

Submission to the Coordinator-General

Topic template: homes, property values, community wellbeing and traffic

Fill in the grey boxes on a computer or by hand, and change any wording that is not true for you. The Coordinator-General's office recommends that each submission is unique, so please add your own words. You can use this on its own or together with the other documents in the kit.

Send to	Email: sdainfo@coordinatorgeneral.qld.gov.au Post: The Coordinator-General, c/- State development areas, PO Box 15517, City East Qld 4002
Name of project	Bromelton Energy and Resource Centre (BERC), Cleanaway Operations Pty Ltd, SDA application AP2026/001 <i>Check this matches the public notice exactly.</i>
Closing date	16 November 2026. Send it a few days early, and check the date in the public notice.

Application	SDA application for a material change of use for special industry (Bromelton Energy and Resource Centre) in the Bromelton State Development Area. Application reference AP2026/001.
Applicant	Cleanaway Operations Pty Ltd
Site	Lot 1 Beaudesert Boonah Road, Bromelton QLD 4285 (Lot 1 on RP45234)

Your details

Full name	
Street address	
Town or suburb, and postcode	
Email (optional)	
Date	

1. Why I am making this submission

I am writing as (describe your connection to the Scenic Rim, for example: I live, work, own property or farm in the area. Include only what is true for you):

I am concerned that the proposed large-scale waste combustion facility could have effects well beyond its site boundary. My concerns relate particularly to residential amenity, the ability to sell or enjoy homes, uncertainty about remaining in the district, traffic and road safety, and the combined effects on the character and economy of the region.

Cleanaway's application describes a facility designed to process approximately 760,000 tonnes of residual municipal and commercial and industrial waste each year (Appendix E, Rev D). A project of this scale deserves a rigorous assessment of what daily life may be like for residents over many decades, not simply an assessment of what occurs inside the industrial boundary.

My personal connection to this area is:

2. Homes, property values and the ability to sell

For many residents, a home is their largest financial asset and the place where they expect to feel secure. I am concerned that the prospect of a large waste incinerator, visible industrial structures, concerns about emissions and substantially increased freight activity may affect how prospective buyers perceive nearby homes and rural properties. Even where an actual price reduction cannot yet be established, concerns about saleability, time on the market, buyer enquiries and insurance or lending perceptions warrant proper investigation.

I do not claim that a particular percentage fall in property values has been proven. I ask instead whether the proponent's socioeconomic assessment contains independent local market evidence, identifies the communities potentially affected, and tests the possibility of negative outcomes. Cleanaway's socio-economic assessment (Appendix V, Rev D) lists land values among the concerns raised by the community (Table 3, pp. 20–21) and describes perceptions of diminished property value as arising "regardless of the Project's actual performance" (pp. 38 and 44). I could not find independent local property-market evidence in it. Any statement by the applicant that impacts will be minor should be supported by evidence, not assumption.

I request an independent assessment by appropriately qualified property-market specialists, using comparable sales where available, interviews with local agents and residents, and an explanation of uncertainty. The assessment should consider both construction and long-term operations, including visual amenity, truck movements and perceptions of environmental risk.

3. The possibility of residents feeling compelled to leave

A proposed industrial development can affect people long before it begins operating. Residents may experience uncertainty about whether to renovate, invest in their properties, retire locally, establish a business or remain in the district. Families with children, older residents and people with limited financial resources may face particular difficulty if they wish to move but cannot readily do so.

I ask the Coordinator-General to require a meaningful assessment of these possible effects on wellbeing, community cohesion and decisions about relocation. That assessment should not assume that people who remain in their homes are unaffected, or that residents' concerns are irrelevant merely because a particular health impact has not been demonstrated.

The application should disclose who was consulted, how people in potentially affected towns were informed, what concerns were raised, and whether independent surveys have examined residents' future intentions. Consultation should include people beyond the nearest industrial properties, including communities along likely transport routes.

My own experience and details:

4. Heavy vehicles, safety and daily disruption

The project would require regular deliveries of waste and movement of materials, in addition to construction traffic. I am concerned about the implications for the Mount Lindesay Highway, Beaudesert–Boonah Road, connecting roads and intersections used by residents, school traffic, agricultural vehicles and visitors. The effect of heavy vehicles is not limited to average daily traffic: vehicle timing, turning movements, road condition, visibility and incidents can all change the experience of using these roads. Cleanaway's traffic assessment (Appendix Q, Rev D, Table 2, "Daily vehicle arrival numbers") estimates 167 trucks arriving each day at full design capacity, and 182 at 110% of capacity. These are arrivals only. The same report says the

roads it reviewed had seven fatal crashes between 2020 and 2024, and a fatality rate of about 1.47 per 100 million vehicle kilometres travelled, compared with 0.50 for Australia and 0.49 for Queensland in 2023 (p. 32).

I request that the Coordinator-General examine the updated Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix Q) and the updated Pavement Impact Assessment Technical Note, including their assumptions about waste origin, truck payload, number of trips, delivery hours, route selection and future growth. Where figures are based on a model rather than contracted routes, that distinction should be made clear. Any public figure for trucks per day must identify whether it means vehicles or one-way movements.

The assessment should address school travel periods, overtaking and turning risks, emergency access, road maintenance, noise, dust and congestion at key intersections. It should also test cumulative traffic from existing and reasonably foreseeable industrial developments, and identify who would pay for any required road improvements and ongoing pavement damage.

For residents and visitors, the experience of sharing regional roads with more heavy vehicles can affect confidence and travel choices even when an intersection technically meets a design standard. I ask that this lived experience be considered alongside traffic-engineering measures.

My own experience, concerns and details:

5. Scenic Rim tourism, farming and community character

The Scenic Rim is valued for its rural landscape, agriculture, small communities and tourism. I am concerned that a major waste combustion facility and associated transport could affect the district’s reputation as a place to visit, invest and produce food. These are potential impacts requiring investigation; I do not assert that particular businesses have already lost income because of the proposal.

I ask for assessment of whether visitor perceptions, agri-tourism, accommodation providers, farm-gate businesses and agricultural producers have been adequately considered. The assessment should examine how visible infrastructure, perceived pollution risk, traffic and changes to the area’s identity may interact. It should also explain the geographic boundaries used: impacts should not be dismissed solely because a property or business is outside a narrow study radius.

Where the proponent forecasts jobs and local spending, I request a balanced account that also tests potential costs to existing industries and households. Cleanaway expects 50–60 operational jobs (Appendix V, Rev D, Table 8, pp. 40–41). Agriculture, forestry and fishing plus accommodation and food services together account for close to 3,800 of the Scenic Rim’s 18,767 employed residents (Appendix V, Rev D, pp. 26–27 and Table B4). The public should be able to understand the evidence, assumptions and uncertainty on both sides of the ledger.

My own experience, concerns and details:

6. The combined impacts and gaps that must be resolved

These concerns should not be assessed in isolation. A family may experience uncertainty about property value at the same time as more heavy traffic, a changed view from their home and concern about future air quality. A tourism operator may experience similar effects through visitors’ perceptions and transport conditions. The cumulative effect could be more significant than any single issue considered separately.

I ask that the assessment clearly distinguish established facts, modelled predictions and matters not yet investigated. If the proponent concludes that the impacts are acceptable, it should explain the evidence supporting that conclusion, including independent verification where material uncertainties remain.

Monitoring or management plans proposed for after approval are not a substitute for understanding whether a project is acceptable before approval.

7. Queensland human rights: homes and families

This application may affect people’s homes, families and daily life. I ask the Coordinator-General to consider whether any rights protected by the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) are affected by a decision on this application, and to explain in the reasons for the decision how those rights were considered.

Legal source: Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) (legislation.qld.gov.au/view/whole/html/current/act-2019-005).

8. What I ask the Coordinator-General to do

First, I request that the Coordinator-General refuse the current SDA development application, because it has not been shown to be consistent with the Bromelton SDA Development Scheme (Schedule 2, clause 2.5(5)(b), relying on s 2.1.1(4)), unless the concerns and information gaps identified in this submission have been satisfactorily investigated, independently assessed where necessary, and resolved before a decision is made. I ask that the decision address each material concern with reasons and evidence.

Second, I separately request that the Coordinator-General consider declaring the proposal a coordinated project requiring a full Environmental Impact Statement under sections 26 and 27AA(2) of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. A full EIS would provide a more comprehensive and publicly scrutinised assessment of environmental, social, economic, health, traffic and cumulative impacts. This is a separate statutory request, not a claim that the present SDA consultation is itself an EIS process.

Third, I request that the Coordinator-General consider whether any rights under the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) are affected, and explain how they were considered. I also request disclosure of relevant technical assumptions, meaningful consultation and a reasonable opportunity to respond to substantial new information.

I ask that my personal circumstances, recorded above, be considered in the decision. My concerns deserve an evidence-based response before a decision with potentially long-lasting consequences is made.

Signature

I confirm the information about me in this submission is true and correct.

Signature		Date	
-----------	--	------	--

If you email your submission or use the online form, that counts as your signature. If you post it, sign it by hand. Please write your name on every page if you add extra pages.

Before you send: give your name and address, sign, and lodge by 16 November 2026. Submissions are not confidential. Cleanaway can get a copy, and it may be made public. Do not include anything you would not want others to read, such as bank details.

Documents relevant to this template (for the decision-maker to examine, not proof of a specific impact)

- Updated Appendix Q — Traffic Impact Assessment (Rev D)
- Updated Appendix V — Socio-Economic Impact Assessment (Rev D)
- Appendix D — Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment
- Appendix T — Noise and Vibration Technical Report
- Appendix W — Community and Stakeholder Engagement Report
- Updated Pavement Impact Assessment Technical Note