



**JOHN MACONACHIE**

**OBJECT**

Submission ID: 217142

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

Submission date: 11/22/2024 4:34:42 PM

*Please see my attached submission - Moss Vale Recycling Plant - Maconachie*

## OBJECTION – PROPOSED PLASREFINE RECYCLING FACILITY

J E Maconachie KC - Burradoo

20 November 2024

- The Departmental Assessment (*DPHI*) is **not a sound basis**, or **starting point**, for consideration of approval of the Applicant's proposal.
- A **high level of generality**, and **absence of reference to, let alone consideration of**, obvious, critically relevant and arguably determinative considerations characterise the assessment.
- No, or no adequate, consideration is given to impacts upon existing agricultural, viticultural, tourism and other vital commercial interests established in the Southern Highlands over the last **180 years**.
- Those agricultural, et cetera, industries and interests generate hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars for the NSW economy every year, so are **critically relevant**: they are **ignored**. see *DPHI* para 123; 129; 131; 137;
- In particular the conclusion at *DPHI* para 139 refers to "significant and sufficient detail" **without the slightest consideration** for existing industries and commercial interests.
- the "changing character of the area" in the *DPHI* conclusion is implicitly, if not expressly, restricted to consideration of the SHIP; plainly so from the reference to "residential area and broader SHIP land" at the end of that paragraph – no detail of the "proposed management and mitigation measures" (antepenultimate sentence) is given or considered; an inadequate, narrow focus is employed<sup>1</sup>. Consideration of scientific, or other, expert commentary is **entirely absent**.
- Any fire at the proposed facility would be **calamitous**. Deer Park, Vic, 19 July 2024<sup>2</sup> – plastic shipping pallets warehouse – 100×50 m in size – huge fire – **80 firefighters and an unspecified number of appliances** – the proposed facility is many times bigger and reasonably available firefighting resources are **minimal**; fire would produce dioxins and other toxins.<sup>3</sup> Appliances from Campbelltown and Wollongong<sup>4</sup> are impracticable, and therefore an irrelevant consideration; the considerations identified in para 163 are **risible**, and characterises the *DPHI* assessment as **superficial, and outcome directed**.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also para 143, last sentence

<sup>2</sup> [www.abc.net.au/news/2024-07-20/vic-chemical-fire-deer-park-melbourne-west/104121174](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-07-20/vic-chemical-fire-deer-park-melbourne-west/104121174)

<sup>3</sup> World Health Organisation, <https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/dioxins>

<sup>4</sup> I page 42, dot point 2



- Extended verbiage is committed to supporting the conclusion at *DPHI* para 159, limited to visual and similar impacts, but no, or no adequate, consideration is given to impacts on **extant industries and commercial interests**.
- The considerations supporting the conclusion at *DPHI* 6.3.3 avoid consideration of the impact on existing interests; the absence of any such consideration renders the conclusion of **no, or little, weight**.
- *DPHI* assessment gives no consideration to the probability of a B-double carrying degraded plastics colliding at the proposed level crossing; such an event will cause significant pollution by microplastics; environmental damage and cleanup considerations are not addressed.
- *DPHI* p. 42. dot point 4 acknowledges increased risk, but avoids assessing proportionate damage from realisation of risk – it is not addressed because it could be **catastrophic**, and antithetical to *DPHI* **outcome directed** assessment. The conclusion at the foot of that page is **flawed** and should be disregarded.
- *DPHI* p. 42, penultimate dot point, “**ensure** there would be no impacts on the... Water Catchment” is an illegitimate and illogical conclusion – it is premised on no fire, no B-double accident, no accidental discharge of solvents toxins or microplastics – it is cast in **absolute** terms; it is superficial and outcome directed.
- Flood considerations, *DPHI* p. 44, 45 rely on “increased development pad height” to protect the Water Catchment – no detail is given; no expert is relied on; any conclusion based thereon would be **flawed**, and dangerously so.
- Microplastics considerations, *DPHI*, p. 46, 47 pay no attention to pollution caused by B-double movements over long distances, and degraded plastics necessarily mechanically interacting, a principal cause of microplastic pollution<sup>5</sup> - everywhere!
- Research into microplastics is not yet determinative of risk factors<sup>6</sup>; *DPHI* notes that, but dismisses it by reference to “no legislative requirement....**complete removal**...” – unsatisfactory, **outcome directed**, commentary.
- Asbestos, silica, coal dust and similar pollutants wrought havoc in our community – hundreds of thousands have died – **extreme caution** is required in the necessary management of this pernicious substance; research facilities like Garvan Institute should be considered for SHIP, otherwise not – the Plasrefine facility will deny future

---

<sup>5</sup> Qin, Asst Prof of Civil and Environmental Engineering, U of Wisconsin – Madison, the Conversation, May 6, 2024)

<sup>6</sup> Qin, *supra*; *DPHI* para 106



opportunities for preferred high level, non-toxic research facilities, which are likely prospects given reasonable proximity to the impending Aerotropolis.

- ***SHIP is a patently inappropriate site.***



20 Nov 2024