

Whether the proponent does this in Stages or not is not the issue - this Incinerator is detrimental to the health of all people living within the danger zone region and given the proponents record of breaching so many EPA laws our hospitals will be inundated with residents suffering from so many illnesses if Stage 1 is granted - there is no doubt that if Stage 1 is horribly considered and granted then Stage 2 will automatically be granted as well. Both Stages should be refused.

NO amount of amendments to the Incinerator will prove and guarantee that what will emit from the incinerator will be safe - you cannot control nor ignore the dioxins, poisonous gases and all other deadly pollutants that will be emitted from the plant and all our families living healthily at present, will be breathing this in all day and all night - extremely detrimental to our health and this WILL cause diseases and premature death in vulnerable as well as healthy people.

Our bodies were not meant to breathe in such toxicity. Do any of you Committee members want to be held responsible for all the deaths, people falling ill, deformities etc that will arise if this Incinerator is allowed to be built here in Eastern Creek? Can you live with this on your conscience knowing full well that you had the opportunity and power to say NO to the incinerator being built near homes at Eastern Creek and that you put the profits and greed of the applicant first over the health and wellbeing of the people.

IGGC Pty Ltd, Newtown NSW, made the following submission on the project:
The Next Generation Energy from Waste Facility, Eastern Creek

(Quote) My apologies for the lateness of this submission but it has just been brought to my attention that the Soil and Water component of the revised EIS for the proposed development both includes and draws upon material produced by IGGC to which the proponent has no ownership nor right to make use of. This includes the report referred to as IGGC, 2015 and associated spreadsheet models, interpretive drawings, collated data and results from other modelling and assessment.

IGGC is currently in a commercial dispute with TNG and its parent companies over matters particularly in relation to non-payment of fees, including those for all of IGGC's work on the revised EIS. This material remains IGGC's copyright and no approval for its use has been sought or granted.

The Soil and Water chapter of the EIS is heavily based on IGGC's draft report, with many section lifted from IGGC's draft with no apparent verification or editing. IGGC can provide no assurances regarding the accuracy or fitness for purpose of any of this material as the review and quality assurance process was not completed.

Finally, I have only had the opportunity for the briefest review of the revised EIS but have noted a number of errors, some of which relate directly to IGGC's work.

Please let me know if you I can provide any further information. . (unquote)



For the proponent to comment that there will be no effluent discharge from the site and no visual plume from the stack, but this can sometimes occur due to climatic conditions is false advertising.

Just take a look at all the Incinerators around the world - everyone of them has a plume of poisonous gas emitting from the stacks and people living around the area have reported that black ash settles on their homes, cars, gardens etc etc every second of every day!

The picture above shows just what WILL emit from the stacks and for the applicant to comment that he knows the type of emissions that will come out of these facilities as the data has existed for 20 years is not true. No one can guarantee what is coming out of the stacks as because of the different materials that will be burnt at this Incinerator, if mistakenly allowed to go ahead, the emissions will be full of toxins of different percentages, all of them dangerous and hazardous to human health and life

There is also no way the proponent can monitor what will emit from the stacks - once again no one in the world can monitor this

No matter what the percentage of pollution control this Incinerator has, there is no guarantee that monitoring these pollution controls will be safe for people to breathe for what emits from the stacks is the result of what is being burnt and mark my words asbestos and dangerous industrial waste will be burned at this site.

Shlomo Dowen of UKWIN said: "Incineration is associated with the linear 'make-use-dispose' model and everyone agrees that this is unsustainable."

Deflocculation can be a problem in wastewater treatment plants as it commonly causes sludge settling problems and deterioration of the effluent quality.
there are no facilities of this type which specify the exact waste streams coming in. the technology of a facility has to deal with the variability of the waste

We are not allowed to burn our garbage in our back yard yet this dangerous, hazardous incinerator is being considered to burn industrial waste less than 800m from homes and less than 5km from our water supply. What hypocrisy!

Incinerators emit varying levels of heavy metals such as vanadium, manganese, chromium, nickel, arsenic, mercury, lead and cadmium, which can be toxic at very minute levels.

Disposing of flue gas residues/bottom ash is a toxic death trap. This bottom ash is so toxic that unless it is disposed of in concrete miles from homes, farms, water supplies, it will leach out into the soil causing hazardous results.

There have so many accidents in Europe at Incinerators - these question the safety about the technology at these Incinerators - no one can guarantee their safety - just not appropriate

The dept of planning had experts go through the proponent's book of 'facts and figures' and had to ask the proponent to rectify many mistakes - with the proponent juggling numbers - unbelievable. This application should never have gone this far - it is morally wrong to grant this application given the dangers to human life.

ARUP are experts in their field and for the applicant to comment that ARUP misunderstood the data is unbelievable - there were so many untruths that ARUP the experts had to do the right thing by recommending that this Incinerator not be given the go ahead - ARUP knew exactly how dangerous and untrue this whole application is.

The families out West have a legitimate claim of objection towards this Incinerator - we have 1 life and a right to live this life in a safe environment and not breathing in harmful gases that WILL emit from this Incinerator if given the go-ahead. I urge you to reject this application.