

From: [Emma Barnet](#)
To: [Giles Bloxham](#)
Subject: FW: submission regarding the Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility (SSD-9409987)
Date: Tuesday, 22 March 2022 2:59:00 PM

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 22 March 2022 2:52 PM
To: Emma Barnet <Emma.Barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: submission regarding the Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility (SSD-9409987)

Dear Emma,

I tried to lodge my submission through the planning portal but was unable to do so for some reason. Instead, please accept this as my written submission **against** the proposed Moss Vale Plastics Recycling Facility (SSD-9409987).

In summary, I object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- the site is not suitable for a number of reasons namely - the proposed road and traffic infrastructure required does not exist and what is proposed is not suitable for a residential and rural area. As a mostly residential area it should not be allowed to occur
- they are proposing changes to land they do not own. These changes proposed do not have the owner's consent e.g. the road proposed on the Garvan institute land. Owner's consent should have been obtained prior to the SSDA being submitted. It is therefore not an honest application
- the proposed factory would have a visual and physical impact on the surrounding landscape. Whilst the proposed site has not been identified as having landscape heritage values and is not in a heritage conservation area, the detrimental visual impact of the proposed development needs to be considered
- whilst a plastic recycling facility is required in Australia, careful consideration of the environmental impacts on the surrounding area should be undertaken. This has been undertaken but the findings are dubious and do not fully consider the impacts that will most likely occur. As such, the assessments undertaken fulfill the bare minimum of requirements
- the consultation process did not provide equitable access to residents. The applicant did the bare minimum in regards to SSDA consultation requirements. Consequently, a significant amount of residents were not able to provide their feedback in a fair and equitable way
- the bare minimum has also been done regarding Aboriginal archaeology and assessment of the site. Whilst the Woronora Plateau Gundungara Elders Council and the Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants noted they wanted any artefacts to be reburied onsite to retain a connection to Country, (there is a recommendation to do so by OzArk too) the practicality of this has not been considered. That is, the proposal is a very large industrial development that takes up the majority of the site. How is it possible to safely and respectfully rebury the artefacts? It is unlikely they would remain undisturbed and protected and it is unclear whether further consultation with the above parties has been undertaken to make this clear
- The social and cultural significance assessment for some artefacts (Beaconsfield Rod)S-1, OS-2, IF2 and IF-3) are noted as having their values diminished as they have been removed by OzArk from the site, therefore their association with Country has been diminished. Whilst they have been removed, there is clear evidence showing their relationship to the site and this can easily be reinstated. There is no way this is an acceptable assessment of significance as it is a

temporary situation caused by the authors. In addition, more detailed consultation would be required to establish significance

I would greatly appreciate it if you could please confirm receipt of my submission.

Many thanks,
Brittany Allen