

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PROPOSAL: DA15/0007 Extractive Industry – Additional area**  
**OFFICER: Sturt McDonald**  
**SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 20 March 2015**

#	Name	Summary of submission	Comment
Agency comments			
1.	Dept Mines and Petroleum	<p>1. Sand is a scarce resource in the South West region.</p> <p>2. Supplies are needed to facilitate affordable development and infrastructure</p> <p>3. Please notify GSWA of all applications for extractive industry to maintain and improve this Geological Survey database.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p>
2.	Dept of Water	<p>1. It is important to protect water quality for people and/or organisations</p> <p>2. Insufficient information has been provided in this application (primarily regarding surface water drainage and groundwater management details) to provide comment. DoW is therefore unable to provide comment.</p> <p>3. If approved without additional information, the following standard conditions should apply a) The extractive industry will not intercept the water table b) No dewatering permitted c) No standing water to occur at the end of mining/post rehabilitation. d) No hydrocarbon storage, major repairs or maintenance to take place on site e) on-site refuelling of equipment will be from a mobile service vehicle carrying appropriate spill prevention and clean-up equipment</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Additional surface water management details will be required. Monitoring of groundwater for 12 months prior to commencement is considered to be an unreasonable request.</p> <p>3. These standard conditions will apply</p>
3.	Department of Parks and Wildlife	<p>1. WRP clearing protocols should be implemented</p> <p>2. Multiple Use (MU) Wetland present feeds into CCW, PEC and ESA. This provides an important ecological function &amp; should be protected.</p> <p>3. EPA guidance statement requires a minimum 50metre buffer from wetlands. A 50 metre buffer should be implemented.</p> <p>4. This buffer includes peppermint trees that should be retained.</p> <p>5. A WAPC subdivision condition requires fencing be installed to protect the CCW and associated watercourse. This fencing should be installed and approved by DPaW prior to any extraction works.</p> <p>6. DPaW does not support the proposal if the above recommendations are not implemented.</p> <p>7. The eastern area of G-1 is recommended to be revegetated to enhance the PEC, CCW and watercourse areas.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Noted</p>
4.	Environmental Protection Authority	<p>1. The proposal is no considered to be significant, therefore no EIA required</p> <p>2. The City is the correct authority to determine if an adjoining lots land use is classified as sensitive, whether setbacks are an appropriate control for the context and whether conditions regarding noise levels ought to be imposed</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted</p>

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PROPOSAL: DA15/0007 Extractive Industry – Additional area**  
**OFFICER: Sturt McDonald**  
**SUBMISSIONS CLOSE: 20 March 2015**

Community comments			
1.	S.Threadgold	<p>Objection</p> <p>1. This proposed extractive industry is 290.75 metres from my residence</p> <p>2. This proposal is 124.3 metres from my rural workers dwelling, where my manager and his family reside.</p> <p>3. Distances to dwellings provided in the site plan (rev 1) are wrong.</p> <p>4. The proposal is inconsistent with the Rural Areas Land Use and Development Policy: primarily- the 300m and 500m setback requirement.</p> <p>5. The proposal has adverse impacts for the amenity of the locality.</p> <p>6. The southern treeline of Haag road is being removed, meaning that the extraction area will be quite visible</p> <p>7. Truck movements (approximately 120 per day) will be hazardous.</p>	<p>1&amp;2. Noted. It is also noted that this residence is also within 100m of this submitters own approved sand extraction area</p> <p>3. Noted. Distances in this report rely on the City's GIS system.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. Noted</p>
2.	M. Kent	<p>Objection</p> <p>1. Concerns regarding lax dust control and monitoring.</p> <p>2. Site manager 'visually inspecting' the issue is both inaccurate and likely to be downplayed due to their conflict of interest.</p> <p>3. Council should bear the responsibility for dust monitoring.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2&amp;3. Revised noise and dust management plan involving monitoring equipment to be a recommended condition of approval. Applicant still to bear responsibility of monitoring.</p>
3.	P. Rouw	<p>Objection</p> <p>1. Location: within 500m of residences. Inconsistent with City Policy.</p> <p>2. Dust: never been effectively controlled on previous sites. Persistent winds in summer and use of pit during dry times (to prevent spread of dieback) will exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>3. Noise: The reversing beepers are already easily heard. This will only be worse</p> <p>4. Screening is inadequate – especially considering Haag road clearing.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2&amp;3. Revised noise and dust management plan involving monitoring equipment to be a recommended condition of approval.</p> <p>4. 2m Bunding will provide some visual screening between road and sand extraction</p>
4.	R. Hoare	<p>Complaint at previous sand extraction on this Lot:</p> <p>1. Inadequate dust control measures. "I could write my name on my desk in the dust".</p> <p>Conditional non-objection-</p> <p>2. Areas A – F are fully rehabilitated prior to the commencement of Area G (Including the removal of all sand stockpiles)</p> <p>3. Concern that there is no incentive or timeline to rehabilitate</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2&amp;3. Timelines/triggers for rehabilitation already exist for these cells.</p>