

From: [DPE PS Industry Assessments Mailbox](#)
To: [Sheelagh Laguna](#)
Subject: FW: Eastern Creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719
Date: Thursday, 11 August 2022 8:38:05 AM
Attachments: [REDACTED] [submissthroughputincrease080822.odt](#)

Kind regards,

Patrick Copas

Senior Environmental Assessment Officer
Industry Assessments

Department of Planning and Environment

T (02) 9274 6273 E patrick.copas@planning.nsw.gov.au

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 August 2022 11:53 PM
To: DPE PS Industry Assessments Mailbox <Industry.Assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox <information@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Eastern Creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719

To Whom It May Concern,

I object to the proposed Eastern creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719

I do not want my details to be made public.

[REDACTED]

Eastern Creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719

The proposed throughput increase at the Eastern Creek Recycling Ecology Park should not go ahead because of the following reasons:

For several years my family, and our community, have had to suffer from exposure to Hydrogen Sulfide (H₂S) gas which was proven by Blacktown Council and the NSW EPA to have originated from the Eastern creek Recycling Ecology Park (REP). Exposure to this poisonous gas effected how we went about our daily lives, forcing us to close up our house so the characteristic rotten egg odour couldn't enter. We were unable to hang out our washing because the gas would make our washing smell. We were unable to use our BBQ, and entertaining was just too much of an embarrassment. We had to bring our pets inside because we were concerned about what effects the gas would have on their health. And even hanging our washing in the garage didn't always help because the gas would often find its way into the garage.

My wife and I have lived in Minchinbury since 1989, and while over the years we have occasionally smelled the normal local tip smell, it wasn't until 2020 that we first smelled the H₂S rotten egg gas. How can a company that is obviously reactive, and not proactive, be allowed to expand its throughput when it isn't capable of handling the existing limit ? Particularly when the facility is in such close proximity to a dense community that predates the waste facility. How also can this proposal be considered when the EPA are yet to start legal proceedings against Bingo for releasing offensive gas into the environment.

This whole proposal, and everything that has come before it, brings into question this company's standards and business practises. This proposal must be rejected.