

Objection to Project Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278

I strongly object to the proposed Project, Woodlawn ARC: SSD-21184278. My reasons are as follows.

1. The application to build a waste incinerator in Sydney was declined. It was not safe for Sydney, and for the same reasons, it will not be safe in Tarago either.
2. The incineration of waste is not renewable energy, nor is it environmentally friendly.
3. The incineration of rubbish 24 hours a day, 365 days a year will add unnecessary pollutants into the environment.
4. The cumulative impact of multiple "State significant projects" on the Tarago and surrounding communities.
5. The proposed incinerator is not necessary.

1. Eastern Creeks proposed incinerator was not approved in 2018 due to multiple concerns. These included concerns about the pollution control technologies being able to manage emissions, potential air and water quality impacts and the potential for adverse environmental outcomes, and possible human health concerns to mention a few. As a large part of the area potentially effected by this development is in the Sydney catchment area, all of these concerns apply equally to this proposal.

2. Waste that was ultimately created from natural resources that is subsequently turned into air pollution, and ash, destroying all of its natural components can hardly be deemed "renewable". A large component of this "waste" will be plastic products that we are not currently able to recycle. Burning these will be the same as burning fossil fuels from which they came. This will not reduce our greenhouse gas emissions or our reliance on fossil fuels.

3. The EIS confirms that multiple pollutants, heavy metals and dioxins will be emitted by this incinerator. These toxins will be emitted 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. It then dismisses these emissions as being below the currently allowable standards. How can these standards be used as an excuse to emit these pollutants, when the waste could be buried right next door without these potentially harmful emissions. How often have the "currently allowable standards" been later proven to be above the wrong?

The EIS also makes reference to (NOT) polluting surface water including Lake Bathurst and Lake George, but I could not see any reference to the effects of the emissions on farm dams (which feed stock for food production or water vegetable gardens), or residents swimming pools. Are the cumulative effects on these negligible as well?

4. Tarago is already the location for the Woodlawn bioreactor, multiple wind farms, multiple other state significant projects and a landfill site that is already burying millions of tons of Sydneys rubbish every year. The town is affected by contamination from the former Woodlawn mine and the odour from the bioreactor is also affecting the surrounding community for a significant radius from its source. The incinerator would place an unacceptable cumulative impact on the community.

5. The incinerator is not necessary as the Woodlawn landfill site has a remaining useful life of 25 years. This lifespan will most likely be increased as we move to a circular economy and our waste output is reused rather than destroyed. Surely it is not necessary to divert any of the waste received by Veolia into an incinerator, when it can easily be buried in the existing facility. This facility is already being used to create methane, which in turn is being turned into electricity.