



NAME REDACTED	OBJECT	Submission ID: 206784
Organisation: N/A	Key issues: Social impacts, Visual impacts, design and landscaping, Land use compatibility (surrounding land uses), Traffic, Other issues	
Location: New South Wales 2577		
Attachment: N/A		

Submission date: 10/22/2024 10:58:21 AM

Dear IPC,

Thanks for letting me have my say. I live on Beaconsfield Road. I don't see the site from my home but it's less than a five minute walk away. I'm horrified to learn approval may be imminent. You've been to the site. You've seen the skinny, almost single lane that Beaconsfield Road becomes, and the steepness of the hill. Please do not consent to this hideous proposal. The Department of Planning are wrong to recommend it for approval.

The Moss Vale site is NOT SUITABLE for this development:

1. There is NO BUFFER ZONE between this monstrous development and residents. As I said, I am horrified that the Department of Planning has got this so wrong. No matter how much freedom the Department has given GHD/Plasrefine to address and minimise all the problems found by residents over the last four years, the fact remains there is NO BUFFER ZONE to protect the community from any fallout, be it physical (personal safety, noise, vibrations, light pollution, contamination of water, ground and air), mental (stress, anxiety, fear and unease) or social (damage to tourism, amenity, beauty of place).

For example, 2 other regions have built plastics recycling factories with buffer zones well away from residents:

In Albury NSW, the Circular Plastics Australia's PET recycling plant is located at the Nexus Precinct, TEN KILOMETRES 10km north of Albury-Wodonga's central business district. Whereas Plasrefine will be LOCATED WITHIN Moss Vale TOWN LIMITS and mere metres from residents!

In Parkes NSW an advanced recycling plastics renewal facility in the Special Activation Precinct is supported by council, is well outside Parkes CBD limits and uses technology with zero incineration. Plasrefine is NOT supported by council and will spew who knows what kinds of toxic chemicals into the air, ground and water.

2. I don't trust the people in charge of this proposal. I don't believe they will be good neighbours. They purchased the land because it was cheap. I don't know what their business model is except to get funds from the taxpayer to build this thing and disrupt the community for years to come.

Moreover, the conditions of consent imposed are not water tight. There are far too many unknowns and promises of fixing problems as they come up. And they can change the conditions any time after consent just by asking the Planning Secretary.

For example:

I thought they would NOT BE PERMITTED to use residential roads at all during construction and operation! But now, to my shock, I find that the Department's Assessment recommends the use of Braddon Road. (Point 138.) This supposedly removes the use Beaconsfield Road, the formerly proposed 'east-west' access road, and avoids schools and residential areas to the south.

BUT how does allowing the use of Braddon remove the use of Beaconsfield Road when Braddon Road, itself a RESIDENTIAL ROAD newly built to service a small lot rural development, comes off Beaconsfield? What is to stop the proponent from going up Beaconsfield Road past all the roads and residents lower down the hill during operation as well as construction? The conditions of consent? Give me a break. The Department has permitted them to carry out earthworks before the proposed north south road is constructed. (Conditions B18/19.) Well,



the only available access is via Beaconsfield / Braddon Road and lower residential roads. We won't be able to leave our driveways safely with semi-trailer loads of construction material and equipment crawling up the hill. The conditions give them three 3 days to undertake earthworks. Give me a another break! They can ask the Planning Secretary for as many extensions as they want.

If this gets the go ahead, there will be no end to the traffic and disruptions on Beaconsfield and adjoining residential roads. Plasrefine do not even have approval yet they have already started earthworks on the rural portion of their land. They placed a couple of stripped out buses there in the last month. What is the intention?

I believe they will use their rural land as site office, car park and stabling yard for material and equipment during construction and as storage for overflow plastic waste during operation. Who is going to stop them?

3. Where are the emissions stacks on the latest architectural analysis / drawings? Is this deliberate misrepresentation? How can they be trusted when they omit such a key component of the proposal? No amount of landscaping mounds and mature trees as per conditions will hide 25 to 28 metres emissions stacks. This is a monster and there is NO BUFFER ZONE in place.

4. What are the ill health effects of this proposal? No one can say. I am fearful of the fine, powdery, sticky plastic dust that will be produced, will swirl around and out of the west facing roller doors in the high westerly winds, permeating the ground, waterways and water table. And more than likely, when it's operational, semi trailers full of plastic waste, spilling onto the country side as the travel along RESIDENTIAL ROADS.

In conclusion, the hundreds of written objections over the last four 4 years should have been enough to stop this. Council objections alone should have been enough to stop this. Yet the Department has recommended this proposal for approval. They are wrong and I strenuously object! No matter what the conditions of consent, no matter what the expert advice there is NO BUFFER ZONE to protect the town and its residents from this harmful, hazardous, heavy industry. It has no place within town limits so close to residents of Moss Vale.

You, the IPC, can stop this before it's too late. Please.
