



MELISSA MOSS

OBJECT

Submission ID: 217242

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Organisation: N/A | Key issues: <i>Social impacts, Visual impacts, design and landscaping, Land use compatibility (surrounding land uses), Traffic, Other issues</i> |
| Location: New South Wales 2577 | |
| Attachment: Attached overleaf | |

Submission date: 11/22/2024 9:48:41 PM

Please refer to letter attached.

Thank you for your consideration.

22 November, 2024

NSW Government
Independent Planning Commission
Attn: Commissioners Andrew Mills, Clare Sykes & Janett Milligan

Dear Commissioners,

Re: Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility SSD-9409987 – we strongly object!

We are a family household living within walking distance (1,200m by road, less than 1,000m as the crow flies). We choose to live in Moss Vale for its quiet, semi-rural existence, down-to-earth people, calming natural surrounds and for health reasons. With a congenital lung defect in our family we strive for clean living with an active outdoor lifestyle importantly away from air pollution. We remain deeply alarmed, angered and stunned by the advancement of this SSD proposal to the position our community finds itself in today.

Apologies in advance for the length of this submission, our list of concerns is obscenely long. The closer we look at this proposal the more we find ourselves in disbelief that the DPHI could possibly recommend this development for approval in its current location. The ramifications of this development are immense, assessing it deserves thorough consideration.

We are not lawyers or experts in applicable planning fields, so this is a very personal *human* account on behalf of my family. I hope in openly sharing our outstanding questions, frustration and concerns you might better understand why we are all in dismay at the advancement of this illogical proposal.

Reading back through our past objections (21 March 2022 and 29 October 2023) little to nothing has changed other than our sense of alarm and dread that this oversized experimental operation might actually proceed on the Beaconsfield Road site. If anything, new details have instead increased our level of concern.

With a 98.7% community objection rate (and growing), local council (when we've had one) rejection and opposition at every stage, our 2 elected state MPs oppose the location, 1 has offered to find a new location (offer ignored) and our elected federal member also opposed to site location we're baffled as to why we are here. Categorically ignored.

We are grateful to have the time and attention of the IPC Commissioners at this critical juncture. We appreciate your consideration of our concerns in your review of DPHI recommendations.

Through our long list of questions and concerns, a notable common thread appears:

- Proximity inappropriate, inadequate infrastructure - Why is such a high-risk hazardous industrial scale development positioned SO CLOSE to residents, businesses, families and towns and SO FAR from transport links and plastic waste sources? Surely this defeats its clean environmental purpose. Why position in a region which hasn't the bare necessity infrastructure nor emergency resource to accommodate such a transport heavy, water thirsty, high-fire risk hazardous industry? Why does the DPHI continue to ignore OUR elected officials (at every level of govt) and these very basic questions? This proposal defies all logic.

- Inappropriate scale and location, too close to residential community - On what grounds does the DPHI believe a combined 32,375m² (8 acre!) building footprint 14.5-15.5m tall (5 stories by Australian Building Standards, not 3 as documented) with 26,000 annual truck movements delivering 120,000 tonnes of hazardous plastic waste for 24/7 processing & reproduction is appropriately positioned SO CLOSE to residents (200m), medical research (50m), childcare (700m), multiple schools (1,800-2,500m), town centre (2,000m), multiple parks, playgrounds and sporting fields (within 2,500m)? What are the DPHI thinking? Evidently NOT about community health or safety. GHD's offer to hedge in residential blocks is merely an admission their proposed landscape measures provide insufficient screening for a such a sizable industrial build. This heavy industrial scale building is far too big for its inappropriately located site.
- Haulage trucks DO pass through a residential area, New Berrima exists! - Why does GHD & DPHI continue to insist trucks won't pass residential area's when 100 daily heavy vehicle movements (26,000 per year) ARE routed along New Berrima residents one and ONLY CONNECTING ROAD, Taylor Ave? A quiet tight-knit community where kids currently freely roam without cause for safety concern. How can this high frequency heavy vehicle haulage route be deemed safe and acceptable for New Berrima residents who MUST pull out onto or across, and/or await public transport on, Taylor Ave to leave & return home each day? The Plasrefine haulage plan is unsafe, unacceptable.
- Fully enclosed operation, disingenuous – DPHI claim “most risks are managed” by Plasrefine being a fully enclosed operation. GHD have this week scrambled to back pedal from their initial “6m roller doors open 5hrs per day” estimate to a revised 42mins per day, 21mins IF they process lesser volumes (av. 25 sec per heavy vehicle movement). Quite the discrepancy at such a late stage in the proposal. Doesn't lend confidence to their modelling abilities, nor care for an honest assessment (old or new). GHD are pedalling hard to steer the IPC away from the fact the 3 x 6m tall x (unspecified) m wide roller doors expose 3 rather large gaps in the Plasrefine “fully enclosed” operation claim. And yet simpler facts remain; production lines are NOT fully enclosed (*according to GHD vague description on Day 3*) and this hazardous waste facility will see 100 truck movements pass through its processing building each business day. 26,000 open roller doors per year! Irrespective of *actual* door opening durations, movement inside and out will create some kind of airflow, the voids are sizable and Plasrefine operations WILL BE OPEN TO ALL weather conditions (*not just westerly winds*), on 26,000 occasions annually. Plasrefine is NOT a fully enclosed operation.
- Nil microplastic emissions, disingenuous - GHD rely on a westerly wind (*no other weather conditions?*) and negative air pressure claims to mitigate concerns around escaping microplastics through multiple semi-trailer sized factory roller doors. In their Roller Door Redaction dated 18.11.24, GHD touch on noise impact yet negate to review the air turbulence created by such rapid high-speed 6m high doors (*width undisclosed*). Surely there will be airflow (& therefore microplastic) implications at suggested speeds. To ignore this detail is to deliberately mislead. In the same response. GHD claim dropped plastic fragments (from *crushed* plastic bales) would be vacuumed and floors washed before a truck is able to leave again. If plastic fragments aren't microplastic (*and therefore not hazardous as is being suggested*) then why the added procedure and delay? GHD are being selective in the detail they provide. The production processes are NOT fully enclosed in this facility. Haulage heavy vehicles WILL sit for a period inside an assumably operational production facility (*since doors will be closed*) until production *can* pause and each truck *can* leave again. Whether it's 2 mins or 20 secs, time is irrelevant. Microplastics are highly mobile and electrostatic. If the air flows inside the processing building, then surely microplastics can escape the building on one (if not all) of the 12 tyres and/or brake pads of a 6 axle 19m heavy vehicle. How many forever chemicals could be

emitted via 156,000 truck tyres (13,000 exits x 12 tyres) each year? GHD insist “nil microplastic emissions”, without evidential data. Their selective modelling is disingenuous. Our community health is at stake, we deserve an honest assessment of the science.

- GHD & DPHI hedging bets with our health – GHD have stipulated measures in Appendix J Air quality and odour to “avoid air pollution” emitted from neighbouring 8 acre *nil emissions* hazardous waste processing facility (50m from nearest business, 200m from residential homes, 700m from childcare, less than 1,000m from my own home as the wind blows). Is this building nil-emissions or not? GHD are hedging bets with our health, and the DPHI are complicit. Neither stakeholder has shown proper regard for community health & safety.
- GHD selective data modelling, disingenuous - GHD Appendix J Air Quality and Odour 2023 cumulative impact assessment modelling is based on a model period 2017-2018 (from Goulburn station, not the site in question). This data selection is presented as one of the only recently available where “normal background levels” could be measured without external influences such as 2019-2020 “bush fires” or in cases of additional “infrequent” “controlled burns or dust storms”. If such influences are so infrequent, why is GHD reliant on data (from another region) that is 5 years old at time of assessment? Why did the DPHI not insist on cumulative impacts during post bush fire periods 2021-2023 from the site in question? GHD can redact and manipulate their meaning (*post submission*) all they like, the reality is their modelling data is not a true or accurate representation of existing air quality at the proposed site.
- Inadequate air quality protections – Based on the previous we don’t accept GHD Air Quality Impact redaction [dated 18.11.24]. Without an honest view of true emissions impacts we continue to question how DPHI can accept the notion that local receptors (*neighbouring humans*) have adequate protection by checking a web page (*of our own accord*) for a degraded air quality notice so we can “minimise exposure to air pollution” or “minimise time outdoors” should we wish to preserve our health on a windy day. With DPHI compliance monitoring taking place only at 6 months and then 2 years post operation commencement and with high winds a frequent fixture on Beaconsfield hill, we’d rather not wait to see if hazardous forever chemicals are in fact escaping. As a resident with compromised lung capacity only a breeze away from Plasrefine, having to stay indoors because Plasrefine operations *aren’t up to scratch today* is unacceptable any day of the week. To deny Australian residents access to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment is a breach of our human rights as per the [Human Rights \(Healthy Environment\) Amendment Bill 2023 | Bills](#).
- Serious health risks ignored - Where IS the health impact study or scientific evidence demonstrating Plasrefine operations incl transport and operational waste, WON’T negatively impact the health of neighbouring residents, childcare and schools? DPHI have been negligent in ticking their good-to-go box without one. If we’ve nothing to worry about where is our Plasrefine health guarantee?
- No evidence of NO health risk - Where is GHD evidence that the increasing trend of research surrounding negative health implications of microplastics worldwide (*a key community concern, if they would listen*) is unfounded? Are Plasrefine factory workers along with residents of Moss Vale, Berrima, Bowral & Burradoo (*all within a direct breeze from this site*), to be the future Asbestos or Thalidomide class action participants? Where is our Plasrefine health guarantee?
- No safe drinking water guarantee? - Where is the guarantee our (Goulburn & Sydney) drinking water fed from Plasrefines 2 (!) onsite riparian water courses WON’T be polluted? This is not a risk worth waiting for a compliance contingency post discovery of problem. Safe drinking water MUST be guaranteed!

- Traffic WILL impact neighbouring residents, contrary to DPHI claims - Residents along Beaconsfield and Bulwer Road ridgelines WILL be impacted by haulage traffic with 26,000 annual truck movements *downshifting* up and down hill, reversing (*sensors*) in and out of building every 6 mins, 11hrs per day, 5 days per week 52 weeks per year. And what of stacking procedures when trucks inevitably move through out of sync? With inadequate buffer zone, Plasrefines front line residential “receptors” will have little fresh air and NO noise relief. A stark contrast to their existence today.
- Inadequate & unsafe buffer zones – Buffer zones aren’t only required for light, noise and traffic as the dismissive DPHI suggests. More alarming aspects also require a reasonable safety buffer. Where is DPHI evidence a mere 200m residential buffer zone, only 700m for childcare is adequate in protecting neighbouring receptors (*humans*) from noxious odours, harmful pollutants, electrostatic microplastics or worse, hazardous factory fire? Australian’s soon to be largest (anticipated 200,000 tonnes annually) Plastics Recycling Plant (managed by experienced professionals) will be appropriately located in purposed built Parkes Special Activation Precinct with adequate emergency and logistics resource minutes away, with appropriate transport links (built ON inland rail and National Logistics Hub) and with buffer zones (1km buffer from its industrial neighbours, 3km from Parkes town centre). Even the 30,000 tonne Cleanaway plastic recycling plant in Albury resides 10km north of its much bigger and appropriately resourced town centre, in an isolated industrial zone. To position a hazardous operation of Plasrefine scale on its proposed site without adequate residential (safety) buffers is outrageous and reckless. DPHI have shown no community regard.
- Light vehicle traffic dangerous – Where is the plan / proposed routes for the additional 280 daily (102,000 annual) light vehicle movements? What are the pedestrian safety measures being implemented when these unmarked vehicles inevitably cut through Moss Vale town centre, Beaconsfield, Lytton and Parkes Rd backstreets to enter the site via otherwise quiet, more convenient and ill-equipped Beaconsfield Road entrance? With few to no footpaths, schools, parks, childcare, narrowing roads and disappearing verges, student and train pedestrian foot traffic, morning exercise and dog walking regulars on this thoroughfare daily. Our quiet residential streets will be no more, pedestrian safety is at very real risk. DPHI know this, we’ve argued it before. They’ve shown no care.
- Transport emissions, omitted / ignored - What are the environmental implications of emissions generated by 26,000 annual heavy vehicle haulage movements travelling 150-200km distances, into and then out of this not so accessible regional site? The 10km route between Medway highway entrance/exit (*via New Berrima residents*) to Moss Vale site alone will add 260,000km to annual haulage journey (*10km x 100 movements x 5 days x 52 wks per year*). And what of the 120,000 tonnes of crushed (*micro*)plastic bales, how is it contained and not spread along the way? Another questionable environmental choice. Again no consideration or care.
- Site IS zoned bushfire prone – Why does GHD refuse to acknowledge this site IS bushfire prone? In accordance with <https://www.rfs.nsw.gov.au/plan-and-prepare/building-in-a-bush-fire-area/planning-for-bush-fire-protection/bush-fire-prone-land/check-bfpl> as at today. Why has DPHI skipped necessary bush fire assessment process entirely?
- High-risk fire hazard, catastrophic for residents - A simple google search will show a growing global trend of plastics recycling plants catching alight with catastrophic outcomes ([Resource Recycling article – study finds rising links to lithium-ion fires](#) a good example). 19+ plastics recycling plants caught fire in Australia between 2019-2023, some multiple times. All required a significant emergency resource and still plants were lost. Toxic smoke and fumes forced evacuation and lock downs for communities kilometres away, not meters. How does the DPHI

believe waiting an hour or more (pending nearest availability) for emergency backup incl. Hazmat resource is safe and acceptable when an 8acre forever chemical laden building is alight so close to neighbouring workers (50m), residents (200m) and childcare (700m). And what of the volumes of hazardous material filled building alight in a bushfire zone leading directly to residential houses? Where is their safety guarantee? What goes up, must come down (*contrary to DPHI smoke assessment*). How will the toxic fire related mess NOT enter the 2 onsite riparian water courses that feed drinking water for millions? Where is Moss Vale town emergency evacuation plan? The hazardous fire risk in this location is inordinately high, to proceed in the proposed location would undoubtedly put lives at risk. DPHI choosing to ignore such catastrophic risk in their buffer zone assessment is reckless and irresponsible.

- What of water usage during drought? - Where will Plasrefine operational water come from during times of drought? Wingecarribee reserves were dangerously low during 2019 drought & fire, restrictions were tight and difficult to manage for a then much smaller community. Where are our guarantees residential reserves won't be drawn on for Plasrefine operations?
- Building plans either incomplete or disingenuous - GHD claims (Day 3 Q&A) stacks "would" be "2m above roof height" before a quick adjustment "could well be more" "could be higher than 2m". How far above roof line will stacks actually reach? And where on the building will they sit? Since submission drawings have omitted them entirely. This should be a simple calculation by this late stage in the process. What is GHD trying to hide?
- Lame and unrealistic safety measures – DPHI conditions to stop operation when roller doors are open is unrealistic. How will Plasrefine meet operational demand if all processing stops when roller doors open. Can operations stop / start mid process? Will this really happen? How will we know? How productive CAN Plasrefine be with 26,000 haulage interruptions each year? Will this force increased production during evenings? When neighbouring residents are *trying* to sleep in their newly illuminated sky. Simpler question, why stop production at all? if particulate *can't* escape from open doors as GHD claim.
- What "community engagement"? - Where is GHD evidence of "community engagement"? We live 1,700 steps from site and not once have we received communication (of any kind); not a notice, letter, flyer, newsletter, email, phone call, message, invite or door knock from GHD. I walk our dog to the site most days, hubby works from home full time, at least one of us is here every day. We live in close proximity, GHD have no excuse to not reach us. If concerted "community engagement" effort was made by GHD then why are an alarming number of residents spanning Moss Vale, Berrima, Burradoo, Bowral, Mittagong & beyond still today (!) unaware of the Plasrefine project! Our media sits behind paywalls, our community left to their own devices. As a result WE are the ones pointing local residents to this SSD submission because GHD have not engaged with the community.
- GHD NOT collaborative - If GHD (on behalf of Plasrefine) are so willing to collaborate with community then why were residents, *who knew of and attended the one-off in-person consultation*, so angered and offended by GHDs treatment of them? The GHD "we don't move, we don't lose" response to a reasonable "would Plasrefine consider an alternative site?" question is offensive and about as far from collaborative as can be. They have labelled our community "divisive" "spiteful" "fearmongering" and "spreading misinformation" because we "don't want change" according to Applicant meeting transcript 22 Oct 24. These accusations only further prove GHD are NOT LISTENING, a by-product of lack of community engagement. They are hiding behind compliance tick boxes rather than addressing our fears and concerns. We have been left to refer to their full suite of submission documentation as our main source of information (not helpful). The community is fearful and angry because GHD (& the DPHI) have

consistently demonstrated no serious regard for the wellbeing of those living on Plasrefines literal doorstep. Our community has been treated with contempt.

- Plasrefine owners NOT collaborative – To add further to the above offensive, Plasrefine owners have dumped 2 abandoned eye sore buses directly next door to immediate neighbours. This is a clear attempt to flex, intimidate and remind stressed, fearful, punch-drunk residents that Plasrefine holds the power. It's disgusting. Plasrefine are not collaborating, they are bullying. We have no trust in the Proponent/s, they collectively have not earned it.
- Our community has been left vulnerable and exposed – Wingecarribee Shire Council was placed into administration in March 2021, early on in this SSD process. Our community has been left vulnerable and exposed without active representation for the entire duration of this SSD process. Convenient for some, though not for Plasrefine neighbours. DPHI have taken full advantage and rushed this proposal through, with their final tick-to-approve recommendation submitted within 1 day of our newly elected *for the people's choice* Mayor being signed into office. Curious timing. This proposal and its *mismanagement* warrant's a formal inquiry.

We've lost faith in the process, our trust is broken

That such consequential questions as these should have to be asked at this late stage demonstrates why we do NOT trust the process NOR the stakeholders involved in decisions already made. That we the community and not so called "responsible" governing agencies are the ones raising such serious questions proves decision makers to date have been negligent in their duty. The "process" is broken.

The proponent's submission is STILL, at this late stage, riddled with assumptions and lacks evidential data surrounding environmental and health impact/s of the proposed operation in this unsafe location. Today, the IPC's involvement has bought about rapid redactions and rushed new improved detail. This submission has become quite the moving feast, we wonder what will be left of the original proposal deemed worthy of approval by the DPHI by the end of this stage. GHD and the DPHI appear to be scrambling to tell the IPC what they think it wants to hear. *Tick.*

Meanwhile receiving community members are required to find avenues to prove technical flaws, prove our concerns and argue with evidence. That very relevant details surrounding owner inexperience, questionable business practices (shelf company) and multiple environmental censures in motherland Beijing are impermissible further erodes our trust in a fair process. It would appear we are victim to a two-tier process with different rules for certain powers and financial interests to those of mere taxpayers who will inevitably pay for this experimental SSD (*one way or another*).

Key stakeholders to date have shown inadequate regard for community concerns

GHD has proven single-minded and disingenuous through-out this process.

- GHD have formed habit of saying whatever they *think* will get the job done. Evident in their backflipping on advice to the IPC and *tick-standards-box-now redact and submit different plans later if questioned* approach we're seeing today.
- Mr Gambles vague responses during Day 3 public meeting did not inspire confidence with too many "most likely" "probably" "pretty much" "could" and "stuff" responses to important questions. Given the serious nature of this proposal, GHD should be delivering certainty, evidence and facts to support their claims.
- Avoiding commissioner questions regarding haulage microplastics, ignoring New Berrima residential existence ON main haulage route (into and out of the region), refuting bushfire zoning, insisting nil-emission operations (even with open doors to accommodate 26,000 heavy vehicle movements into and out of a sizable microplastic particulate zone) and insisting air CAN

blow in but CAN'T flow out EVER, leaves us with no confidence in GHD honesty, management or care for community needs.

- To use examples of other approved businesses already “doing it” nearby (*a co-ordinated argument shared by the DPHI*) is dismissive and an unacceptable excuse in any scenario. The cumulative impact due to the sizable scale and nature of Plasrefine operations will be significantly adding to existing (& future planned) load on our community and environment. Whether it be traffic, pollution, health or safety demands. We don't want it our daily lives!
- Our elected council and community repeatedly and wholeheartedly reject this proposal. So rather than obfuscate their responsibilities and respond with childlike school-yard antics, how about GHD instead demonstrate to us all that Plasrefine operations WILL be safe and NOT a burden on our infrastructure, environment, community health and wellbeing. They haven't done this, because they can't. Their operation is on the WRONG SITE.

DPHI is too cavalier and treats community with contempt without hope of real protections.

- DPHI stakeholders demonstrate an underwhelming understanding of the operational realities of the proposal they recommend be approved. ██████████ is an excellent public speaker but appears to have neglected due diligence in his operational consideration of this proposal, evident in Day 3 public meeting. “Most risks are managed by being a closed facility” “doors have to remain closed while operating” “acoustic expectation” will be “low at night-time where processing *might* be low”. And yet ██████████ didn't appear to have taken into consideration HOW long the semitrailer sized roller doors might be open each day, 26,000 times per year. Will “doors closed while operating” condition result in increased night-time processing? What then for neighbouring residents, long sleepless nights? ██████████ appears to have taken little care or consideration beyond achieving Plasrefine and Govt needs in a timely manner. *Tick.* We have no confidence in his judgement.
- DPHI stakeholders show contempt for the health and the safety of neighbouring residents (and community at large). ██████████ of the residential buffer zone question during Day 3 IPC Q&A was an insult to intelligence. Her continual sighing (*of impatience? inconvenience? or just a difficult question to skirt around?*) and avoidance of the obvious showed nothing more than contempt for a community that has repeatedly and increasingly voiced one particular concern of the most serious nature...
Ms Laguna: “*So, I suppose, I mean, I don't know if the Commissioner would like to elaborate further on what a buffer zone, what the community considers to be a buffer zone, or what they considered would be necessary there.*”
The Audacity! Sorry, but isn't this the DPHI's responsibility? As a mere community member, *not employed to determine industrial development planning requirements*, I can't say what IS a safe buffer. As a compassionate human with common sense however, I can comfortably say 50m from businesses, 200m from residential homes and 700 m from childcare is NOT SUFFICIENT BUFFER when a HAZARDOUS TOXIC FOREVER CHEMICAL FIRE of Plasrefine operational scale breaks out on bushfire prone land with insufficient emergency infrastructure nearby to manage it. Ms Laguna should perhaps refer to comparable industry best practice if she hasn't the skill required to determine “appropriate” safety buffers zones. The NSW Parkes Activation Precinct might be a good starting place, it can be found on NSW DPHI file.
Excuse my anger, I find this particular matter outrageous.
- DPHI are hiding behind convenient technicalities in their flawed buffer zone argument – The consequence and convenience of no sitting council during the duration of this proposal is becoming more clear. Just because zoning didn't apply buffers 13! years ago, *when no-one saw*

the nature of this development coming, does NOT lend adequate excuse for the DPHI to ignore residents today. How dare the DPHI put lives at risk of hazardous fire on the grounds of an outdated technicality that ONLY suits the proponent. How dare the DPHI turn a blind eye and ignore this VERY REAL (and VERY LOUD) community issue. It is reckless and inexcusable. Their blinkered "buffer assessments" prove the DPHI are either incompetent or captured (or both). The team responsible should be placed under review.

- DPHI have done nothing more than help GHD tick compliance boxes. DPHI have obfuscated their responsibilities at every turn, passing problems down the line with insufficient and inadequate protections in the guise of "supplier contracts" and "conditional consents" for every challenging occasion. To be later applied and managed by a multitude of other bureaucratic agencies no less. By Mr Ritchie's own admission periodic checking mechanisms WILL reveal any shortfalls in their tick-box process (*once operations are underway*) so further contingencies can be applied then... once our drinking water is already polluted? Or once electrostatic microplastics have already filled our lungs (or lung as is my situation)? According to Mr Ritchie contingency requirements (*further conditional add-ons*) are apparently "inevitable" and it's "not unusual, where we do have to look at these quite regularly". This is not good enough. These are not valid protection measures for an operation of this scale and hazardous nature positioned so close to residents and drinking water catchments that feed millions.
- Our health and local environment IS at risk should Plasrefine proceed on this site unless the proponents can categorically prove otherwise (which they haven't). DPHI ignoring community AND elected govt concerns by deferring to conditional consent is both lazy and highly inadequate. It's reckless and unacceptable. A farce.

From the ground, the NSW State Significant Development planning process appears to fail its citizens and communities like ours. In this case a foreign investor has acquired a cheap, inconveniently located, piece of land and with no relevant experience is willing to take on an unsavoury operational risk on behalf of a Govt in need of quick wins before the next election... using a shelf company no less. The people trapped on its literal doorstep are being ignored, sacrificed because it's "state significant" and for the "greater good". This situation reeks of more than just toxic waste management. This proposal and its participating stakeholders be placed under investigation.

Should Plasrefine proceed there WILL be a mass exodus.

Knowing what we now know about health and environmental implications of forever chemicals and hazardous microplastics, and with DPHI and *partner* Proponents contempt for our community, my husband and I cannot in good conscience keep our children here should this SSD proceed in its proposed location. What future will we be giving them? We love living in the Highlands, Moss Vale is our home. We are actively involved in the community, our life is here. Sadly, our Plasrefine experience to date has left us with no faith in the Proponent/s nor the system supposedly designed to protect us. Should these stakeholders take the reigns of this ultra high-risk experiment, we'll be forced to leave the region at significant emotional and financial expense. And where are we to go once we sell at a financial loss? This burden is real and we are not alone, there are many families on this doorstep who are at this moment reconsidering their plans for their children. What then for the future of the Southern Highlands?

The SHIP will sink, REAL economic opportunity will be lost

The SHIP plan was the first real glimmer of hope for our kids (all local youth) to NOT have to leave the region for further education, training and job opportunities. We are excited by its prospect for our own family and the future of the wider community. SHIP is a real economic opportunity which

will enable our kids to stay and build their own careers, business and families here... well beyond the prospects of 140 cleaning, forklift or IT services jobs in an enclosed forever chemical waste facility with an owner who to date has shown little human regard.

Until recently we had plans to diversify my husband's business and were on the brink of investing in a light factory unit on Redfields Road only weeks ago, at the time of DPHI approval recommendation in fact. We immediately took pause. Negotiations have ceased until we have a clear view of what's coming with Plasrefine across the road. \$40M worth of investment in the SHIP have already alarmingly been lost at the mere hint of a Plasrefine approval, money talks. Should Plasrefine proceed we, like many others, will NOT invest here. The ramifications of such a high-risk environmental & health disaster lurking on our doorstep are simply too great. We will remove our family from the region and begrudgingly start life over elsewhere. The SHIP will sink and this region will stagnate... all for the sake of 140 mediocre Plasrefine jobs and political promise forgotten within an election cycle.

No more conditions... NO consent! Please, do not proceed. This is NOT the right site.

The location of such a large scale high-risk hazardous SSD does not belong so close to residents of any town nor region without appropriate infrastructure to safely accommodate it. This is not a NIMBY situation, this is WELL AWAY FROM ANY BACKYARD situation. There aren't enough conditional consents or contingencies in existence to mitigate the potential risks being enforced on literal residential doorsteps.

The proposed Plasrefine plant is clearly NOT in the interest of our community. The implications of this development in its proposed location WILL absolutely diminish our sense of place and change our community character. It carries NO social license. We, along with so many Southern Highlanders, wholeheartedly object to this proposal.

This is NOT the right site. Our future is yours to determine, we only hope you come to agree.

Thank you for taking the time to understand our objection.

Kind regards,

Melissa & Nick Moss

Lytton Road, Moss Vale Residents