

[REDACTED]

Department of Planning

---

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Content:  
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

3 April 2013

Major Projects Assessment  
Department of Planning and Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: Submission regarding proposed Materials Recycling Facility – Moorebank  
(05\_0157)  
OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL

---

We write in vehement objection to the proposed Moorebank Concrete Recycling Facility (hereinafter referred to as “the proposed recycling site”) at Lot 6, DP 1065574 Newbridge Road Moorebank.

We have been a resident of George's Fair in Moorebank (just 300 metres from this proposed site) for approximately 2 and a half years. Our neighbourhood consists of predominantly young families with children, who chose this community due to many factors including parks, cycle-paths, the neighbouring George's River and New Brighton Golf Course, as well as it's close proximity to numerous child care facilities and primary schools. In summary, George's Fair was deemed to be an ideal place for young families in South-Western Sydney.

You can imagine our shock and distress upon learning that the Moorebank Recyclers wished to build this monstrosity in our local area, risking harm and ill-health to our children, as well as to our natural environment.

The site is bound by the Georges River to the East, Benedict Sands to the north (which we have been informed will soon be relocated to an industrial area making way for a proposed Marina and residential housing estate), a large area of Cumberland State Forest (environmentally sensitive vegetation) to the west of the site, as well as a section of George's Fair residential estate also to the west of the site, and New Brighton Golf Course to the south of the site.

The Moorebank Resident's Action Group (of which we are members) has been incorporated and in existence for the last two years, purely to fight this facility. Hundreds of local residents have attended meetings and are on mailing lists, all of which vehemently oppose this facility being built close to their homes and families. See this article published in the Liverpool Leader on 15 June 2011 - <http://liverpool-leader.whereilive.com.au/news/story/residents-protest-moorebank-recycling-plant/>

Our main objections to this proposed recycling facility are based on the following issues:

**The area is residential and is no longer industrial**

This entire area was previously Boral Brickworks, until Boral sold the majority of the land to Investa (who developed the George's Fair estate). The area has been gentrified and given a complete overhaul. It is no longer an industrial area. Benedict Sands have even recognised this and are relocating their sand and soil facility to a nearby industrial area.

The Liverpool City Council has recently received plans from Benedict Industries, who hope to transform their quarry on Newbridge Road (adjacent to this proposed site) into a recreational and dining hub called Georges Cove Marina.

If the plans get approved, the new marina will include 250 dry berths, a function centre, kiosks, tourist and entertainment facilities, a private clubhouse and 3 car parks.

It's expected to cost about \$50 million to build the marina, but if it does go ahead it could become a major attraction for locals and visitors to the Liverpool region and it would help put a positive focus on Georges River. Liverpool Council as well as residents in the area strongly support this development. It is important to note that the only objection that has been made to this Marina development was by Moorebank Recyclers.

There will also be 250 dwellings built within this site – residential dwellings that would be even closer in proximity to the proposed recycling facility than homes in Georges Fair.

The proposed recycling site is completely incompatible with the vision for this area of the Georges River.

### **The acquisition of this land could be viewed as underhanded**

It is important to note that Moorebank Recyclers purchased the 20 hectare site in 1994 for \$10,000 – an amount which is clearly under market value (see Attachment one - Transfer). This is a salient point which demonstrates that they have nothing to lose if this development application is refused. Surely the health and wellbeing of thousands of residents outweigh the loss of \$10,000 by a large corporate entity.

At the time of its purchase, it was known to Moorebank Recyclers that the land was zoned as 1A Rural, 7A Waterways, and 7C Environmental Conservation. In 1997 the LEP was altered to insert an exception clause to the E2 environmental conservation zoning, allowing for a materials recycling facility (now Clause 11 of Schedule 1). This is completely inconsistent with the zoning of this area. This clause was inserted at a time when George Paciullo was Mayor of Liverpool – a man who has been investigated by the ICAC in the past.

### **The proposal is inconsistent with the zoning for that area**

This area was re-zoned some years ago for Environmental Conservation. Liverpool City Council was then dissolved and put under the control of a minister-appointed Administrator, Gabrielle Kibble, who was guided by the then General Manager, Phil Tolhurst (now deceased).

To satisfy Moorebank Recyclers, the administrator re-zoned the former contaminated landfill (Moorebank Recyclers' Land) to Environmental Conservation (which prohibits almost any activity) *but* with a ten year window to allow it to be used for waste recycling should they be able to organise consent. Otherwise, after that period this direct conflict with the zoning was to be extinguished (in October 2018). The administrator also gave Moorebank Recyclers access through council lands but this was rescinded last year by Liverpool City Council (see below).

I question the legal validity of this exemption that was given by one person acting as Administrator to Moorebank Recyclers which totally contradicts the zoning for that area.

### **The Moorebank Recyclers do not have legal access to the proposed site**

The Developer is well aware that the Director-General has stipulated that access to the site is a requirement.

The Moorebank Recyclers do NOT HAVE ACCESS to the land in which they seek to build this proposed facility, despite what they have written in their application. At the Liverpool City Council Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 15 June 2011, a motion was moved that the council write to the State Government immediately to recommend refusal for this development as the proposed use of this site is incompatible with the current and planned residential and recreational uses of the area. There was also a motion that the Council write to Moorebank Recyclers clearly stating that approval will not be granted for access to this land for waste management/recycling purposes. Further, there was a motion that Council make submissions to the Director General which summarises and comments on the community concerns and such submissions should note that the Council does NOT support the application.

A letter dated 14 July 2011 from Farooq Portelli, General Maager of Liverpool City Council, was sent to Brett Lawson from Moorebank Recyclers Pty Ltd stipulating that Liverpool City Council will not grant access (see Attachment two - Letter). The developer has not included this second letter in their application and is therefore misrepresenting the fact that access issues have not been resolved.

Moorebank Recyclers are currently in the Supreme Court of NSW trying to gain access to the site.

They have been denied access via Newbridge Road by the RTA (now RMS).

### **Environmental dangers - flooding**

The proposed site is currently in a flood corridor.

The facility will be in operation from 7am to 6pm MONDAY TO SATURDAY.

I note that on page ii of the Executive Summary, the run-off from this site will drain into a drainage channel which runs beneath the entrance to the site and then *into the Georges River*.

This particular section of the George's River (Milperra-Moorebank area) ranks as one of the most severely flood prone valleys in the state (see <http://www.georgesriver.org.au/IgnitionSuite/uploads/docs/Have%20We%20Forgotten%20About%20Flooding%20on%20the%20Georges%20River.pdf>)

The earthworks associated with the access road would lead to a loss of flood storage of 3,500m<sup>3</sup>. I submit that this is an unacceptable outcome especially considering the area is IN A FLOOD ZONE, and only 12 months ago, the southern homes of George's Fair (close to Brickmakers Drive) were actually threatened by flood waters after heavy rain. Brickmakers drive was flooded with water. To lose such a large amount of flood storage would be detrimental to the region, in particular with regards to the risks associated with the spread of waste through the residential housing estate, not to

mention the George's River. The Recyclers submit that this will be offset by lowering the surface level of the southern section of the Site by rolling with a heavy roller – however, we question the effectiveness of this and have not seen any evidence as to the adequacy of this method.

The risk of flood (and damage caused by leaking building waste from the site) will not only affect the local and immediate residents. The Georges River has a catchment area of 890km. With a population of over 1 million, it is one of the most populated catchments in Australia. Almost 1/3 of Sydney's population is located within the catchment

(<http://www.georgesriver.org.au/IgnitionSuite/uploads/docs/Have%20We%20Forgotten%20About%20Flooding%20on%20the%20Georges%20River.pdf>, page 2)

The area is of such concern, that the Liverpool City Council is currently engaged in the Moorebank Flood acquisition scheme where they are slowly buying all the homes on Newbridge Road adjacent to this part of the Georges River, in the flood prone area (see

<http://www.liverpoolchampion.com.au/story/1295918/swamped-but-many-refuse-to-sell/?cs=1843>)

In the event of another flood within this region, the effects would be catastrophic if any of the concrete and building waste from this proposed waste recycling facility was caught in the mix.

## **Traffic**

The estimated number of truck movements per day resulting from this facility is 324. That is an extra 324 trucks per day to an already congested area. These roads will be faced with gridlock once the Intermodal Facility in Moorebank is in operation, which will bring in excess of one million trucks a year on Moorebank roads particularly Newbridge Road, Nuwarra Road, Heathcote Road, Moorebank Avenue and the Hume Hwy/M5. This area cannot handle any further traffic, particularly from trucks. This particular area of Brickmakers drive is currently used as a road joining Newbridge and Nuwarra roads, not to mention an access point for the thousand odd homes built or being built in Georges Fair. There are also hundreds of homes being built by Mirvac on the New Brighton Golf Course, and the potential for 250 homes at the new residential Marina development which will also add substantially to traffic in the region, and in particular on Brickmakers Drive.

Despite the Fact Moorebank Recyclers have stipulated that trucks would turn right onto Brickmakers drive in order to exit the estate, we believe there is absolutely nothing stopping these trucks from turning left into Brickmakers drive and driving along this road which runs parallel to residential homes, and most importantly a bicycle track frequented by young children and health-enthusiasts. There are already a large number of trucks driving along this road, at speeds well above the 50km speed limit. Although we use the bike tracks regularly, our children are not allowed to travel along the bike track during peak hours because it is deemed unsafe and too close to traffic. Evidence of the traffic along Brickmakers Drive can be seen here:

<http://aca.ninemsn.com.au/article/8625573/housing-dream-shattered>

This video also shows footage from Moorebank Recyclers other recycling facility in Camelia, and the dust and pollution this generates. No amount of sprinkler systems or brick boundaries can prevent the disastrous effects this type of facility will produce (see <http://parramatta-advertiser.whereilive.com.au/news/story/in-a-dust-up-over-pollution/>)

The land currently occupied by Benedict Sands to the North of the proposed recycling plant has recently been rezoned for development and plans have almost been approved for a Marina and housing development. If this recycling plant goes ahead, the trucks will be required to drive

directly past the Marina, as well as the hundreds of residences which will be built along that stretch of land.

We submit that the Environmental Assessment has been drafted based on OUTDATED material which was in existence prior to the area becoming a residential housing estate.

We further note that Moorebank Recyclers base their traffic movement estimates on data collected over a two month period in 2003. **This data is over ten years old** and was collected at a time before the residential housing estate of George's Fair was even in existence. George's Fair will comprise over 1000 residential homes upon completion – which means thousands of extra cars and trucks driving along these roads on a daily basis. The New Brighton Golf Course is also currently constructing hundreds of homes adjoining this proposed facility, not to mention Benedict's proposed Marina and Residential development which will be located to the north of this proposed recycling site.

They have also based their measurements of TEOM data (regarding air quality) on measurements taken between 2005 and 2007 (more than 6 years ago and prior to the residential developments in the area, which are currently still in operation). The current air quality in the area is appalling, particularly due to the large number of trucks delivering building materials to the hundreds of different construction sites in George's Fair and at the New Brighton Golf Course.

We request that these “statistics” be disregarded as they are outdated and irrelevant.

We consider Moorebank Recyclers environmental assessment as completely outdated and irrelevant, and submit that the Minister CANNOT rely on this document for the purposes of their determination.

It is important to note that there is potential for a 5 tonne limit along Brickmakers Drive. The matter has been referred to the RMS by Council for final consideration. This would render Brickmakers Drive inaccessible for trucks entering and exiting the proposed site. The only exceptions to the limit that have been stipulated are buses and garbage vehicles ([http://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0016/5353/Agenda-Part-13-Page-210-234.pdf](http://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/5353/Agenda-Part-13-Page-210-234.pdf))

### **Air quality and health risks**

As mentioned above, the measurements regarding air quality are outdated and unreliable.

The Air Quality Impact Assessment was drafted in 2007 and was last reviewed in March 2010. This is 6 years ago, and over three years ago since it was reviewed. The circumstances of the area have changed significantly since. There are hundreds of new homes that have been built since this point in time.

We also note that dust deposition data is stated as being unavailable for the site. This is a huge issue to consider and is completely unacceptable for this facility to state that data is unavailable. The explanations given by Moorebank Recyclers are flawed. Residents are entitled to know what they should expect regarding dust deposition. Silica dust is a major cause of cancer, and is not something that should be overlooked (see [http://www.deir.qld.gov.au/workplace/resources/pdfs/silica\\_crystalline\\_dust.pdf](http://www.deir.qld.gov.au/workplace/resources/pdfs/silica_crystalline_dust.pdf))

The most common form of silicosis develops after long exposure to **relatively low concentrations**

(my emphasis added). Once the disease has begun, it will progress slowly but relentlessly even if the person is removed from further exposure. There is no medical treatment for silicosis. People with silicosis are also at greater risk of developing lung cancer. In 1996 the International Agency for Research on Cancer classified crystalline silica dust as a human carcinogen (Group 1). (<http://unionsafe.labor.net.au/hazards/1047876604328.html>).

Even if Moorebank Recyclers were to submit that the silica dust would likely be of minute proportions, research has shown that the disease can occur even after exposure to low concentrations. We submit that allowing this chance is playing roulette with our lives.

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. There is a link between silica dust and lung cancer (*'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 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.

It has been stated by Moorebank Recyclers in the executive summary (page x) that exposed areas to dust should be stabilised as quickly as possible, and that monitoring will be carried out which would include dust deposition gauges at the closest residences or other sensitive receptors, to assess compliance. We submit that this is unacceptable and insufficient, as by that stage, the damage would already have been done. The report does not mention any possible solutions to this potential problem. It has identified the risk, indicated how the risk can be assessed, but does not give an adequate solution in the event these areas are exposed to the dust.

Further, we beg the question – what has Moorebank Recyclers done to remedy the silica dust problem at it's other location in Camelia? This article is chilling: <http://parramatta-advertiser.wherelive.com.au/news/story/in-a-dust-up-over-pollution/#.UT2c0kip5S0.mailto>

## **Noise**

Once again, we submit that the statistics relied on by Moorebank Recyclers regarding noise are flawed, unreliable, and outdated as they rely on monitoring of noise levels at three residences in 2007 (some 7 years ago). The residences that were measured were at that particular time in 2007, the closest residences to the proposed recycling site (some 700 metres away), however, with the recent development at George's Fair, at least 1000 residences are now so much closer to the proposed recycling site – as little as 250 metres away.

We note that Moorebank Recyclers have indicated that the closest future residence will be over 400 metres from the proposed site. We submit that this is wrong, and that it is in fact closer.

The noise expected to be generated by such a facility would be of such significance that it would effect the lives of thousands of people within the area. Residents of Camelia have referred to the noise that has been generated by a similar facility in their area in the article mentioned above.

The sheer number of trucks expected to enter and exit the site on a daily basis would also exacerbate the noise problems within the area – an area already riddled with truck noise (see the A Current Affair article referred to above).

### **Visual impacts**

The Moorebank Recyclers have asserted (at page xiii of the Executive Summary) that the site is effectively invisible from the George's River and the reserve land between it and the site as a result of the screening effect of riparian vegetation. That might be the case at this present time because the proposed recycling site has no facility built on it and is a flat piece of land. I submit that once the 10 metre shed and stockpiles are formed, the visual impact would be somewhat different. I disagree with the assertion that future growth of vegetation would lead to greater and potentially total screening of the view into the site. This is a prediction made without any evidence to back it up.

The Moorebank Recyclers also state that the land surface is not visible from any existing residential location outside the site and rely on a survey performed in 2003. Once again, this information is outdated, flawed and unreliable as hundreds of double storey dwellings with balconies and windows have been constructed within George's Fair since this date. There is also a 6 story residential building currently under construction on Nuwarra Road, which would overlook the proposed site.

The Moorebank Recyclers have admitted (Executive Summary page xiv) that there is visibility from parts of the Benedict Sands site. This site has been rezoned for residential development, which means that these potential residences will be able to see this proposed recycling site. It is not enough to say that views from potential residential streets and residences located in the majority of the Benedict site would be blocked by intervening residential development in the foreground within this site itself. That is purely an assumption with no evidence to back it up.

The Moorebank Recyclers admit (at page xv of the Executive Summary) that there may be glimpses of the site from the George's River. This is detrimental to those traveling by boat through the George's River, particularly if the Marina development is approved. This view would also be seen from residences across the river at Milperra. There has been no consideration to those residents at Milperra in the Moorebank Recycler's report.

It is important to note that this proposed site can be seen from the top of Elizabeth Drive near Mount Pritchard.

### **Geotechnical impact**

The proposed development would be constructed on an old landfill. Moorebank Recyclers have admitted that the proposed development has potential to impact the integrity of the landfill, and stipulates a number of issues that will need to be addressed.

### **Flora and Fauna**

The report (at page xxiii) stipulates the flora and fauna that occupy the area, but hasn't identified the risks associated with this flora and fauna being in the vicinity of such a recycling facility.

We submit that there is a high risk of harm to particularly the fauna in the area, including birds, foxes, fish, bats, and other marsupials. The potential for pollution generated by the facility itself as well as the number of trucks traveling to and from the site, not to mention the dust residue and leakage of other concrete waste, will all have a detrimental effect on fauna within the region. The issue of pollution to the waterways (George's River) and the fauna that dwells within has not been adequately addressed by the Moorebank Recyclers in their report. A facility like this CANNOT be erected within such close proximity to a river which serves a large majority of Sydney residents, not to mention bordering the remaining 5% of Sydney's Cumberland Forest.

### **Water quality, flooding and stormwater drainage**

The executive summary states (at page xxiv) that the water quality in this area is generally quite poor. Dredging has already begun by Benedict Sands in preparation of the Marina, and the water quality within the area is expected to improve as a result of this Marina development. The erection of a concrete waste facility on the banks of the Georges River would only undo all this hard work, and would adversely effect the water quality of this part of the Georges River.

Page xxv of the executive summary explicitly states that pollutants which could potentially originate from the Materials Recycling Facility include suspended solids in site runoff, and oil, fuel or chemicals used on the site.

It states that the runoff would be captured in sumps, giving the site operator the opportunity to respond to any spills flowing off site. It is envisaged that 91% of the suspended solid load would be captured on the site and therefore the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the water quality of the Georges River. We refute this assertion that the remaining 9% of solid waste that would leak into the Georges River is considered as not having an adverse impact.

### **Conclusion**

This facility is much better served in an industrial area, where any potential risks would fall on industrial neighbours, not on the lives and health of thousands of human beings, including children. Australia is a country where public health and safety is of paramount importance. We therefore expect that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure will decide against this ludicrous and dangerous facility, placing utmost importance on the health and wellbeing of the people of Moorebank and surrounding suburbs.

We understand that due process must be had, but we strongly feel that the fact this proposal has reached exhibition stage is appalling. Please redeem our faith in government and **reject this proposal**. Despite what the developer suggests, this proposed development is NOT an acceptable land use for the site.

Regards,

*Name Withheld*

*Moorebank Resident*

Attachment one – Transfer

Attachment two – letter re access.

Form: 97-01T  
Licence: 10V/0096/95  
Printed: 0897LTO



# TRANSFER

New South Wales  
Real Property Act 1900

5337605G



Instructions for filling out  
this form are available  
from the Land Titles Office

Office of State Revenue use only

00'24 50/58269300 40 2015 860110  
N.S.W. STAMP DUTY

(A) **LAND TRANSFERRED**  
If appropriate, specify the  
share or part transferred.

VOL 4916 FOL 244  
FOLIO IDENTIFIER 1/336613

(B) **LODGED BY**

LTO Box	Name, Address or DX and Telephone
3684	Hardings Reference (15 character maximum): RB-940355

(C) **TRANSFEROR** MAYNE NICKLESS LIMITED ACN 004 073 410

(D) acknowledges receipt of the consideration of \$10,000.00  
and as regards the land specified above transfers to the transferee an estate in fee simple.

(E) Encumbrances (if applicable): 1. .... 2. .... 3. ....

(F) **TRANSFEEE**

<b>T</b> <b>TS</b> (s713 LGA) <b>TW</b> (Sheriff)	MOOREBANK RECYCLERS PTY LIMITED ACN067 281 083 <b>TENANCY:</b>
---	--

(H) We certify this dealing correct for the purposes of the Real Property Act 1900. DATE .....

Signed in my presence by the transferor who is personally known to me.

The Common Seal of Mayne Nickless Limited was  
affixed in accordance with its Articles of Association  
Signature of Witness



Name of Witness (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address of Witness

*KM SLEEP*  
SECRETARY  
KM SLEEP

*JC Trethowan*  
Signature of Transferor Director  
JC TRETOWAN

Signed in my presence by the transferee who is personally known to me.

Signature of Witness

Name of Witness (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address of Witness

Solicitor for *Roslyn Bean*  
Signature of Transferee  
Roslyn Bean

If signed on the transferee's behalf by a solicitor or licensed conveyancer, show the signatory's full name in block letters.



# Minutes

**Meeting:** Access Committee

**Venue:** Whitlam Centre

**Date:** 9 June 2011

**Time:** 1.00pm – 3.00pm

## 1. ATTENDANCE

Members:	Wendy Waller Ollie Lassen Jim Simpson Barbara Wright Peter Fraser Glen Ford Rita Harden Kamrun Rahman Maya Elnaza	Mayor, Liverpool City Council Community representative Community representative Community representative Community representative Community representative Disability South West Inc. Liverpool City Council Liverpool City Council (part meeting)
In Attendance:	David Maguire	Liverpool City Council
Apologies:	Nil	

## 2. CONFIRMATION OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 May 2011 were confirmed as a true record of that meeting. Moved Barbara Wright, seconded Peter Fraser.

## 3. GUEST SPEAKER – Presentation on Council's Code of Conduct

Council's Governance Officer presented on the Code of Conduct. It was noted that Council's committee members must read, understand and follow the Council Code of Conduct at all times. Members of Council committees must demonstrate a high standard of professional behavior that maintains and promotes confidence and trust in the work of Council. It was noted that members of committees must perform their duties with integrity, honesty and fairness. Council is committed to high ethical standards for everyone who works with Council in a paid, elected or voluntary capacity.

A range of specific issues were discussed, including personal conduct, equitable treatment, health and safety, Council resources, public comments and the media, conflict of interest, gift and benefits, confidential and personal information and breaches of the code of conduct.

**Action: Community Development Worker (Aged and Disability) to provide copies of the full Code of Conduct at the next meeting**

## Attachment 12:



**Liverpoolcitycouncil**  
creating our future together

Our Ref: 100519.2011  
Contact: Tanya O'Brien 9821 9287

14 July 2011

Mr Sam Haddad  
Director-General  
Department of Planning and Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Haddad

**Re: Proposed Resource & Waste Project**  
**Project Number: P 05\_0157**  
**Lot 6 DP 1055574 – Lot 6 Newbridge Road Moorebank**

I write in regard to a proposal for a Resource and Waste Project on the abovementioned property. It is noted that the developer has been issued with modified Director-General's requirements for the project on 7 July 2008.

The scope and extent of matters to be considered by the applicant in fulfilling the Director-Generals requirements is noted. A key issue relating to the project that you noted in your letter to the applicant regarding the DGRs is relating to access.

The proponent is aware that they are unable to gain access from Newbridge Road for the purpose of the proposed development and there is currently no alternate road access, without utilising property not in the applicant's ownership.

The applicant has made representations to Council with regard to gaining access via land in its holding however this has not been granted. Council considered this matter at its meeting of 15 June 2011, and resolved that it should be made clear that the Council does not support the application, and that approval for access over Part Lot 310 and Lot 309 in DP 1118048 will not be granted for the proposed project. As such it is unclear how the applicant intends to gain access to the project.

Further Council has received numerous representations regarding the proposal raising a number of issues not limited to the following:

- Heavy vehicle movements associated with this proposal should not be encouraged to come into residential areas,
- The use will cause dust, noise, light spill and other nuisance disturbances to nearby residents,
- The use will increase pollution including heavy metals, particulates, fumes or other environmental impacts,
- The site is flood liable and use of the site as proposed could create water quality and flooding issues,
- The site has environmental values and is located between a large area of high quality vegetation and the Georges River and is an important biodiversity and conservation link.

Administration Centre 1 Hoxton Park Road, Liverpool NSW 2170, DX 5030 Liverpool  
Customer Service Centre Liverpool City Library, 170 George Street, Liverpool NSW 2170

All correspondence to The General Manager, Locked Bag 7064 Liverpool BC NSW 1871 Call Centre 1300 36 2170  
Fax 9821 9333 Email [lcc@liverpool.nsw.gov.au](mailto:lcc@liverpool.nsw.gov.au) Web [www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au](http://www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au) TTY 9821 8800 ABN 84 181 182 471

The Council have in their resolutions expressed that the proposed use of this site is considered incompatible with the current and planned residential and recreational uses of the area. It is therefore recommended that in light of the above issues that this project be refused.

Should you require any further information on this matter, please do not hesitate to call me on 9821 9221.

Yours sincerely



**Farooq Portelli**  
General Manager

## Attachment 11:



**Liverpoolcitycouncil**  
creating our future together

Our Ref: 100519.2011  
 Contact: Tanya O'Brien 9821 9287

14 July 2011

Mr Brent Lawson  
 Moorebank Recyclers Pty Ltd  
 PO Box 238  
 RYDALMERE NSW 1701

Dear Mr Lawson

**Re: Proposed Resource & Waste Project**  
**Project Number: P 05\_0157**  
**Lot 6 DP 1055574 – Lot 6 Newbridge Road Moorebank**

I write in regard to your company's proposal for a Resource and Waste Project on the abovementioned property. It is noted that the Department of Planning has issued modified Director-General's requirements for the project.

A key issue that is noted in the letter from the Department of Planning dated 7 July 2008 regarding the Director-General's requirements is relating to access.

Council considered this matter at its meeting of 15 June 2011, and resolved that Council does not support the application, and that approval for access over Part Lot 310 and Lot 309 in DP 1118048 will not be granted for the proposed project.

Should you require any further information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact Tanya O'Brien Acting Manager Statutory Planning on 9821 9287.

Yours sincerely

**Farooq Portelli**  
 General Manager