

SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED ST PETERS RECYCLING FACILITY

Name: G Karras and M Buencamino

Address: 210 Marco Ave., Panania NSW

Affected property: Crown St, St Peters NSW

PROJECT APPLICATION No. MP11_0086

Proponent: Concrete Recyclers (Group) Pty Ltd

Statement of objections to the above project proposal

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment and make a submission on the proposed project under consideration by NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

We have summarised our comments and objections to the proposed project to be located at St Peters due to potential environmental impacts the project will generate if approved by NSW Planning and Infrastructure. Our statements are based on our positions as property investors, household cleaners and as ordinary environmentally conscious citizens of the community:-

- 1. As property investors, the mere presence of this type of business operating in St Peters will deface its good suburban characteristic and devalue the value of existing properties within and surrounding suburbs in the commercial market.**
- 2. The likely degradation of the physical appearance of buildings, houses, units, etc. from continuous emission of dust particles coming from piles of left waste materials on site and its precursor as air pollutant are now visible and have stayed on the cement and brick walls of new houses, units and buildings.**
- 3. The long term future development and improvement of St Peters will be hindered as having grinding/recycling facility in the city area is not an attractive suburban asset. It will discourage prospective investors and residential buyers to live in an area where there is a continuous emission of tiny particles of sandstone dust, other waste materials and its precursors on a daily basis. Considering the objectives of the project, on face value alone, the proposed business will not create a sustainable and environmentally friendly relationship within the community. It will further prevent potential investors and property buyers to live in a suburb with a NSW government approved automatic air pollutant generator located within the busy Sydney belt area.**
- 4. The presence of the recycling facility within the heart of the City of Sydney is not a suburban asset but a long term environmental burden to the whole eco system and its residents.**

5. For over hundreds of centuries now, the suburb of St Peters has humbly built its own reputation as a modern cosmopolitan/adaptable town, majority of which are environmentally conscious residents with affluent lifestyle in an expensive suburb spanning a few kilometres from the world famous Sydney city. The existence of a waste material recycling facility at the core of Sydney cosmopolitan area will defaced its long historically earned good reputation and be degraded to its lowest level only to be trademarked in our civilised Australian environmental caring society as the **“AIR POLLUTANT SUBURB GENERATOR OF SYDNEY”**.

6. Most importantly, the health risk of continuously breathing in sandstone dust and other by-product of its operation will slowly and forcefully be deposited into everyone's lungs and its long term health effect to all residents. The children's health and well-being should be considered seriously. Its operational presence in a congested community based setting simply means that residents are continuously exposed to finely grained sandstone dust and other by-product of various waste material dusts all year round.

7. From a homeowner cleaners point of view, our current experience is that without the grinding business actively in operation, we are already experiencing accumulation of finely grained yellowish/brownish sandstone dust being air blown around the whole building complex specifically inside the unit and outside the veranda and car space areas coming from the site. No matter which direction the wind blows and the frequency of cleaning I undertake inside and outside part of the unit per day, the task has become annoying and arduous due to the constant accumulation of unwanted yellowish/brownish sandstone coloured dust particles coming from even the undisturbed piles of sandstones being air blown to all properties in close proximity to the recycling site and those farther to its location. I am more than happy to show this irrefutable evidence to the business owner and to the NSW Transport and Planning senior management as a symptom and an early sign of health and hygiene hazards as a predecessor risk due the presence of these materials. Without the business even being functionally operational, its environmental impact to the community is already visible.

8. It would be beyond anyone's comprehension if this type of business is unconscionably approved by NSW government in a non-geographically appropriate site and environmentally non-conducive location. Even if there are mitigation measures to be adopted, the adopted measures are not sufficient to effectively eliminate the presence of millions of various waste material dusts floating in our eco system which would easily find it's way into community residents own premises and healthy lungs. These particles can only be eliminated in the air through complete closure of the recycling facility on site.

9. The business proposal failed to consider the daily inefficient use and

wasteful consumption of water per day. This is a very significant concern where everyone and every household are mindful of water restrictions and observe the practical consumption of daily water usage. In our household, everyone always take extra effort to save rain water in big buckets to be used for watering plants, cleaning vehicles, washing driveways, etc. It's really mind boggling and defeats the purpose of householders' attitudes to be environmentally efficient if we allow meeting the proposed project's unjustified operational demand and level needs of water usage to crush and recover waste material to create its end product. This is unsustainable both ecologically and environmentally.

A waste recycling business must be set up near a pond, lake areas or along the perimeter of open water areas with the presence of alternative source of recycled water to minimise its impact to our resources and to the health of the residents. Implementing ecological sustainability requires honest commitment from everyone and the government at the very least must lead and act as a model.

Why should someone be allowed to use and put into waste an insensible amount of precious water resources to maintain its business operation when all Australians are working together to conserve our ecological system? What is the overall daily effect of consuming this large volume of water to the households? Do we have to experience a drib and drop of water while in the shower?

Would the NSW government provide us a guarantee that we have sufficient availability of water resources or with eyes blind folded, allow the impractical use and waste of our water resources? Is this a smart NSW Conservation Strategy or should we allow anyone to go against NSW government own environmental and conservation initiatives and slowly creep out this dark school of thoughts from the backdoor office?

10. The everyday noise level coming from the site including weekend Saturday is not fair, not family friendly and socially unacceptable. The proposed project blatantly excludes the residents' right to come home after long hours of hard work to enjoy a private, quiet relaxing and family friendly atmosphere without the disturbance coming from an unacceptable level of noise intrusion from waste crushing and truck operations.

11. Added traffic burden to an already existing over stretched and congested roadways are also a big concern. The trucking load would substantially increase traffic as trucks would both upload and deliver waste materials and then transport these processed materials for commercial use. Regardless of the number of loads being carried out every day, these trucks

would still have to bisect with the existing congested traffic and create further bottle neck.

We appreciate the NSW government's implementation of various ecological sustainability initiatives and policies to reduce waste and better make use of resources. The Waste Strategy 2007 has provided guidance to ensure that efficient use of resources and impact on the environment are considered throughout the life cycle of goods and materials.

From our point of view, it would appear that the project owner is missing the point on what conservation, ecological and environmental sustainability really means. We will all agree that waste recycling is good; however, both myself and my partner can confidently say that there were no material and relevant information at the proposed project location that reflects ecology and bionetwork conservation apart from the business objective to achieve and assist NSW government to meet its 68% target to recover waste material. This objective is not impossible to achieve as the business site can be relocated to an appropriate location. The assessment report provided by an external third party and the attached documents relates to how the business will meet the government target; its business operation, the recycling process, etc. However, there were no justifications at all why they have to waste our water just to grind the waste material; no alternative resources was available; no additional information from a reputable health risks epidemiologist was submitted to support its operational viability at the proposed site. We do understand that the project proposer had entered a lease with NSW government. However, it does not mean that the proposed project can be conducted on the leased premises. Why establish a recycling facility plant at the very heart of a densely populated Sydney area? Is the company reducing operational costs at the expense of city residents?

The proposed location of the recycling project is not geographically conducive in a densely congested residential area such as St Peters and surrounding suburbs and impractically very unsuitable as the business location would place the project and its unhealthy operational dusts by-products being inhaled by residential neighbourhoods including school children.

The manner and the process of transforming the waste material operationally at the proposed site is absurd, illogical and against the Waste Strategy Initiatives of sustaining an efficient use of resources, energy and the totality of its adverse environmental effect to the whole ecosystem.

A relevant and logical questions we would like to ask the proposer of this project is for him to tell us how is the company going to reasonably eliminate/prevent any potential health risk to residents and children inhaling these tiny particles as a by-product of grinding the sandstone and other waste

materials so it can be converted into a recycled material to be sold for substantial amount of profits?

Would the company be employing an expert to monitor and measure the average monthly dust levels being accumulated in the lungs of all St Peters residents and other potentially affected people living within the neighbouring locations?

Would the business proposer able to establish a medical/hospital trust fund for the benefit of those residents and children who will be potentially affected by the company's dust emission operation in due course?

OR would the NSW government able to openly accept future liabilities and long term health risks suffered by residents resulting from its continuous and long term exposure to finely grained hazardous dust as a consequential by product of the business operation?

How and would the NSW Planning and Infrastructure senior management be capable enough to efficiently manage residents' complaints associated with environmental and health concerns on a daily basis?

Would they want to create a corridor for community shut down request and to ignite a forum for a political limelight? Without the presence of this business at St Peters, residential owners are not burden by additional daily stress, anxiety and health risk to their mental and social well-being.

We were not able to conclude based on rational and objective considerations that the presence of this business is environmentally, ecologically and health wise sustainable to be actively operating at St Peters. There is no doubt that we all want to conserve and appropriately recycle any unwanted materials or waste and turn it into something useful. However, the intended site and location of the proposed project is not environmentally friendly with its attached long term hazards to the health of all residents within and around the Sydney area. No breathing human being would want to increase the weight of their lungs from breathing in tiny sandstone particles and other residual dust and unwillingly lodge it into their healthy lungs on a daily basis.

Overall, our submission is that the proposed location is poorly chosen and reflects an impractical site for the proposer to conduct its business of waste recycling facility at St Peters. Approving this type of business operation right at the centre and within the bounds of the City of Sydney by the NSW government is a clear manifestation of a backward way of thinking forward. Squeezing in this type of business in an unacceptable site within a densely populated area within the heart of Sydney is a big joke.

To be environmentally supportive, the project must be relocated to a more conducive location and an excellent example is in a large clearing area away from densely populated residential area or in a site where its operation has very little burden to the environment, health of community and must be ecologically sustainable where an alternative source of using recycled water not water straight from the tap must be utilised.

Our suggestion is for the NSW Planning section to endorse an alternative and conducive site location farther to densely congested city area if the business owner had an honest intention to assist the NSW government to sustain the conservation of waste material and the development of a recycling industry in NSW using a common sense approach of the whole ecological system.

The approving senior management staff must consider all submissions received, the environmental effect and health impact of the proposed project to the residents and not the viability of the establishment of the business in an unacceptable location. Approving the project at the proposed site is a wrong pathway to support the government's initiatives to waste recovery and conservation.

Thank you for giving us the time and opportunity to voice our environmental concerns and would appreciate receiving any feedback regarding the outcome of our submission against the proposed project location.

Regards

G Karras and M Buencamino as signed