

To: The Department of Planning and Environment
Re: Objection to Mod 7 and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Proposal – Kurnell

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Kurnell to formally object to Modification 7 and the proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facility associated with this modification.

As a parent raising young children in this community, I am deeply alarmed by the potential risks to our air quality, natural environment, and overall public health. Kurnell is a uniquely sensitive area, bordered by national parks, coastal ecosystems, and residential neighbourhoods. Introducing an industrial-scale BESS facility here would fundamentally and irreversibly change the character of our suburb and jeopardise the health and safety of its residents.

While I acknowledge the importance of energy storage infrastructure in supporting renewable energy goals, such facilities must be located and managed with appropriate safety, environmental and community safeguards—none of which have been clearly demonstrated in this proposal.

One major concern is the lack of thorough geo-technical and environmental testing for the site. As local homeowners, we are required to undergo rigorous geo-testing simply to install a swimming pool. Yet, a project involving massive battery banks, high-voltage equipment, and significant fire and contamination risk appears to face far less scrutiny. This double standard is unacceptable and suggests a disregard for the environmental and geological sensitivities of the Kurnell area.

In addition, the burying and capping of toxins and pollutants on the Ampol site is not a solution—it is simply a cost-saving measure that prioritises financial efficiency over environmental and public health. This short-sighted approach shows no regard for the site's exposure to flooding, storm events, and other extreme weather conditions common to this geographical location. The risk of leaching, groundwater contamination, and pollution entering nearby waterways remains an ongoing threat. These decisions will have consequences—not just for the environment, but for our children's physical and mental health in the years to come. Who will take responsibility then?

There is also a glaring contradiction in the direction of government priorities for this area. Kurnell is promoted as a place of great cultural and historical significance—millions have been invested in public infrastructure to celebrate its heritage. Over \$3 million was spent on bronze sculptures; another \$3 million on the whale-watching platform; \$100 million on new wharf upgrades at Kurnell and La Perouse; and \$25 million on a Visitor Centre to house the historically significant Gweagal Spears, returned from England—spears taken in 1770 after Captain Cook first stepped onto this land. These public investments frame Kurnell as a cultural icon and major tourism destination. Yet now, the same location is being earmarked for industrial development that brings toxic waste, chemical risks, and heavy infrastructure. It is as if we are turning a national treasure into a dumping ground—completely at odds with its cultural, environmental, and social value.

Additional points of concern include:

Air quality impacts, especially during extreme heat events or equipment failure (e.g., fire, explosion, or thermal runaway).

Inadequate public consultation and lack of transparency regarding long-term health and environmental risks.

Proximity to homes and children, with little detail on emergency response planning or safe buffer zones.

The potential for long-term environmental degradation and irreversible damage to local ecosystems.

In the absence of detailed independent assessments and meaningful community consultation, I urge the Department to reject Modification 7 and the associated BESS proposal. Kurnell deserves thorough planning, fair regulation, and genuine protection of its people and environment—especially for our youngest and most vulnerable residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this submission.