



BARRY SMITH

OBJECT

Submission ID: 207823

Organisation: N/A	Key issues: <i>Social impacts, Land use compatibility (surrounding land uses), Traffic, Other issues</i>
Location: 2576 New South Wales	
Attachment: N/A	

Submission date: 10/25/2024 1:28:59 PM

I am writing to vehemently oppose the construction of the Plasrefine factory in Moss Vale.

It is disappointing that the proposal has even made it this far, given how totally unacceptable it is for the location.

I am a strong supporter of recycling, and waste recycling facilities, as are most Wingecarribee locals.

What we object to is the fact that this proposal is planned for a site that is completely unacceptable for the proposed facility.

Unfortunately, instead of designing the proposal and then looking for a suitable site, it appears the developers have purchased the site first and then are trying to make the project fit. Like trying to make a square peg fit in a round hole, instead of looking around for a square hole once you now you have a square peg.

There are many more suitable locations that this facility could be built at. Our local member has even offered to help the applicants find a more suitable site, but they are not interested.

Even the DHPI Executive Summary highlights that there are numerous reasons why this is the wrong location.

Many others have discussed the issues in depth. I would like to focus on 3 issues;

1) TRUCKS

One of the main reasons this is a ridiculous location is that the plastic waste to be recycled is to be trucked in from Sydney, Canberra and Illawarra. It is not local plastic being recycled. So the plastic will be sorted in a facility in Sydney, then loaded on to large trucks and trucked vast distances to the MossVale facility. The plastic pellets will then be loaded, no doubt on a separate truck, and returned to various areas of Sydney for use.

Any sensible person would realise the answer to the issues raised is to build the Plasrefine Plastic Recycling Facility either at the location of the plastic sorting facility or within close proximity. It is illogical, especially when we are trying to reduce carbon emissions, to use trucks to move the plastic waste around simply because the applicants bought a cheap block of land and they want to use it.

Build the facility in a sensible location.

And if it so safe and will cause no disruption, then there is no reason why it cannot be built within the Sydney region and close to the origin of the plastic waste sorting, which would eliminate the issue of truck movements.

From a Global Warming perspective, this project should be clearly cancelled.

The NSW Waste & Sustainability Materials Strategy has as one of its aims the reduction of carbon emissions through recycling.

According to that report, recycling 1 Tonne of PET plastic results in a reduction of around 1.2kg t CO2.

At the maximum production, the plant will process 120,000 tonnes, but this is not projected for a while. So as a conservative estimate, if they produce half their capacity they will assist in reducing carbon emissions by 72,000 t CO2 each day.



It is possible to estimate CO2 emissions from trucks through various NSW government websites.

Even though I believe that the applicant has underestimated their truck movements, using their own figures we have calculated that the trucks and light vehicles accessing the site will produce a total of 91,033 t CO2 - more than any reduction obtained through recycling.

This doesn't include any carbon emissions produced daily at the factory through other means - this is purely just from transport.

That means that instead of being a means of reducing Carbon emissions into the future, this facility will be a significant producer of Carbon emissions.

The frustrating aspect of this is that the facility could move us into the future with reducing carbon emissions - if it was built in a suitable location, adjacent to a plastic sorting waste depot.

The other more concerning aspect of the truck movements is the route chosen. There is no doubt that the trucks will access the most convenient route possible when the site is opened. It makes no difference if there is a designated route - we have seen from other facilities in the area that trucks will access the most convenient route. There are residential streets in those areas that are not suitable for large trucks.

2) FIRE RISK

Waste facilities catch alight on a regular basis. It is usually not a question of if, but when. And plastic waste facilities are the most dangerous and dramatic fires. I would like to challenge the assertion from Fire and Rescue NSW mentioned in the Assessment report that there is no concern for the Garvan institute and surrounding properties because 'toxic smoke from a prolonged fire at the development would rise directly upwards'.

I would like evidence that Fire and Rescue NSW actually visited the site. That location is one of the windiest areas of the Highlands, and it is rare not to have some level of westerly wind through the property. Unless they have conducted some sort of experiment, I would challenge the assertion that toxic smoke will rise upwards and won't be pushed by the prevailing winds into neighbouring properties and the Garvan institute. The potential risk associated with just one fire that could potentially damage the important research that is conducted at the Garvan institute should be reason enough to cancel this project.

3) CONSIDER A NEW LOCATION

This project is a good idea on paper, but it is being built in an unsuitable location. The local community do not want it, and there have been numerous issues indicated that still have not been overcome. Even the DPHI assessment has listed numerous issues that have not been addressed. The Moss Vale water treatment plant cannot cater for the local community without adding to the load. The solution offered by DHPI, of making the facility only use the sewer system to dispose of water at night when the load is less is not only ludicrous but not enforceable.

There are many other areas, around the state and around our local area, where the facility would be welcomed. It seems counter-productive to force this facility on the community when it is not welcomed.
