



NAME REDACTED

OBJECT

Submission ID: 218452

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 2575	
Attachment: N/A	

Submission date: 11/25/2024 4:23:14 PM

I am opposed to this development, it is not the right site.

One primary issue is the business case, which does not stack up financially or environmentally.

The southern highlands is a low population regional area and most of the plastic recycling waste will need to be brought in from population dense areas, primarily Sydney, Canberra and in the proposal there has been consideration for Melbourne or even QLD based waste.

Based on Sydney distances, this means each load of waste needs to travel an excess 130km to reach the plant, or 260km for a round trip based on the origin of the waste. For Canberra this is 160/320km, Melbourne is 750/1500km and Brisbane is 1000/2000km based on one way/return trip distances.

This equates to an excess financial cost of approx \$13.4m annually if all waste comes from Sydney, based on 50 trucks per day, or ~\$0.5 billion assuming a 40 year plant life and before inflation. This is an extraordinarily poor financial implication for NSW taxpayers. If waste comes from Canberra, this would rise to \$16.5m annually, from Melbourne \$77m annually and worst case, Brisbane, would be \$104m excess travel costs or over \$4 billion over the life of the plant.

In addition, the risk of committing to such a large scale privately owned plant risks reduced competition and higher costs of disposal for NSW taxpayers.

Whilst recycling is important, it is important to do so in an environmentally responsible way. Transporting waste excessive distances does not meet this criteria.

In addition this development risks the basic human rights of the population in relation to safe drinking water, and clean and safe air. The applicant has suggested that local residents will be able to manage risk to poor air quality exposure by limiting time spent outside. Considering within 1km of the proposed site are multiple residents, a childcare centre and water flowing into the drinking water catchment, this is a violation of human rights. In addition, studies completed in China have shown that residents within 1km of these facilities have significantly higher rates of plastic based toxins such as PFAs and PFOAs in their blood, and higher cancer rates. It is not right to expose the local community to these risks.

The financial and health risks of this proposed development are unacceptable. In the event of a fire, which are regular occurrences in these types of sites, there is inadequate distance available from the proposed building to adequately fight the fire and protect surrounding residents, and inadequate local fire facilities to adequately address a fire. In this event, there is a likelihood that there would be irreparable damage to riparian land and drinking water sources, the Garvin institute, and local agricultural interests such as the cattle yard, farms and vineyards. Tourism will be at significant risk, and there is no planned fund or contingency adequate to address this.

Other concerns I have include inadequate sewerage services, risks to future surrounding development, real estate values and the local economy as a whole, psychological and physiological impacts to local residents.