



SAM SEVIERI

OBJECT

Submission ID: 217660

Organisation: N/A	Key issues: Social impacts
Location: New South Wales 2577	
Attachment: N/A	

Submission date: 11/24/2024 1:33:41 PM

Appendix D: Object (a) of the EP&A Act:

(a) to promote the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by the proper management, development and conservation of the State's natural and other resources

DPHI report must consider objects of the Act and how they have been considered. It states (p.65) the proposal has generated a high level of community interest due to its potential for impacts on surrounding residents.

It goes on to state, "The Applicant has made amendments to the original development to address these concerns and, with the recommended conditions, the potential impact of the development have been greatly reduced and are unlikely to impact on the social welfare of local residents"

It states (without evidence) that the development would increase waste recovery capacity and employment in the Southern Highlands

The community absolutely rejects this assessment on the grounds that:

- *The applicant has made mainly negligible changes to the original development and these were made as a result of community members conducting due diligence on serious issues, such as truck and haulage routes (originally along Beaconsfield Rd, a narrow residential rural road unable to withstand over 380 truck and light vehicle movements daily. These changes were made because the original proposal was unworkable, sloppy, presented safety issues for children and residents, and demonstrated even a basic understanding of the local context*

- *To state that the development is unlikely to impact on [sic] the social welfare of local residents is misleading at best and deliberately underplays the considerable suffering already caused by what would appear to be an opportunistic and ill-conceived proposal*

- *Far from increasing employment in the Southern Highlands, this proposal is likely to negate any ambitions of the proposed SHIP to operate effectively, attract businesses and employment/training opportunities, and meet its vision of becoming an agri-innovation precinct within a green landscape setting that capitalises on its locational strengths and features "low scale built form and materiality" that is "not your typical industrial shed"*

- *Far from increasing employment in the Southern Highlands, this proposal is likely to negate any ambitions of the proposed SHIP to operate effectively, attract businesses and employment/training opportunities, and meet its vision of becoming an agri-innovation precinct within a green landscape setting that capitalises on its locational strengths and features "low scale built form and materiality" that is "not your typical industrial shed"*

The community absolutely rejects this assessment on the grounds that:

- *The applicant has made mainly negligible changes to the original development and these were made as a result of community members conducting due diligence on serious issues, such as truck and haulage routes (originally along Beaconsfield Rd, a narrow residential rural road unable to withstand over 380 truck and light vehicle movements daily. These changes were made because the original proposal was unworkable, sloppy,*



presented safety issues for children and residents, and demonstrated even a basic understanding of the local context

- *To state that the development is unlikely to impact on [sic] the social welfare of local residents is misleading at best and deliberately underplays the considerable suffering already caused by what would appear to be an opportunistic and ill-conceived proposal*
 - *Far from increasing employment in the Southern Highlands, this proposal is likely to negate any ambitions of the proposed SHIP to operate effectively, attract businesses and employment/training opportunities, and meet its vision of becoming an agri-innovation precinct within a green landscape setting that capitalises on its locational strengths and features 'low scale built form and materiality' that is 'not your typical industrial shed'*
 - *DPHI accepts the proponent's assertion that the development will generate '200 FTE construction jobs and 140 operational jobs and invest \$88,120.922 in the LGA'. There appears no attempt to verify these figures or to attempt to analyse or quantify the net gain if hundreds of skilled jobs are lost from the SHIP. This would appear to be contrary to Object (a) of the Act*
 - *DPHI's assessment that the proposal will, 'reduce the use of natural resources to create new products' is made without providing any supporting evidence or analysis.*
-