

From: [DPE PS Industry Assessments Mailbox](#)
To: [Sheelagh Laguna](#)
Subject: FW: Eastern Creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719
Date: Thursday, 11 August 2022 8:37:54 AM
Attachments: [REDACTED] [submissthroughputincrease090822.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 11:32 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]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Eastern Creek REP Throughput Increase SSD-11606719

I object to the increased throughput because :

1/ The rotten egg gas smell that plagued many communities surrounding Bingo's Eastern Creek facility in 2020, and in 2021 has not gone away. People have still been complaining about the smell in July of this year on social media. Nothing was said about this in the company's EIS. How can something of this significance not be detailed in the EIS ? Literally hundreds of complaints were registered with Blacktown Council, the NSW EPA, and with Bingo themselves. So much attention was raised by the community's concerns that Ben Fordham spoke about it, and interviewed people live, on Sydney radio station 2GB. It was also reported in newspapers and on television news reports.

2/ In the beginning Bingo continually refused to acceptance responsibility for being the source of the smell. They continued to deny responsibility until Blacktown Council, and the NSW EPA, identified Bingo as the source of the rotten egg gas.

3/ It is irresponsible or negligent for this company not to have had in place a system to mitigate the Hydrogen Sulphide gas from the outset. How can this company, who aren't capable of handling their current waste levels, be permitted to increase their throughput limits ?

4/ Bingo are required to monitor leachate as a condition of their licence. But at <https://www.bingoindustries.com.au/Policies/eastern-creek-policies-and-reporting> ,where Bingo makes its monitoring results public, there are many errors. It appears that the NSW EPA have not been checking Bingo's reported leachate results, despite this being their responsibility.

5/ Given the close proximity of Bingo's Eastern Creek Ecology Park to the pre-existing, and densely populated communities surrounding it, their behaviour thus far seems to indicate their complete disregard for the health and well being of their neighbours, and for the environment. It would appear that this company has been left to regulate themselves and to just go about their business. The end result of which has meant that the community has been traumatised by the rotten egg gas. People have had to change the way they live their daily lives to avoid the distressing health effects caused by Hydrogen Sulphide poisoning.

6/ In the EIS their isn't anything about the proponent being prosecuted for breach of regulation by the NSW EPA for allowing the rotten egg gas to escape into the environment. This deliberate lack of transparency coupled with their refusal to accept responsibility for being the source of the odour means that the community looks upon Bingo and its operations with scepticism and distrust.

7/ This current expansion that Bingo is seeking is a modification of an original SSD from over 10 years ago. How can such a modification be entertained after so much time has elapsed from the original proposal ? This modification should have been rejected by the Department and a whole new proposal should have been submitted, not modification number 8 of a 10 plus year old proposal. A lot has changed in the last 10 years, the community is more populated, business development in the region has increased, this coupled with longer hours of operation has increased road congestion, air and noise pollution levels.

In addition the recent weather changes that have caused significant rain events are being blamed in part by Bingo for the release of the rotten egg gas into the environment. These weather events are forecasted to continue due to global warming but this has not been addressed by Bingo on site to date nor in their EIS.

Bingo acknowledge that if the modification is approved that there will be a slight increase to particulate pollution levels above the already existing levels of pollution. The existing levels of pollution regularly exceed recommended standards as can be seen in the EIS's of other state SSD proposals to build Energy from Waste Incinerators in the same area. How in an area already bearing the brunt of high pollution levels in the form of high hospital admissions for heart/lung conditions can this increase even be considered ?

In light of this I would ask that you look at the evidence and reject Bingo's proposal to increase their throughput limits.