TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: **a) The Council Committee Minutes Item numbers may be out of sequence. Please refer to Section 10 of the Agenda – Information Report - Committee Decisions Under Delegated Authority for these items.**

b) Declaration of Councillors and Officers Interest is made at the time the item is discussed.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 6 PATERSON STREET MUNDIJONG ON FRIDAY 3rd JUNE, 2005. THE PRESIDING MEMBER DECLARED THE MEETING OPEN AT 1.09PM AND WELCOMED MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT IN THE GALLERY, COUNCILLORS AND STAFF.

1. ATTENDANCE & APOLOGIES:

IN ATTENDANCE:

COUNCILLORS: DL Needham ..... Presiding Member
JE Price
AW Wigg
WJ Kirkpatrick
THJ Hoyer
JC Star
JA Scott
KR Murphy
EE Brown

OFFICERS:
Ms J Abbiss ..... Chief Executive Officer
Mr M Beaverstock ..... Director Asset Services
Mr B Coelho ..... Manager Asset Services
Mrs E Cox ..... Acting Director Corporate Services
Ms C Eldridge ..... Acting Director Sustainable Development
Mr B Gleeson ..... Manager Planning & Regulatory Services
Ms M Kenny ..... Senior Planner
Mr T Turner Principal Environmental Health Officer at 1.11pm
Mr P Zahra ..... Environmental Health Officer at 1.11pm
Mrs S Rowse ..... Communications Officer
Mrs S Langmair ..... Minute Secretary

APOLOGIES: Cr IJ Richards

GALLERY: 2

2. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME:
Nil

3. PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME:
Nil

4. PETITIONS & DEPUTATIONS:
Nil

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:
Nil

6. DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS INTEREST:
Nil

7. RECEIPTS OF MINUTES OR REPORTS AND CONSIDERATION FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

SD078/06/05 PROPOSED EXTENSION TO EXISTING POULTRY FARM - LOT 21 HOPELAND ROAD (CNR PUNRAK ROAD), SERPENTINE (P00286/02)		
Proponent:	J Byatt	In Brief Proposed addition of four new poultry sheds to an existing poultry farm. Approval is recommended subject to conditions.
Owner:	L & M Byatt	
Officer:	Meredith Kenny - Senior Planner	
Signatures Author:		
Senior Officer:		
Date of Report	1 June 2005	
Previously	P326/05/98	
Disclosure of Interest	No officer involved in the preparation of this report is required to declare an interest in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act	
Delegation	**Committee in accordance with resolution SM051/06/04**	

Date of Receipt:	28 February 2005
Advertised:	Yes
Submissions:	2 objections
Lot Area:	22.5 ha.
L.A Zoning:	Rural with Special Control - Poultry Policy Area overlay
MRS Zoning:	Rural
Byford Structure Plan:	Not applicable
Rural Strategy Policy Area:	Rural Policy Area
Rural Strategy Overlay:	Poultry Policy Area Overlay
Municipal Inventory:	Not applicable
Townscape/Heritage Precinct:	Not applicable
Bush Forever:	Nil
Date of Inspection:	15 March 2005

Background

The subject site is located on the north-west corner of the Hopeland and Punrak Roads intersection. The southern boundary of the site has frontage to both Punrak Road and Jarrah Road. The western boundary abuts a vacant property previously used for tree farming. The northern boundary abuts a property in the same ownership as the poultry farm. Hopeland Road forms the eastern boundary of the lot and is also the eastern boundary of the Poultry Farm Overlay Area.

The site is predominantly cleared with only some sparsely scattered trees in the northern part of the site and along some natural drainage creeks.

A copy of the location and site plans (aerial photographs) are with the attachments marked L21 01.pdf***,*** L21 02.pdf ***and*** L21 03.pdf***.***

Existing Development

Planning Approval was granted for the establishment of the poultry farm at the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 25 May 1998 (P326). The approval was granted subject to the following conditions:

1. *The development being carried out substantially in accordance with plans and details submitted to Council except where amended by these conditions.*
2. *Compliance with the WA Planning Commission Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 setback/buffer for new poultry farms (this implies 100m from the sheds to any of the proponent's boundaries).*
3. *A revegetation plan shall be submitted to the Council and approved by the Environmental Officer. For the purpose of these conditions a landscape plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and shall show the following:*
   (a) the location and type of existing trees and shrubs
   (b) any lawns to be established
   (c) any natural landscape areas to be retained; and
   (d) those areas to be reticulated or irrigated
   (e) location and type of proposed trees and shrubs to achieve significant revegetation of the lot.
4. *All stormwater shall be contained and disposed of on site to the satisfaction of Council.*
5. *The finished floor level of the proposed building shall be set at a maximum height of 600mm above the natural surface level of the site or any other level determined by the Principal Building Surveyor.*
6. *A bond for landscaping of the site to the value of $5000 shall be paid to the Council prior to the issue of the building licence and held in trust until the landscaping has been completed to Council's satisfaction.*
7. *Where an approval from another authority(ies) is required, the applicant shall provide the Council with a copy of the written approval(s) from the authority(ies) prior to the issue of a building licence or the development and use of the land in accordance with this approval.*
8. *All feed truck transport to be in daylight hours.*
9. *A sign indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas should be required as a condition of development approval.*
10. *Access to be from Punrak Road.*
11. *Punrak Road from Jarrah Road to Hopeland Road is to be upgraded by the developer at no cost to Council if, following a review of traffic six months after commencement of the use carried out by Council's Manager of Technical Services, such an upgrade is considered necessary.*
12. *Access to the site from Punrak Road is to be upgraded by the developer to the satisfaction of the Manager Technical Services.*

The planning approval was for the construction of four 50 000 bird sheds. The sheds are the tunnel ventilated controlled environment type. The sheds are located in the south-west corner of the property with vehicle access being via Jarrah Road.

The level of compliance with the conditions of the original approval is discussed in detail in the "Comment" section of this report.

Proposed Development

The proponents have now purchased another contract to grow broilers and as such need to increase the number of sheds to accommodate the increased production from 200,000 birds to 440,000 birds. Two sheds are proposed to be constructed within this current financial year and a third shed is proposed to be constructed in the 2006/2007 financial year. These three sheds in addition to the existing four sheds will enable production of up to 380,000 birds. A fourth new shed for 60, 000 birds is also included in the application. However, a timeframe for the construction of this shed has not yet been determined.

An aerial view showing the elevations of the existing and new sheds on Lot 21 is with the attachments marked L21 04.pdf***.***

Subsequent to submission of the application, the applicant has submitted supplementary reports with regard to odour , noise and dust modeling.

The Shire has engaged independent Environmental Consultants to review the odour, noise and dust modelling provided by the proponents.

The supplementary information submitted by the applicant and the review of that information by the independent Environmental Consultants engaged by the Shire are summarised and discussed in the Comment section of this report.

Sustainability Statement

Effect on Environment:
The proposed extension to the existing poultry farm will not require the clearing of any native vegetation. The applicant has not proposed any additional screening vegetation and as such a condition of approval will require additional screening to occur.

Resource Implications:
The extension to the poultry farm may require an increase in ground water usage. However, the new technology incorporated into the controlled environment poultry sheds means that water usage is 50% less than with older style sheds. Any increase in the use of bores outside current licensing limits, will require an application to the Department of Environment to extend those limits.

Use of local, renewable or recycled Resources:
It is uncertain whether the proposed sheds will be constructed from locally available resources.

Economic Viability:
The proposal may be economically viable in a way that incorporates its external costs if conditioned, managed and monitored appropriately but it is not possible to determine that the proposal will be economically viable.

Economic Benefits:
The proposal has the potential to generate long term employment within the Shire.

Social – Quality of Life:
The application was referred to surrounding landowners for comment. Concerns and issues raised by the community are addressed through appropriate conditions of planning approval. There is the potential that the amenity of the area could be affected by noise, odour and dust as well as visually if not managed appropriately to ameliorate these potential impacts.

Social and Environmental Responsibility:
In order to prevent any adverse impacts on the environment or amenity of the area, the owners would need to demonstrate a commitment to a high level of social and environmental responsibility through compliance with the conditions of approval.

Social Diversity:
The application for the extension of the poultry farm does not directly impact on any particular social group.

Statutory Environment: Town Planning and Development Act 1928
Town Planning Scheme No.2

As per the resolution of the Western Australian Planning Commission made under Clause 32 of the Metropolitan Region Scheme, extensions to poultry farms that are greater than 100 square metres in area require separate determination by the WA Planning Commission under the

Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS). The Shire determines the application under the Town Planning Scheme (TPS) only.

Policy/Work Procedure Implications:

The application was required to be referred to the Department of Environment and Agriculture Western Australia as the site is within the Peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment Area Statement of Planning Policy No.2.1, Statement of Planning Policy No.5, Draft Environmental (Peel Harvey Estuarine System) Policy 1992

Financial Implications:

There are no Financial implications to Council related to this application/issue.

Strategic Implications:

This proposal relates to the following Key Sustainability Result Areas:-

2. Environment

Objective 1: Protect and repair natural resources and processes throughout the Shire

Strategies:

1. Increase awareness of the value of environmental requirements towards sustainability.
3. Encourage protection and rehabilitation of natural resources.
4. Reduce water consumption.
5. Reduce green house gas emissions.
6. Value, protect and develop biodiversity.

Objective 2: Strive for sustainable use and management of natural resources

Strategies:

1. Implement known best practice sustainable natural resource management.
2. Respond to Greenhouse and Climate change.
3. Reduce waste and improve recycling processes

3. Economic

Objective 1: A vibrant local community

Strategies:

1. Attract and facilitate appropriate industries, commercial activities and employment.

4. Governance

Objective 3: Compliance to necessary legislation

Strategies:

1. Ensure development and use of infrastructure and land complies with required standards.

Comments from External Agencies

The application was referred to the Department of Environment and the Department of Agriculture for comment. Their comments are summarised below:

Department of Environment (DoE)

The Department is not opposed to the expansion but recommends that the Shire require the proponent to undertake the following studies to determine whether the proposed buffers are satisfactory:

Odour impact study addressing the following:

quantifying odour sources using dynamic olfactory analysis;
prediction of the down wind odour impacts using dispersion modelling; and
comparison of the dispersion modelling results to a recognised environmental odour criterion to derive an appropriate odour buffer distance.

The odour study should be undertaken in accordance with the EPA's Draft Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors No. 47 - "Assessment of Odour Impacts".

If odour is not the only factor which requires a separation distance, appropriate studies should be undertaken for each factor. Alternatively, clear demonstration that the odour impact area encompasses all the other factor impact areas needs to be provided.

Subject to the resolution of this matter, the DoE would have no objections to the proposal subject to the following condition and advice:

Environmental Management Plan
The subject land is located within the proposed Karnup-Dandalup Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA) which has been declared for Priority 3 (P3) source protection. Housed poultry farming is considered to be a conditionally compatible landuse type in P3 areas. As a result, an Environmental Management Plan should be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment (DoE) and the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.

Such a plan should comply with the DoE's Environmental Code of Practice for Poultry Farms in Western Australia; and clearly prescribe both the proposed operation of the development and the environmental management of issues including but not limited to odour, noise, dust and wastes (including washdown water and contaminated litter).

Drainage Management
The proponent should be required to separate roof stormwater from effluent discharge such as washdown water. This should ensure that during high rainfall events the storage capacity of the retention pond to infiltrate wastewater and retain nutrients is not compromised by the increased stormwater discharge from roofs.

A minimum 50 metre separation between the sheds and settlement pond and the conservation category wetland on the adjacent property is considered to be adequate subject to the above measures being implemented.

Groundwater Abstraction
The proponent should be advised that the property is located in the Serpentine Groundwater Area where there are issues of groundwater quality and availability. The proponent should be advised to seek advice from the DoE's Mandurah office concerning groundwater usage.

Actions taken in response to Department of Environments Comments
The applicant was required to engage suitably qualified consultants to prepare an assessment of the worst case scenario potential odour and noise impacts and to determine whether there were measures that could be put in place to address these worst case scenarios. The applicant has now submitted additional reports in this regard and these are discussed in detail in the Comment section of this report.

Agriculture Department of Western Australia
Comment
AWA advise:
Staff of the Department of Agriculture have reviewed the application for planning approval for the development of a new poultry farm on the above property.

The proposal as listed should meet the Environmental Code of Practice for Poultry Farms and our Nutrient Management staff assure me that the plan is in accordance with best

practice. The proposed poultry farm is in a rural area in the proximity of other poultry facilities and within the Poultry Policy Overlay area designated by the Council.

The Department of Agriculture has no objections to the proposed extensions to this existing poultry facility.

Actions taken in response to Department of Agriculture's Comments
Department of Agriculture's comments are noted.

Community Consultation:

Required: Yes by resolution of Council
Support/Object: 2 letters of objection were received. The content of the submissions are detailed below:

Submission 1

1. *The proponents have not yet complied with the first approval with regard to the visual screening required. The operators say that they have planted trees and they have died. Do they have to be native? The proponents should plant large established trees or find some other means of screening the development.*

2. *The proponents must be required to comply with the original approval before they get any more favours from Council otherwise these conditions are just a nonsense if they are not enforced.*
3. *The fans need to have scrubbers to filter out all particles before being released onto other people's properties especially with all the warnings coming from the World Health Organisation about the likelihood of bird flu mutating.*
4. *The nearest poultry shed on an adjacent property is only 600 metres away instead of 1000 metres. Before extensions are granted this should be looked at. If there are rules for some why not all? Is it good enough just to say there are already sheds there?*
5. *The submitter is already surrounded by four poultry farms, a piggery and a turf farm and these are all impacting on our lives and now you want us to have three more multiple impacts by way of two extensions and new huge broiler farm.*
6. *Council has a duty of care to protect the rate payers from having their lives ruined by so many impacts on our lives.*
7. *Fan noise needs to be engineered out as well as smell.*
8. *No new applications, where buffer zones are such an issue, should not be granted until this discriminatory law has been reviewed. I believe I should have equals rights as anyone else but if my place becomes someone else's buffer now or in 20 years time I find it the worst kind of discrimination for several industries to be allowed to get away with a caveat on my land.*

Submission 2

1. *It is acknowledged that the proposed development is within the poultry overlay area and as such is a permitted use.*
2. *The most worrying factor associated with poultry farms is health. All of the state government policies acknowledge the operation of poultry farms as "a nuisance" because of the ongoing problem with noise, dust and odour. The World Health Organisation regard the bird flu as a serious threat to world health and Council has a duty of care to consider the reality of a pandemic. The Poultry Industry require 1000 metres between farms, the proposal is far short of that.*
3. *The buffer will cause a future imposition on neighbours, this regulation is unjust and legislation needs to be changed.*
4. *Other problems are increases in traffic, times of operation and multiple impacts.*
5. *No approval should be given until all conditions imposed 6 years ago are fulfilled.*
6. *It is my view that there should be a halt to all proposals of this type until a total review is held at State Government level into legislation controlling the Poultry Industry.*

Development Control Unit Comment:

Environmental Officer
Issues/ discussion
Non compliant with regard to revegetation from previous planning approval

Recommendations
It is recommended that the Shire gives serious consideration to not issuing approval for the expanded poultry farm until the owners are compliant with their previous planning approval in relation to revegetation. At the very least, the applicants should be made aware that they are to include revegetation required for the existing farm in the next stage of development and that the Shire is not satisfied with the revegetation outcome from the first stage of development.

Conditions recommended:

1. *The proponent shall prepare for Director Sustainable Development's approval a Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan that identifies requirements for weed control, details the protection of existing vegetation, and describes the densities and distributions of indigenous trees, shrubs, groundcover and shoreline plant species to be established.*
2. *The proposed development is not to commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan in writing.*
3. *The implementation of the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan shall commence within twelve months of the development approval being granted and is to be completed within three years of the development approval being granted. Vegetation on site is to be maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan thereafter.*
4. *Vegetation planted by the developer must be fenced from grazing livestock in order to protect trees and other vegetation from damage.*
5. *Any discharge of water from the premise including seepage to groundwater, other than directly to sewer or septic systems, shall be via treatment in silt traps, nutrient extraction swales, detention ponds, settling ponds or other effective mechanism to remove nutrients and chemical agents.*

It is of concern that there are no plans to extend the settling pond to cope with more than double the amount of storm water runoff from roofs. It is recommended that a drainage and nutrient management plan be prepared that includes calculations proving that the current settling pond size will cope with storm events (severity of storm event as specified by the Shire's engineers). The fact is that this settling pond drains to a conservation category wetland that is only 90 metres away so the water needs to be treated effectively.

6. *The proponent shall prepare a Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan for Director of Sustainable Development approval and thereafter implement the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in its entirety.*
7. *The proposed development is not to commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in writing.*

A condition is required that refers to the code of conduct adopted by the poultry industry and requires the company to comply with guidelines in this document. The conditions in this regard should read:

8. *Poultry shed design and management, plus the management of stock feed, water, waste products and all other aspects of poultry farm operations is to comply with the management guidelines set out in Environment Code of Practice for the Poultry Industry in Western Australia May 2004.*
9. *The proponent shall store environmentally hazardous chemicals including, but not limited to, fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons (where the total volume of each substance*

stored on the premises exceeds 250 litres) within low permeability (10-9 metres per second or less) compound(s) designed to contain not less than 110% of the volume of the largest storage vessel or inter-connected system, and at least 25% of the total volume of vessels stored in the compound.

10. *The storage, use and disposal of all chemicals including, but not limited to, pesticides, disinfectants and veterinary products is to comply with the manufacturers recommendations.*
11. *No chemicals or potential liquid contaminants are to be disposed of on-site.*
12. *Stock feed is to be stored within containers which preclude access to vermin and native wildlife.*
13. *Outside lighting is to be kept to a safe minimum and should be angled to minimize light impacts on neighbouring properties.*

Advice Notes recommended:

1. *The Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan shall:*
   - *a) Include a scaled map of the development which can be placed as an overlay over a recent (since 2003) aerial photograph of the whole of lot 21 Hopeland Road;*
   - *b) Locate on the map, and both identify and describe how existing indigenous vegetation is to be protected or is not to be retained as a result of driveways, fences, drains and other surface water features, firebreaks, power lines and other access ways and services plus proposed buildings and other structures;*
   - *c) Locate on the map and both identify and describe the management of existing exotic vegetation;*
   - *d) Locate on the map and identify both the types and magnitudes of weed infestations and describe weed management to be undertaken;*
   - *e) Locate proposed revegetation works on the map and describe the species, densities, soil preparation and plant protection to provide complete screening of all existing and proposed poultry sheds from the roads and adjoining properties, maximise nutrient uptake from surface waters and surrounding soils, reconnect remnant vegetation with visual screen plantings and, provide habitat for local woodland and wetland fauna.*
   - *d) Describe ongoing management of vegetation on site;*
   - *e) Clearly state auditable vegetation management targets including weed control and revegetation outcomes for audit at the time of vegetation management bond return and thereafter as follows –*

     - *i) Visual screens are to include a minimum of six rows of trees and shrubs and must be no less than 10 metres wide;*
     - *ii) Stems within visual screens are to be planted at minimum densities of one stem per three metres along rows that are no more than two metres apart;*
     - *iii) Visual screening is to include a mixture of trees and shrubs such that no more than one third of the plants are trees.*
     - *iv) Sedges and rushes to be planted around the settling pond are to be clumped with densities of four stems per meter squared within clumps and interspersed with other local wetland species;*
     - *v) Required stem densities relate to a time when a minimum of 80% of the plants have survived at least two summer seasons and this is to be achieved initially within three years after development approval is given and thereafter maintained;*
     - *vi) All plants are to be of locally native species indicative of neighboring woodland and wetland communities;*
     - *vii) Achieve a plant diversity of at least 80% of the plant species that are listed within the dominant shoreline ground cover, medium shrub, tall shrub and tree categories for the relevant woodland and wetland communities on the Shire Planting List;*
     - *viii) Maintain a weed burden at levels not likely to threaten the native species;*
     - *ix) Locate fire breaks on the map.*

2. The Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan is required to address the following:

a) show how the capacity of the settling pond will cope with storm water and shed wash down water including all 1:10 year storm events;
b) show how chemicals from disinfectants used, and nutrients from wash down water are treated so that no pollution can impact ground water resources or drain to the conservation category wetland down stream;
c) describe and commit to best management practice of swales including the placement of, and periodic replacement of yellow sand linings, establishment and maintenance of a complete cover of healthy kikuyu, repeated clipping of kikuyu and disposal of clippings away from water courses, preferably to be exported off site to be composted with shed litter.

3. The compound(s) described in condition …shall:
a) be graded or include a sump to allow recovery of liquid;
b) be chemically resistant to the substances stored;
c) include valves, pumps and meters associated with transfer operations wherever practical - otherwise the equipment shall be adequately protected e.g. bollards and contained in an area designed to permit recovery of chemicals released following accidents or vandalism;
d) be designed such that jetting from any storage vessel or fitting will be captured within the bunded area - see for example Australian Standard 1940-1993 Section 5.9.3 (g);
e) be designed such that chemicals which may react dangerously if they come into contact, are in separate bunds in the same compound or in different compounds; and
f) be controlled such that the capacity of the bund is maintained at all times e.g. regular inspection and pumping of trapped uncontaminated rain water.

Comment:

Statutory Context

The subject site is zoned Rural and is also within the Poultry Farm Special Control Area. Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2) states that the purpose and intent of the Rural Zone is to allocate land to accommodate the full range of rural pursuits and associated activities conducted in the Scheme Area. Generally in the Rural zone a Poultry Farm is an "AA" use (discretionary). However, for those lots also covered by the Poultry Farm Special Control Area overlay a Poultry Farm is a "P" (Permitted) use.

Under the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) the land is zoned Rural.

Normally the single planning approval granted by a local authority represents approval under both the MRS and the local authority town planning scheme (TPS). This is by virtue of the Notice of Delegation issued by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) under the WAPC Act 1985, which delegates the power to issue approvals under the MRS to local government. However, in the case of certain types of applications the WAPC has made resolutions under Clause 32 of the MRS calling in the power of determination. This is the case for all applications involving new poultry farms or extensions to existing farms. Accordingly, the application has been referred to the WAPC for determination under the MRS. The Shire's decision may only relate to TPS 2.

Compliance with the provisions of TPS 2 relating to Poultry Farms

The provisions contained in Part X of TPS 2 relating to poultry farms and the subject proposal's compliance with those provisions is detailed in the table below:

Scheme Provision	Complies?	Comments
Controlled environment sheds or other (more superior) best practice controlled environmental technology, will be used to house the poultry.	Complies	N/A
There will be an internal loop road to allow articulated vehicles and truck and dog configurations to enter and leave the site, and service the facility, in a forward direction.	Complies	N/A
Landscaping and screening of the poultry sheds and surrounds accords with the "Standards for Revegetation on New Poultry Farms".	Doesn't comply	The existing landscaping does not comply with the original approval issued for the poultry farm. Appropriate conditions should be placed on the approval for the extensions requiring the landscaping around the existing sheds to be brought up to standard and the implementation of vegetation screening for the new sheds.
All litter material and dead birds will be disposed of off the site and in accordance with best practice.	Complies	Dead birds are kept in a cool room, collected weekly and disposed of at an approved composting facility. All litter material is removed from the site at the end of each cycle and disposed of at an approved composting facility.
A sign/s is placed on the site in a visible location to the satisfaction of the Council indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and possibility of undesirable environmental impacts on the surrounding areas as specified in schedules 1 and 2 of the Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 5 Poultry Farms Policy.	Doesn't comply	A sign was required under the original approval but has not been erected. Given the dual street frontage it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the erection of signs on both the Hopeland Road and Punrak Road frontages of the site.
In respect of <u>New</u> Poultry Farms the sheds are at least: 500 metres from any existing or future residential zone; 300 metres from any existing or future rural-residential zone; 200 metres from any wetland subject to Water and Rivers Commission advice; 100 metres from the boundary of the Poultry Farm.	 Complies Complies Doesn't comply Complies	This is not a new farm so these provisions do not apply. The existing sheds are located only 150 metres from a Conservation Category Wetland on the adjacent lot to the west. The original farm was developed prior to this provision being inserted in TPS 2. The northern most new shed will be located only 90 metres from this wetland. The Department of Environment advise that whilst the 200 metre setback is the most desirable outcome a minimum separation of 50 metres from the wetland dependent vegetation will be acceptable subject to appropriate management controls being imposed and implemented particularly with regard to waste water retention. All storm and wash down

Scheme Provision	Complies?	Comments
		water is currently directed to a large existing settlement pond located between the sheds and the wetland. This pond is adjacent to a stream that flows through Lot 21 to the wetland on the adjacent lot. It is recommended that monitoring of the quality of the water in the stream be undertaken on a regular basis by the Shire at the cost of the developer to ensure that the settling pond is adequately filtering the water before it gets into the wetland. In addition, the DoE recommend that separate retention facilities be provided for stormwater and waste water to prevent the possibility of a single pond overflowing during a major storm event.
All the application requirements have been provided and the Council is satisfied with the establishment, operations and management and the impacts of the proposed development on the local environs.	Generally Complies	All application requirements provided as detailed previously in this report. The operation and management of the existing farm is considered to be adequate as no complaints have been received since commencement of operation in 1999. As detailed above vegetative screening needs to be improved to comply with original approval.

EPA – Guidelines for Separation Distances

Under the Environmental Protection Authority's *Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors - Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses (Draft June 2004)* the proposed use fits within the land use category of Poultry Industry – Intensive Farming. Under this document the potential impacts for this use are dust, noise and odour.

This document identifies a guideline separation distance between poultry farms and sensitive land uses as between 500-1000 metres depending on the size of the farm. It should be noted that the document does not detail what is considered to be a small, medium or large poultry farm. Clause 2.3 of the document defines "Sensitive Land Uses" as follows:

Land uses considered to be potentially sensitive to emissions from industry and infrastructure include residential areas, hospitals, hotels, motels, hostels, caravan parks, schools, nursing homes, child care facilities, shopping centres, playgrounds and some public buildings.

Clause 3.1 of the document goes on to state that it has only attempted to incorporate advice relating to separation distances from various codes relating to specific types of industry such as the poultry industry and that some of these codes may provide more detailed information on buffers that may be relevant to the achievement of acceptable environmental outcomes.

A single house on a Rural zoned lot is not classified as a “Sensitive Land Use” under the EPA’s guidelines. The 100 metre boundary setback is considered to be acceptable development in this regard. However, a map was prepared to show the distance of existing dwellings on adjacent properties from the existing and proposed sheds on this farm. This determined that the nearest house on an adjacent property was 340 metres from the poultry

sheds (ie consistent with the buffer the state government thinks is appropriate for a rural-residential area – that is almost three times greater than the distance the state government thinks is appropriate in a Rural zone).

A map showing the location of existing dwellings on adjacent properties in relation to the existing and proposed sheds on Lot 21 is with the attachments marked L21 05.pdf***.***

WAPC's Statement of Planning Policy No.4.3. Poultry Farms
The main provision of the WAPC's Poultry Farms policy relating to the expansion of existing farms is that the new sheds not be located any closer than 100 metres from any boundary. The proposed development complies with this requirement. Existing and proposed sheds will be 100 metres from the northern, western and southern boundaries and over 300 metres from the eastern boundary (Hopeland Road).

The remainder of the policy deals mainly with ensuring new poultry farms achieve a certain buffer to existing/proposed residential and rural-residential areas and that any proposals to rezone land to residential or rural-residential also comply with the buffers. This is consistent with the provisions for poultry farms contained in Part X of TPS 2.

Odour, Noise, Dust and Traffic Assessment
Odour, noise and dust are the three main elements of poultry farm operation that may impact on the amenity of adjoining properties. Traffic impact is another major element but the impact caused by traffic volumes generally fall into the noise and dust impact categories. As detailed in the Background section, the proponent engaged consultants to carry out odour, noise and traffic modelling to enable assessment of the likely impact of the proposed farm on the amenity of adjacent properties. Dust modelling was not carried out by the proponent.

A company that specialises as environmental consultants was engaged by the Shire to review the information submitted by the proponent in support of the application. The scope of work performed by these independent consultants is as follows:

a) Independent review of the two Development Applications;

b) Written advice on the validity of predicted environmental impacts, proposed processes and farming techniques, proposed environmental mitigation options, and any air dispersion modelling undertaken;

c) Provide commentary on the level of compliance with state Poultry Farming Codes of Practice; and

d) Assess the Development Applications against industry best practice.

In the sections below the above elements (odour, noise, dust and traffic) will be discussed including in each case:

1. Proponent's assessment and recommendations;
2. Shire's independent reviewer's assessment and recommendations;
3. Recommended conditions and action based on the findings of 1. and 2. above.

Odour
Even if a farm achieves the minimum setbacks required under both local and State Government policies that does not provide a guarantee that odour emissions will not impact on neighbouring properties. One of the main factors is the amount of moisture in the litter on the floor of the sheds and the humidity in the sheds. In addition, as per the results of the odour modelling carried out by the proponent's consultants, meteorological conditions and ventilation design will effect how odour is dispersed once it is exhausted from the sheds.

Public comment received in regard to the current applications being dealt with by the Shire and complaints received at other times confirm that the 100 metre boundary setback is not adequate to contain all emissions, particularly if no filtration or dispersion devices are fitted to the exhaust fans.

Odour Modelling and Management Methods intended to be implemented by proponent

Under the current Department of Environment Guideline the recommended approach to modelling of forced ventilation sheds is to move the source of odour to the end of the shed where the fans are located. This is, however an inadequate representation of the odour characteristics of these sheds and does not take into account the pre-dilution that occurs in the latter stages of the growth cycle.

The operation of these sheds can be considered as three phases

1st Phase – When the birds are still young or the air is very cold the fans are operated in a manner that provides optimum oxygen exchange whilst retaining warmth for the birds. Two extractor fans, one at either end of the shed, are operated on a timer and air is drawn into the shed through side vents. In the existing sheds, When the birds are very young the fans are set to operate for just 30 seconds out of every five minutes and run at a flow rate of 20,000 cubic feet (40,000 total) per minute. As the birds grow the fans operate for longer periods and the flow rate may increased to 40,000 cubic feet (80,000 total) per minute. The new sheds will operate in a similar manner, but the new fans will only operate at a flow rate of 22,000 cubic feet (44,000) per minute. A typical operating temperature of such a shed is about 28 degC and this needs to be factored in to allow for buoyant rise of any exhaust on cold mornings.

2nd Phase – In this mode, air is drawn into the sheds by the fans on the western end and through the side vent walls. As with the 1st phase, the rate of operation of the fans is ramped as the birds grow, so that at the beginning of this phase there is little more than 80,000 cubic feet per minute being drawn through the shed but as the birds grow this ramps up to all 15 fans per shed (390,000 cubic feet per minute) in operation. The target temperature of this phase is around 22 degC.

3rd Phase – In this phase the ventilation is directed through one end of the shed and out of the other so that a breeze is established in the shed. This increases the cooling effect of the ventilation. When necessary the cooling cell is also switched on to reduce the temperature in the shed. Ventilation rates are typically high and as the birds reach full size the fans are running pretty much all the time. The target temperature of such a shed is 18 degC.

It is important to note that the target of the forced ventilation changes a little over time. In the early stages the mode of operation is keep the birds warm, whilst providing sufficient oxygen for optimum growth. As the birds grow, more and more air is drawn through the sheds in order to keep the birds cool. Since the temperature of the sheds is the key operating factors the actual number of fans operating at any time will be strongly dependent on the temperature of the air drawn in from outside the shed. Therefore the fan rate will be strongly diurnal in character with more fans operating during the day and a minimum number of fans operating during the night. In view of this it becomes clear that the peak odour emission rate from the sheds will occur in the morning as the sun begins to warm the air.

The reason for this is quite clear; overnight ventilation is at a minimum and the air exchange rate is likely to be insufficient to allow a full flushing of odours produced by the birds. As the sun rises, the air begins to warm and more fans are engaged, producing a flushing effect. By late morning the fans are operating at a much higher rate and the dilution effect takes over. In order to ensure this effect was included, GHD collected two odour samples between 8:30 and 9:30 in the morning whilst the birds were approximately 15 days old. This age is important because the birds are still small enough to be sensitive to cold, whilst large enough to produce significant odour. These odour samples were found to contain 1350 and 1180 odour units, which when re-calculated to be an odour emission rate are approximately twice the emission rate that would have been calculated using the DoE guideline.

In order to account for this, modelling undertaken for ten day old chicks incorporated a diurnal variation where emissions doubled for two hours of the morning around sunrise.

Methodology

Two odour samples were collected from the western end of sheds 2 and 4 between 0800 and 0930 hrs. As the temperature increased, fans were automatically turning on an off and sampling was conducted in a manner designed to ensure that the samples were only collected when the fans were exhausting. The two samples were then transported to "The Odour Unit"; a laboratory NATA accredited for the analysis of odour samples.

Modelling of odours from force ventilation sheds is a complex procedure because the fans operate in different modes at different times of the day and at different times in the growth cycle. At this stage the relationship between ambient temperature/growth stage and ventilation rate is not well documented and therefore it was decided to undertake representative modelling at four different stages of the growth cycle as follows;

Day 1 – Two fans at each end only operate for 30 seconds every five minutes. The temperature of emission is 28 degrees. The odour concentration is the same as measured during the early morning flush (that is approximately twice the concentration that would be produced by the guideline).

Day 10 – 2 fans operates for 50% of the time– the odour concentration is the same as the early morning flush. The temperatures is 24 degrees. Note that this is overstating the situation at night because the cooler night temperatures would reduce the required rate of circulation.

Day 20 – One fan operates for 50% of the time at night, 2 fans operate continuously during the day. The odour concentration reflects the measured odour concentration during the night and in the morning. At 10 Oclock it is assumed that the sheds are now fully circulated and the shed emission rate drops to the guideline emission rate of 0.2 odour units per bird per second. This stage is dominated by the morning flush.

Day 30 – 10 fans operating continuously. Sheds are continuously flushed with respect to odour and the emission rate is the same as the guideline.

The location of these sheds, halfway across the Swan Coastal Plain makes the selection of a meteorological file difficult. Therefore the model was run for both the Hope Valley (coastal) dataset and the Caversham (near hills) dataset. Due to the coastal effects (reduced diurnal variability, increased sea breeze) it would be expected that the coastal conditions would lead to improved dispersion of odours and a smaller impact area. The location of these sheds in the middle of the swan coastal plain would tend to produce a dispersion patter somewhat between the hills and the coast. In order to simplify the interpretation of this, the model was also run on a combined Hope Valley, Caversham dataset spanning two years.

Results

Odour measurements were found to be 1350 and 1180 odour units showing a high degree of agreement between the two sheds. These represent two of very few odour measurements taken at forced ventilation sheds, but represent only a small part of the picture. The collection of these samples was timed to be during the morning flush and represents the concentration of emission during the night and early morning when the sheds are operated with minimal ventilation to maintain warmth within the shed. When the fans are operated in order to provide cooling (as opposed to maintaining a minimum oxygen supply), a considerably higher air exchange rate is used and the emission strength is aligned with the guideline emission rate.

Modelling of these emission scenarios against the guideline value of 7 odour units for a and 99.5%ile 3 minutely concentration indicates the following;

Day 1 – odour emissions are negligible (Figure 1) at any time of the year

Day 10 – Odour emissions are significant depending on the meteorological data file used (Figure 2). Modelling using Hope Valley data indicates a 7 OU contour within the 300m buffer. Modelling using the Caversham dataset indicates a broader spread of emissions.

Day 20 – Odour emissions create an impact between the two meteorological data files seen at day 10 (Figure 3). The contour is aligned along the line of the sheds.

Day 30 – Odour impacts are reducing due to the increased dilution effect of the fans (Figure 4).

Figure 5 provides a summary of this variability based upon the combination meteorological file. In addition these contours can be compared with the expected modelled value from naturally ventilated shed. There are some important considerations relating to these contours that will be discussed in section 4 or this report.

Conclusion

The odour contours produced in this report are for four stages of the growth stage. Three of these four stages produce odour contours that are quite similar, however it is also clear and expected that the early stages of growth will produce little by way of odour impact. At this stage the most reasonable approximation of the likely odour impact is an average of the four stages shown in figure 5. Such a contour would be extremely close to, if not within the 300m buffer.

The use of a naturally ventilated volume source model to represent a force ventilated shed is not appropriate. Naturally ventilated sheds are entirely at the whim of the prevailing meteorological conditions whilst emitting at the same odour rate. This is manifestly not the case for force ventilated sheds, which due to the slowing down of ventilation during colder weather will emit less during the worst dispersion conditions and pre-dilute the odour during other parts the growth stage. With this in mind, it is important for the reader to note that the naturally ventilated contour on figure 5 represents the odour emission according to the current guideline.

This report has also modelled the emissions using emission rates that more closely match the true conditions and using a modelling setup that more closely approximates the emission characteristics of the fans. It is important in this modelling to note that Ausplume cannot directly model a side emitting fan and therefore the model was established using broad low level stack sources that simulated the immediate lateral spread of the emission and then allowed the buoyancy of the emission to take over. This approach does not over-represent the vertical rise due to velocity that would occur if narrower stacks were used.

It is reasonable to conclude that odour impacts are significantly reduced by the use of forced ventilated sheds. This occurs due to a combination of reduced emissions when the chicks are young and pre-dilution of the odours when the broilers reach maturity. Modelling suggests that the 7OU 99.5% ile 3 minute contour will, in reality, be within the 300m buffer limit allowed within the guideline.

Odour Modelling mapping prepared by the proponent's consultants is with the attachments marked** L21 06.pdf**,** L21 07.pdf**,** L21 08.pdf**,** L21 09.pdf **to** L21 10.pdf**.

Independent Reviewer's assessment of Odour Modelling

Comments on the modelling approach

Odour modelling has been conducted for the proposed development by GHD. GHD have based odour modelling on the assumption that odour emissions from the sheds will vary according to the batch age of the chickens and the associated level of ventilation required to achieve adequate comfort levels for the birds. When the birds are young, low levels of ventilation are maintained so as to keep the birds warm, while still allowing for oxygen exchange. As the birds grow ventilation rates are increased to keep the birds cool and as the

birds reach full size the fans are running constantly. Modelling has taken place at four different batch ages to take account of the differing odour emission rates at each phase of chicken growth.

Modelling also included the use of odour sampling results taken at the predicted time of maximum emission rate, during the early morning when the fans are 'flushing' out the odour built up from the night before when ventilation is running at a minimum. The odour units measured are approximately twice the emission rate that would have been calculated using the current W.A Department of Environment odour modelling guideline ('the guideline').

Modelling has considered the variation of odour emissions from the shed by using the higher measured odour emission rate in modelling the phases when ventilation rates are low and there is little dilution of the odour before it is emitted from the sheds. This occurs in the initial stages of the bird growth cycle. The guideline odour emission rate has been used in the later periods of the growing cycle to represent the situation when fans are operating almost continuously and dilution of the odour is assumed to occur. Diurnal variation has also been considered by using a higher emission rate during the morning period when the chicks are small

.

This approach towards odour emission rates is seen to be a more rigorous method of modelling the emissions from tunnel ventilated sheds than assuming the same odour emission rate over all batch ages and temperature variations. In addition, as odour sampling results have been incorporated into the model, actual odour emission rates will present a more accurate representation of the odour emissions occurring at the poultry farm.

The guideline method suggests that in tunnel ventilated sheds the source location should be at the air exit end of the shed and conservatively modeled as a volume source. ERM agrees with the statement that this is an inadequate representation of the situation occurring in tunnel ventilation sheds as it is clear that a tunnel ventilated shed does not behave like a naturally ventilated shed.

In a naturally ventilated shed odour emissions occur from the entire building, while in the more controlled environment of the tunnel ventilated shed odour emissions are concentrated at the fan exits. As Ausplume cannot model fans that exit sideways, GHD has modelled the situation with each fan acting like a low broad stack. The fan will emit the plume horizontally, and as the plume will have no vertical velocity, vertical dispersion will rely on the buoyancy of the plume, with buoyancy largely dependent on plume temperature and external effects such as wind speed. At the time of this review ERM had not received the Ausplume configuration file details and therefore were unable to determine the velocity value that was entered for the stack. However, if the fans were to be modelled as a vertical stack the velocity of this stack would have to be negligible to account for the fact that a plume emitted from a horizontal fan will have no vertical velocity. GHD claims that the approach of using broader stacks does not over represent the vertical rise that could occur if narrower stacks were used, however ERM was unable to verify this statement as no information as to the diameter of the stacks and the velocity was available.

The main differences between the methodology used by GHD and the guideline methodology involves modelling as a volume source without a vertical discharge velocity and a stack source with a vertical discharge velocity. Discharging vertical with an associated velocity will no doubt improve dispersion and therefore reduce ground level odour concentrations. GHD have also included a contour diagram indicating the model results obtained when the guideline methodology was used. It can be clearly seen that this results in odour impacts occurring beyond the site boundary.

In ERM's opinion any improvement in dispersion modelling which eventually leads to a decrease in odour experienced at ground level should be considered by industry experts and incorporated into guidelines or legislation after appropriate due diligence. It is clear that greater investigation into the approach taken for modelling tunnel ventilated sheds is needed as these types of sheds become more prominent throughout the poultry industry.

The GHD report is based on the assumption that when ventilation is in full mode there is predilution of the odour within the shed before it is emitted. This appears reasonable as it is evident that the quantum of odour emitted from the poultry will remain the same but will be diluted into a much greater volume of air before dispersing to the atmosphere. Despite this there is anecdotal evidence that forced ventilation may lead to greater stripping of odours from the poultry floor – this may be in the order of 10-20%. This potential increase in emissions does not appear to have been factored in to the model and should have been considered if a worst case scenario was to have been modelled.

Comments on model inputs
The modelling has not used site specific meteorological data but has used two meteorological files, one exhibiting coastal weather patterns and the other inland weather patterns. Actual meteorological conditions experienced at the site have therefore been assumed to occur somewhere in the middle of the two. In addition GHD has also modelled impacts using a combined meteorological file from both the coastal and inland locations. This is seen to be a reasonable assumption and in the absence of real site data is an appropriate method to use.

Odour Mitigation Measures
The predominant source of odour emissions from poultry farms is the litter in the sheds. Controlling odour emissions from the source is therefore largely dependant on the management practices employed at the farm. As this is difficult for council to control, odour mitigation measures that control the odour in between the source and the receiver can be prescribed as conditions of approving the development application (subject to odour modelling considering the odour removal efficiency of such equipment).

ERM recommends review of the following;

Short stacks – odorous compounds are released from short stacks above the building height (approx. 5 metres). This aids the dispersion process prior to impacting sensitive receptors.

Windbreak walls – windbreak walls enhance the dispersion of odorous gases by directing the air upwards into enhanced mixing conditions. This can dilute the odorous air and therefore reduce the odour nuisance at sensitive receptors. As a solid screen will generally be more effective at forming a windbreak than a vegetative screen, the solid screen should be retained even after the vegetation screen has reached maturity. The vegetation screen is important to enhance the aesthetics of the poultry farm and provide a screen between the farm and neighbouring properties. There is little available information on the odour abatement effectiveness of windbreak walls, however studies have shown that a tarpaulin wall can reduce odour at sensitive receptors by between 30 and 90 percent. Due to the large volumes of air required to be treated and the associated large capital costs for pollution control equipment, engineering out odours from poultry farms is not commonly practised within the industry. To control odour from poultry farms, effective design and management strategies must be implemented to minimise odour emissions. Odour eliminating controls such as biofilters and scrubbers are well outside the economic constraints of the current industry and unrealistic options to control odour problems. In addition, a trial of a low flowrate water spray scrubber undertaken at a poultry farm in Queensland concluded that these scrubbers were ineffective at removing odour from the exhaust of the poultry fan shed. Clearly, greater research is required in order to find an adequate solution for the odour problem related to intensive poultry farms.

Conclusion
Based on the modelling results, our experience with the poultry industry and the nature of this proposal, it is suggested that odour impacts will occur beyond the site boundary. The nominated criteria of 7 odour units itself is likely to be detectable by most of the affected population, however the level of odour annoyance may differ and this is the acceptable standard in W.A.

Consideration should be given to conducting a modelling exercise with control options such as short stacks and solid windbreak walls to determine the effectiveness of these control options. The modelling approach taken by GHD in varying the emission rates according to the batch age of the chickens and the time of the day, and using odour sampling results rather than emission factors in ERM's opinion presents a more accurate representation of the conditions experienced with a tunnel ventilated shed.

However, the model methodology also considers the fan exhaust emissions as acting as a stack source rather than a volume source. If the stack has been afforded a vertical velocity this may overestimate the plume dispersion as it is evident that a horizontally venting fan will have no vertical velocity and will rely on buoyancy for dispersion. It is ERM's opinion that any method that results in greater dispersion and therefore lower ground level concentrations at receptors and deviates from the guideline method should be discussed appropriately with regulatory authorities before modelling proceeds.

State regulatory authorities generally give special consideration to the poultry industry and allow higher odour ground level concentrations (at detectable levels) at sensitive receptors. In addition, regulatory authorities are moving away from assessing poultry farms through odour concentration methodologies and are moving towards odour intensity techniques. The key is to manage odour annoyance at sensitive receptors, which considers the frequency, intensity, duration, offensiveness and location of the odour.

Recommended Conditions
It is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the fitting of such devices and measures to the fans of the proposed sheds on the subject property to achieve compliance with the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47" of 7 Odour Units at sensitive receptors. In addition vertical barriers such as bunds will aid in the containment and vertical dispersion of odour. This is consistent with the results of the odour modelling carried out by the proponent's odour consultant.

Therefore, it is recommended that permanent earthen bunds be required on the eastern, western and northern sides of the sheds to assist in the containment and vertical dispersion of odour. Although the abutting property to the north of Lot 21 is currently in the same ownership as Lot 21, this may not always be the case and accordingly a bund has been required on this side of the sheds as well.

Noise
Noise Modelling and Management Methods intended to be implemented by proponent
The applicant's consultant's report is summarised below:

Assigned Noise Levels for Noise Sensitive Premises

Time of Day	***Assigned Level (dB)***		
	L_{A10}	L_{A1}	L_{Amax}
7am-7pm Mon to Sat	*45 + IF*	*55 + IF*	*65+IF*
9am-7pm Sun & Public Holidays	*40 + IF*	*50 + IF*	*65+IF*
7pm-10pm all days	*40 + IF*	*50 + IF*	*55+IF*
10pm-7am Mon to Sat *10pm-9am Sunday & Public Holidays*	*35 + IF*	*45 + IF*	*55+IF*

L_{A10} *Noise level exceeded for 10% of measurement period – Intrusive noise*
L_{A1} *Noise level exceeded 1% of the measurement period –average maximum allowed*
L_{Amax} *Maximum noise level allowed during measurement period*
IF Influencing Factor – factors which may affect ambient noise levels such as major roads, commercial or industrial development existing around the site (ie

a premise may produce the maximum decibel level above the ambient (always existent noise levels).

The nearest residences are to the west on Hopelands Road and to the south on Jarrah Road. The consultants have calculated that there are no influencing factors as there aren't any existing factors such as commercial, industrial or highways within 450 metres of any of these houses. Therefore, only the flat assigned noise levels will apply to this development.

Modelling has been carried out based on the worst case scenario of night time noise as this involves harvesting noise being added to the constant noise generated by the fans that run 24 hours a day. The timeframe used is 10pm to 7am.

The assigned noise levels (ie the level of noise that is permitted to be emitted when measured at the sensitive premises) and the actual noise level for the fans, forklift and truck movements are as follows measures at 7 metres from the fans are as follows:

Noise Source	***Description***	***Assigned Noise Level***	***Noise level at source***
Fans	*Continuous operation*	L_{A10} *35 dB*	L_{A10} *87 dB*
Forklift	*Generally only audible when outside sheds but is likely to be present 10% of the time.*	L_{A10} *35 dB*	L_{A10} *98 dB*
Truck Movements	*Prime mover drives in to pick up loaded trailer. Assumed to be present 1% of the times and noise levels combined with fans and forklift.*	L_{A10} *55 dB*	L_{A10} *103 dB*

Based on the noise levels at the source (see above), topographical characteristics of the site (flat) and worst case meteorological conditions (cold, still and humid) the predicted noise levels at the noise sensitive premises adjacent to the subject site are as follows:
The noise sources assumed in the noise model are as follows:
- 14 cooling fans in west wall 3.0m above ground
- forklift operating outside shed 1 for existing operation
- forklift operating outside shed 8 for future expansion
- truck traveling down the farm road at low speed (L_{Amax} level only).

Calculated noise levels for existing and future development during night-time catching

Scenario	***Noise Sensitive Receiver***	***Predicted L_{Amax} Noise Level***	***Predicted L_{A10} Noise Level***
Existing operations	*North* *East* *South* *West*	L_{A10} *36 dB* L_{A10} *43 dB* L_{A10} *35 dB* L_{A10} *32 dB*	L_{A10} *28 dB* L_{A10} *37 dB* L_{A10} *29 dB* L_{A10} *32 dB*
Future operations	*North* *East* *South* *West*	L_{A10} *39 dB* L_{A10} *43 dB* L_{A10} *35 dB* L_{A10} *35 dB*	L_{A10} *35 dB* L_{A10} *37 dB* L_{A10} *26 dB* L_{A10} *35 dB*

Notes:
1. *The LAmax level assumes a combination of fan noise, forklift noise and trucks travelling down the farm road at low speed which is likely to occur for more than 10% of the time.*
2. *The LA10x level assumes a combination of fan noise and forklift noise only.*
3. *The low fan speeds suggest that tonal noise will not be present.*
4. *Care should be taken in the selection of forklifts, ensuring that the equipment does not exhibit tonal noise components.*

Noise contour mapping as per the above table are with the attachments marked L21 11.pdf ***and*** L21 12.pdf***.***

The predicted noise levels show that there is a marginal exceedance of the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, during night-time catching for both the existing and future operations. The major noise source is the forklift.

As the predictions are conservative, in that they assume flat ground and worse-case meteorological conditions, and the exceedance is marginal (less than 2 dB), we would recommend that the noise levels during night-time catching, be measured on-site once the proposed the expansion has been completed. The results of these measurements can then be compared against the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 and recommendations made on appropriate noise mitigation if required.

Independent Reviewer's assessment of Noise Modelling

Noise Impacts Predicted By Modelling
Lloyds Acoustics completed a noise assessment for the proposed poultry sheds at Lot 21 Hopeland Rd, Hopeland. The report indicated that there may be a marginal exceedance of the noise regulations during night time catching for both the existing and future operations. These exceedances of noise regulation levels are at the nearest sensitive receptors, therefore it follows that noise levels at the site boundary will also exceed the regulations. This is confirmed by the contour diagrams generated as part of the noise modelling. For both of the existing and proposed development noise levels at the western boundary exceed 55 decibels, which is well above the regulated level of 35 decibels at sensitive receptors for night time periods.

Comments on model inputs
In terms of the model input data, the model includes the use of 14 fans, which presumably takes into account the 4 existing sheds and the 3 of the 4 proposed sheds. As the application includes provision for the construction of four sheds (one in the future), it should be taken into account that an additional two fans will be contributing to the overall noise levels once all of the proposed sheds are in operation. The model has incorporated conservative and worst case assumptions where real data is unavailable, as is the case with topographical information. This is considered to be a valid approach, as actual results will most likely be below those predicted.

Meteorological data has been used which represents worst case conditions for noise dispersion, eg still clear conditions across which sound can travel the greatest distance from the source. From a brief study of average meteorological conditions in the vicinity of the Serpentine area (using data obtained from the closest BOM weather station located at Karnet, WA), the average wind speed recorded annually is 3.6 metres per second. The wind speed used in the modelling assessment is 3 m/s, therefore the meteorological inputs can be considered to appropriately represent the conditions in the area. The ground absorption coefficient is given as 95%, therefore the model is assuming the majority of the surrounding land to be acoustically absorbent. This is considered to be a reasonable assumption as the majority of the surrounding area consists of grassed or vegetated areas, with a small area of acoustically reflective surfaces such as roads and surface water.

Source sound power levels for cooling fans, forklifts and truck movements have been based on manufacturer's data and tests on similar equipment. Comparison of this sound data with sound levels measured by another consultant confirmed that these values are good representations of the actual data.

The noise modelling has assessed noise from the poultry sheds originating from fans, forklift use and truck movements. Noise from the chickens does not appear to have been included as a noise source, this may add to reported noise levels, particularly in times of disturbance due to harvesting. Background noise levels have not been included as part of the modelling assessment. From inspection of aerial photos it does not appear that there are any other

major sources of noise emissions in the vicinity of Lot 21 Hopeland Road and as the catching of the birds occurs at night it is unlikely that there will be any significant background sources of noise, therefore the omission of a consideration of background noise appears reasonable.

Noise Mitigation Measures
The main noise mitigation measures proposed for the expansion of the poultry farm at Lot 21 Hopeland Road are outlined in the document titled 'Development Plan Application 2005'. A list of measures have been given which Raintree County claim have or will be taken to alleviate noise impacts. The majority of these involve farm management practices such as maintaining equipment, low speed limits for on farm transport and educating employees and contractors on noise minimisation.

The document also states that buildings, earth bunds or natural topography are used as noise barriers when possible. It appears from the figures included with the Development Application that the design for the expansion includes a bund along the eastern side of the roads and sheds. There is no information contained with the Development Application that gives the dimensions for this bund, therefore it is impossible to determine if this will form an adequate noise mitigation barrier.

The bund should be at least the height of the highest noise source (most likely to be the fans), and could be made up of an earthen bund with a solid fence on top, or simply a high earthen bund. While planting on the bund is a useful way of improving the appearance of the poultry farm, trees are not considered to be as effective at mitigating noise as a solid bund, therefore it should be ensured that the bund is still of sufficient height to block noise emanating from the shed areas. The bund should also extend at least 20 metres past the end of the shed in both the north and south direction. From the figures provided this does not appear to be the case.

The noise modelling has indicated that there may be noise impacts beyond the site boundary on the western side, therefore consideration of a bund or other structure along the western side as well as the eastern side should be considered, especially as the fans are located on the western end of the sheds.

Lloyds did not model the effects of noise mitigation measures, as their recommendations included measuring noise levels on site once the expansion has been completed and noise mitigation measures implemented on this basis. While this may be appropriate if predictions were well below regulations, the fact that they are close to or exceeding regulations at the sensitive receptors (albeit under conservative modelling conditions) suggest that noise mitigation measures should be put in place before the expansion is undertaken, especially if impacts just beyond the site boundary are of importance. A proactive approach of incorporating noise mitigation measures into the design phase of the proposed expansion would be preferable to a reactive approach of implementing measures once the expansion is already completed and operating. This has the potential to result in noise impacts on the surrounding land in the interim period while noise mitigation measures are being put in place.

Potential noise mitigation measures which could be considered in addition to the proposed bunding on the eastern side of the poultry farm include:

Additional Vegetation screens – while vegetation screens can provide an extra barrier between noise sources and residences, they are not as effective as solid barriers at reducing noise impacts. Vegetation screens are not proposed as noise mitigation measures in the Development Application, however they have been included in order to screen the poultry farm from the road and neighbouring land. A vegetation buffer should contain trees and shrubs that will form an effective barrier ie they should have foliage that extends to the ground, consist of evergreen species to avoid the creation of gaps during leaf loss and grow to a sufficient height. One of the difficulties with vegetative noise barriers is the potential for individual trees or shrubs to die, thus creating a gap in the screen which can take many

years to be replaced. As such the farm operator needs to ensure that screens are well maintained.

Other potential noise mitigation measures which should be employed include curfews on the delivery of feed and materials, silencers to be fitted to all fans and the use of flashing lights and/or auto diallers to alert the farm operator to problems with the operation of the shed in place of audible alarms.

Conclusion
The noise modelling has indicated that there may be noise impacts beyond the site boundary on the western side. Noise modelling has been carried out in an appropriate manner and considered the worst case scenario of harvesting the chickens at night, although the noise of the chickens during disturbance could have been considered as an additional noise source during harvesting activities. Modelling should also be carried out to determine the effects of any noise mitigation measures.

Recommended Conditions
The proponent's consultants do not show two existing dwelling to the east of Lot 21 on the noise contour maps. These have been drawn in by a Shire officer and it can be seen that both of these dwellings are within the 35-40 dB noise contour. Accordingly, the existing and proposed development on Lot 21 significantly exceeds the assigned nighttime noise level at those two properties.

As per the recommendation of the Shire's independent environmental consultant, a condition should be imposed requiring the construction of a bund of at least the height of the highest noise source and be located across the front (eastern side) of the existing and proposed sheds on Lot 21 Hopeland Road extending from at least 20 metres before the first shed to at least 20 metres past the last shed.

The noise contour mapping produced as a result of the modelling carried out by the proponent's acoustic consultant for Lot 21 shows that more than 60% of the adjoining lot to the west will be affecting by night-time noise levels between 5 to 20 decibels above the assigned level under the relevant regulations. This lot does not currently contain a dwelling. However, the extent of the noise impact on this lot will significantly constrain the location of any future dwelling on the lot. Accordingly, it is recommended that bunding also be required along the western side of the sheds to the same height and length specified above for the bunding on the eastern side of the sheds.

In both the case of the eastern and western bunds the bunding should be extended to incorporate any plant rooms including the building housing the backup generator.

Conditions relating to the noise attenuation measures required have been included in the recommendation.

It should be noted that apart from the operation of the fans the noise associated with the operation of the poultry farm is not continuous seven days a week or 24 hours a day but occurs mainly during feed deliveries and harvesting processes. A condition has been imposed requiring feed deliveries to occur between 7am and 7pm due to the noise associated with the transfer of feed from the trucks to the silos.

Dust

Dust Modelling and Management Methods intended to be implemented by proponent

The proponent engaged an environmental consultant to undertake dust emission modeling. The results of this are detailed below.

There is very little information on dust emissions from broiler sheds. In view of this, a dustrack was used to measure the emissions from three sheds for an hour at each shed. The dustrack is not

accredited to an Australian standard and serves only as a guide of emission rates. However as a screening assessment it provides a useful indicator of levels that might be encountered in the environment.

Dust modelling was undertaken using an average emission rates per fan calculated from the dustrack results. Modelling was undertaken using the Days 1, 10, 20 and 30 scenarios described above. In this case modelling was undertaken using the more conservative Caversham dataset.

Monitoring using the dustracks found an average concentration of 291 µg m^{-3} of PM_{10}. It is evident that emissions of this strength at the source are insufficient to represent a short term nuisance impact at the boundary since this would only require a two times dilution of the particulates. Therefore modelled values are compared against the 24 hour national environmental protection measure of 50 µg m^{-3} with a target not to be exceeded more than 5 times a year in 10 years.

Figure 6 indicates the 1 day a year exceedence contour for this contaminant on days 20 and 30. There were no exceedences for days 1 and 10. It is evident that for 50% of the time there is no location where this guideline criteria are exceeded and for a further 25% of the time the guideline may be exceeded for 1 day in the near field. In the latter part of each cycle depending upon the meteorological conditions that occur it is possible that the NEPM criteria might be exceeded, however since the guideline has a target that this criteria should not be exceeded more than five times in a year, there appears to be no reasonable indication that this number of exceedences could occur.

Conclusion

There is no guideline for the modelling of particulates from these sheds and therefore this report models them using the broad low stack setup. This is entirely appropriate because these particulate emissions will be a function of wind speed within the shed and therefore more related to the number of fans operating inside the shed than to any external wind condition. Modelling of these emissions are rudimentary but conservative assuming that the concentration of dust emitted remains constant and therefore the overall dust emission is directly related to the number of fans operating with no factor for dilution as the volume of air drawn through the shed increases. Nevertheless there is no indication that the particulate emissions represent a nuisance or would exceed the NEPM guideline if it were applied to this source.

A screening study of particulates has found that emissions of particulates are negligible in the early stages of each growth cycle and only become significant in the last 25% of the cycle. At this point there is a small possibility that the NEPM guideline if it were applied to this location would be exceeded on 1 or two days of the year. However the ten year target for the NEPM is to reduce exceedences to 5 time a year. It should be noted that the major target for reduction of particulates emissions is wood burning from heaters and burn-offs. It can be concluded that the impact of particulates from the proposed increased in broiler sheds is negligible.

Independent Reviewer's assessment of Dust Modelling

A dust impact assessment has been completed for Lot 21 Hopeland Road, Hopeland (Reference Report GHD report no. 61/16186/51121). An assessment of fine particulates was completed with Particulate Matter less than 10 micron (PM10) being selected as an indicator of fine particulates. PM10 is commonly assessed because of its documented health impacts and nominated assessment criteria (NEPM PM10 – 50 Mg/m3).

Comments on model inputs
The meteorological data used in the assessment was collected from Caversham and is regarded as more conservative than a coastal meteorological data file. No evidence of this has been presented and should be included as part of the report (refer to bullets below).

The dust impact assessment has been based on PM10 monitoring results using a Dustrak. This instrumentation provides real time measurements of PM10 using light scattering measurement techniques, however, is not recommended by an Australian Standard. GHD have recognised the limitations of the instrument and referred to its results as a 'screening assessment'. Despite this, the sampling time has not been reported. Ideally, the 1 hour sample period employed by GHD should represent worst case PM10 emissions (i.e. during a period of high ventilation rates and at the end of the growth cycle). The use of PM10 results in dispersion modelling assessments that do not represent worst case conditions should be interpreted with care.

The dust impact assessment concluded that no exceedances of the nominated PM10 criteria would occur at anytime based on the 1 and 10 day growth cycles. In the latter part of each cycle, and during unfavourable meteorological conditions, it was concluded that it is possible that the NEPM criteria might be exceeded, but less than the goal of 5 times per year. Should the dispersion modelling be based on worst case PM10 emissions, it would be reasonable to suggest that the NEPM criteria might be exceeded on occasions. However, given that the dispersion modelling has not considered background contributions, or other on-site sources such as unpaved roads and other poultry farms, it is unreasonable to conclude that "there appears to be no reasonable indication that this number of exceedences could occur" (i.e. greater than 5 per year).

The following information should be obtained and reviewed to confirm the modelling based on a particulate matter assessment:

- *Comparison of hourly wind speed and stability class for each meteorological data file, to confirm Caversham represents poorer dispersion conditions;*
- *Sample time of each PM10 monitoring event (and subsequent confirmation of worst case sampling); and*
- *Assessment of other on-site or local dust sources/contributions, such as nearby poultry farms.*

Dust mitigation measures
The Development Application has outlined the following dust management strategies:

- *Litter is to be loaded into a truck with minimum spillage and dust creation;*
- *Ensuring loads of feed/litter/birds are appropriately sized, secured and covered to prevent the discharges of dust; and*
- *Screening of the site with trees and shrubs to lessen dust impacts.*

Dust is an inevitable emission from poultry sheds due to the use of sawdust litter and the necessity of keeping this litter dry in order to reduce odour impacts. Dust is typically worst during clean out operations, when litter is disturbed.

ERM recommends the following potential additional controls to ensure dust impacts beyond the boundary are minimized:

1. *Sealing of roads where possible and the watering of unsealed internal roads on days of high traffic use and during meteorological conditions that are conducive to transporting dust offsite ie dry, windy conditions;*
2. *controlled application of water if excessive dust is generated during the shed clean out process. Care should be taken not to soak the material as this may lead to odour emissions from the litter;*
3. *The installation of hoods onto fans which will direct dust and feather emissions to the ground as much as possible. Generally a 15 degree angle results in efficient plume settling and depletion of the particulate matter. However, this method may lead to an odour problem due to poor dispersion of the exhaust plume and this should be further investigated before implementing this measure;*
4. *Fan blades, screening and hoods could be washed out with water rather than blown out with air;*

5. Feed could be provided in pelleted form where possible; and
6. A dust monitoring program could be initiated at the site to assess the effectiveness of dust mitigation measures put in place.

The majority of dust minimising measures involve good management practices such as keeping litter at an optimal moisture level to ensure it is not excessively dry nor damp and scheduling litter removal from the sheds at times when dust nuisance to neighbours is likely to be minimised.

Conclusion
Modelling of dust was carried out as a screening assessment using actual dust measurements. It is unclear at what time the dust sampling was carried out, therefore it cannot be concluded if the dust modelling has considered worst case emission rates. Given this, and the fact that the dispersion modelling has not considered background contributions, or other on-site sources such as unpaved roads and other poultry farms, it seems unreasonable to conclude that there will not be greater than 5 exceedances of the relevant criteria per year. It cannot be concluded that there will be no dust impacts at the site boundary.

Recommended Conditions

It is considered that conditions should be placed on the development consistent with dust mitigation measures 1.-4. and 6. as recommended in the independent environment review with the outcome to be monitored and reported on as part of the audit process that is also included as a condition in the Officer's recommendation. The first audit is required to be done at the end of the first growing cycle in the new sheds. Therefore the ability of these measures to achieve the desired outcomes will be revealed via that process.

It is not considered appropriate to impose dust mitigation measure 5. (relating to the type of feed to be used) as feed is a matter that should be left to the industry.

In addition, the bunding and vegetative screening required by other conditions included in the Officer's recommendation will also assist in the dispersion of dust and reduce the spread of particulates to adjacent properties.

Traffic Issues

The estimated vehicle movements for a 400 000 bird farm over the 60 day growing cycle is as follows:

Sawdust Truck	8
Day Old Chick Truck	8
Feed Rations	40
Live Bird pickup	72
Cleanout	28
TOTAL MOVEMENTS	156 VEHICLES

156 vehicles over the 60 day cycle averages out to approximately 2-3 vehicle movements per day. The applicant advises that there would be a maximum of 10 vehicles at the property on any one occasion (ie during live bird pickup). However, most of the vehicles would arrive over a 2 or 3 day period during the change over process of:

1. Live bird pick-up
2. Clean out of sheds
3. Sawdust delivery
4. Day Old Chick delivery

It should be noted that not all the birds are harvested at the same time. This is generally staged over last 3-4 weeks of the 60 day cycle to provide birds of different sizes for the market.

Dead bird pick-up and feed deliveries occur intermittently throughout the cycle.

The entrance and exit to the poultry sheds is off Jarrah Road, which currently only has a limestone surface. This causes a dust problem when trucks are using the road. It is recommended that the surface of the portion of Jarrah Road abutting the poultry farm property be upgraded to a sealed standard (at the expense of the applicant) to the satisfaction of the Shire to prevent this dust problem. A concrete apron is also required between the crossovers and the Jarrah Road seal to prevent truck turning movements causing the edge of the seal to break down.

Punrak Road is sealed but is only a single vehicle width, which means that when two vehicles are approaching from different directions one must pull over. Traffic volumes on this portion of Punrak Road are however very low. It is the intersection of Punrak Road and Hopeland Road that is of most concern as regular turning movements by large vehicles will continually cause damage to this unkerbed seal. It is recommended that the intersection be upgraded (at the expense of the applicant) to provide a fully constructed T-junction with kerbed edges, and an asphalt seal extending to the kerb. This will reduce the potential for the edge of the seal to break down through the turning movements of heavy vehicles.

Conclusion

The subject farm is within the Poultry Policy Overlay area and as such the proposed extensions are a "P" Permitted use. It is considered that adequate measures can be put in place through the imposition of appropriate conditions to minimise the impact of this poultry farm on the amenity of surrounding properties. Accordingly, it is recommended that approval be granted for the extensions subject to conditions.

Voting Requirements: Normal

Officer Recommended Resolution:

Council grants approval to commence development for an application dated 28 February 2005 for the addition of four poultry sheds as shown on plan marked L21/02 and associated works to the existing Poultry (Broiler) Farm on Lot 21 Hopeland Road corner Punrak and Jarrah Roads, Serpentine subject to the following conditions:

General

1. Development shall be in accordance with the approved plans except as otherwise required by a condition of this approval.
2. A building licence being obtained prior to the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval including earthworks.

Environmental Management System

3. An Environmental Management System shall be prepared for the farm to the satisfaction of the Shire and shall be submitted to and approved by the Shire prior to the commencement of the use covered by this approval.
4. In carrying out the development the approved Environmental Management System must be complied with at all times.
5. A report (audit) on compliance with the approved Environmental Management System shall be submitted to the Shire within 28 days of the completion of the first growing cycle in the new sheds and thereafter on an annual basis by the anniversary date of this approval. The annual audit must include:

    a) an identification of the sources and nature of all emissions, discharges and wastes generated on the site

b) an assessment of dust amenity (dust deposition) and health impacts (total suspended particulate, particulate matter less than 10 micron).
c) an assessment of environmental impacts associated with its operations and its compliance with planning and environmental requirements
d) an evaluation of its response to any complaints
e) a review of operational and management practices relating to environmental performance and the management of environmental risk, including emergency response, contingency plans and other measures to prevent or minimise environmental impacts.

A suitably qualified and experienced person to the satisfaction of the Shire must conduct the audit.

6. In the event the Shire is not satisfied with any audit, the Shire may by notice in writing require the applicant to take the action stipulated in the notice in order to ensure the approved Environment Management System is complied with.
7. Poultry shed design and management, plus the management of stock feed, water, waste products and all other aspects of poultry farm operations is to comply with the management guidelines set out in the Environmental Code of Practice for the Poultry Industry in Western Australian May 2004.

Vegetation Management

8. Prior to the issue of a Building Licence for the new sheds, the proponent shall submit for the Director Sustainable Development's approval a Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan that identifies requirements for weed control, details the protection of existing vegetation, and describes the densities and distributions of indigenous trees, shrubs, groundcover and shoreline plant species to be established.
9. The proposed development shall not commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan in writing.
10. The implementation of the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan shall commence within twelve months of the development approval being granted and is to be completed within three years of the development approval being granted. Vegetation on site is to be maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan thereafter.
11. Prior to the commencement of site works, the proponent shall provide a bond in accordance with Shire policy to the value of $7500 with the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale. The bond may be in the form of cash, cheque or bank guarantee, and is a performance guarantee against satisfactory completion of the auditable completion criteria in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The performance guarantee will be refunded in full, immediately the outstanding works are completed / established as required in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. Any such bond is to be accompanied by a written authorisation from the owner of the land that the Shire may enter the land to complete or rectify any outstanding works in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The Shire may recover from the bond, or part of the bond, as appropriate, the cost to the Shire, including administrative costs, of completing or rectifying any outstanding works.
12. Remnant vegetation and vegetation planted by the developer must be fenced from grazing livestock in order to protect trees and other vegetation from damage.
13. No indigenous vegetation and trees shall be destroyed or cleared except, but subject to, the developer obtaining the prior consent of the Council in writing, where such vegetation (dead or alive) is deemed as structurally unsound by a certified arboriculturist, or where the clearing is required to accommodate approved developments.

Drainage & Nutrient Management

14. The proponent shall prepare a Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan for approval by the Director of Sustainable Development prior to the issue of a building licence for the new sheds and thereafter implement the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in its entirety.
15. In carrying out the development the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan must be complied with at all times.
16. The proposed development is not to commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in writing.
17. The developer shall ensure that the use of water for wash down is minimised.
18. Any discharge of water (washdown water, stormwater) from the premise including seepage to groundwater, other than directly to sewer or septic systems, shall be via treatment in silt traps, nutrient extraction swales, detention ponds, settling ponds or other effective mechanism to remove nutrients and chemical agents to the satisfaction of the Shire.
19. Separate facilities should be provided for the retention of both washdown (and other waste waters) and storm waters to prevent the settling pond overflowing during major storm events and not filtered waste waters possibly impacting on the adjacent wetland as a result.
20. All water treatment facilities are to be regularly maintained to minimise the discharge of nutrients, total suspended dissolved solids, total suspended solids and other pollutants to ground and surface water resources.

Storage and disposal of chemicals, feed and waste materials

21. The proponent shall store environmentally hazardous chemicals including, but not limited to, fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons (where the total volume of each substance stored on the premises exceeds 250 litres) within low permeability (10-9 metres per second or less) compound(s) designed to the satisfaction of the Shire to contain not less than 110% of the volume of the largest storage vessel or inter-connected system, and at least 25% of the total volume of vessels stored in the compound.
22. The developer shall immediately remove and dispose of any liquid resulting from spills or leaks of chemicals including fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons, whether inside or outside the low permeability compound(s).
23. The storage, use and disposal of all chemicals including, but not limited to, pesticides, disinfectants and veterinary products is to comply with the manufacturers recommendations.
24. No chemicals or potential liquid contaminants are to be disposed of on-site.
25. Stock feed is to be stored within containers that prevent access by vermin and native wildlife.
26. All solid wastes (including poultry litter and spilt feed) should be contained in weather-proof conditions (on a covered hardstand) until removed from the site for disposal at an approved facility.
27. Manure shall not be disposed of on site and all temporary stockpiles of manure are to be contained in covered storage compounds which maintain them in a dry condition and do not allow access by flies.
28. Dead birds shall be stored in a cool-room facility and removed from the site on at least a weekly basis for disposal at an approved facility. Vehicles used to remove dead birds from the premise shall be covered to reduce odour emission.
29. All feed deliveries shall take place between the hours of 7.00am and 7.00pm.

Noise

30. Reversing beepers are to be removed from all forklifts and tractors used on the property and alternative non-audible warning measures such as flashing lights (subject to compliance with the relevant Australian Standard and any Worksafe codes) are to be fitted to these vehicles instead.
31. All alarms associated with the operation of the poultry farm (ie power supply, temperature, feed and the like) shall be non-audible. Alternative non-audible

methods of notification such as personal pagers carried by farm operators and employees shall be used to the satisfaction of the Shire.

32. Prior to the commencement of use of the new poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations:
    (i) Installation of an earthen bund at least 4 metres high between the sheds and Hopeland Road extending from at least 20 metres to the north of the northern side of the northern most new shed to a point at least 20 metres south of the southern side of the southern most existing shed;
    (ii) Any plant rooms, including any backup power generator, are to be located between the sheds and the required earthen bunds; and
    (iii) The implementation of all noise attenuation measures proposed in the report entitled "Environmental Noise Assessment, Proposed Poultry Farm Expansion Lot 2 Jarrah Road, Hopeland" prepared by Lloyd Acoustics for Raintree County Pty Ltd May 2005, lodged with the Shire by the applicant as part of this application;

    to the satisfaction of the Shire. The noise attenuation measures required by this condition must be maintained throughout the life of the development.

    The use (including construction of sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

    (a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and

    (b) certification from a suitably acoustic expert that the noise attenuation measures required and proposed will ensure that the noise generated by the development will at all times comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations.

33. Noise generated by the operation of the farm shall comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations at all times.

Odours

34. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the criterion of 7OU/m^3 3 minute average 99.5th percentile as determined using the methodology prescribed in the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47":
    (i) The installation of permanent earthen bunds as windbreak walls to the east, west and north of the sheds; and
    (ii) The installation of odour mitigation measures

    as specified in the Environmental Resources Management Australia Development Application Reviews Report May 2005 Ref 0031408RP2 to the satisfaction of the Shire. Odour emissions must at all times comply with the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47"as amended from time to time.

    The use (including construction of the sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

    (a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and

    (b) certification from a suitably qualified environmental consultant with expertise in odour modelling, that the odour attenuation measures proposed and required will ensure the odour emissions generated by the development will at all times comply with the requirements of this condition.

35. The fill used to construct the required earthen bunds shall consist of clean, uncontaminated material to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Dust

36. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds the developer is to provide certification from an appropriately qualified environmental consultant that the sheds' ventilation systems incorporate measures to reduce the emission of dust to a target of 50 µg m^{-3} and, so as not to have greater than 5 exceedances per year, to the satisfaction of the Shire.
37. All bedding materials placed within sheds (ie sawdust) shall be treated (ie with oils) to reduce dust production.
38. Fan blades, screening and hoods shall be washed out with water rather than blown out with air.

39. Litter removal from the sheds shall be scheduled for times when dust nuisance to neighbours is likely to be minimised to the satisfaction of the Shire.

40. The developer shall prevent the generation of visible particulates (including dust) from access ways, trafficked areas, stockpiles and machinery from crossing the boundary of the premises by using where necessary appropriate dust suppression techniques.

Lighting

41. Outside lighting is to be kept to a safe minimum and should be angled to minimize light impacts on neighbouring properties.

Engineering

42. A single crossover be provided for access to both the dwelling and sheds.
43. Crossovers to be constructed in accordance with Serpentine Jarrahdale standard industrial crossover specifications and be located to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.
44. The surface of the portions of Jarrah Road and Punrak Road abutting the subject site from the western-most crossover up to and including the intersection with Hopeland Road shall be upgraded to the satisfaction of the Shire. Concrete aprons shall be constructed between the crossovers to the sheds and the sealed surface of Jarrah Road to the satisfaction of the Shire. All costs associated with the required upgrading shall be at the expense of the developer of the subject site.
45. All driveway surfaces are to be constructed of a suitable material such as paving, road base, limestone or coarse gravel and compacted to limit the generation of dust and to ensure that no visible dust extends beyond the site boundary.
46. A maximum speed limit of 20 kilometres per hour shall be applied to all internal roads, driveways and vehicle accessways and signs in this regard shall be displayed at the entrances to the site and adjacent to the location of the sheds.
47. The movement of any oversize vehicle, as per the interpretation contained in the Road Traffic Act 1974, to/from the subject site will require the separate approval of the Shire.

Visual Amenity

48. The external cladding of the new poultry sheds shall match that of the existing poultry sheds.

Signage

49. Notices indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and potential impacts of the poultry farm operation to be displayed adjacent to both the Hopeland Road and Jarrah Road frontages of the site in accordance with the specifications contained in

the Western Australian Planning Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 4.3 - Poultry Farms Policy, to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Advice Notes:

1. The application and a copy of this decision has been referred to the Western Australian Planning Commission for determination under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and you will be advised in writing by that authority once a determination in this regard has been made.
2. Separate approval may need to be obtained from the Water and Rivers Commission for a bore licence.
3. A works approval or licence may need to be obtained from the Environmental Protection Authority for the poultry farm development;
4. The operations should be carried out in accordance with the document *'Water Quality Protection Note Poultry Farms in Public Drinking Water Source Areas'* produced by the Water and Rivers Commission.
5. The Environmental Management System required by condition 3 shall be prepared in accordance with the *EMS for Meat Chicken Farms - Example Environmental Management Plan* published by the Australian Government Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.
6. The Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan required by condition 8. shall:
    a) Include a scaled map of the development which can be placed as an overlay over a recent (since 2003) aerial photograph of the whole of Lot 21 Hopeland Road;
    b) Locate on the map, and both identify and describe how existing indigenous vegetation is to be protected or is not to be retained as a result of driveways, fences, drains and other surface water features, firebreaks, power lines and other access ways and services plus proposed buildings and other structures;
    c) Locate on the map and both identify and describe the management of existing exotic vegetation;
    d) Locate on the map and identify both the types and magnitudes of weed infestations and describe weed management to be undertaken;
    e) Locate proposed revegetation works on the map and describe the species, densities, soil preparation and plant protection to provide complete screening of all existing and proposed poultry sheds from the roads and adjoining properties, maximise nutrient uptake from surface waters and surrounding soils, reconnect remnant vegetation with visual screen plantings and, provide habitat for local woodland and wetland fauna.
    f) Describe ongoing management of vegetation on site;
    g) Clearly state auditable vegetation management targets including weed control and revegetation outcomes for audit at the time of vegetation management bond return and thereafter as follows:
        i) Visual screens are to include a minimum of six rows of trees and shrubs and must be no less than 10 metres wide;
        ii) Stems within visual screens are to be planted at minimum densities of one stem per three metres along rows that are no more than two metres apart;
        iii) Visual screening is to include a mixture of trees and shrubs such that no more than one third of the plants are trees.
        iv) Sedges and rushes to be planted around the settling pond are to be clumped with densities of four stems per metre squared within clumps and interspersed with other local wetland species;
        v) Required stem densities relate to a time when a minimum of 80% of the plants have survived at least two summer seasons and this is to be achieved initially within three years after development approval is given and thereafter maintained;
        vi) All plants are to be of locally native species indicative of neighboring woodland and wetland communities;
        vii) Achieve a plant diversity of at least 80% of the plant species that are listed within the dominant shoreline ground cover, medium shrub, tall

shrub and tree categories for the relevant woodland and wetland communities on the Shire Planting List;

viii) Maintain a weed burden at levels not likely to threaten the native species;

ix) Locate fire breaks on the map.

7. The Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan required by condition 14. above shall address the following:
   a) show how the capacity of the settling pond will cope with storm water and shed wash down water in all but 1:10 year storm events;
   b) show how chemicals from disinfectants used, and nutrients from wash down water are treated so that no pollution can impact ground water resources or drain to the conservation category wetland down stream;
   c) describe and commit to best management practice of swales including the placement of, and periodic replacement of yellow sand linings, establishment and maintenance of a complete cover of healthy kikuyu, repeated clipping of kikuyu and disposal of clippings away from water courses, preferably to be exported off site to be composted with shed litter;
8. The compound(s) described in condition 21. shall:
   a) be graded or include a sump to allow recovery of liquid;
   b) be chemically resistant to the substances stored;
   c) include valves, pumps and meters associated with transfer operations wherever practical - otherwise the equipment shall be adequately protected e.g. bollards and contained in an area designed to permit recovery of chemicals released following accidents or vandalism;
   d) be designed such that jetting from any storage vessel or fitting will be captured within the bunded area - see for example Australian Standard 1940-1993 Section 5.9.3 (g);
   e) be designed such that chemicals which may react dangerously if they come into contact, are in separate bunds in the same compound or in different compounds; and
   f) be controlled such that the capacity of the bund is maintained at all times e.g. regular inspection and pumping of trapped uncontaminated rain water.

9. Litter shall be kept at an optimal moisture level to ensure it is not excessively dry nor damp.
10. This approval is issued under the provisions of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2. Separate approval under the Metropolitan Region Scheme is also required to be obtained from the Western Australian Planning Commission prior to issue of a Building Licence and the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval.

SD078/06/05 ORIGINAL MOTION

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Price
Council grants approval to commence development for an application dated 28 February 2005 for the addition of four poultry sheds as shown on plan marked L21/02 and associated works to the existing Poultry (Broiler) Farm on Lot 21 Hopeland Road corner Punrak and Jarrah Roads, Serpentine subject to the following conditions:

General

1. **Development shall be in accordance with the approved plans except as otherwise required by a condition of this approval.**
2. **A building licence being obtained prior to the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval including earthworks.**

Environmental Management System

3. **An Environmental Management System shall be prepared for the farm to the satisfaction of the Shire and shall be submitted to and approved by the Shire prior to the commencement of the use covered by this approval.**
4. **In carrying out the development the approved Environmental Management System must be complied with at all times.**
5. **A report (audit) on compliance with the approved Environmental Management System shall be submitted to the Shire within 28 days of the completion of the first growing cycle in the new sheds and thereafter on an annual basis by the anniversary date of this approval. The annual audit must include:**

   a) **an identification of the sources and nature of all emissions, discharges and wastes generated on the site**
   b) **an assessment of dust amenity (dust deposition) and health impacts (total suspended particulate, particulate matter less than 10 micron).**
   c) **an assessment of environmental impacts associated with its operations and its compliance with planning and environmental requirements**
   d) **an evaluation of its response to any complaints**
   e) **a review of operational and management practices relating to environmental performance and the management of environmental risk, including emergency response, contingency plans and other measures to prevent or minimise environmental impacts.**

   A suitably qualified and experienced person to the satisfaction of the Shire must conduct the audit.

6. **In the event the Shire is not satisfied with any audit, the Shire may by notice in writing require the applicant to take the action stipulated in the notice in order to ensure the approved Environment Management System is complied with.**
7. **Poultry shed design and management, plus the management of stock feed, water, waste products and all other aspects of poultry farm operations is to comply with the management guidelines set out in the Environmental Code of Practice for the Poultry Industry in Western Australian May 2004.**

Vegetation Management

8. **Prior to the issue of a Building Licence for the new sheds, the proponent shall submit for the Director Sustainable Development's approval a Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan that identifies requirements for weed control, details the protection of existing vegetation, and describes the densities and distributions of indigenous trees, shrubs, groundcover and shoreline plant species to be established.**

9. The proposed development shall not commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan in writing.

10. The implementation of the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan shall commence within twelve months of the development approval being granted and is to be completed within three years of the development approval being granted. Vegetation on site is to be maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan thereafter.

11. Prior to the commencement of site works, the proponent shall provide a bond in accordance with Shire policy to the value of $7500 with the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale. The bond may be in the form of cash, cheque or bank guarantee, and is a performance guarantee against satisfactory completion of the auditable completion criteria in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The performance guarantee will be refunded in full, immediately the outstanding works are completed / established as required in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. Any such bond is to be accompanied by a written authorisation from the owner of the land that the Shire may enter the land to complete or rectify any outstanding works in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The Shire may recover from the bond, or part of the bond, as appropriate, the cost to the Shire, including administrative costs, of completing or rectifying any outstanding works.

12. Remnant vegetation and vegetation planted by the developer must be fenced from grazing livestock in order to protect trees and other vegetation from damage.

13. No indigenous vegetation and trees shall be destroyed or cleared except, but subject to, the developer obtaining the prior consent of the Council in writing, where such vegetation (dead or alive) is deemed as structurally unsound by a certified arboriculturist, or where the clearing is required to accommodate approved developments.

Drainage & Nutrient Management

14. The proponent shall prepare a Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan for approval by the Director of Sustainable Development prior to the issue of a building licence for the new sheds and thereafter implement the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in its entirety.

15. In carrying out the development the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan must be complied with at all times.

16. The proposed development is not to commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in writing.

17. The developer shall ensure that the use of water for wash down is minimised.

18. Any discharge of water (washdown water, stormwater) from the premise including seepage to groundwater, other than directly to sewer or septic systems, shall be via treatment in silt traps, nutrient extraction swales, detention ponds, settling ponds or other effective mechanism to remove nutrients and chemical agents to the satisfaction of the Shire.

19. Separate facilities should be provided for the retention of both washdown (and other waste waters) and storm waters to prevent the settling pond overflowing during major storm events and not filtered waste waters possibly impacting on the adjacent wetland as a result.

20. All water treatment facilities are to be regularly maintained to minimise the discharge of nutrients, total suspended dissolved solids, total suspended solids and other pollutants to ground and surface water resources.

Storage and disposal of chemicals, feed and waste materials

21. The proponent shall store environmentally hazardous chemicals including, but not limited to, fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons (where the total volume of each substance stored on the premises exceeds 250 litres) within low permeability (10-9 metres per second or less) compound(s) designed to the satisfaction of the Shire to contain not less than 110% of the volume of the largest storage vessel or inter-connected system, and at least 25% of the total volume of vessels stored in the compound.

22. The developer shall immediately remove and dispose of any liquid resulting from spills or leaks of chemicals including fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons, whether inside or outside the low permeability compound(s).

23. The storage, use and disposal of all chemicals including, but not limited to, pesticides, disinfectants and veterinary products is to comply with the manufacturers recommendations.

24. No chemicals or potential liquid contaminants are to be disposed of on-site.

25. Stock feed is to be stored within containers that prevent access by vermin and native wildlife.

26. All solid wastes (including poultry litter and spilt feed) should be contained in weather-proof conditions (on a covered hardstand) until removed from the site for disposal at an approved facility.

27. Manure shall not be disposed of on site and all temporary stockpiles of manure are to be contained in covered storage compounds which maintain them in a dry condition and do not allow access by flies.

28. Dead birds shall be stored in a cool-room facility and removed from the site on at least a weekly basis for disposal at an approved facility. Vehicles used to remove dead birds from the premise shall be covered to reduce odour emission.

29. All feed deliveries shall take place between the hours of 7.00am and 7.00pm.

Noise

30. Reversing beepers are to be removed from all forklifts and tractors used on the property and alternative non-audible warning measures such as flashing lights (subject to compliance with the relevant Australian Standard and any Worksafe codes) are to be fitted to these vehicles instead.

31. All alarms associated with the operation of the poultry farm (ie power supply, temperature, feed and the like) shall be non-audible. Alternative non-audible methods of notification such as personal pagers carried by farm operators and employees shall be used to the satisfaction of the Shire.

32. Prior to the commencement of use of the new poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations:

- **(i) Installation of an earthen bund at least 4 metres high between the sheds and Hopeland Road extending from at least 20 metres to the north of the northern side of the northern most new shed to a point at least 20 metres south of the southern side of the southern most existing shed;**
- **(ii) Any plant rooms, including any backup power generator, are to be located between the sheds and the required earthen bunds; and**
- **(iii) The implementation of all noise attenuation measures proposed in the report entitled "Environmental Noise Assessment, Proposed Poultry Farm Expansion Lot 2 Jarrah Road, Hopeland" prepared by Lloyd Acoustics for Raintree County Pty Ltd May 2005, lodged with the Shire by the applicant as part of this application;**

to the satisfaction of the Shire. The noise attenuation measures required by this condition must be maintained throughout the life of the development.

The use (including construction of sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

- **(a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and**

(b) certification from a suitably acoustic expert that the noise attenuation measures required and proposed will ensure that the noise generated by the development will at all times comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations.

33. Noise generated by the operation of the farm shall comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations at all times.

Odours

34. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the criterion of 7OU/m^3 3 minute average 99.5th percentile as determined using the methodology prescribed in the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47":

(i) The installation of permanent earthen bunds as windbreak walls to the east, west and north of the sheds; and

(ii) The installation of odour mitigation measures

as specified in the Environmental Resources Management Australia Development Application Reviews Report May 2005 Ref 0031408RP2 to the satisfaction of the Shire. Odour emissions must at all times comply with the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47"as amended from time to time.

The use (including construction of the sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

(a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and

(b) certification from a suitably qualified environmental consultant with expertise in odour modelling, that the odour attenuation measures proposed and required will ensure the odour emissions generated by the development will at all times comply with the requirements of this condition.

35. The fill used to construct the required earthen bunds shall consist of clean, uncontaminated material to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Dust

36. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds the developer is to provide certification from an appropriately qualified environmental consultant that the sheds' ventilation systems incorporate measures to reduce the emission of dust to a target of 50 µg m^{-3} and, so as not to have greater than 5 exceedances per year, to the satisfaction of the Shire.

37. All bedding materials placed within sheds (ie sawdust) shall be treated (ie with oils) to reduce dust production.

38. Fan blades, screening and hoods shall be washed out with water rather than blown out with air.

39. Litter removal from the sheds shall be scheduled for times when dust nuisance to neighbours is likely to be minimised to the satisfaction of the Shire.

40. The developer shall prevent the generation of visible particulates (including dust) from access ways, trafficked areas, stockpiles and machinery from crossing the boundary of the premises by using where necessary appropriate dust suppression techniques.

Lighting

41. Outside lighting is to be kept to a safe minimum and should be angled to minimize light impacts on neighbouring properties.

Engineering

42. A single crossover be provided or access to both the dwelling and the sheds be deleted from the original motion
43. Crossovers to be constructed in accordance with Serpentine Jarrahdale standard industrial crossover specifications and be located to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.
44. The surface of the portions of Jarrah Road and Punrak Road abutting the subject site from the western-most crossover up to and including the intersection with Hopeland Road shall be upgraded to the satisfaction of the Shire. Concrete aprons shall be constructed between the crossovers to the sheds and the sealed surface of Jarrah Road to the satisfaction of the Shire. All costs associated with the required upgrading shall be at the expense of the developer of the subject site.
45. All driveway surfaces are to be constructed of a suitable material such as paving, road base, limestone or coarse gravel and compacted to limit the generation of dust and to ensure that no visible dust extends beyond the site boundary.
46. A maximum speed limit of 20 kilometres per hour shall be applied to all internal roads, driveways and vehicle accessways and signs in this regard shall be displayed at the entrances to the site and adjacent to the location of the sheds.
47. The movement of any oversize vehicle, as per the interpretation contained in the Road Traffic Act 1974, to/from the subject site will require the separate approval of the Shire.

Visual Amenity

48. The external cladding of the new poultry sheds shall match that of the existing poultry sheds.

Signage

49. Notices indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and potential impacts of the poultry farm operation to be displayed adjacent to both the Hopeland Road and Jarrah Road frontages of the site in accordance with the specifications contained in the Western Australian Planning Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 4.3 - Poultry Farms Policy, to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Advice Notes:
1. The application and a copy of this decision has been referred to the Western Australian Planning Commission for determination under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and you will be advised in writing by that authority once a determination in this regard has been made.
2. Separate approval may need to be obtained from the Water and Rivers Commission for a bore licence.
3. A works approval or licence may need to be obtained from the Environmental Protection Authority for the poultry farm development;
4. The operations should be carried out in accordance with the document *'Water Quality Protection Note Poultry Farms in Public Drinking Water Source Areas'* produced by the Water and Rivers Commission.
5. The Environmental Management System required by condition 3 shall be prepared in accordance with the *EMS for Meat Chicken Farms - Example Environmental Management Plan* published by the Australian Government Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.

6. The Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan required by condition 8. shall:

- **a) Include a scaled map of the development which can be placed as an overlay over a recent (since 2003) aerial photograph of the whole of Lot 21 Hopeland Road;**
- **b) Locate on the map, and both identify and describe how existing indigenous vegetation is to be protected or is not to be retained as a result of driveways, fences, drains and other surface water features, firebreaks, power lines and other access ways and services plus proposed buildings and other structures;**
- **c) Locate on the map and both identify and describe the management of existing exotic vegetation;**
- **d) Locate on the map and identify both the types and magnitudes of weed infestations and describe weed management to be undertaken;**
- **e) Locate proposed revegetation works on the map and describe the species, densities, soil preparation and plant protection to provide complete screening of all existing and proposed poultry sheds from the roads and adjoining properties, maximise nutrient uptake from surface waters and surrounding soils, reconnect remnant vegetation with visual screen plantings and, provide habitat for local woodland and wetland fauna.**
- **f) Describe ongoing management of vegetation on site;**
- **g) Clearly state auditable vegetation management targets including weed control and revegetation outcomes for audit at the time of vegetation management bond return and thereafter as follows:**
  - **i) Visual screens are to include a minimum of six rows of trees and shrubs and must be no less than 10 metres wide;**
  - **ii) Stems within visual screens are to be planted at minimum densities of one stem per three metres along rows that are no more than two metres apart;**
  - **iii) Visual screening is to include a mixture of trees and shrubs such that no more than one third of the plants are trees.**
  - **iv) Sedges and rushes to be planted around the settling pond are to be clumped with densities of four stems per metre squared within clumps and interspersed with other local wetland species;**
  - **v) Required stem densities relate to a time when a minimum of 80% of the plants have survived at least two summer seasons and this is to be achieved initially within three years after development approval is given and thereafter maintained;**
  - **vi) All plants are to be of locally native species indicative of neighboring woodland and wetland communities;**
  - **vii) Achieve a plant diversity of at least 80% of the plant species that are listed within the dominant shoreline ground cover, medium shrub, tall shrub and tree categories for the relevant woodland and wetland communities on the Shire Planting List;**
  - **viii) Maintain a weed burden at levels not likely to threaten the native species;**
  - **ix) Locate fire breaks on the map.**
  - **x) All earth bunds are to be vegetated to the satisfaction of the Shire.**

7. The Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan required by condition 14. above shall address the following:

- **a) show how the capacity of the settling pond will cope with storm water and shed wash down water in all but 1:10 year storm events;**
- **b) show how chemicals from disinfectants used, and nutrients from wash down water are treated so that no pollution can impact ground water resources or drain to the conservation category wetland down stream;**

c) describe and commit to best management practice of swales including the placement of, and periodic replacement of yellow sand linings, establishment and maintenance of a complete cover of healthy kikuyu, repeated clipping of kikuyu and disposal of clippings away from water courses, preferably to be exported off site to be composted with shed litter;

8. The compound(s) described in condition 21. shall:

a) be graded or include a sump to allow recovery of liquid;
b) be chemically resistant to the substances stored;
c) include valves, pumps and meters associated with transfer operations wherever practical - otherwise the equipment shall be adequately protected e.g. bollards and contained in an area designed to permit recovery of chemicals released following accidents or vandalism;
d) be designed such that jetting from any storage vessel or fitting will be captured within the bunded area - see for example Australian Standard 1940-1993 Section 5.9.3 (g);
e) be designed such that chemicals which may react dangerously if they come into contact, are in separate bunds in the same compound or in different compounds; and
f) be controlled such that the capacity of the bund is maintained at all times e.g. regular inspection and pumping of trapped uncontaminated rain water.

9. Litter shall be kept at an optimal moisture level to ensure it is not excessively dry nor damp.

10. This approval is issued under the provisions of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2. Separate approval under the Metropolitan Region Scheme is also required to be obtained from the Western Australian Planning Commission prior to issue of a Building Licence and the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval.

AMENDMENT

Moved Cr Murphy seconded Cr Price that Condition 42 – A single crossover be provided or access to both the dwelling and the sheds be deleted from the original motion.

After debate the Presiding Member then put the amendment which was
CARRIED 9/0

The Presiding Member then put the amended motion

SD078/06/05 COUNCIL DECISION

Council grants approval to commence development for an application dated 28 February 2005 for the addition of four poultry sheds as shown on plan marked L21/02 and associated works to the existing Poultry (Broiler) Farm on Lot 21 Hopeland Road corner Punrak and Jarrah Roads, Serpentine subject to the following conditions:

General

1. Development shall be in accordance with the approved plans except as otherwise required by a condition of this approval.
2. A building licence being obtained prior to the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval including earthworks.

Environmental Management System

3. An Environmental Management System shall be prepared for the farm to the satisfaction of the Shire and shall be submitted to and approved by the Shire prior to the commencement of the use covered by this approval.

4. In carrying out the development the approved Environmental Management System must be complied with at all times.

5. A report (audit) on compliance with the approved Environmental Management System shall be submitted to the Shire within 28 days of the completion of the first growing cycle in the new sheds and thereafter on an annual basis by the anniversary date of this approval. The annual audit must include:

a) an identification of the sources and nature of all emissions, discharges and wastes generated on the site
b) an assessment of dust amenity (dust deposition) and health impacts (total suspended particulate, particulate matter less than 10 micron).
c) an assessment of environmental impacts associated with its operations and its compliance with planning and environmental requirements
d) an evaluation of its response to any complaints
e) a review of operational and management practices relating to environmental performance and the management of environmental risk, including emergency response, contingency plans and other measures to prevent or minimise environmental impacts.

A suitably qualified and experienced person to the satisfaction of the Shire must conduct the audit.

6. In the event the Shire is not satisfied with any audit, the Shire may by notice in writing require the applicant to take the action stipulated in the notice in order to ensure the approved Environment Management System is complied with.

7. Poultry shed design and management, plus the management of stock feed, water, waste products and all other aspects of poultry farm operations is to comply with the management guidelines set out in the Environmental Code of Practice for the Poultry Industry in Western Australian May 2004.

Vegetation Management

8. Prior to the issue of a Building Licence for the new sheds, the proponent shall submit for the Director Sustainable Development's approval a Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan that identifies requirements for weed control, details the protection of existing vegetation, and describes the densities and distributions of indigenous trees, shrubs, groundcover and shoreline plant species to be established.

9. The proposed development shall not commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan in writing.

10. The implementation of the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan shall commence within twelve months of the development approval being granted and is to be completed within three years of the development approval being granted. Vegetation on site is to be maintained in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan thereafter.

11. Prior to the commencement of site works, the proponent shall provide a bond in accordance with Shire policy to the value of $7500 with the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale. The bond may be in the form of cash, cheque or bank guarantee, and is a performance guarantee against satisfactory completion of the auditable completion criteria in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The performance guarantee will be refunded in full, immediately the outstanding works are completed / established as required in the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. Any such bond is to be accompanied by a written authorisation from the owner of the land that the Shire may enter the land to complete or rectify any

outstanding works in accordance with the approved Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan. The Shire may recover from the bond, or part of the bond, as appropriate, the cost to the Shire, including administrative costs, of completing or rectifying any outstanding works.

12. **Remnant vegetation and vegetation planted by the developer must be fenced from grazing livestock in order to protect trees and other vegetation from damage.**
13. **No indigenous vegetation and trees shall be destroyed or cleared except, but subject to, the developer obtaining the prior consent of the Council in writing, where such vegetation (dead or alive) is deemed as structurally unsound by a certified arboriculturist, or where the clearing is required to accommodate approved developments.**

Drainage & Nutrient Management

14. **The proponent shall prepare a Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan for approval by the Director of Sustainable Development prior to the issue of a building licence for the new sheds and thereafter implement the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in its entirety.**
15. **In carrying out the development the approved Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan must be complied with at all times.**
16. **The proposed development is not to commence until the Director Sustainable Development has approved the Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan in writing.**
17. **The developer shall ensure that the use of water for wash down is minimised.**
18. **Any discharge of water (washdown water, stormwater) from the premise including seepage to groundwater, other than directly to sewer or septic systems, shall be via treatment in silt traps, nutrient extraction swales, detention ponds, settling ponds or other effective mechanism to remove nutrients and chemical agents to the satisfaction of the Shire.**
19. **Separate facilities should be provided for the retention of both washdown (and other waste waters) and storm waters to prevent the settling pond overflowing during major storm events and not filtered waste waters possibly impacting on the adjacent wetland as a result.**
20. **All water treatment facilities are to be regularly maintained to minimise the discharge of nutrients, total suspended dissolved solids, total suspended solids and other pollutants to ground and surface water resources.**

Storage and disposal of chemicals, feed and waste materials

21. **The proponent shall store environmentally hazardous chemicals including, but not limited to, fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons (where the total volume of each substance stored on the premises exceeds 250 litres) within low permeability (10-9 metres per second or less) compound(s) designed to the satisfaction of the Shire to contain not less than 110% of the volume of the largest storage vessel or inter-connected system, and at least 25% of the total volume of vessels stored in the compound.**
22. **The developer shall immediately remove and dispose of any liquid resulting from spills or leaks of chemicals including fuel, oil or other hydrocarbons, whether inside or outside the low permeability compound(s).**
23. **The storage, use and disposal of all chemicals including, but not limited to, pesticides, disinfectants and veterinary products is to comply with the manufacturers recommendations.**
24. **No chemicals or potential liquid contaminants are to be disposed of on-site.**
25. **Stock feed is to be stored within containers that prevent access by vermin and native wildlife.**
26. **All solid wastes (including poultry litter and spilt feed) should be contained in weather-proof conditions (on a covered hardstand) until removed from the site for disposal at an approved facility.**

27. Manure shall not be disposed of on site and all temporary stockpiles of manure are to be contained in covered storage compounds which maintain them in a dry condition and do not allow access by flies.

28. Dead birds shall be stored in a cool-room facility and removed from the site on at least a weekly basis for disposal at an approved facility. Vehicles used to remove dead birds from the premise shall be covered to reduce odour emission.

29. All feed deliveries shall take place between the hours of 7.00am and 7.00pm.

Noise

30. Reversing beepers are to be removed from all forklifts and tractors used on the property and alternative non-audible warning measures such as flashing lights (subject to compliance with the relevant Australian Standard and any Worksafe codes) are to be fitted to these vehicles instead.

31. All alarms associated with the operation of the poultry farm (ie power supply, temperature, feed and the like) shall be non-audible. Alternative non-audible methods of notification such as personal pagers carried by farm operators and employees shall be used to the satisfaction of the Shire.

32. Prior to the commencement of use of the new poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations:

(i) Installation of an earthen bund at least 4 metres high between the sheds and Hopeland Road extending from at least 20 metres to the north of the northern side of the northern most new shed to a point at least 20 metres south of the southern side of the southern most existing shed;

(ii) Any plant rooms, including any backup power generator, are to be located between the sheds and the required earthen bunds; and

(iii) The implementation of all noise attenuation measures proposed in the report entitled "Environmental Noise Assessment, Proposed Poultry Farm Expansion Lot 2 Jarrah Road, Hopeland" prepared by Lloyd Acoustics for Raintree County Pty Ltd May 2005, lodged with the Shire by the applicant as part of this application;

to the satisfaction of the Shire. The noise attenuation measures required by this condition must be maintained throughout the life of the development.

The use (including construction of sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

(a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and

(b) certification from a suitably acoustic expert that the noise attenuation measures required and proposed will ensure that the noise generated by the development will at all times comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations.

33. Noise generated by the operation of the farm shall comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations at all times.

Odours

34. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds, the following measures must be taken in order to achieve compliance with the criterion of 7OU/m^3 3 minute average 99.5th percentile as determined using the methodology prescribed in the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47":

(i) The installation of permanent earthen bunds as windbreak walls to the east, west and north of the sheds; and

(ii) The installation of odour mitigation measures

as specified in the Environmental Resources Management Australia Development Application Reviews Report May 2005 Ref 0031408RP2 to the satisfaction of the Shire. Odour emissions must at all times comply with the Environmental Protection Authority's document "Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors – Assessment of Odour Impacts from New Proposals No. 47"as amended from time to time.

The use (including construction of the sheds) shall not commence until the Shire has received from the applicant and has approved:

(a) specifications and elevation drawings of the earthen bunds; and
(b) certification from a suitably qualified environmental consultant with expertise in odour modelling, that the odour attenuation measures proposed and required will ensure the odour emissions generated by the development will at all times comply with the requirements of this condition.

35. The fill used to construct the required earthen bunds shall consist of clean, uncontaminated material to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Dust

36. Prior to the commencement of use of the poultry sheds the developer is to provide certification from an appropriately qualified environmental consultant that the sheds' ventilation systems incorporate measures to reduce the emission of dust to a target of 50 µg m^{-3} and, so as not to have greater than 5 exceedances per year, to the satisfaction of the Shire.
37. All bedding materials placed within sheds (ie sawdust) shall be treated (ie with oils) to reduce dust production.
38. Fan blades, screening and hoods shall be washed out with water rather than blown out with air.

39. Litter removal from the sheds shall be scheduled for times when dust nuisance to neighbours is likely to be minimised to the satisfaction of the Shire.

40. The developer shall prevent the generation of visible particulates (including dust) from access ways, trafficked areas, stockpiles and machinery from crossing the boundary of the premises by using where necessary appropriate dust suppression techniques.

Lighting

41. Outside lighting is to be kept to a safe minimum and should be angled to minimize light impacts on neighbouring properties.

Engineering

42. Crossovers to be constructed in accordance with Serpentine Jarrahdale standard industrial crossover specifications and be located to the satisfaction of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale.
43. The surface of the portions of Jarrah Road and Punrak Road abutting the subject site from the western-most crossover up to and including the intersection with Hopeland Road shall be upgraded to the satisfaction of the Shire. Concrete aprons shall be constructed between the crossovers to the sheds and the sealed surface of Jarrah Road to the satisfaction of the Shire. All costs associated with the required upgrading shall be at the expense of the developer of the subject site.
44. All driveway surfaces are to be constructed of a suitable material such as paving, road base, limestone or coarse gravel and compacted to limit the generation of dust and to ensure that no visible dust extends beyond the site boundary.

45. A maximum speed limit of 20 kilometres per hour shall be applied to all internal roads, driveways and vehicle accessways and signs in this regard shall be displayed at the entrances to the site and adjacent to the location of the sheds.

46. The movement of any oversize vehicle, as per the interpretation contained in the Road Traffic Act 1974, to/from the subject site will require the separate approval of the Shire.

Visual Amenity

47. The external cladding of the new poultry sheds shall match that of the existing poultry sheds.

Signage

48. Notices indicating the type of operation, hours of operation and potential impacts of the poultry farm operation to be displayed adjacent to both the Hopeland Road and Jarrah Road frontages of the site in accordance with the specifications contained in the Western Australian Planning Commission's Statement of Planning Policy No. 4.3 - Poultry Farms Policy, to the satisfaction of the Shire.

Advice Notes:

1. The application and a copy of this decision has been referred to the Western Australian Planning Commission for determination under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and you will be advised in writing by that authority once a determination in this regard has been made.

2. Separate approval may need to be obtained from the Water and Rivers Commission for a bore licence.

3. A works approval or licence may need to be obtained from the Environmental Protection Authority for the poultry farm development;

4. The operations should be carried out in accordance with the document *'Water Quality Protection Note Poultry Farms in Public Drinking Water Source Areas'* produced by the Water and Rivers Commission.

5. The Environmental Management System required by condition 3 shall be prepared in accordance with the *EMS for Meat Chicken Farms - Example Environmental Management Plan* published by the Australian Government Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation.

6. The Landscape and Vegetation Management Plan required by condition 8. shall:

- **a) Include a scaled map of the development which can be placed as an overlay over a recent (since 2003) aerial photograph of the whole of Lot 21 Hopeland Road;**
- **b) Locate on the map, and both identify and describe how existing indigenous vegetation is to be protected or is not to be retained as a result of driveways, fences, drains and other surface water features, firebreaks, power lines and other access ways and services plus proposed buildings and other structures;**
- **c) Locate on the map and both identify and describe the management of existing exotic vegetation;**
- **d) Locate on the map and identify both the types and magnitudes of weed infestations and describe weed management to be undertaken;**
- **e) Locate proposed revegetation works on the map and describe the species, densities, soil preparation and plant protection to provide complete screening of all existing and proposed poultry sheds from the roads and adjoining properties, maximise nutrient uptake from surface waters and surrounding soils, reconnect remnant vegetation with visual screen plantings and, provide habitat for local woodland and wetland fauna.**
- **f) Describe ongoing management of vegetation on site;**

g) Clearly state auditable vegetation management targets including weed control and revegetation outcomes for audit at the time of vegetation management bond return and thereafter as follows:

- **i) Visual screens are to include a minimum of six rows of trees and shrubs and must be no less than 10 metres wide;**
- **ii) Stems within visual screens are to be planted at minimum densities of one stem per three metres along rows that are no more than two metres apart;**
- **iii) Visual screening is to include a mixture of trees and shrubs such that no more than one third of the plants are trees.**
- **iv) Sedges and rushes to be planted around the settling pond are to be clumped with densities of four stems per metre squared within clumps and interspersed with other local wetland species;**
- **v) Required stem densities relate to a time when a minimum of 80% of the plants have survived at least two summer seasons and this is to be achieved initially within three years after development approval is given and thereafter maintained;**
- **vi) All plants are to be of locally native species indicative of neighboring woodland and wetland communities;**
- **vii) Achieve a plant diversity of at least 80% of the plant species that are listed within the dominant shoreline ground cover, medium shrub, tall shrub and tree categories for the relevant woodland and wetland communities on the Shire Planting List;**
- **viii) Maintain a weed burden at levels not likely to threaten the native species;**
- **ix) Locate fire breaks on the map.**
- **x) All earth bunds are to be vegetated to the satisfaction of the Shire.**

7. The Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan required by condition 14. above shall address the following:

- **a) show how the capacity of the settling pond will cope with storm water and shed wash down water in all but 1:10 year storm events;**
- **b) show how chemicals from disinfectants used, and nutrients from wash down water are treated so that no pollution can impact ground water resources or drain to the conservation category wetland down stream;**
- **c) describe and commit to best management practice of swales including the placement of, and periodic replacement of yellow sand linings, establishment and maintenance of a complete cover of healthy kikuyu, repeated clipping of kikuyu and disposal of clippings away from water courses, preferably to be exported off site to be composted with shed litter;**

8. The compound(s) described in condition 21. shall:

- **a) be graded or include a sump to allow recovery of liquid;**
- **b) be chemically resistant to the substances stored;**
- **c) include valves, pumps and meters associated with transfer operations wherever practical - otherwise the equipment shall be adequately protected e.g. bollards and contained in an area designed to permit recovery of chemicals released following accidents or vandalism;**
- **d) be designed such that jetting from any storage vessel or fitting will be captured within the bunded area - see for example Australian Standard 1940-1993 Section 5.9.3 (g);**
- **e) be designed such that chemicals which may react dangerously if they come into contact, are in separate bunds in the same compound or in different compounds; and**
- **f) be controlled such that the capacity of the bund is maintained at all times e.g. regular inspection and pumping of trapped uncontaminated rain water.**

9. Litter shall be kept at an optimal moisture level to ensure it is not excessively dry nor damp.

10. This approval is issued under the provisions of the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2. Separate approval under the Metropolitan Region Scheme is also required to be obtained from the Western Australian Planning Commission prior to issue of a Building Licence and the commencement of any of the works covered by this approval.

CARRIED 9/0

Council Note: The Officers Recommended Resolution was changed by adding part 6 x) – All earthen bunds are to be vegetated to the satisfaction of the Shire and by deleting part 42 regarding a single crossover be provided for access to both the dwelling and the sheds.

8. MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

9. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

10. URGENT BUSINESS:

COUNCIL DECISION
Moved Cr Star seconded Cr Kirkpatrick
That Council considers Item CGAM083/06/03 in relation to Disaster Relief as an item of urgent business
CARRIED 9/0

CGAM083/06/05 DISASTER RELIEF (A0349)		
Proponent:	Director Asset Services	In Brief Council is requested to create a Disaster Relief Expenditure Account accessible immediately to a maximum of $100,000 and allocate a portion of rate income annually to a Disaster Relief Reserve Account.
Officer:	MC Beaverstock Director Asset Services	
Signatures Author:		
Senior Officer:		
Date of Report	1 June 2005	
Previously		
Disclosure of Interest	No officer involved in the preparation of this report is required to declare an interest in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act	
Delegation	**Council**	

Background

The storms of Monday 16th May 2005 resulted in significant damage throughout the Shire, predominantly to structures and trees which were uprooted or lost limbs. On the day the Shire's Emergency Services, Operations Team, Administration staff and community worked tirelessly to make safe the worst effected areas. The cleanup from the storms is still ongoing with the most noticeable works being removal of vegetation.

Within road reservations and lands under the care and control of the Shire, it is estimated that approximately $50,000 will be expended. This expenditure is predominantly being allocated to ensuring trees are safe however branches, etc are generally being moved out of harms way with the intention being to progressively remove material over the next two (2) calendar years as mulching of all materials now will likely result in a cost in excess $100,000.

The bulk of damage from the storms has occurred on private property and officers are being contacted by residents who are suffering genuine hardship in dealing with the cleanup. This is both the cost of the cleanup, manpower to undertake works and disposal of material. Residents have been advised to place vegetative material on verges and Operations are progressively removing it. A number of residents are stockpiling material on their properties for burning.

Some properties adjacent to reserves (including those under the care and control of authorities other than Council) have suffered damage from fallen trees from those reserves. This has resulted in damage to fences and large limbs, etc needing to be removed. Legally the various government authorities have little responsibility for the damage however there is arguably a moral responsibility to assist.

Major concerns exist along the Serpentine River between Rapids Road and Parry Road where a number of large trees have either fallen into the river or over fences. There is a genuine risk that trees in the river may either result in flooding or move downstream potentially damaging bridges. Officers have been liaising with agencies such as Water and Rivers Commission however minimal assistance is being offered at this time.

It is recommended that Council give consideration to assisting the community in dealing with the effects of the storm. In this regard the primary assistance required is removal of trees from fences.

As a minimum Council is requested to endorse a waste collection in July 2005 to provide residents with the opportunity to dispose of materials, both greenwaste and hardwaste resulting from damage to structures. A collection in July is recommended to provide sufficient time for residents to move material to verges and will be undertaken in areas known to be impacted by the storm, mainly Serpentine, Oldbury, Oakford, Jarrahdale and Mundijong. Corridors in which damage occurred have been identified and it is recommended that residents within these corridors are advised personally of the collection. Residents will be encouraged to utilize the normal greenwaste collection programmed for November 2005 where possible.

The creation of a Disaster Relief Expenditure Account is also requested from which works undertaken by the Shire to date are costed against and costs to assist residents suffering hardship could be charged, up to a maximum of $100,000. As has occurred, the priority of Shire works would be the making safe of lands under our control. Assistance to residents would be by application and assessed by officers. In this regard it is requested that delegation is given to Director Asset Services to expend these funds where deemed appropriate.

Sustainability Statement

Effect on Environment*:* The storm has resulted in significant damage to both natural and built environments.

Economic Viability**:** The total cost of recovery from disasters can be significant however currently Council has no Reserves from which funding can be sought. The creation of a Disaster Relief Reserve Account will reduce the financial impact on Council operations should disasters occur in the future.

Social – Quality of Life: The purpose of the recommendations of this item are to provide assistance to the community in the event of disasters, particularly those residents facing hardship in the recovery process.

Social and Environmental Responsibility: The proposal is designed to be both socially and environmentally responsible through enabling a rapid response to disaster recovery.

Social Diversity: The proposal does not disadvantage any social groups.

Statutory Environment: Approval requires an absolute majority of the Council to vote in support of the recommendation.

Policy/Work Procedure Implications: There are no work procedures/policy implications directly related to this application/issue.

Financial Implications:

The request of $100,000 is an "out of budget" allocation and would be considered on the basis of accepting a budget deficit. The extent of the deficit will be better known following assessment of the current financial position as at 30 June 2005. While it is desirable to wait until our financial position is better known, the need for works and assistance is immediate.

Additionally, it is recommended that Council create a Disaster Relief Reserve account into which 0.5% of rates income is paid annually. This would result in approximately $25,000 per annum being placed in the Reserve which would be available in the event of future disasters in our community.

Savings of approximately $11,000 have been achieved in the 2004/05 Sanitation Accounts which would normally be transferred to the Waste Reserve. This amount will likely cover the bulk of the recommended July waste collection for which a quotation is currently being sought. The additional cost would be allowed for in the 2005/06 budget when known.

Recovery of some costs may be possible through FESA Disaster Relief Arrangements and other agencies however these are still being clarified.

Strategic Implications: This proposal relates to the following Key Sustainability Result Areas:-

1. People and Community

Objective 1: Good quality of life for all residents

Strategies:

6. Ensure a safe and secure community.

Objective 2: Plan and develop towns and communities based on principles of sustainability

Strategies:

4. Foster a strong sense of community, place and belonging.

Objective 3: High level of social commitment

Strategies:

1. Encourage social commitment and self determination by the SJ community.
2. Build key community partnerships.

2. Environment

Objective 1: Protect and repair natural resources and processes throughout the Shire

Strategies:

3. Encourage protection and rehabilitation of natural resources.
6. Value, protect and develop biodiversity.

3. Economic

Objective 3: Effective management of Shire growth

Strategies:

1. Enhance economic futures for Shire communities.
2. Represent the interests of the Shire in State and Regional planning processes.

4. Governance

Objective 1: An effective continuous improvement program

Strategies:

1. Identify and implement best practice in all areas of operation.
2. Promote best practice through demonstration and innovation.
4. Balance resource allocation to support sustainable outcomes.

Objective 2: Formation of Active Partnerships to progress key programs and projects

Strategies

1. Improve coordination between Shire, community and other partners.
2. Improve customer relations service.
3. Develop specific partnerships to effectively use and leverage additional resources.

Objective 3: Compliance to necessary legislation

Strategies:

1. Ensure development and use of infrastructure and land complies with required standards.
2. Develop a risk management plan.
3. Comply with State and Federal policies and Legislation and the Local Government Act in the most cost-effective way.

Community Consultation:

Community members have been contacting Council regarding assistance with the storm cleanup.

Comment:

Following the storm event there have been several residents contacting the Shire seeking assistance. Emergency Services teams are continuing to assist where possible, as are the Shire's Operations team. Although a number of residents are able to undertake recovery actions utilising insurance or own funds, there are residents suffering genuine hardship who require assistance.

Voting Requirements: **ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

Cr Star left the meeting at 1.54pm and returned at 1.55pm.
Cr Star left the meeting at 1.56pm and returned at 1.57pm.

Officer Recommended Resolution:

Council:

1. Approve the creation of a Disaster Relief Expenditure Account from which works associated with declared disasters are funded to a maximum of $100,000.
2. Delegates authority to Director Asset Services to expend funds from the Disaster Relief Expenditure Account.
3. Approves a waste collection service to be provided to residents in areas identified as impacted by the 16 May 2005 storm, to be undertaken in July 2005.
4. Allocates 0.5% of rate income each year to a Disaster Relief Reserve Account.

CGAM083/06/05 COUNCIL DECISION

Moved Cr Needham seconded Cr Star

1. **Approve the creation of a Natural Disaster Recovery Management Account from which works associated with declared disasters are funded to a maximum of $100,000.**
2. **Delegates authority to Director Asset Services to expend funds from the Natural Disaster Recovery Management Account.**
3. **Approves a waste collection service to be provided to residents in areas identified as impacted by the 16 May 2005 storm, to be undertaken in July 2005.**
4. **Allocates 0.5% of rate income each year to a Disaster Relief Reserve Account.**
5. **The Natural Disaster Recovery Management Account is to be used to provide assistance to community members dealing with the effects of Natural Disasters.**
6. **The Director Asset Services be requested to develop a policy for the future expenditure from this account.**

CARRIED 9/0 ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

Council Note: The Officers Recommended Resolution was changed by adding the word "Natural" before Disaster Recovery Management Account and by adding parts 5 and 6 to the motion.

Paul Zahra left the meeting at 1.59pm
Tony Turner left the meeting at 1.59pm

12. CLOSURE:

There being no further business the Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 2.00pm.