wood, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to Mundaring catchment • Drinking water pollution • Odour • Gas emissions • Traffic risk and impacts • Earthquake risk • Fire risk • No benefit to the community • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Land will be polluted • Impact on tourism
123. D & B Hill, Avon Valley Residents Association, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main focus on planning and environmental grounds • Planning consent should be refused • Concerns regarding deficient groundwater data • Landfill is located within the Helena River catchment, a public water drinking source

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water pollution • Ground water impacts • Insufficient information for assessment under scheme provisions • Considers noxious industry more appropriate land use definition • Rezoning should be required to special purpose • Will not continue agricultural uses • Will expand in the future to include toxic wastes • Proposal is of no benefit to the district • Impacts on tourism acknowledged by applicant through the use of unmarked trucks • Impact on local amenity and brand of the district • Impact on lifestyle and economic development • Evidence of total opposition from community • No environmental information submitted with planning application • Traffic impact and risks • Inconsistent with State Planning Strategy 1997 • Draft State Planning Strategy 2012 acknowledges need for strategic planning and acknowledges existing buffers are inadequate. • Inconsistent with Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy – proposal not considered as a regional waste issue • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy – no reference to metro waste • Proposal does not comply with York Community Strategic Plan • Proposal does not comply for approval under any zoning or clause of the Town Planning Scheme • Inconsistent with the provisions of State Planning Policy 2 • No economic benefit to York • Economic affect will be a net negative • Social impacts • Environmental impacts – noise, air and ground water pollution • Liner leakage • Drinking and stock water contamination • Provides for no groundwater separation is unacceptable • Inconsistent with all policies • Fails to provide information required by Town Planning Scheme • Refuse application
124. W Hoffman, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution
125. M Pierce, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Concern for future generations
126. E Cullen, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Proximity to water catchment • Toxic air emissions • Air pollution
127. N Lynch, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Impact on flora and fauna • Contaminate drinking water and 13 Mile Brook
128. K Ashworth, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Earthquake risk • Contaminate drinking water supply • Liner rupture and leakage • Proximity to water catchment
129. C Humphrey, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Water pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna
130. T Morris, Kauring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic risk and impacts • Future generations
131. L Johnston, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts
132. K Gurner, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Don't want it
133. P Carrero, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Water pollution • Proximity to catchment • Impact on flora and fauna
134. C Farrell, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water contamination • Traffic risk and impacts
135. T Whelan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Air pollution

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic risk and impacts
136. G Greenwood, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Toxic emissions • Contamination
137. E & A Glynn, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
138. E M Ayres, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
139. S Sloss, Gwambygine
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Impacts on flora and fauna • Impacts on farming land • Earthquake risk • Impacts on tourism • Water pollution • Traffic risk and impact
140. J Green, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Impact on heritage town • Water pollution
141. P Wingrove, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Proximity to catchment • Pollution of drinking water
142. S Hodgkinson, Kauring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Water pollution • Contamination
143. N Tonkin, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
144. N Warr, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with zone objectives • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land
145. W Gould, Caljie
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact • Impacts on Black Cockatoos
146. S Davies, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to Mundaring water catchment • Impacts on nearby farms • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Impacts of flash flooding • Water pollution • Leaking of leachate ponds • Effect on bio-security

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic risk and impacts • No benefit to the community
147. D Fairclough, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Not in a historic town • No benefit to the community • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Dire affects on environment and farming activities • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Proximity to Mundaring catchment area • Water pollution • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme • Concerns for future generations • Traffic risk and impacts
148. S Fleay, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Water pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna • Earthquake risk • Contamination to environment
149. D Fleay, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts
150. C E Thorp, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Proximity to water catchment • Traffic risk and impacts
151. S Sullivan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts
152. M Narkle-Goodwin (Noongar from Ballardong people), York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Proximity to catchment • Water pollution • Impacts on flora and fauna • Traffic risk and impacts • Liner rupture and leakage • Impacts on Aboriginal heritage – clearing our land
153. L Kane, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises concerns • Earthquake risk • Fire risk • Property devaluation • Traffic risk and impacts • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Flash flooding impacts • Proximity to catchment area • Unacceptable proposal that should be rejected
154. Y Kane, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly oppose • Earthquake risk • Liner rupture and leakage • Toxic emissions • Water pollution • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Proposal does nothing to encourage agriculture or tourism • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Impact on heritage town • Traffic risk and impacts • Fire risk • Capacity of volunteers to respond to an incident • Suggests risk indemnification
155. E & P Mogridge, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Proximity to water catchment area • Water pollution • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Earthquake risk • Devaluation of adjoining farmland

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns approval would set a precedent of allowing landfill and other industries in general agriculture zone • Air emissions • Odour • Capacity of volunteers to respond to an incident • Traffic risk and impacts • No guarantee of employment, which is minimal • Impacts on future generations • Application should be refused • No benefit to residents of York and surrounds
156. Tudorgold Pty Ltd, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
157. M Brewster, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
158. R Crane, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
159. A Dougan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
160. B J Meredith, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Traffic risk and impacts • Proximity to catchment area • Pollution of drinking water

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should promote non-polluting industries • If proposal proceeds, then other polluting industries will come • Opposes use of agricultural land in a productive farming area • Council should indemnify themselves from any class action
161. M Gill, Talbot Brook
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
162. G Brewster, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
163. B Dougan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
164. M Barrett-Lennard, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
165. R Reed, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
166. R Harris, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
167. P Hubbard, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
168. J Fuller, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
169. A King, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impacts • Concerns for future generations
170. I Benaddi, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
171. J Moore, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
172. K Rivette, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
173. F Annakin, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
174. S Grierson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
175. K Higginson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
176. I Taylor, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
177. A Pierce, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Landfill does not enhance or preserve but instead destroys environment • No benefit to York
178. T Marwick, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
179. G Flaney, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
180. J Broadbent, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
181. C Cable, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
182. A Kiernan, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme

183. C Jones, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
184. D Sipos, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
185. J Ashworth, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
186. S Candlin, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
187. S Del Gobbo, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme
188. K King, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
189. L A Mercer, Greenhills
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal • Inconsistent with Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to water catchment area • Landfill will not enhance environment • Traffic impacts and risk • No benefit to community • Impacts on heritage
190. F Edwards, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
191. R Delich, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
192. H Munckton, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
193. D Lawson, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
194. Owner, Penny Farthing Sweets, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
195. R Nolan, Gwambygine
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
196. T Travis, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
197. I H Parker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
198. K Nicholls, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
199. W Steed, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
200. C Grieves, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
201. R E Lange, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
202. S Russo, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
203. B Elliott, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
204. C Simula, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
205. A Baker, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
206. E Taylor, Beverley
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with State Planning Policy 2.5 for rural land • Inconsistent with the Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • Inconsistent with the Town Planning Scheme
207. I D & J S McColl, Oringa Park, St Ronans
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission against proposal • Water pollution • Proximity to Mundaring water catchment

- Water table levels
- Landfill is sited on a huge Paleo water shed
- Concerns over damming water course
- Differences in submitted plans to Shire, EPA & DER
- Objects to use of prime agricultural land that currently supports cropping
- Landfill will prevent further development of our land
- Buffers inadequate to prevent impacts
- Noise pollution
- Odour
- Impacts on amenity
- Visual impacts
- Light pollution
- Discrepancy in proposed hours of operation
- Concerns classification of landfill will change from II to III
- Concerns where cover material will be sourced from and impacts to remainder of farm
- Concerns regarding impacts of introduced species to be used for revegetation
- Leachate leaking into environment over many years
- Groundwater table is within the landfill area – no separation
- Contamination of fresh, not saline, groundwater
- Groundwater contamination will be forever
- Liner leakage at a rate of 10 litres per day, that is 180,000 litres per way
- Impacts of flash flooding
- Impacts on flora and fauna
- Impacts on nature reserves and national parks
- Concerns regarding introduction of exotic weeds and pests
- Clearing of native vegetation, including very aged marri and wandoo gums
- Impacts on Black Cockatoo habitat
- Impacts on nearby agricultural activities
- Objects to good agricultural food producing farmland being used for landfill
- Devaluation of property
- Impacts on quality of produce and livestock and reputation
- Jeopardise 'free range' and 'organic' status
- Noxious gas emissions
- Fire risk
- Generating electricity is unlikely due to age of infrastructure
- Traffic risk and impacts
- Litter
- Lack of emergency response facilities
- Any increase in road crashes and fatalities are not acceptable
- Affect on views from highway and Mt Observation
- Impacts on tourism
- No economic benefits to York
- 21 properties within 2.5 km's of this proposal that will be affected
- Impacts on honey production
- Increase in impacts of feral animals and vermin, including flies and mosquitoes
- Earthquake risk
- Pollution of drinking water and stock water supplies
- Inconsistent with the SEAVROC Waste Management Plan – not a regional facility
- Concerns about types of waste, including medical and impacts
- Liner rupture and leakage
- Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan
- WA Government should take responsibility for waste management and not use prime agricultural land.
- Too many issues to allow proposal to go ahead

208. D McColl, York

- Object to proposal

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Inconsistent with the Community Strategic Plan • No benefit to York • Traffic risk and impact
209. S McColl, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is not warranted • Noise, dust and odour pollution • Impacts on health • Concerns for future generations • Impact lifestyle • Impacts on stock • Light emissions • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Water pollution • Liner rupture and leakage • Groundwater contamination • Impacts on flora and fauna • Dust emissions • No water, no farm, no life • Do not place landfill here • Alternative sites available • Suggests recycling
210. Avon Valley Residents Association, York
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of petition against the proposal containing 509 signatures of York ratepayers and 782 signatures from surrounding towns and visitors.
211. R Chester, Owner of Allawuna (subject site)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports proposal • Argues property is subdividable resulting in fragmentation • SITA intends to continue farming residue • No appropriate sale options to continue farming • Argues no water channels exist on property • Proposal will not be seen from the road • Proposal will not affect tourism • Impacts of increased truck movements have been assessed by Main Roads • No increase in seismic activity • Land will be rehabilitated and revegetated • Drainage does not flow into Mundaring catchment • Landfill has been thoroughly investigated by owner and ticks all the boxes
212. M E Fleay, York (Received 19/3/14)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal • Inconsistent with Town Planning Scheme • Landfill is not an agricultural activity • Will affect agriculture and bio-security • Inconsistent with Local Planning Strategy • Proximity to Mundaring water catchment • Pollution of drinking water supplies • Traffic risk and impacts • Will not benefit York • Impact on heritage of town