

Independent Planning Commission

Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street

SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Ms. Kruk, Mr. Duncan and Mr. Pearson

I write to register my OBJECTION to the proposed Energy from Waste Facility at Eastern Creek by The Next Generation NSW Pty Ltd.

I am resident who lives 5.07Km from the proposed site. Our family spends most of our time in the local area to the proposed facility. We have our home here. We work and go to school in the local area. We socialise and spend time with our friends and family in our local community. We spend considerable time participating in range of outdoor activities including sport in the immediate area.

I am very concerned about the impact of the emissions from the proposed Energy from Waste Facility will have on the health of my family and friends who live locally and also those of the wider area of western Sydney. I am also very concerned about the environmental impact including the food and water supplies, animals and farming.

I believe the location is unacceptable:

- It is 800 meters from homes, in the middle of a densely populated area including schools, hospitals, playing fields and areas of recreation that thousands of people use every day.
- It violates the zoning classification. The Blacktown Local Environment Plan states that the objective of an IN1 General Industrial zone is "To minimise adverse impacts on the natural environment". If this is to have any meaning in real terms, such a facility cannot be allowed. The type of permitted industries in section 3 include depots, freight facilities, garden centers, general industries, kiosks etc.- hardly similar in nature to the application. In fact listed prohibited industries include extractive industries, heavy industries of similar nature to the application.
- It requires the removal of river flat eucalypt forest and Cumberland plain woodland, which are both endangered.
- Three aboriginal sites were identified within the proposed location.
- I am not satisfied that the proponent has justified that location of the application is suitable.

I have concerns about toxicity:

- According to the air quality index, the immediate area already has very poor quality of air before the project is even considered. This will worsen the quality of life of the residents and workers in the immediate area.
- It is impossible to demonstrate with unknown feed stocks the output of toxins and pollutants.
- Dioxins have no safe level

- The proponent cannot say categorically that pollution will not cause harm – only unlikely and for “most” pollutants. I am not satisfied that the proponent has adequately addressed the issue of pollution. Again, with unknown feed stocks how can the proponent accurately assess what the output will be?

I’m concerned about the proponents methods and ethics.

- Public Awareness of the project: In May 2018 I assisted with door knocking residents of Minchinbury to inform residents about the project. I was very surprised at the lack of community awareness of the residents we met. People were genuinely shocked to hear about the proposal and had not received any information about the project from the proponent. The issue of lack of adequate community consultation was raised at the Government Inquiry in July 2017.
- Track record: The proponent has a long record of environmental breaches. In the proponents document addressing concerns, section 5, under the heading “Consultation Process” the proponent states the manufacturer of this particular type of plant has never had a forced shut down by a breach of operating standards”. However in published answers to questions on notice from the Parliament Inquiry on Energy to Waste Technology showed that there have been in fact 18 compliance breaches associated with Proponent and his companies between 2005-2017 and 581 complaints associated with the proponent and his companies between 2001-2017.
- The proponent’s response to the impact on existing air quality basically states that they only have to worry about their part of the problem and not address the existing air quality problems. This is unacceptable as a prospective long term member of our community. I feel that should there rise in health problems from the facility that it would be blamed on existing poor quality of health and the proponent would avoid responsibility for damage caused by the facility.
- When questioned during the state government inquiry about toxic materials being fed into the incinerator, the response was that it was of such a high temperature they would all be burned up, as if that’s how chemical reactions work.
- Using HZI to plan, build and run the project comes across as a tactic to offload responsibility if the facility fails in the future.
- I am not satisfied that the proponent has been open and honest in their responses to the public earlier this year to the objection of “transparency and risk of non-compliance”.
- Alarmingly it appears that the proponent has offered free solar power should the project be approved. This could be construed as bribery.
- I’m confused how the data models change significantly each time the proponent submits revisions of the project, apparently without significant changes in methods.
- Accountability: I don’t understand why it would be acceptable that the monitoring is an in house arrangement. This needs to be independent and publicly available.

There has been widespread lack of support for the project:

- The EPA concluded that “there is an unknown and potentially unacceptable risk to human health for the local community”.

- NSW Health raised concerns regarding modelled emissions and potential impact on human health.
- The Office of Environment and Heritage had concerns about conservation (particularly indigenous sites) and biodiversity.
- The Department of Planning and Environment found the proposal inconsistent with the EFW policy and had concerns about long term health of the local community, and the location was unsuitable.
- The NSW Parliamentary Inquiry does not support the project due to the level of concerns expressed about the proposal and the uncertainty of impacts to human health and the environment.
- Local Councils. Blacktown and Penrith councils objected to the proposal on the basis of gaps in the EIS, insufficient verification of the predicted emissions, inconsistency with the IN1 general industrial zone, concerns about health and the environment and lack of confidence in the operator.
- Two petitions of 10,000 + signatures on each were submitted to NSW Parliament which indicates that the project does not have social license. This is a requirement of the EPA for a project to be approved.
- Incineration is opposed by the World Health Organization.

Living in this area would be simply impossible should the plan go ahead our family would certainly have to leave Sydney. The risk on our health is just too great. This would mean leaving family and friends, work and community responsibilities.

The stress of uprooting our family, the likely drop in house values and the breakup of our community should the project go ahead is devastating.

We don't want to leave!

The process as a resident has been quite frankly very disappointing. The process feels completely stacked against residents and towards big business. It is worth noting that I believe that this issue would not happen in other areas of Sydney. I feel that as a working-class community with low income, high levels of immigrants, people with a lower level of education we have not had a fair chance to defend our families and homes. This is not right.

I beg you please consider our family and community when making this decision. The consequences of the Energy from Waste facility are long lasting and significant. The impact will simply be devastating on the health and lives of real people, real communities and our irreplaceable environment.

I thank you for your time in considering my concerns and I trust that you will make wise decisions that will be best for the community of Sydney.