

Clarence Correctional Centre - Complaints Register

Time of complaint	Date of complaint	Complaint Source	Stakeholders	Time/Date of Initial Resonse	Stakeholder comments	Project team response
10.26pm	03-Jul-17	Email	(name removed)	3.12pm 04/07/2017	Stakeholder emailed concerns about workers on site interaction with the community police presence at the site traffic management and site procedures site signage requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 14 workers in hi vis were taking part in a site induction as per WHS requirements, and were not undertaking any works on the site. The police were called in accordance with site procedure, after a request was denied for a community member's vehicle to be moved when it was obstructing access to the site. As part of the project induction, staff and subcontractors have been briefed on expectations and acceptable behaviours when interacting with community members. As a result of the incident described above, traffic control measures are being reviewed to ensure community and employee safety and these revised measures will be in place shortly. Signage for Development Consent Condition C6 was erected on Thursday 6 July. Perimeter fencing for site security is required to protect the sign, for public safety & the risk of vandalism (considerable vandalism has been witnessed on the existing buildings on site). In addition bulk excavation works (requiring the Signage for Development Consent Condition C6) do not commence until the week starting 10 July 2017
	04-Jul-17	email	(name removed)	9.12am 05/07/2017	Stakeholder emailed concerns about traffic control alleged safety incident with community member	<p>In response to the questions raised in your email dated 4 July, our Safety Manager has investigated the incident and taken witness accounts from the Site Manager, Excavator Operator and the Site Foreman. We note that a statement was not taken from the person who allegedly had his foot run over by the excavator as he did not notify John Holland of the incident.</p> <p>Based on this investigation, the following outcomes have been implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Traffic Control Plan (TCP) has been reviewed and minor improvements have been proposed. The amended TCP provides clear isolation between parties (in the instance of community members and plant). Barriers will be procured to facilitate the amended TCPs isolation protocol. <p>The investigation concluded, from witness accounts, that the community member's alleged injury could not be verified, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alleged injury was not notified to any person(s). The person did not seek assistance from the Police. The person did not seek assistance from site personnel. First aid was available – yet not requested.
3.33pm	14-Jul-17	phone call	(name removed)	14/7/2017 3.37	Phone call was recived via INSW that an adjoining landowners property access had been restricted as a lock had been placed on the gate.	<p>Site team had locked gate to stop cattle accessing site as there had been incidents where cattle were on site and at risk from heavy plant.</p> <p>Site team advised that no gates to adjoining properties can be locked.</p>
2.47pm	03-Aug-17	phone call	(name removed)	2.47pm 3 August 2017	Resident called concerned about the noise levels of on-site plant.	Noise monitoring was completed on the northern boundary fenceline and found to be within licence requirements.
10.00am	08-Aug-17	phone call	(name removed)	10.41am - Advice given to our employees had been advised that they were not not use Six Mile Lane.	<p>Hi x</p> <p>Thank you for your phone call yesterday advising of John Holland traffic use Six Mile Lane. As a result, the following actions have been taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All John Holland staff were briefed verbally and advised that using Old Six Mile Lane was in breach of the John Holland Traffic Management Plan. During the weekly subcontractor meeting held on 8/8/2017 all subcontractors were also advised that use of Old Six Mile Lane was not part of the designated route to/from the NGCC site. <p>Please do not hesitate to advise me if you see any further breaches. John Holland takes the safety of our staff and the community very seriously.</p> <p>Kind regards xxx</p>	Use of Old Six Mile lane to be rerouted during inductions.
10.15am	17-Oct-17	phone call	(name removed)	11.19am	Landowner complaint in relation to detention basins on western side of site discharging onto adjoining properties and proposed WWTP operation in respone to a heavy rainfall event 15/16 October 2017.	Letter sent containing the following: Licensing requirements Controls in place for basin function Proposed additional controls for basins invitation to view controls in place Invitation for environmental plans content WWTP operation diagram
2.32pm	17-Oct-17	phone call	(name removed)	10.44am 18 October 2017	Landowner complaint in relation to detention basins on western side of site discharging onto adjoining properties and proposed WWTP operation in respone to a heavy rainfall event 15/16 October 2017.	Letter sent containing the following: Licensing requirements Controls in place for basin function Proposed additional controls for basins invitation to view controls in place Invitation for environmental plans content WWTP operation diagram
3.33pm	09-Nov-17	phone call	(name removed)	3.33pm 9 November 2017	Local resident called to inform that there was a truck driving dangerously on Eight Mile Lane with the number plate xxxxx.	Delivery dockets searched, none with the number plate found. Suggestion was made that the truck may be from another project in the area.
2pm	05-Apr-18	phone call	(name removed)	2pm 5 April 2018	Local landowner called to complain about the amount of water being discharged from the and why he was not advised of the discharge occurring.	Message was left for landowner however he did not receive. Landowner does not have a mobile phone. In future additional attempt to contact will be made. Additional informaiton via a letter was supplied to landowner regarding flow rates from detention basin and operations information
7.48am	23-Apr-18	Via email	(name removed)	01/06/2018	Landowner on northern boundary raised issue with the discharge of water from detention basins. The creek we discharge into crosses their property. They accepted that the water was clean (or at least hoped so as people downstream used the water for drinking purposes) They complained that they were given no notice that a significant amount of water was to be released and that the volume of water caused flooding in some areas of their property to the extent they could have become bogged or cut off if they had vehicles in the area at the time.	Formal letter issued to landowner from John Holland. Letter contained information from consulting engineers regarding detention basin operations during construction and operational phases of the project. Basin discharge protocol updated to include additional step of affected landowner notification prior to release of water.
3.45pm	22-Jun-18	phone call	(name removed)	3.45pm	Local resident called to discuss construction noise levels at residence.	Advised that John Holland would investigate the noise levels and get back to resident with the readings and additional informaiton. Noise levels were found to be within limits.
10.06	22-Jun-18	text message	(name removed)	22/6/2018 10.06am	Local resident texted concerns regarding additional dust/dirt on floor of residence and possibility of the dust affecting solar panels and water tanks and health of residents.	Dust monitoring records consulted and found to be within limits, additional water cart usage in the vicinity of the residence will be implemented during earthworks. Resident advised that bulk earthworks are nearing completion.