Schedule of Public Submissions

Summary

- A total of 472 individual public submissions were received.
- 2 of these were in support of the application.
- 470 submissions objected to the proposal, 5 of which were received after the period for submissions closed and are considered 'late' submissions.

 *Pro forma used with additional comments added, and one petition like submission using pro-forma.

	ic Submissions -		1			_
No.	Date Submission Received	Name	Property Affected	Summary of Submission	Officer's Comment	
1	15 Jan 18	Robert Chester	Allawuna - PO Box 137, York	 Supports the proposal. Extension is necessary, as the development was held up by unforeseen circumstances outside the control of Alkina Holdings and the State Administrative Tribunal, including: Previous state government was placed in a position where due to the State Election being called had insufficient time to undertake assessment and grant approval. The newly elected state government is yet to undertake assessment or grant approval as the relevant Government departments are presently being merged and work by the previous Government has yet to be assigned by the newly appointed Minister. Alkina Holdings was not permitted to commence works until the work approval had been signed off by the State Government and Minister. The application to date has met all environmental and social measures required. Alkina is an experienced operator of licenced landfill sites and part of the Instant Waste Management Group, the largest private waste and recycling company in Western Australia. 	Local Government, Development Assessment Panels and State Administrative processes and time frames are not affected by state government elections. The state elections were held 11 March 2017. From the time of an election announcement and until new Ministers are appointed there is generally a 'caretaker' period where no new major decisions are made. A reconfiguration of departments also occurred following the elections, although departments remain functional during this time. The works application was submitted to the DWER by AMI/Alkina in July 2017. It is not clear how the application was held up as a result of the elections and is not a matter the Shire is able to comment on. Regardless of this, a works approval application was issued 17 March 2016, and then cancelled 11 August 2016, at the works approval holder's request. Almost a full year passed prior to resubmission of a works approval application approval which is the main cause of delay in the application being commenced.	d
2	10 Jan 18	A Adamini	1 Emmet Pl, York	Supports the proposal.	Noted.	Part 1
Publ	ic Submissions -	1	1			
3	11-Dec- 17	Danielle Courtin	251 Ashworth Rd, St Ronans	 Objection to proposal. The approval was permitted two years to substantially commence the development. The uncertainty of whether 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR.	

				development will commence and uncertainty causes angst for the community. No extension should be permitted. • Large amount of community opposition to proposal.	Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported.
4	22 Dec 17	Alan & Peta Hucker	8 Thorn St, York	 Objection to proposal. Have written three objection submissions in the past. Landfills should not be located on land in proximity to the water table, quality agricultural land. Additional heavy vehicle traffic on Great Southern Highway and safety concerns. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and appropriateness of location of landfill), are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the State Administrative Tribunal. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.
5	2 Jan 18	Robert, Norma & Matthew Hall	74 Bland Rd, York	 Objection to proposal. The site is in a water catchment area operated by the Water Corporation. Expert reports, have indicated that there is no guarantee that pollutants from this proposed rubbish tip will not enter the water system. Concern regarding location of landfill in earthquake seismic zone. The location of the development site is located between Wandoo National Park (with its famed scenic tourist viewpoint Mount Observation) and Wambyn Nature Reserve. The location of the rubbish tip is inappropriate in proximity to areas of high natural value. Concerns regarding destruction of RARE black cockatoo bird habitat and flora which form part of the indigenous culture of the Noongar people of the area. Concerns regarding additional vehicular volumes generated by landfill and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Safety concerns from increased traffic, width of road, crash statistics and safety of road for heavy vehicles. Safety concerns are noted by authorities which have 	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), Strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR report on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the State Administrative Tribunal. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

	1	1		reduced except limit to 1001 and to Decide and the ter	
				reduced speed limit to 100km/h. Roads need to be	
6	3 Jan 18	Roger Underwood	5463 Great Southern Hwy, Gwambygine	 widened and upgraded. Confident that the landfill operation itself could be handled efficiently without risk of polluting groundwater or the surrounding countryside. Objection to proposal based on the following. Great Southern Highway is not of an adequate standard to accommodate additional heavy vehicles generated by development. Detrimental impact on amenity. The landfill will not add any value to community. Suggested that landfill would be better directed to degraded areas such as mining voids around Southern 	Noted. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill and that there may be better alternative sites. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments
	2 hrs 10	Elizahash 0	20 Control Dd	Cross or Coolgardie by train.	in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application which considered the matters above, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR report.
7	3 Jan 18	Elizabeth & Frank Parker	38 Carter Rd, York	 Objection to Proposal. Development has had a two-year window to commence development. An approval which has expired should not be able to be extended. No demonstrated need for landfill and reference to Minister Jacob letter dated 21 August 2013 stating that there is no need for more landfills until at least 2030. Long term Government plans show the Gt Eastern Hwy to be rerouted along the Toodyay Road. Government planning documents dealing with waste disposal indicate that rubbish should be transported along major transport corridors e.g. Great Eastern Highway. No rubbish trucks should be allowed onto the Great Southern Highway. WALGA has identified that there are Draft Environmental standards being formulated with a requirement that landfill needs must be demonstrated prior to construction being approved. Safety concerns of additional heavy vehicles on Great Southern Highway, and comment on rubbish trucks being involved in crashes since previous RAR report. 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), Strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. WALGA has issued a policy statement on waste management that legislative amendments should be made to ensure that consideration of landfill applications by DWER can be refused if the facility will undermine the State Waste Strategy (i.e that there be a demonstrated need for landfill). This has not been adopted into any strategic or statutory documents.

				 A 5 million rehabilitation Bond should be required. In the event that something occurs and rehabilitation of the site not carried out, rehabilitation will cost millions and may be difficult to require its implementation. A project of this scale and risk is not unreasonable to require a bond to be paid upfront. Insufficient monitoring of bores carried out, to provide understanding of hydrology of area. Should the development be approved additional conditions should be imposed to investigate hydrology of area. Landfill Levees collected by the WA Government original purpose was to create a disincentive to taking stuff to landfill and to create a fund to finance options. Levees collected have been directed to General Revenue, not fulfilling this purpose and need to be directed to finding solutions to waste disposal issues. Landfill proposals such as this one are a result of absence of coherent policy on waste. There is no demonstrated benefit to the Shire of York and community. 	Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingency conditions) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although is not something that can be addressed within assessment of this proposal. Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.
8	3 Jan 18	F & B Schreuder	24 Macartney St, York	 Objection to proposal. Use of productive agricultural land, in a reliable rainfall area for a landfill. Should be retained for agricultural use. No strategic basis for management of metropolitan waste and location of landfill. Landfill sites should be combined with processing, i.e organic waste processed to make compost and soil improver, and organic waste recycling. Metropolitan waste should be disposed of in a low rainfall area, on land already cleared, by railway, out of a seismic activity area and in low population areas. Concerns regarding impact on amenity, and environment. Concerns regarding location of landfill in seismic zone and potential for leaching of pollutants into groundwater in event of failure, which has potential to impact the Mundaring water catchment. Concerns regarding capacity of leachate and retention ponds to retain water in event of heavy rainfalls. Concerns regarding dust movement and contamination of surrounding land. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, economy and location on agricultural land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since approval of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

				 Concerns regarding additional vehicular volumes generated by landfill and capacity of Great Southern Highway, Mundaring and Sawyers Valley to accommodate. Increase in heavy vehicular volumes on Great Southern Highway will be detrimental to tourists. No demonstrated benefit to the Shire of York community, and more likely to have a detrimental impact on economy from additional heavy vehicle traffic which deter tourists travelling to York. 	Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR report. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed within assessment of this proposal.
9	4 Jan 18	Chris & Melody Chipper	1219 Mokine Rd, York	 Objection to proposal. Concerns regarding accountability of business if anything goes wrong with proposal. Uncertainty regarding change of applicant, and commitment to operation in the same manner of the previous applicant's proposal and information in support of application such as Fire Contingency Plan, groundwater monitoring, or traffic movements. Landfills should not be located on prime agricultural land, and in an area adjacent to a water catchment area and national park. Environmental impacts including emissions and impact on climate change, contamination from movement of dust and water quality, location of landfill in seismic area, potential for damage to pit line and contaminate leakage. 	'Risk' and 'contingency is fall within the scope of environmental issues. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment or that the proposal has been progressed enough by DWER to confirm that the existing conditions are sufficient (including conditions regarding contingency planning). The change in applicant and associated implications is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Implications from a change of application on development approval is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and location of landfill on agricultural land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.
10	8 Jan 18	Annette McArthur	2/9 Joaquina St, York	 Objection to the proposal. Agricultural land should be retained for agricultural purposes. A landfill adjacent to a National Park reserve for its high quality environmental values are incompatible land uses. Landfills for metropolitan waste should be located within the metropolitan area. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and location of landfill on agricultural land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is

				Strategic focus for waste should be on recycling, not landfills.	not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.
11	10 Jan 18	Margaret Sharp	9 View St, York	 Objection to the proposal. There has been sufficient time permitted to commence the development, and the approval has lapsed. Use of productive agricultural land, in a reliable rainfall area for a landfill. Impacts on amenity, history, heritage (including Aboriginal heritage) and lifestyle. That the proposal has not demonstrated a benefit to the community and locality. That the landfill development is inconsistent with State or regional strategic plans or policies. No demonstrated need for a landfill. Dated landfill technology and better alternatives available. Unacceptable risk to the community, road users and environment. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Waste authorities are targeting zero waste. Community opposition against proposal. Bushfire risk, and capacity of emergency services to respond. Increase in heavy vehicular volumes on Great Southern Highway will be detrimental to tourists. That the proposal is not consistent with principles of sustainable development. Landfill is incompatible with proposed future zoning of immediate locality. Landfill is adhoc and is not considered proper and orderly planning. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and location of landfill on agricultural land), principles of sustainable development, strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill, targets towards zero waste and a direction to move towards alternative waste disposal. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider, such as orderly and property planning) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported. Scheme Amendment No. 50 and implications are discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. The Shire is not aware of any other proposed amendments to zoning in the locality. Consistency with orderly and proper planning is discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR report. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR. 'Risk' and 'contingency' fall within the scope of environmental issues. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

				 adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Concerns regarding ability of applicant to implement contingencies if anything goes wrong with proposal and need for a bond. Environmental impacts, including contamination to flora, fauna, reserves, national parks, land, water and air, land degradation. Impacts on human health of adjoining properties, from dust and properties relying on rainwater. Odour and gas emissions. Insufficient monitoring of bores carried out, to provide understanding of hydrology of area. Should the development be approved additional conditions should be imposed to investigate hydrology of area. Concerns regarding location of landfill in seismic zone and potential for leaching of pollutants into groundwater in event of failure, which has potential to impact the Mundaring water catchment Borrow pits will detrimentally impact surface flow, and cause erosion and dust emissions. 	Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment or that the proposal has been progressed enough by DWER to confirm that the existing conditions are sufficient (including conditions regarding contingency planning). The regulation of 'borrow pits' is discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR.
12	10 Jan 18	K Edis	PO Box 242, York	 Objection to the proposal. Concern for the manner the new applicants will operate landfill in. Landfill is located in a high-risk earthquake zone, where leachate pond could be compromised by seismic activity, and have risk of potential contamination. Pollution and contamination of surface water and groundwater from loose rubbish into the Avon Catchment, in proximity to the Mundaring Weir. Concerns regarding flash flooding along the 13-mile brook, Avon River and Swan River and proximity of landfill and overflow of leachate ponds. Detrimental impact on air quality, from dust, odour and fire within the landfill. Fire risk. Landfills are highly flammable due to their contents. The burning of landfill material may result in poisonous smoke being released. 	The change in applicant and associated implications is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR.
13	10 Jan 18	Shire of Mundaring	-	Objection on behalf of Shire of Mundaring to the proposal.	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine

			 Concerns regarding potential leachate contamination of this proposed landfill into the Mundaring Weir water catchment which serves as a water source for the area between Mundaring and Kalgoorlie. Concerns on metropolitan waste being delivered through the Shire of Mundaring to a landfill site outside the metropolitan area thereby avoiding better sustainable options to dispose of waste such as a waste to energy facility. The desired waste to landfill reduction targets will not be meet by the State, should landfills for metropolitan waste continue to be approved in regional country areas. 	that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Strategic waste documents and targets are noted. However, this matter was considered by SAT and there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.
14 10 Ja	an 18 Pamela M Dougall	39/20 Redmile Rd, York	 Objection to proposal. There has been sufficient time permitted for commencement of the approved landfill. Alkina Holdings are leasing Allawuna from AMI Enterprises Pty Ltd for a period of approximately 20 years. Alkina Holdings is a small company with few shareholders and we question their financial position to have a multimillion dollar contingency plan when contamination occurs to the environment or businesses in the area. The landfill possesses risks to the environment. A landfill will contaminate the flora, fauna, reserves and National Parks, the land water and air surrounding the site. The landfill has the potential to impact ground and surface water and contaminate drinking water. The landfill proposal will result in land contamination and degradation. There will be a loss and reduction of productive agricultural land. The bio-security of surrounding agricultural land will be affected. The proposal will impact amenity, heritage and the lifestyle of York. There are no quantified benefits to the community as a result of the proposal. The proposal will result in an unacceptable risk to the community, road users and the environment. Great Southern Highway is not a safe and appropriate road to position a landfill. 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourism), Strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR report on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the RAR report. Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported.

15	11 Ian 18	William & Jean	86 Hanny Pd	 More appropriate and suitable sites are available for use as landfills. There is substantial community objection to the landfill, which has increased over the last 6 years. The proposal will put undue and unnecessary strain on local emergency service volunteers. The landfill does not encourage tourism in the Shire of York. Many York community members and businesses rely on tourism. With the increase in traffic along Great Southern Highway tourism will seriously be affected in York thus affecting the enjoyment and quality of the lives of community members. The proposal is not consistent with the principals of sustainable development. The proposal is not consistent with State and Regional Strategic Plans & Policies for use of rural land. There are sufficient landfills available to cater for metropolitan waste. The reduction of waste and the increase in recycling practices have increased the life of existing landfills. Landfill technology is out dated and there are better alternatives available. There is no facility of this type in the locality and the landfill is foreign to rural amenity. The proposal is ad-hoc and is not considered proper and orderly planning. York is a seismic activity hot spot, so there is great concern over lining damage within the landfill. Earthquakes can destroy liners. The precautionary principle and the principle of sustainable development are not being considered as a landfill will have a huge negative impact on our legacy for future generations. 	Relevant environmental and environmental health (including hydrology)
15	11 Jan 18	William & Jean Durbin	86 Henry Rd, York	 Objection to proposal. Impact on adjoining organic farms. Waste disposal sites should be on land that is already degraded. Reference to Minister Jacob letter dated 21 August 2013 stating that there is no need for more landfills until at least 2030. 	Relevant environmental and environmental health (including hydrology) issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and appropriateness of landfill location), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated

				 Government planning indicates that rubbish should be transported along major transport corridors, the Great Southern Highway is not a major transport corridor. Risk from location of landfill within a water catchment area. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Impact on vehicular volumes will be detrimental to tourists. No demonstrated benefit to the Shire of York community. Concern regarding contingency measures if things go wrong. A substantial bond should be lodged with the York Shire as a guarantee. Suggestion that the landfill levy be used to reduce waste instead of being directed to general revenue. 	documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR report. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed within assessment of this proposal. 'Risk' and 'contingency is fall within the scope of environmental issues.
16	14 Jan 18	L. Christmas	66 Suburban Rd, York	 Objection to Proposal. Two-part submission – one containing detailed research to support summary of issues below and the second a copy of the pro-form submission addressed further below. Use of agricultural land for landfill. Application is inconsistent with objectives of General Agriculture zone of the Scheme and query of accuracy of SITA's previous statements in supplementary report. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Risks of former application are the same with current proposal. Precautionary principle should apply. Detrimental impact on environment and environmental health, including water quality, air, flora, fauna, human health, dust, pollution, contamination, adjoining properties and reserves, traffic noise, noise, natural hazards, pollution from vehicles. Bushfire risk, particularly from flares burning gases. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, location in an agricultural area), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents) and deficiencies of the previous application are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR report on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of that application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR report. Traffic Impacts (excluding noise) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

				traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. • Duration of landfill likely to be extended past that proposed.	The SAT orders and conditions of approval did not deem it necessary to condition a time limit of the landfill and this is therefore not controlled by planning matters. Officers have however noted in the RAR report the intent of the applicant as specified in the works application of the landfill to have a nominal life of 28 years, as opposed to the previous applicant's submission of 20 years.
17	16 Jan 18	Jake Davies	PO Box 222, York	 Objection to Proposal. This proposal is of no benefit to York, its' community or its' natural environment. Landfill is not an agricultural activity and should not be placed in a zone that will have disastrous effects upon the surrounding agricultural properties. Landfills should not be located on prime agriculture land, in a high rainfall area, which produces high volumes of valuable produce. Landfill activities are not consistent with the Shire of York Town Planning Scheme No. 2 General Agriculture zone objectives, Local Planning Strategy, Strategic Community Plan, State Planning Policy 2.5 – Land Use Planning in Rural Areas. Detrimental impact on historical character, tourism and agricultural economies. There are insufficient services to the site, such as reticulated water, and power is unsuitable for large scale proposals. Landfills have been well documented for their noxious affects upon the environment and the positioning of Allawuna next to a catchment area is unsuitable for this purpose. Concerns on environmental impacts including air quality, dust and emissions. Adjoining properties are reliant on rainwater and run-off causing health concerns. Concern regarding reliability of liners, and potential for leachate to leak into the ground. Landfill being located in an earthquake area with potential for a magnitude 7 earthquake, which has potential to compromise the liner, which have been shown to tear at a magnitude of 5. Concerns regarding implications should failure of the liner occur. Noise emissions will be detrimental to adjoining properties and fauna. 	Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR report. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans, and in appropriate location of landfill are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters such as the appropriateness of the location of the landfill on rural land, availability of services, and impact on amenities which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. This is relevant to comments regarding the 'precautionary principle'. Borrow pits, management and rehabilitation is discussed within the RAR. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR.

- Pollution from rubbish discharging across the site to neighbouring properties and reserves. Fences are proposed to 1.8m high which is insufficient, and rubbish may be carried by wind or flash flooding.
- Concern regarding impact on adjoining organic farming operations, and biosecurity.
- Great Southern Highway is an unsuitable Highway not designed to transport high volumes of heavy trucks and with few overtaking lanes;
- Concerns regarding bushfire hazard from the landfill and capacity of emergency services to respond, as well as additional hazards the burning of waste may create.
 Comment that the current Fire Management Plan is insufficient.
- Impact of excavation for borrow pits including surface water runoff, erosion, wind damage and impact on agricultural capability of overall property which will not be suitable for continued agricultural use.
- Insufficient information given on rehabilitation of borrow pits, and query as to whether blasting will be required, if rock is encountered.
- There has been sufficient time to commence the landfill proposal and no extension of time shall be given.
- The planning approval has lapsed, and as per the SAT conditions, the approval has lapsed.
- Scheme Amendment No.50 was for the purposes of implementing the development in accordance with the SAT approval, which required the development to be substantially commenced before the expiry date or the approval would lapse. To date there has been no significance commencement of the landfill and the application should not be extended.
- The works Approval Application made by Alkina Holdings has altered the original application made by SITA to warrant a new development application submitted including:
 - the layout of the landfill itself
 - modifications made to the leachate ponds
 - changes made to truck movements and the construction of a bitumen road into Allawuna.

There has been no application made for the approval of these modifications by Alkina Holdings. The modifications Discussion on Scheme Amendment No. 50, and implications regarding orderly and proper planning in discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR.

The regulation of 'borrow pits' is discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR.

With regard to the amendments to the works application from the information submitted by the previous applicant's works approval and development approval:

Internal roads. The applicants amended submission to JDAP in 2015 provided a commitment to construction primary landfill access roads to bitumen sealing and undertake associated drainage works. It was noted roadways providing access within the operational landfill area would not be sealed. The works application approval in Appendix M2 Technical Specification Infrastructure in section 6 was consistent with this commitment advising of use of compacted granular basecourse and bitumen seal for entrance access, internal access roads, turnaround areas and areas of hardstands at the site.

Condition 5) of the SAT orders, requires: "The internal access roads shall be constructed prior to commencement of landfill operations and maintained to a standard to ensure safety and minimise dust emissions from machinery and traffic to the satisfaction of the local government".

The ability to control the standard of road construction is provided via condition 5 of the approval (noting the wording does not necessarily specify bitumen construction). It appears in the recent works application submitted that the new applicant does not intend to carry through construction to this standard which increases potential for dust emissions. The SAT via condition of approval determined that maintenance was the responsibility of the Shire, which if the Shire may bring dust management as a consideration of the Shire from internal roads also should gravel be permitted.

The Works Application Approval does not form part of this application, although is being given due regard in assessment. Should extension be permitted the Shire has ability to enforce adequate construction via condition 5 of the approval, and may not be an issued, although the condition of approval was not formulated on the intent of a primary internal gravel access road, which may need to specify additional dust management measures if it had been

				have altered the original application significantly enough to warrant the application requiring new approval by all relevant agencies including the EPA and the DWER.	considered within the jurisdiction of the Shire to monitor and ensure it was maintained. As road construction standards are enforceable via condition 5, should it be extended, it is not necessarily an issue, although this point is consistent with officer's discussion within the Planning Assessment section, that the change of applicant has resulted in an amended manner in the way the landfill is intended to be operated from that originally proposed, and that the extension should not be approved as the DWER has not indicated an intention to give approval, or intended conditions which was the basis of the current application.
					The size and location of the leachate ponds and appears in the current works approval application appears consistent with that in the approved development plans. The design of the previous leachate pond was not part of the development approval and SAT has determined that DWER are the principal regulators in regard to environmental matters which includes the leachate ponds. It is noted that there are further amendments proposed such as the inclusion of a sediment basin, reconfiguration of cells from 6 to 7 (layout of the landfill) and change in nominal life span. These amendments and implications are discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. It is noted within the officer's report than a change in configuration of cells is different to the approved plans, and therefore inconsistent with the SAT approval. A revised Traffic Impact Assessment has also been noted as a requirement prior to consideration of any extension, although the Shire notes that
18	15 Jan 18	Isabella Moore	C/- 150 Yilgarn	Objection to the proposal. There has been sufficient time permitted to commence	volumes of anticipated traffic volumes have been reduced. Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR.
			Avenue, Northam	 the development, and the approval has lapsed. Concerns regarding ability of applicant to implement contingencies if anything goes wrong with proposal and need for a bond. Environmental impacts, including contamination to flora, fauna, reserves, national parks, land, water, air and land degradation. Unacceptable risk to the community, road users and environment. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. 	'Risk' and 'contingency is fall within the scope of environmental issues. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment or that the proposal has been progressed enough by DWER to confirm that the existing conditions are sufficient (including conditions regarding contingency planning). Hydrology, location in seismic zone, dust, odour and gas were part of the development application and fall under the scope of 'environmental' considerations.

10	14 log 19	Luctio Magnical:		 Impacts on human health of adjoining properties, from dust and properties relying on rainwater. Odour and gas emissions. Insufficient monitoring of bores carried out, to provide understanding of hydrology of area. Should the development be approved additional conditions should be imposed to investigate hydrology of area. Borrow pits will detrimentally impact surface flow, and cause erosion and dust emissions. Use of productive agricultural land, in a reliable rainfall area for a landfill. Impacts on amenity, history, heritage (including Aboriginal heritage) and lifestyle. That the proposal has not demonstrated a benefit to the community and locality. Community opposition against proposal. Bushfire risk, and capacity of emergency services to respond. Increase in heavy vehicular volumes on Great Southern Highway will be detrimental to tourists. That the landfill development is inconsistent with State or regional strategic plans or policies. That the proposal is not consistent with principles of sustainable development. No demonstrated need for a landfill. Landfill is incompatible with proposed future zoning of immediate locality. Landfill is adhoc and is not considered proper and orderly planning. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Dated landfill technology and better alternatives available. 	The regulation of 'borrow pits' is discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, appropriateness of location of landfill), principles of sustainable development, strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location, need for a landfill and targets towards zero waste and a direction to move towards alternative waste disposal. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider, such as orderly and property planning) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported. Scheme Amendment No. 50 and implications are discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. The Shire is not aware of any other proposed amendments to zoning in the locality. Consistency with orderly and proper planning is discussed within the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR.
19	14 Jan 18	Justin Marwick	-	 Objection to proposal. Inconsistent with strategic direction and vision of York and region. Landfill does not enhance amenity of locality, or productivity of land. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, alternative locations available), Strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill.

				 Sites in the fringe of metropolitan areas are suited to sustainable activity such as farming, catchment of forestry. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Heavy transport by rail is a better alternative. Environmental concerns and deficiency of SAT and DWER in considering previous environmental issues raised by local stakeholders. Concerns about performance and administration of site after licence is granted. Query as to who is responsible for ensuring measurement of emissions and reporting for the site. Supporting information and copy of submission dated 27 September 2017 and 25 May 2015 to DWER attached outlining environmental, environmental health, traffic, no benefit to the community and detrimental impact on economy. Landfill is inconsistent with strategic direction and intent of levees to reduce waste being directed to landfill. Alternative technologies available which would produce better outcomes or alternative locations in areas of lower risk and better infrastructure provision. Signed copy of proforma submission dated 14/1/2018 (considered further below). 	However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. The Shire notes comments regarding the previous assessment. It is not the Shire's role to consider the adequacy of previous determinations made by the SAT or DWER. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. It will be the responsibility of the DWER to enforce any Works Application Approval and licence and monitor compliance and undertake inspections. It is officers understanding there is also a requirement for the works approval holder to comply with reporting requirements. The Shire of York is responsible for monitoring and enforcing compliance of conditions of approval (should the extension be granted). Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed
20	15 Jan 18	Christine Marwick	135 Talbot Hall Rd, York	 Objection to the proposal. Great Southern Highway is inadequate and unsafe for additional heavy vehicular traffic. Detrimental impact on amenity and tourists. Location of landfill in proximity to a drinking water catchment is inappropriate. 	within assessment of this proposal. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourist economy) are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.

			Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.
21 15 Jan 18	Talbot Brook Land Management Association	 Objection to proposal. Alkina Holdings has had sufficient time to commence the approved landfill. Alkina Holdings are leasing Allawuna from AMI Enterprises Pty Ltd for a period of approximately 20 years. Alkina Holdings is a small company with few shareholders and we question their financial position to have a multimillion dollar contingency plan when contamination occurs to the environment or businesses in the area. The landfill possesses significant risks to the environment. A landfill will contaminate the flora, fauna, reserves and National Parks, the land water and air surrounding the site. The most serious of these environmental risks is the landfill has the potential to impact ground and surface water and contaminate drinking water. The landfill proposal will result in land contamination and degradation. There will be a loss and reduction of productive agricultural land. The bio-security of surrounding agricultural land will be affected. York is a Seismic activity hot spot, so there is great concern over lining damage within the landfill. Earthquakes can destroy liners. The proposal is not consistent with the principles of sustainable development. The precautionary principle and the principle of sustainable development are not being considered as a landfill will have a huge negative impact on our legacy for future generations. The proposal will result in an unacceptable risk to the community, road users and the environment. The proposal will impact amenity, heritage and the 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Contingency planning is considered as part of the environmental considerations and ability to manage in the event should failure occur. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and location on agricultural land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans, alternative options are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR. Consistency with orderly and proper planning is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR.

				 There is no facility of this type in the locality and the landfill is foreign to rural amenity. There are no quantified benefits to the community as a result of the proposal. There is substantial community objection to the landfill, which has increased over the last six years. The landfill is incompatible with proposed future zoning of the immediate locality. The proposal is not consistent with State and Regional Strategic Plans and Policies for use of rural land. The proposal will put undue and unnecessary strain on local emergency and service volunteers. The landfill does not encourage tourism in the Shire of York. Many York community members and businesses rely on tourism. With the increase in traffic along Great Southern Highway tourism will seriously be affected in York thus affecting the enjoyment and quality of the lives of community members. Under Government regulations, there needs to be a demonstrated need for the landfill. There are sufficient landfills available to cater for metropolitan waste. The reduction of waste and the increase in recycling practices have increased the life of existing landfills. Landfill technology is out dated and there are better alternatives available. There are other more appropriate and suitable sites available for use as landfills already. The proposal is ad-hoc and is not considered proper and orderly planning. Great Southern Highway is not a safe and appropriate 	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
22	15 Jan 18	Roy Chase	PO Box 805, York	 Objection to the proposal. Growing awareness towards recycling and reuse, or alternate methods for waste disposal, such as the waste to energy facility planned in Kwinana. Great Southern Traffic Highway is insufficient for additional heavy vehicular movements. Impact on vehicular volumes will be detrimental to tourists. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourists), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT,

				 Concern regarding leaching of pollutants into water catchment area. Insufficient information on hydrology of area to support proposal. Landfill levees should be used for their original purpose as a disincentive for waste to landfills, such as waste to energy plants. 	and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed within assessment of this proposal.
23	16 Jan 18	Alisdair Dougall	65 Waterway Ct, Ascot	 Objection to the proposal. There has been sufficient time to substantially commence the development within the time permitted. Extension would be inconsistent with condition 9 of the SAT approval which provides that the application lapses if not substantially commenced. The application has lapsed. The extension is inconsistent with the Shire of York's Strategic Community Strategic Plan 2016-2026 and in particular the objective of "Protect and enhance our rural land and spaces" and the priority to "establish land use strategy to ensure rural and farming land is protected". The odour, dust, rubbish and increased heavy traffic on Great Southern Highway from the proposed landfill would have a negative impact on the amenity of York. There are no tangible benefits to the York community from the proposed landfill. In a letter dated 21 August 2013 minister Albert Jacob stated, "current putrescible landfill capacity on the Perth and Peel coastal plain is likely to last until about 2030." As such there is no necessity for Alkina's proposed landfill to be constructed at Allawuna Farm. 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.
24	16 Jan 18	Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council	PO Box 234, Belmont	 Objection to proposal. Refute applicant's submission that the operators are experienced operators of licenced landfill sites and part of Instant Waste Management, the largest waste and recycling company in Western Australia. Submission 	Submission regarding applicant's experience, and company status is noted, although not a matter required to be given due regard in the planning assessment. It is considered relevant to the DWER application, which is 'specific' to an applicant. The change in applicant and associated

				 advises they have very little experience, and there is no way of verifying these statements, and is not relevant to this application. Better alternative options for waste disposal, including EMRC's Red Hill Waste Management Facility. Transport of waste to outer metropolitan landfills imposes unnecessary impact on communities due to movements of large vehicles causing unnecessary traffic hazards and vehicle emissions. Approval of landfills outside of the metropolitan area, further exacerbates the unlevel playing field that currently exists for operators of non-metropolitan sites who transfer metropolitan waste to such facilities, to avoid paying the landfill levy that is imposed on all metropolitan landfill sites. Concerns regarding capability of applicant to implement the landfill in a safe manner which will protect environmental values, and adhere to licence conditions and requirements, or payment of applicable landfill levy obligations. 	implications relevant to the development application is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourism), strategic documents (which should document appropriate locations for landfills) considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Comments regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed within assessment of this proposal.
25	16 Jan 18	Judy Davies	-	 Objection to proposal. Location of landfill on valuable agricultural land. Concerns regarding impact on environment. Great Southern Highway is inadequate for increased heavy vehicular movements, and in particular there are a lack of overtaking lanes for heavy vehicles. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including appropriateness of location of landfill) is noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR report on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.
26	16 Jan 17	Walter and Adelphe King	64 Webster St, Nedlands	Objection to proposal.	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning

				 Proximity of site upslope from thirteen-mile brook which eventually flows into the Helena River. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Detrimental impact on economy from perceived opinion of York as area for a landfill, and additional heavy vehicles and traffic on Great Southern Highway deterring tourists from travelling to York. 	Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, economy and tourism), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.
27	11 Dec 17, 9 Jan 18 & 17 Jan 18	Roma Paton	30 Bouverie Rd, York	 Objection to the proposal. Conflict of interest for LSV Borello to represent both owner and purchaser. The Shire should not consider an application for an extension of time. The applicant has had sufficient time to substantially commence the landfill. The period for substantial commencement has effect from the date of the JDAP refusal. Application has lapsed, and extension would not be consistent with orderly and proper planning. DWER works approval application has not been issued. Concern regarding contamination and pollution from landfill to groundwater and surface water, and risk from location to creek, potential for flash flooding and proximity to water catchment area. Impact on landowners who rely on groundwater from bores and quality. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Environmental and Environmental health impacts, from noise emissions during construction and daily operations, dust emissions and impact on air quality. Bushfire risk and capacity of emergency services to respond to a bushfire. 	Conflict of interest is not a relevant planning consideration. The Shire is required by the Planning and Development Act 2005 and associated regulations to accept and process the application. Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. The works application is currently under assessment by the DWER. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues, and status of the DWER works application are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents and requirement for bonds were considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR

				 Landfill is inconsistent with the strategic direction to move away from landfills. If extension to 2020 is approved, a contingency bond of \$50 million should be require against environmental accidents or contamination remediation. Issue of landfill could have been avoided if the Shire had made sure the land was zoned General Agricultural purpose only under the Scheme. Deliberate timing of application to catch residents off guard. Disappointment with four-week time period taken to advertise application from when it was received. JDAP to give due regard to Scheme Amendment No. 50 where Council voted 14 April 2014 to make Waste Disposal Facilities a prohibited use in the Scheme. The SU8 zone was created with the intent to permit the development as approved by SAT which required substantial commencement to occur or the approval lapses. Extension is inconsistent with the SU8 zone. The works Approval Application made by Alkina Holdings has altered the original application submitted including: the layout of the landfill itself modifications made to the leachate ponds changes made to truck movements and the construction of a bitumen road into Allawuna. There has been no application made for the approval of these modifications by Alkina Holdings. The modifications have altered the original application significantly enough to warrant the application requiring new approval by all relevant agencies including the EPA and the DWER. 	report on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to question or reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. The land is currently zoned 'General Agriculture'. 'Waste Disposal Facilities' are currently an unlisted use in the General Agriculture zone and was assessed on its merits. The State Administrative Tribunal on appeal determined that amended application in 2015 was consistent with the objectives of the General Agriculture zone. The timing of submission of application is not a planning matter for consideration of this proposal. A complete application to amend the development approval was submitted on the 28 November 2017. Referrals were sent 4 December 2017 to adjoining landowners and those who had previously made a submission on the application. A public notice was placed in the Avon Valley Gazette on the 4 December 2017. Scheme Amendment No.50 and orderly and proper planning is discussed in the Planning Assessment section of the RAR report. Refer comments in submission 16 above regarding amendments in the current works application approval from the previous applicants works approval and information submitted in support of the development approval.
28	17 Jan 18	James Plumridge	14 Harriott St, York	 Objection to proposal. Contamination from landfill into water and air and impact on adjoining properties. Comment that landfill is designed to accommodate Class II and III putrescible wastes, which can include pathogens and waste with toxins and waste with potential to damage liners, construction waste which generates dust and asbestos. 	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Asbestos arrival will be required to be in accordance with the DWER approval and Health (Asbestos) Regulations 1992. As noted above, officers have outlined in the Planning Assessment Report that in absence of advice from DWER of intention to approve, or conditions there is

				Query as to how asbestos will arrive at Allawuna and how secure the method of sealing is. Concern regarding pollution and contamination from leaching and gas emissions containing heavy metals and toxins and associated odour, air quality and ground water and surface water quality impacts. Landfill and risk of contamination is inappropriate in proximity to water catchment area. Cupery as to reliability and lifespan of liner from events and wear and tear. Impact on fauna and birds who may be attracted to site, as well as attraction of pests and feral animals such as rodents and impact on adjoining landowners and birds who may carry pollution out of site. Threats to Water Security from depleted groundwater and associated potential for sinkholes, impact on adjoining flora and fauna as the developer will not be able to rely solely on water from storm water dams and is likely to require groundwater for use. Natural hazards such as flash flooding, storms and potential contamination and reliability of landfill in such an event and inadequacy of measures to monitor or identify if failure or contamination occurs, particularly in areas where groundwater may be fractured and not easy to monitor. Any blasting required for rock formations is likely to adversely affect groundwater and structure of underground waterways. Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Impact of vegetation removal and bird species, such as endangered black cockatoos. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Loss of Amenity, from perception, potential odour emissions and general nature of landfill.
29	17 Jan 18	K & R Kneuss	2120 Top Beverley Rd, York	Objection to proposal. The SAT approval permitted two years to substantially commence the development which was ample. By not

			fulfilling such a condition, the application should lapse, and a new application required. Landfill is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Agriculture zone. Landfill sites should be planned on strategic traffic routes such as Great Eastern Highway or Great Northern Highway, or via rail access. Alternative more sustainable technologies available rather than diverting waste to landfill. Compatibility with surrounding land-uses, specifically organic farming. Traffic Impacts (including on tourism) of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Concerns regarding pollution and contamination to groundwater and surface water in a water catchment area and adjoining reserves. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity, use of alternate technologies and location of landfill), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. Officers notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and term better alternatives and technologies for waste disposal. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to
30	17 Jan 18	Mundaring Residents & Ratepayers Assoc Inc	 Objection to proposal. Landfill is too close to catchment boundary for Goldfields water supply and a risk. Under no circumstance should this single drinking water source be able to be rendered unusable. Insufficient information submitted on hydrological connections between the site and catchment to confirm that there is no risk of contamination. Further monitoring bores required, by a party with no vested interest. Concerns over dust emissions from dried leachate pond and natural hazards such as flash flooding contaminating water catchment area. Traffic Impacts of additional heavy vehicles and increased traffic on Great Southern Highway to accommodate. Impact of additional heavy vehicles through Sawyers Valley, Mundaring and Glen Forrest townsites. Comment that previous traffic volume figures were conservation and that there is no hourly/time restriction on vehicular movements.

31	18 Jan 18	Brian Harffey & William Allister	47 Newcastle St, York	 Objection to proposal. Impact on environment and environmental health from dust emissions, leaching and contamination of surface and ground water. Comment that monitoring will be difficult and risk of proximity to water catchment area. 	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.
				 Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination. Concerns regarding pollution and odour emissions affecting air quality. Noise Emissions - impact on adjoining properties and fauna. No demand for a landfill and better technologies available for disposal of waste. There are alternative better sites for a landfill. Impact on tourism economy. 	Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme, strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. Officers note that there may be better alternative sites and impacts on tourism economy. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.
32	18 Jan 18	River Conservation Society Inc		 Objection to proposal. Condition 9 specifies the approval will lapse if not substantially commenced from the date of approval (31 August 2015). Extension of the period to substantially commencement after the application has lapsed is inconsistent with the intent of condition 9 and SAT approval. Reasons for refusal of the application by the Shire of York in 2014 and 2015 are still valid. Other circumstances have changed since the original application: The Great Southern Highway from the Lakes to York has been declared one of the most dangerous roads in the State. Toodyay Road is proposed to be developed as the main East/West Highway route and any developments should use that facility. The Minister for Planning in the previous Government asserted that no new landfill sites were needed and that the current landfills have enough capacity to support the Metropolitan needs. The climate of thinking about dumping waste in landfill has changed in the last 5 years. There are new investigations by the Waste Authority, and 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans, strategic traffic routes, lack of strategic planning and demand for landfill, changes to overall waste climate and previous for refusal are noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. With reference to the above comment, the Waste Strategy is currently being reviewed, and is at early consultation phase with the Waste Authority advising that a draft is not likely to be ready until June 2018. In discussion with the Department of Planning, WALGA and WA Waste Authority, officers are not aware of any other landfill strategic plans which have been released in a draft format or adopted since consideration of the previous application. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

	1	т			
				 appropriate interest in developing other alternatives to landfills. WALGA is also demonstrating a new paradigm in relation to alternative waste disposal. That there is now a landfill strategic plan 'in process', an underlying reason considered by SAT in the appeal. There is no strategic rationale for location and need of the landfill. The hydrology for the site was never properly addressed and is insufficient. Additional monitoring should be required to support the application. 	
33	18 Jan 18	Keith Schekkerman	420 Boyercutty Rd, York	 Objection to the proposal. Extension of the period to substantially commence would be inconsistent with SAT judgement, which states the application has expired. Support for arguments as per previous Responsible Authority Report. Great Southern Highway is inadequate and unsafe for additional heavy vehicle movements. There is no demonstrated need for a landfill. Insufficient bores and water monitoring to demonstrate hydrology underlying the site. A \$5 million rehabilitation bond to the Shire of York should be required as a contingency. Landfill Levees collected by the WA Government original purpose was to create a disincentive to taking stuff to landfill and to create a fund to finance options. Levees collected have been directed to General Revenue, not fulfilling this purpose and need to be directed to finding solutions to waste disposal issues. Landfill proposals such as this one is a result of absence of coherent policy on waste. In absence of the proposal demonstrating that there will not be an adverse effect or risk to human health or the environment, the precautionary principle should be invoked, and the application not proceeded with. 	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Comments regarding overall consistency with the scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents considered by SAT (including waste Strategy and associated documents), rehabilitation bond and previous reasons for refusal are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of this application to reconsider matters already determined by SAT. 'Risk' and 'contingency is fall within the scope of environmental issues. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment or that the proposal has been progressed enough by DWER to confirm that the existing conditions are sufficient (including conditions regarding landfill levees and wider operation of waste management is noted, although not something that can be addressed
34	18 Jan 18	York Health Advisory Committee	-	 Objection to the proposal. Concerns about impact on human health from contaminants leaching from the landfill into adjoining environment, including into the atmosphere. Great Southern Highway is inadequate and unsafe for additional heavy vehicle movements. 	within assessment of this proposal. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.

					Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning				
					· ·				
	10. 10	a			Assessment' section within the RAR.				
35	18 Jan 18	Glenn Davies	9386 Great	Objection to proposal.	Impact on land value is not a listed matter to be considered by local				
			Southern	De-valuation of property and businesses in proximity to	government by the Scheme or Regulations.				
			Highway, St	site should contamination occur.					
			Ronans	Landfill should not be located on or in proximity to prime	Comments regarding overall consistency with the scheme (including				
				agricultural land, or areas of high environmental value.	impacts on amenity and tourism and location of landfill on agricultural				
				Detrimental impact on amenities of locality.	land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy				
				There has been sufficient time to implement the approved	and associated documents), State Planning Policies and Regional Plans are				
				landfill.	noted. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and				
				The period for substantial commencement ended on the	strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be				
				31 August 2017, and the application has lapsed. An	amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is				
				extension of the period to substantially commence would	not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have				
				be inconsistent with condition 9 of the SAT approval. A	already been determined by the SAT.				
				new application should be required.					
				Concern regarding change in applicant and arrangement	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning				
				of ownership by AIM Enterprises to lease the site to Alkina	Assessment section within the RAR.				
				Holdings and liability to be responsible for any					
				contamination or failure that may occur.	The change in applicant and associated implications is discussed in the				
					'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR.				
	Aikilla s proposal is sittilial to sitta s proposal altitough								
				note that there were deficiencies in assessment of the	Comments regarding the previous assessment are noted. It is not the role				
				proposal, such as site visits carried out.	of officers to consider the adequacy of previous determinations made				
				Impact on adjoining properties and bio-security of	the SAT or DWER as part of this application.				
				adjoining farms from contamination to stock and produce	the 5/11 of 5 Well as part of this application.				
				by air, dust and discharge of contaminates to water systems.	Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning				
				Concern regarding impact on human and animal health	Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is				
				from those working on the adjoining properties from air,	insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an				
				dust, odour and noise emissions from landfill.	adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.				
				Concern on human and animal health from reliance on	adverse impact of flatdraffesources of the environment.				
							1	non-scheme supplies such as rainwater tanks, bores and	Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning
				surface water, and impact should dust, and contaminants	Assessment' section within the RAR.				
				be spread to these sources.	ASSESSMENT SECTION WITHIN the RAK.				
				Insufficient flora and fauna investigations by SITA.	Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and				
					Insufficient information on bird/pest management, such	Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and			
				as seagulls, wild pigs, rats, cats and birds, flies and	responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning				
				mosquitos which have potential to be attracted to the site	Assessment within the RAR.				
				and may result in spread of contamination and diseases.					
				Landfills should be located in areas of low environmental					
				risk.					
L	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	113%					

				 Dust Management proposed by Alkina is insufficient for weather conditions of site. Natural hazards, such as storms and flash flooding and impact on landfill and planning for such events. Precautionary principle should be applied in absence of full scientific certainty that threats and risk can be avoided. Period of rehabilitation and revegetation and monitoring after conclusion of landfill should be required to ensure containment. A \$50 million contingency fund be set up to guarantee future contamination will be dealt with. Deficiency in Alkina Holdings proposal to demonstrate that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the environment and use of old outdated assessments with updates. New flora and fauna surveys should be required as these can change over time and increase from that previously measured. Traffic data used in the assessment is outdated, and Great Southern Highway is inadequate for additional heavy vehicle traffic and increased traffic. Bushfire hazard and impact on adjoining properties, community and businesses from prolonged and toxic bushfire at landfill. Landfill is a bushfire risk that is inappropriately located adjacent a national park with high fuel loads and 44,000ha in area is an unacceptable risk. Concern over capacity of emergency services to respond in event of bushfire, and contaminated runoff if water is used to extinguish. Query as to what occurs if liner is damaged during fire. 	
36	18 Jan 18	The York Society Inc	-	 Objection to the Proposal. Property should be rezoned prior to consideration of application for landfill. No demonstrated benefit to the Shire of York community. 	The current Town Planning Scheme No.2 in absence of prohibition of 'waste disposal facilities' allows for the land use to be considered without a rezoning application required. The implications of 'Scheme Amendment No.50' which propose a rezoning of the Allawuna Farm site are outlined in the RAR. Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the
37	18 Jan 18	Kay Davies	PO Box 222, York	 Objection to proposal. Copy of letter signed by the now Premier Mark McGowan dated 19 April 2016, that an Environmental Assessment should be required by the Environmental Protection 	'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR report. Copies of letter from the Premier is noted. The Shire is not able to comment on legislative processes required under the Environmental Protection Act, or what will be considered at a State Government level.

Authority, and that proper consideration is given to road safety.

- Copy of speech from Hon Darren West on the need for strategic planning for landfill sites and impacts of ad hoc sites on rural communities.
- There has been sufficient time to substantially commence the proposal.
- The development approval has lapsed in accordance with condition 9 of the approval and should not be extended.
- JDAP to give due regard to Scheme Amendment No. 50 where Council voted 14 April 2014 to make Waste Disposal Facilities a prohibited use in the Scheme.
- The SU8 zone was created with the intent to permit the development as approved by SAT which required substantial commencement to occur or the approval lapses. Extension is inconsistent with the SU8 zone.
- The works Approval Application made by Alkina Holdings has altered the original application made by SITA to warrant a new development application submitted including:
 - the layout of the landfill itself
 - o modifications made to the leachate ponds
 - changes made to truck movements and the construction of a bitumen road into Allawuna.
- There has been no application made for the approval of these modifications by Alkina Holdings. The modifications have altered the original application significantly enough to warrant the application requiring new approval by all relevant agencies including the EPA and the DWER.
- No demonstrated benefit to the Shire and community.
- Proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Agriculture zone, Strategic Community Plan, Shire of York Local Planning Strategy, Avon Arc Sub-Regional Strategy, Wheatbelt Land Use Planning Strategy and State Planning Policy 2.5 – Land Use Planning in Rural Areas.
- Landfill should not be located on or in proximity to prime agricultural land, or in proximity to areas of high environmental value.
- Better alternative technologies for waste disposal available.
- Detrimental impact on amenities of locality.

Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourism), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy, State Planning Strategy 2050 and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location, as set by Hon Darren West and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of the Shire to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT.

Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR.

Scheme Amendment No. 50 and Special Use Zone No. 8 are discussed within the RAR.

Refer comments in submission 16 above regarding amendments in the current works application approval from the previous applicants works approval and information submitted in support of the development approval.

Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment.

Impact on land value is not a listed matter to be considered by local government by the Scheme or Regulations.

Comments regarding the previous assessment are noted. It is not the role of officers to consider the adequacy of previous determinations made by the SAT or DWER as part of this application.

The change in applicant and associated implications is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section of the RAR.

- Concern regarding future use of property after landfill site will remain contaminated.
- Use of broader farm for agricultural purposes will be affected.
- Proposal is inconsistent with State Planning Strategy 2050 which identifies the Avon Valley and Eastern Hills in section 10 for food production, landfill is not compatible with this use.
- Impact on adjoining properties and bio-security of adjoining farms from contamination to stock and produce by air, dust and discharge of contaminates to water systems. Reference to NSW DPI 'Agricultural Issues for Landfill Developments' document, which identifies a risk assessment to ensure bio-security of adjoining properties should be undertaken and extend 3km from the landfill site.
- De-valuation of property and business reliant on should contamination occur.
- Concern regarding gas emissions, wider impact on environment from greenhouse gas emissions and principles of intergenerational equity from detrimental impacts of current waste disposal on future generations.
- Concern regarding impact on human and animal health from those working on the adjoining property from air, dust, gas, odour, noise emissions from landfill.
- Concern on human and animal health from reliance on non-scheme supplies such as rainwater tanks, bores and surface water, and impact should dust, and contaminants be spread to these sources.
- Insufficient bore monitoring undertaken to understand hydrology of site. Insufficient flora and fauna investigations by SITA.
- Insufficient assessment of visual amenity and no site visit undertaken during SAT consideration of application.
- Insufficient information on bird/pest management, such as seagulls, wild pigs, rats, cats and birds, flies and mosquitos which have potential to be attracted to site and may result in spread of contamination and diseases.
- Alkina's proposal is similar to SITA's proposal although note that there were deficiencies in assessment of the proposal, such as site visits carried out.

The operation and regulation of borrow pits is discussed in the RAR.

Any extension of time, increase or modification of the approved development would require a new or future development application to the Shire of York or JDAP and potentially DWER. Assessment of that proposal would occur at that time. This would include a proposal to extract materials for the purposes of transporting offsite not associated with the landfill. Also, refer comments in RAR regarding operation and regulation of borrow pits.

Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR.

Materials to be used in the construction of the landfill is within the prescribed premises boundary and falls under the jurisdiction of the DWER (notwithstanding comments on regulations of borrow pits within RAR).

- Landfills should be located in areas of low environmental
 risk
- Land capability maps presented by SITA in supplementary report were inconsistent with DAFWA land capability maps.
- Aboriginal heritage impacts not sufficiently assessed.
- Inappropriate location for landfill, for risk.
- Concerns of location of landfill within seismic zone, and impact on liners with risk of rupture or failure causing contamination.
- Concern regarding reliability of liner.
- Dust Management proposed by Alkina is insufficient for weather conditions of site.
- Natural hazards, such as storms and flash flooding and impact on landfill and planning for such events.
- Precautionary principle should be applied in absence of full scientific certainty that there will be no adverse impact on the environment.
- Period of rehabilitation and revegetation and monitoring after conclusion of landfill should be required to ensure containment.
- Reference to a requirement from NSW EPA solid waste landfill guidelines, which advises inappropriate locations for landfills as within 250m of areas of significant environment or conservation value identified under relevant legislation or environmental planning instruments. Advise that the landfill site is within 250m of a waterway – thirteen-mile brook.
- Incorrect information in DWER application. Reference to landowner is AMI Enterprises Pty Ltd, which should be Robert Chester. Rainfall data was incorrect in previous submission and has been increased from 381mm to 590mm. Change in data warrants a new application. Query as to reliability of information in this application.
- Amendments to lifetime of landfill increasing from 20 years to 28 years, and operation hours which are inconsistent within document.
- Concern with owner leaser operation arrangement between AMI Enterprises leasing site to Alkina Holdings for operation and legal complexities may prevent carrying of responsibilities such as rehabilitation/monitoring and remediation required. A \$50 million contingency fund be

				 set up to guarantee future contamination will be dealt with. Deficiency in Alkina Holdings proposal to demonstrate that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the environment and use of old outdated assessments with updates. New flora and fauna surveys should be required as these can change over time and increase from that previously measured. Borrow pits should be treated similar to an extractive industry. Concern regarding emissions and how these will be managed. Traffic data used in the assessment is outdated, and Great Southern Highway is inadequate for additional heavy vehicle traffic and increased traffic. Bushfire hazard and impact on adjoining properties, community and businesses from prolonged and toxic bushfire at landfill. Landfill is a bushfire risk that is inappropriately located adjacent a national park with high fuel loads and 44,000ha in area is an unacceptable risk. Concern over capacity of emergency services to respond in event of bushfire, and contaminated runoff if water is used to extinguish. Query as to what occurs if liner is damaged during fire. Certainty that threats and risk can be avoided. Concern regarding expansion of the facility in the future. Insufficient control over borrow pits should they choose to dig in different areas. Concern over use of 'outside' soil and contamination concerns. 	
				 Insufficient wind data to inform DWER works application. 	
38	18 Jan 18	Alison Theelen	Lot 774 Cubbine Rd, York	 Objection to proposal. Shire of York have voted to prohibit landfills within the Shire of York. Detrimental impact on environment and environmental health from dust, fire, noise, physical pollution, odour and other contaminants impacting air quality, welfare and amenity of people and nearby land uses. These impacts include dust, noise, odour and especially the danger of fire within the landfill. Insufficient information provided on hydrology of area. 	Scheme Amendment No. 50 relating to the request for prohibition of landfills is discussed in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is

				 Spreading of contamination from birds. There will be an increase in vermin and pests which will impact native flora and fauna as well as farm bio-security. Concern regarding reliability and lifespan of liners to prevent contamination to water table. Farms to the west of York have no scheme water, relying on rainwater tanks for human consumption as well as stock watering. Contaminated dust will have a huge effect upon the area. Traffic increases along Great Southern Highway and associated impacts upon air quality as well as the flora and fauna from noise pollution. 	insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR.
39	18 Jan 18	Robyn Davies Terry Davies	3592 Great Southern Hwy, York	Objection to proposal. Period to substantially commence ended 31 August 2017. In accordance with condition 9 of approval, the approval has lapsed. A new application should be required. Pouse of information proposed by SITA/SUEZ and that	Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR. There is nothing within the planning framework that prohibits the use of information prepared by another application (subject to copyright issues
40		Terry Davies	Southern Hwy, York	 Re-use of information prepared by SITA/SUEZ and that information presented in this application is insufficient. Alkina Holdings has had sufficient time to have their landfill proposal approved. Alkina Holdings are leasing Allawuna from AMI Enterprises Pty Ltd for a period of approximately 20 years. Alkina Holdings is a small company with few shareholders and we question their financial position to have a multimillion dollar contingency plan when contamination occurs to the environment or businesses in the area. The proposal is not consistent with the principals of sustainable development. York is a seismic activity hot spot, so there is great concern over lining damage within the landfill. Earthquakes can destroy liners. Natural disasters such as flash flooding and impact on landfill. The precautionary principle and the principle of stainable development are not being considered as a landfill which will have a huge negative impact on our legacy for future generations. Detrimental impact on environment, from contamination to flora, fauna, national park, soil, ground water, surface water and air. 	not arising). Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is insufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Comments regarding overall consistency with the Scheme (including impacts on amenity and tourism and location on agricultural land), strategic documents considered by SAT (including Waste Strategy and associated documents), State Planning Policies and regional plans are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location, need for a landfill and that there are alternative technologies available for waste disposal. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and strategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be amendments to consider) since determination of the application, and it is not within the jurisdiction of this application to reconsider matters which have already been determined by the SAT. Traffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR.

41	18 Jan 18	Gregory &	6 Wheeler St,	 The bio-security of surrounding agricultural land will be affected. The proposal will result in an unacceptable risk to the community, road users and the environment. Great Southern Highway is not a safe and appropriate road to position a landfill. More appropriate and suitable sites are available for use as landfills. Loss and reduction of productive agricultural land. The proposal will impact amenity, heritage and the lifestyle of York. There are no quantified benefits to the community as a result of the proposal. There is substantial community objection to the landfill, which has increased over the last 6 years. The proposal will put undue and unnecessary strain on local emergency and service volunteers. The landfill does not encourage tourism in the Shire of York. Many York community members and businesses rely on tourism. With the increase in traffic along Great Southern Highway tourism will seriously be affected in York thus affecting the enjoyment and quality of the lives of community members. The proposal is not consistent with State and Regional Strategic Plans & Policies for use of rural land. There are sufficient landfills available to cater for metropolitan waste. The reduction of waste and the increase in recycling practices have increased the life of existing landfills. Landfill technology is out dated and there are better alternatives available. There is no facility of this type in the locality and the landfill is foreign to rural amenity. The landfill is incompatible with proposed future zoning of the immediate locality. The proposal is ad-hoc and is not considered proper and orderly planning. Objection to proposal. 	Value or benefits to community is discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Fire Management and associated considerations are discussed and responded to within the 'Planning Assessment' section in the Planning Assessment within the RAR. Community opposition is noted as a reason that the extension of period to substantially commence the development should not be supported. Scheme Amendment No.50 and orderly and proper planning is discussed in the Planning Assessment section of the RAR.
		Susan Norris	York	 Risky and unknown nature of materials diverted to landfill, and risk of contaminants and toxins leaching from the site to water catchments is unacceptable. 	contingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning Assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is

				traffic on Great Southern Highway and concern of the adequacy and capacity of Great Southern Highway to accommodate. The development was not substantially commenced in accordance with condition 9 of the development approval and has lapsed.	rasufficient information to determine that the proposal will not have an dverse impact on natural resources or the environment. Fraffic Impacts are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning assessment' section within the RAR. Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning assessment section within the RAR.
42	19 Dec 17 & 19 Jan 18	Peter & Helen Green	2839 Great Southern Hwy, St Ronans	 Reasons for refusal in 2014 and 2015 still apply. There have been changes since consideration of the application by SAT: The Great Southern Highway from the Lakes to York has been declared one of the top most dangerous roads in the State. Recent accidents and spills from rubbish trucks on Toodyay Road illustrate the potential for such accidents on Great Southern Highway. Toodyay Road is to be developed as the main East/West Highway and any developments should use that facility. The Minister for Planning in the previous Government asserted that no new landfills were needed. The current landfills have enough capacity to support the Metropolitan needs. The climate of thinking about dumping waste in landfill has changed in the last 5 years. There are new investigations by the Waste Authority and the appropriate interest in developing other alternatives to landfills. WALGA is demonstrating a new paradigm also. The SAT gave approval on the definition contained in the Town Planning Scheme, particularly the definitions of Industry-Noxious. Rejection of the application should rest on the notion that a landfill is noxious and does not conform to definitions of Industry. Reference to underlying SAT reasons for decision, and 'expert Planners agreed that 'the proposal was not inconsistent with the local planning framework (including the relevant town planning scheme), nevertheless 	comments regarding overall consistency with the scheme (including impacts on amenity), strategic documents considered by SAT (including vaste Strategy and associated documents), rehabilitation bond and previous reasons for refusal are noted. The Shire notes that there is a lack of strategic planning to justify the landfill location and need for a landfill. However, there has not been a substantial change in the policy and trategy framework (note comments in RAR on areas where there may be mendments to consider) since determination of the application at SAT, and it is not within the jurisdiction of this application to reconsider natters already determined by SAT. Refer comments in submission 16 above regarding amendments in the urrent works application approval from the previous applicants works proval and information submitted in support of the development proval. The application was processed by the Shire as a 'use not listed'. Discussion occurred within the SAT decision document regarding whether the use was more appropriately classified as 'Industry – Noxious', although was not clarified when the orders giving approval were issued. Regardless of his the assessment process for an 'Industry-Noxious' listed as an 'SA' use in the General Agriculture zone, has the considerations and application process as an 'use not listed'. A change in the classification of land use lose has no implications on this application, or a new application. Noting that Scheme Amendment No.50, which is to be given due regard in any application and proposes a new Special Use Zone No.8 as discussed in the tark. Relevant environmental and environmental health issues (including ontingencies) are discussed and responded to in the 'Planning assessment' section within the RAR. Officers have noted that there is neutificient information to determine that the proposal will not have an diverse impact on natural resources or the environment.

	 until more strategic, over-arching and long-term planning had taken place. Recommended that the application be rejected on the basis proper planning is not in place. SOY should reject the application on the basis that the proper planning is not in place. The hydrology was not sufficiently addressed and additional bore monitoring should be required. The proposal by Alkina, is a new proposal. The period for substantial commencement has expired and in accordance with condition of the approval, the application has lapsed. Extension of the period to substantially commence would be inconsistent with the intent of the approval. 	Comments regarding the strategic planning and discussion of expert planners are also noted. The Tribunal on considering the expert advice referred to determined it was appropriate to issue approval in absence of wider strategic planning. There has been no substantial amendments to the strategic planning framework (other than those noted within the RAR report), and it is not within the Shire's jurisdiction to question a matter which has been determined by SAT. Discussion on the application for extension is discussed in the Planning Assessment section within the RAR.
--	---	--