

## Item 11.3: Macs Reef Waste Management Working Group

<b>SUBJECT</b>	Investigations into the construction of a Waste Transfer Station at Macs Reef by the Working Group		
<b>FILE NO.</b>	WM0016	<b>DIVISION</b>	Infrastructure Planning

### **Attachments**

1. Minutes of Wamboin / Bywong / Sutton East Waste Management Working Group meeting held on 9 February 2010.
2. Concepts Option Report – Macs Reef Waste Transfer Station (Quadro Australia Pty Ltd - February 2010)
3. Letter from Kim Bolas

### **Recommendation**

Recommended that Council:

1. Note the minutes of the Wamboin / Bywong / Sutton East Waste Management Working Group held on 12 January 2010.
2. Accept the Concept Options Report and Recommendations at Section 13 (page 34), should Council formally resolve to proceed with the construction of a waste transfer station at Macs Reef.
3. Include the provision of a Waste Transfer Station at Macs Reef in its draft 2010/11 Management Plan and determine whether to proceed with the facility after consideration of community comment received at the end of the exhibition period.

### **Synopsis**

The results of investigations undertaken by the Wamboin/Bywong/ Sutton East Waste Management Working Group into the possible construction of a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) at Macs Reef are presented for Council's consideration.

### **Report**

#### **Concept Options Report**

To assist the working group in its assessment of possible sites for a WTS at the Macs Reef landfill, the services of consultant Quadro Australia Pty Ltd were engaged to prepare a Concept Options Report. A copy of this report is attached minus Appendix E (Flora/Fauna Report), and Appendix F (Archaeological/Heritage Report). These appendices are not included in order to reduce the size of the report and make it more manageable for the business paper. The important information in these documents is referred to in the main part of the report.

In summary the outcomes of the report are as follows;

- Three siting options were investigated at the Macs Reef site. These are as indicated in Figure 10.1 at page 32.
- A concept layout was prepared for a suitable WTS that would cater for the expected waste flow volumes to the site and the expected number of customer visit for average and peak periods extending out for 20 years. In keeping with the brief, and with the objective of minimising the footprint and costs of constructing and operating the facility, the WTS will not cater for vehicles larger than 2 tonne, commercial & industrial waste, green waste, clean fill, tyres, mattresses, white goods and large scrap, chemicals, dead animals nor asbestos. Customers with these loads/items will need to travel to Bungendore. Aside from general residual waste it will cater for batteries, e-waste, oils, small cut-up scrap metals, small swappable/buy-back items, and of course general recycling.
- It was determined that 4@30 m<sup>3</sup> bins with covers will be required for waste and 1@ 20m<sup>3</sup> bin will be required for recycling with all bins being emptied each week after transport to suitable off -site destinations. The recycling would most likely go to the Hume MRF and the waste to either Bungendore WTS or hopefully directly to Woodlawn Bio-reactor.
- The site will be staffed and require staff amenities
- A storage shed has also been included for buyback centre and office.
- Common to all proposals is the need to upgrade the intersection where the access road joins Macs Reef Road and for all road and manoeuvring areas to be bitumen sealed to avoid dust and muddy surfaces. Based on traffic volumes and expected turning movements an RTA standard AUR/BAL intersection treatment is required as detailed in Appendix D.
- The preferred siting option for the WTS is Site 3 with layout as indicated in Appendix C. It best satisfied evaluation criteria as demonstrated in Table 12.1 at page 43. Option 3 fitted in best with the site constraints which were mapped at Figure 6.4 and operational considerations. It is assessed as being the least expensive site to develop at an estimated cost of \$1 232 000. See details in Section 11 and Appendix H.
- Following discussions with the Working Group, the following operating hours are proposed:
  - 2.00pm to 5.00pm Fridays
  - 8.00am to 4.00pm Saturdays and Sundays
  - 7.00am to 11.00am Mondays

This is a considerable reduction on current operating hours of the landfill but was considered necessary to reduce costs of operation which will also include bin servicing. The costs of labour and plant (\$92 000 pa) and bin servicing (\$113

000) have been detailed in Section 11 and are further considered in Financial Considerations below.

#### **Input from neighbouring property owners**

The working group, as part of its investigations, was keen to ascertain the opinions/comments/concerns of the neighbouring property owners on the proposal to construct the WTS at the site. This task was undertaken by members on the working group from the Wamboin and Bywong Community Association. Their report follows:

*'Jim Greethead and John van der Straaten were deputed by the Working Group to contact the owners of the properties adjoining the Macs Reef Tip to provide them with the options for the future of the landfill, ie the development of a transfer station.*

*We have made the requested contact with the owners of the four properties and have made personal contact with three of them and telephone and email contact with the fourth. Their comments on the proposals have been noted and individually listed below. Also, they have been asked for their written comments and, if received in time, will be attached to this report.*

*1. Neighbours A (names deleted) were interviewed on 1 February 2010: They were very interested in the history of the developments leading to the Quadro Report. They considered that the site 3 Concept would be the best option for them. Their main concerns were for:*

- 1. a properly designed and safe turning system for traffic from Macs Reef Road travelling into the tip road entrance, eg safe passing lanes;*
- 2. an adequate drainage system to cater for flood water and any overflow from the leachate dam;*
- 3. a fence system of sufficient height and construction design to prevent rubbish, eg plastic bags, being blown onto their property.*

*Minor concerns related to the possibility of dust and screening, eg trees.*

*2. Neighbours B (names deleted), were interviewed on 12 February 2010. They were appreciative of the opportunity to discuss the future of the landfill and comment on the Quadro Report. The Site 3 Concept was their favoured option. They have been experiencing constant problems with people dumping waste either on their road or inside their property when unable to gain entry to the tip. The responses from Council to their representations were considered to be unsatisfactory. Their main concerns relate to this problem:*

- 1. the dumping of waste, eg cars, on their road preventing access to their property;*
- 2. an efficient gate management system to minimise opportunities for dumping out of hours (see attached email response);*
- 3. a turning circle on the road outside the entrance to the tip to enable vehicles towing trailers to turn without having to back; and*

4. a safe transition zone on Macs Reef Road for entry to the transfer station road entrance.

3. Neighbours C (names deleted), were interviewed on 21 February 2010. They are new residents in the area but were very interested in the proposals for the landfill site, particularly as their house overlooks the whole site. They have been experiencing problems with wind blown rubbish and dust from the tip, noise from the heavy machinery working the tip and trucks dumping volumes of fill. They said that they would appreciate assistance from Council to remove the large amount of detritus from the gullies which had come from the existing tip once the transfer station had been completed and all the planned fencing had been undertaken. Their main concerns were for:

1. the siting of the transfer station so that only minimal existing tree canopy is disturbed and the transfer station is camouflaged from their driveway and at the entrance to their property;
2. the height of the shedding is not excessive and it is camouflaged, eg green colourbond cladding and roofing;
3. sufficient screening of all buildings with trees and shrubs;
4. sealed roads throughout the transfer station to minimise blown dust;
5. fencing to contain all windblown material, eg plastic bags, paper and cardboard; and
6. slip lanes on Macs Reef Road at the entrance to the transfer station road sufficient to cater for the speeding hill traffic.

4. Kim Bolas, 704 Macs Reef Road, Bungendore, NSW. 2621, (Kim has indicated that she is happy to have her name included in the report to Council) finally made contact with Jim Greethead on 19 February 2010 by telephone and on 20 February by email. She had been provided with the summaries and documents shown to the other persons interviewed. We have been unable to meet with her as yet although the offer has been made. Her written response is attached.

In summary, she is totally opposed to the proposal to establish a transfer station at the Macs Reef Road landfill site but in the event of it proceeding says that "the following must be applied:"

1. no increase in rates to the local ratepayers;
2. no trees are cut down; and
3. there is a turning lane on Macs Reef Road and not on the tip road.

Many of the points she raises have been covered off in the reports by Patricia Saunders (Archeological/heritage study), Roger Good (Flora/fauna study) and Quadro and in Council discussions. She states that she is referring her email to Council and it is appropriate for Council and not either Jim Greethead or John van

*der Straaten to provide her with the statistics she has asked for in her email. A courteous acknowledgement has been provided to her.*

*Jim Greethead*

*John van der Straaten'*

Council has received a copy of Ms Bolas's letter and it is attached as Appendix 3. Ms Bolas has requested that her letter be referred to the meeting for Councillors consideration. Responses are as follows:

#### **Macs Reef Road Traffic**

- The WTS would generate less traffic than the current landfill as many less loads will be accepted at the facility.
- The proposal for the WTS includes the upgrading of the current deficient intersection to RTA standard in keeping with the predicted traffic volumes in the area.

#### **The Environment**

- The adoption of site 3 or 1 will require the removal of trees within the footprint of the facility and its access road. The flora/fauna study however indicates that no endangered species will be affected. The loss of trees from the WTS site will be compensated somewhat by the restoration of the landfill site and the revegetation cover that will be provided.

#### **The cost to the ratepayer**

- There will be a cost and this is covered under Financial considerations below.

#### **Alternatives to the current landfill site**

- Moving the WTS to another location on Macs Reef Road/Bungendore Road will not necessarily make for a safer location. Obviously acquiring a new site in a rural residential zone would be an added, very expensive cost to the facility and will change the amenity of that area. It is expected that the facility definitely will not be feasible if moved to another site.

#### **Other issues**

- The traffic count on Macs Reef road is currently about 3600 vehicles per day AADT.
- RTA records indicate that there have been 2 tow-away and 2 injury accidents in the vicinity of the tip entrance and Bankers Road intersection between 2002 -2008.
- The tip has approximately 10 000 vehicles visit per year. This is an average of 48 vehicles per day on the 4 days a week it is open. Peak visits occur on Saturdays when up to a 200 vehicles may visit the site.

- An additional left turning lane is expected to cost in the order of \$50 000.

### **Financial considerations**

The report indicates that the capital cost of the WTS is likely to be about \$1 232 000 plus the ongoing operation costs of \$205 000 p.a. made up of \$92 000 for staffing and \$113 000 for bin servicing.

The funding of the capital cost would need to be from loans with the repayment for these to come from the general waste charge (GWC). The operational costs would need to be covered by a combination of the general waste charge and gate fees at the WTS. However, there will theoretically be no increase in revenue from gate fees as gate fees for this waste from Wamboin/Bywong/Sutton East are already accounted in expected receipts at the Bungendore WTS.

A loan of \$1 232 000 at 7.25 per cent interest over 25 years will require annual repayments of \$108 110. This would be funded by a \$16.15 increase in the GWC (\$108 110/6690 assessments). Each extra \$100 000 in borrowings would add an additional \$1.30 increase in the GWC.

The annual operational costs of \$205 000 fully funded from the GWC would increase the GWC by an additional \$30.65 (\$205 000 /6690).

Once the facility is up and operating the GWC will need to be increased in total by \$46.80 p.a. in 2009/10 dollars.

However, if the project is approved the increase would probably occur over 3 years with costs for design in 2010/11, construction in early 2010/11 and operation from the second half of the year and in 2012/13, full year operations.

With reference to the Concept Options Report it is suggested at Table 11.1 that an amount of \$140 000 be allowed for investigations/design/planning process including \$50 000 for an EIS. If this was funded directly from the GWC this would add \$20.90 in 2010/11. If the WTS was constructed in early 2011/12 and operated from mid-year, \$1 092 000 would need to be borrowed (\$1 232 000 - \$140 000) with repayments of \$95 800 p.a. funded by an increase in the waste charge of \$14.30. The operation costs that year would be \$102 500 (\$205,000/2), adding a further \$15.30 to the GWC. In 2012/13 when the WTS operates for a full year, running the operations would require \$30.65 per assessment.

In summary the GWC over the 3 years would need to increase in 2009/10 dollars as follows:

2010/11	\$20.90 pa, say \$21
2011/12	\$14.30 (loan) + \$15.30 (half year operation) = \$29.60 pa, say \$30
2012/13	\$14.30 (loan) + \$30.65 (full year operation) = \$44.95 pa, say \$45

Already proposed in the draft 2010/11 Management Plan Budget is an increase in the GWC of \$18 to cover the costs of already approved waste projects under Council's adopted 20 year Waste Strategy, including the construction of the Bungendore WTS and programmed re-instatement of Bungendore and Macs Reef landfills for which new loans will need to be serviced and disposal fees will need to be paid at the new waste disposal destination.

### **Policy implications**

The current position of Council is that adopted at its meeting held on 6 August 2009 when it was advised of the results of the waste survey conducted in the Wamboin/Bywong/Sutton East area. The outcomes were:

- that more than one out of every two households in Wamboin, Bywong and Sutton East responded to the waste management survey;
- this 54.5 per cent response rate is a remarkable return rate, even with supply of reply-paid envelopes, given that survey specialists regard an 8-10 per cent response rate as very good;
- that of the residents responding to the survey:
  - 75.2 per cent favoured replacement of Macs Reef Road Tip with a small Waste Transfer Station (WTS) on the site;
  - just 19.7 per cent of respondents favoured a roadside waste and recycling wheelie bin collection by Council; and
  - 67 per cent of respondents were against a Council-run roadside wheelie bin collection trial costing \$30 000 of all Palerang ratepayers' money.

On being advised of these results, Council resolved to take the following actions:

- 1) That in the face of such overwhelming opposition to the trial, Council postpone plans to hold the roadside wheelie bin collection trial;
- 2) Given the broad support for a small WTS at the Macs Reef Road Tip site, investigations, concept designs and environmental studies on its feasibility be expedited, including addressing EPA issues with the current landfill, obtaining the required flora and fauna, heritage and Aboriginal study reports and seeking the Director-General of Planning's form & content requirements for the preparation of an EIS, so a Development Application for the small WTS can be prepared; and
- 3) Should the investigative studies prevent a small WTS being established on the Macs Reef Road landfill site, a second survey be held giving residents the options of choosing either:
  - a. to use Bungendore Waste Transfer Station;or support
  - b. a Council-operated roadside waste and recycling wheelie bin service in the Wamboin / Bywong / East Sutton area.

### **Social implications**

The results of the waste survey in the area indicated that for future waste arrangements in the area, 72.2 per cent of residents returning the survey forms favoured the replacement of the existing tip with a small waste transfer station on the site.

The viability of constructing the facility however in the end will come down to a decision of Council, once it has received public comments on the proposal. While it would appear from the Concept Options Report that there is unlikely to be a major impediment that could not be overcome to its physical construction on the site, the issue is likely to be whether the community, both locally and shire wide, are willing to pay for the construction and ongoing operation of the replacement facility.

### **Environmental considerations**

The Good Environmental Systems Report indicated that no threatened, locally rare or vulnerable species were located on the site and no significant vegetation habitats were noted.

The consultant's report also indicated that there was no specific or significant habitat for any native animals.

A Seven Part Test was undertaken and concluded that no significant impacts will accrue from the restoration of the tip or the construction of the waste transfer station.

It remains however that a decision will still need to be made whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be needed for the project because it would with the adoption of Site 1 or 3 lie within 250 m of a residence. With reference to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 Part 1 Schedule 3 Clause 32, the construction of the facility will be designated development unless Council's planning staff, having regard to topography and local meteorological conditions, are satisfied that the facility will not significantly affect the amenity of the neighbourhood by reason of noise, visual impacts, air pollution (including odour, smoke, fumes or dust), vermin or traffic.