(42)

IPC Meeting 28/10/2024 **Bowral Memorial Hall**

Bev Hordern : [redacted] Moss Vale 2577 [redacted]

Good Afternoon Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity - I have three main concerns :

1. **LAND USE CONFLICT and UNSUITABLE SITE SELECTION**

I live just 200m from the site on land zoned Conservation 4 which, according to NSW Department of Planning *"is about **conserving the environmental values and natural qualities in areas where it applies."*** C4 residential land between us and the site has just a narrow residential road between it and the site. There is **NO BUFFER.**

We have been told by GHD, that Plasrefine has a right to occupy General Industrial land because it is a permissible use. I strongly contend that based on the scale, nature and intensity of the proposed developments' operations it is properly characterised as a potentially hazardous heavy industry that should be situated in a Heavy Industrial Zone. Based on its current IN1 zoning it is totally inconsistent with two critical Objectives. ***"To minimise any adverse effect of industry on other land users."*** and ***" To ensure that new development and land uses incorporate measures that take account of their spatial context and mitigate any potential impacts on neighbourhood amenity and character, or the efficient operation of the local or regional road system."***

If this massive factory is built on the current site the SHIP will be sunk (along with Garvan), it will dominate the landscape for kilometres with emissions, noise, vibrations, light spill and traffic in its 24/7 operation and we ratepayers will forever be covering the cost of damage to our roads. The riparian zones will be impaired and water quality in the Sydney Water Catchment will be at great risk. An inspection of the topography of the site illustrates this.

JUST BECAUSE YOU CAN, DOESN'T MEAN YOU SHOULD!

I support plastic recycling and whilst acknowledging the pressing need world-wide to find a solution – this is **NOT THE RIGHT SITE**. The applicant refused an offer from Mrs Wendy Tuckerman MP to find a more suitable site comparable to Brightmark, 7km out of Parkes. This is a company with proven experience in plastic recycling which has managed to find a suitable site. **Plasrefine has not.**

2. **SOCIAL IMPACT**

600 objections, 400 people at a public meeting and many wishing to speak here indicate the scale of the Social Impact on our community concerned for their **HEALTH, SAFETY AND THE ENVIRONMENT**. It is incomprehensible that there was no HEALTH STUDY as part of the SIA and that the Health Department did not provide an Agency response.

This proposal holds inherent danger due to the acknowledged risks the leakage of **forever chemicals, microplastics and Chemicals of Concern** pose.

How can this be approved when in Appendix 2 of the Department's Assessment Report there are 27 ***"revised environmental mitigation measures to be incorporated into management plans where relevant".*** Who decides the relevance? These are all **after the fact** and indicate unacceptable risks to the community. 27 promises which, and I quote *"will be developed prior to commencement of construction ...during the detailed design phase... plan developed after construction contractor is engaged,* and most concerning of all ***"Fire risks : plans to be developed prior to commencement of operations!!!*** Fire is a real and present danger to nearby residences and Garvan and the lack of resources available to local services to manage such a catastrophic event should be enough to shut this project down now! And to say the smoke will rise vertically is just an insult to anyone's intelligence!

3. THE PROCESS

When responding to two EIS's a non-negotiable period of just four weeks to digest and respond to literally thousands of pages of technical information was imposed. Requests for an extension of time fell on deaf ears. Yet, when the proponent failed to meet a stated response date we were told by planning that this date was not a ***"statutory deadline as such."*** One rule for them and one for us?

There is a solution : **FIND THE RIGHT SITE for a development of this scale and intensity.**

There is nothing intrinsic about the site which says **"place a plastic factory here!"** The proponent does not have to be denied permission to recycle plastic in Australia – just not on this site. **The proponent has no social licence to do so and approval of the DA would be contrary to the public interest.**

Thank you for time.