

From: [Darrell Cooney](#)
To: [DPE PS Industry Assessments Mailbox](#)
Subject: Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278 OBJECTION
Date: Wednesday, 7 December 2022 9:36:15 PM

Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278

OBJECTION

Darrell Cooney
58 Carneys Road
Currawang NSW 2580

I Darrell Cooney of 58 Carneys Road Currawang NSW, wish to object to the Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278.

I wish to object to Veolia's Waste incinerator proposal, I have read through their Noise and Vibration reports, their Traffic Impact Reports along with several other EIS reports on the resources supplied to support their State Significant development.

Veolia have done nothing to engage with me or my family at any point we live within a 10km radius of the proposed development. Not once have we received any mail or information relating to or informing us of the proposal which is absolutely disgraceful. This will impact our future greatly; our property will be near on worthless as nobody ever wants to live near an incinerator. We don't live in a residential zone, and we don't live off reticulated water all of our water comes from the rainwater we harvest. From my knowledge and understanding of International safe standards, this Incinerator proposal is not good enough. I will be seeking compensation for any damages if this disgusting proposal goes ahead relating to water quality, air quality and safety. And if an incinerator is not ok for Sydney or Canberra then it's not OK for our region. The current Woodlawn site has sufficient room for the next 20 years of waste storage requirements so burning waste seems an exorbitant and redundant waste of time and money.

From my review of the Traffic Impact report I was angered to read that in Paragraph ES2.3, stating there were no reported crashes on Collector road and no reported crashes on Bungendore Road between Crisps creek and the ECO precinct between 2016 and 2020. I have personally witnessed a garbage truck roll over at the intersection to the ECO precinct on Bungendore Road, around 2016-2017. I know it happened because I was driving back from Canberra and I saw the truck laying on its side blocking most of the road with rubbish everywhere. It would have to be reported somewhere as they needed to bring in a crane or heavy tow-truck to put it back on its wheels. Did they hide this information somewhere?

There are items within their report that raised questions for me and did very little to support their proposal.

Within ES3.2 they state they did not model the intersection to the site as the construction will be using a new intersection.

They did not model the impact of the new intersection, which they could easily do, as they could model other roads and intersections they have already got data on and based predicted vehicles used for construction, why did they not bother to generate a model for this one?

They got basic information wrong, Table 3.3 they state speed limit through Tarago is 60 km/h it is actually 50 km/h, this is incorrect information. Table 3.4 they say the approach to the intersection to the site is 100km/h but it has been 80 km/h for a long time.

In 3.4 they also state there is a full lane and a deceleration lane on approach to the intersection, in the photo on page 23 there isn't and the one on the same page backs this up. They also say it is a give way intersection, this needs to be changed so the trucks stop as it is dangerous. I personally have had to slow down for trucks coming out, that did not give way and I am sure I am not the only individual who has encountered this.

Paragraph 3.4.1 again they have not surveyed traffic volumes because the site access is not built yet, it can be surveyed based on the current site access as it is in close proximity to the current one. Are they just being lazy?

Figures 3.3 and 3.4 show vehicle movements at the intersections during the AM peak time indicates half the heavy vehicles leave the site compared to the number going in. Exactly half in both surveyed and predicted, this information seems a bit set up where is the evidence supporting this?

From reading Appendix BB Landscape and visual impact assessment, I struggled with applying the amount of imagination these architects have, they have applied a great deal of poetic licence to the region's landscape and the impact of the structures they are referring to.

The encapsulation cell is basically a landfill site and by the map it will right up near the road near the dam and 30 metres high as stated in paragraph 4.4 page 19, which means it will be clearly visible from the road for quite a distance and an eyesore being as it is a landfill site.

In 8.7 Summary of visual impact, page 54 they say that driving along Collector road you will only see the sites for less than 10 seconds and it will be indirect, I find that hard to believe as we currently see the existing sites for a longer period and they are not always indirect they are sometimes right in front and they are not as high as the new building and stack and they are further from the road. Also, on page 54 they say that the stack seen from Collector road will not be significantly visible and indirect, again I say bullshit, something 3metres wide towering 50 metres above the native tree line only a couple of hundred metres from the road pumping out steam and who know what nanoparticles will draw your sight to it so it is not indirect. They just need to look at any of the wind turbines which stand out, at 80m they are not insignificant land features.

On page 55 the architects say that the encapsulation cell will be largely indistinct from Weereewa lookout when established with grass cover, which will not be until they have finished with the incinerator which they say is 25 years if it doesn't get extended. So, a minimum of 25 years looking at a landfill site from the lookout, so yes still visible. They also say the stack would be visible but smaller than the wind turbines. Well yes compared to the closer ones but similar in size to the ones a similar distance away but it will also have a big building under it and it will be pumping out a plume which will make it highly visible. We are in a cool climate any amount of heat that goes up quickly comes down in the form of fog or low-level cloud. They also try to justify the plume by saying dwellings with wood burning stoves will be pumping out a plume at certain times of the year. The difference is the dwelling do not pump out as much and it is generally almost invisible and dissipates quickly unlike an industrial incinerator and no one is running a wood burner 24 hours a day, seven days a week for 25 years.

To surmise from what I have read in these very weighted Veolia centric reports, they are not getting the basic facts straight, they haven't engaged with locals nor will this be any good for our future or the climate. This has to stop and should not even remotely be considered anywhere within Australia. We have to get smarter at this and not let multinational companies that don't pay Australian Tax, poison our heritage, Country, waterways and future.

I declare that I have not made any reportable political donations in the last two years. I acknowledge and accept the Department of Planning and Environment for New South Wales' disclaimer and declaration.

Regards

Darrell Cooney

6.12.22