

Form Letter v7

I oppose the proposed Moorebank Waste Processing Project (Project Number 05 0157) at Lot 6 DP 1065574, Newbridge Road, Moorebank.

1. I oppose the building waste processing plant because the proposed development is far too close to existing and proposed residential homes. The proposed development is just 250 metres from the Georges Fair housing estate. Trucks using the proposed facility will travel even closer to residential homes. Trucks will likely short cut through Georges Fair, passing parks and local residents, using roads not designed for massive trucks.
2. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the known risks from inevitable silica dust, asbestos and toxins. At the community consultation meeting held on 31/5/2011 at New Brighton Golf Club, the representatives of the developer refused to comment on whether asbestos would be processed at the facility and whether toxins would be released. It is well known that inhalable silica dust causes lung cancer and silicosis ('Occupational Exposure to Silica and Lung Cancer', Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Prevention Journal, Volume 19, 2010). There is no known cure for silicosis ('A Brief Review of Silicosis in the US', Environ Health Insights, Volume 4, East Carolina University, 2010). The building materials proposed to be crushed at the plant inherently contain very high silica content. The developer plans to install sweepers "where trucks and people will travel" and that there are "unsealed areas" in the development. Their own documentation refers to "likely dust from the recycling facility" (pg 3, developer's information distributed on 31/5/2011 at New Brighton Golf Club). This is an unacceptable health risk for local residents.
3. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the lack of studies in a non-industrial setting of inevitable exposure to respirable silica dust of nearby residents, particularly infants, the elderly and those with pre-existing health conditions. A lot has been said in the literature about exposure limits, necessary safety gear, etc. of the grownup employees working for only around 40 hours a week in such plants but information is lacking about the unprotected residents, especially infants, growing children and elderly, exposed 24/7 to such carcinogenic environments. NSW government's own website (http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/soe/soe2009/chapter4/chp_4.1.htm#fig4.11) has the following to say: "Those particularly susceptible to the health impacts of air pollution are the very young (because they are generally more active outdoors and their lungs are still developing), the elderly and those with pre-existing health conditions." Additionally, since infants breathe by mouth, thus bypassing the natural filtering mechanism of nose, they are at a much higher risk.
4. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the known increased toxicity of freshly fractured silica that will be released from the plant than aged crystalline silica dust found elsewhere.
5. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the potential for flooding. The proposed development is in an area that floods. In the event of a flood, unsafe building materials and material stockpiles may cause an environmental disaster throughout Moorebank and the entire Georges River Basin.
6. I oppose the building waste processing plant because the NSW Government has indicated there will be "a return of local planning powers to local communities" ('NSW govt scraps 3A planning provision', SMH, 4/4/2011). The local community is opposed to this development. Councillors of the Liverpool City Council have voted unanimously against this development (Minutes, Liverpool City Council meeting, 15/6/2011).
7. I oppose the building waste processing plant because the proposed development is incompatible with the current and planned residential and recreational uses of the area. The proposed concrete processing facility is just 250 metres from the Georges Fair housing estate, with a high proportion of residents having young families. The area is zoned E2 Environmental Conservation. It should not be used for a concrete processing plant. In close proximity are schools, parklands, the Georges River itself, cycleways, a proposed waterside marina, a library and a golf club. The land is more suitable for recreational facilities or a reserve. Even the owners of the Benedict Recycling plant at Moorebank (which borders the proposed facility) have accepted that the area is no longer suitable for a building waste processing plant and have started to shut down their operations to create their own housing estate and marina.
8. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of increased traffic. The developer states the proposed facility will result in an extra 324 truck movements a day, which is "very low and will have no impact on the arterial road network" (developer's information distributed on 31/5/2011 at New Brighton Golf Club). Increased traffic will have a significant impact on arterial roads including Nuwarra Road, Newbridge Road and Governor Macquarie Drive. There is already significant traffic in the area which will be made worse by the 'Intermodal', which will cause an extra 1.5 million truck movements in the first year. Truck movements will primarily be in peak hours, further impacting on already high congestion. The residents of Moorebank and other areas should not experience any additional noise, pollution and congestion from this proposed facility, given the likelihood of the 'Intermodal'.
9. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the negative impact on land values. Residents of the Moorebank precinct in particular have spent significant amounts of money on land and homes. The proposed development will have a severe impact on land values and residents will not be compensated.

10. I oppose the building waste processing plant because there was a lack of community consultation at a meeting held by representatives of the developers on 31/5/2011. The organisers did not notify a significant number of local residents and future residents about the meeting. The organisers refused to answer questions from local residents on health risks. The organisers did not allow time to note down and respond to residents' concerns.
11. I oppose the building waste processing plant because it is dangerous to residents for a concrete processing plant to be located in this area of metropolitan Sydney. There are pre-existing waste processing plants operated by Benedict Recycling and Smorgan Steel Recycling at Chipping Norton. Benedict Recycling is planning to build another plant at Heathcote. There is no need for so many waste processing plants in such close proximity to each other.
12. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the misleading information provided by Moorebank Recyclers in their application showing their panhandle as the access route for their trucks to New Bridge Road whereas RTA has already refused this access. The environmental assessment is meaningless without taking correct route into account to assess the impact on the nearby residents and environment. The to and fro movement of 324 trucks per day will create huge dust clouds if one goes by what their trucks were shown to do in a recent ACA report on Channel 9 titled "Housing dream shattered".
13. I oppose the building waste processing plant because of the misleading information provided by Moorebank Recyclers in their application claiming their "model to predict dust concentrations in the region and at nearest sensitive receptors" whereas the nearest sensitive locations are actually much closer than those used in their model, i.e., Georges Fair residences just across the Brickmakers Drive.
14. I oppose the building waste processing plant because the model used by Moorebank Recyclers for Air Quality Assessment is based on pollution data obtained during 2005 whereas government's own website (mentioned above in 3) says: "Emissions from the commercial and domestic sectors are growing, increasing their relative contribution to overall emissions." In view of this the modeling should be based on recent data and not some old convenient data.
15. I oppose the building waste processing plant because the model used by Moorebank Recyclers for Air Quality Assessment is based on meteorological data obtained from Bankstown Airport which is kilometers away but still "considered to be representative of conditions experienced at the project site" despite "Terrain around the site consists of gentle hills, bounding the Georges River (see Figure 2)". These types of gross assumptions are risky to be made when it comes to public health and safety especially when DECCW requirements clearly state that "Data must be representative of the area in which emissions are modeled".
16. I oppose the building waste processing plant because Moorebank Recyclers already admit in their Air Quality Assessment that "Assessment of cumulative 24-hour average PM10 air quality impacts is often complicated as there may be many occasions when background concentrations are already above the 24-hour average air quality criteria". The pollution levels have further increased since this data was obtained and will most likely keep increasing due to proposed Intermodal. Therefore, the pollution levels cannot be allowed to increase any further risking thousands of innocent lives.
17. I oppose the building waste processing plant because Moorebank Recyclers proposal is denying the opportunity to the future residents closest to the proposed site who are yet to complete their construction and start living there.
18. I oppose the building waste processing plant because we might be creating another James Hardy situation considering the similarities of health effects of asbestos and respirable silica dust. 30 years ago it was considered perfectly fine to work with asbestos without any protection. Even at that time plenty of medical break-through were occurring. Yet, nobody banned asbestos back then. It was only years later that the real danger of working with asbestos was known. Unfortunately, for some people it was too late. However, the dangers about exposure to silica are already well known and perhaps in future we may find that it is even more dangerous than we ever knew. Despite knowing this, if this development were to go head, it not only would be an environmental and health catastrophe but it would also be a moral catastrophe where future generations may not look at this event kindly. It is unclear why despite having recently looked at the James Hardy debacle we are trying to create another James Hardie? Why are the poor people who have nowhere to go be subjected to this silica dust 24/7?
19. I oppose the building waste processing plant because I am aware of significant scientific literature which clearly states that methods often used to control dust, such as watering or screening by trees, is most ineffective when it comes to the extremely fine particles of respirable silica dust, which is an integral part of air and will follow it everywhere.

As a community member, who would soon be living in Georges Fair, I OPPOSE the building waste processing plant. I call on councillors, the NSW Parliament, the Minister for Planning, the Planning Assessment Commission, the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure and the Premier of NSW to REJECT this proposal.

Name	Address 1	Address 2
Confidential		
Confidential		
Confidential		
Confidential		
Confidential		