

Revesby Resource Facility
Application No. SSD 7349

Submission by way of objection to the expansion of the Revesby Recovery Facility

This submission serves as a way of objection to the expansion of the Revesby Recovery Facility. The following grounds of objection are relevant:

1. The proposal seeks an expansion of non-putrescible waste recycling volumes from the current 30,000 t/annum to 250,000 t/annum. Being an increase of 733%, this is an extremely significant expansion which is likely to cause detriments to health of residents, have negative environmental impacts and will generally reduce the current enjoyment of land of residents, animals, and plant life.
2. The hours of proposed operation as per part 2.3.7.1 of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are from 6.00 am to 12.00 midnight, Monday to Saturday. This will cause increased noise, traffic congestion, and air pollution to neighbouring households which are in close proximity to the facility.
3. Part 2.3.7.2. of the EIS states that truck movements, associated with the loading and removal of recycled material from the facility, may be required to be carried out until 12.00 midnight and part 2.3.7.3 states that deliveries could also occur until 12.00 midnight. This will cause great inconvenience to surrounding homes as there will be a significant intensification in truck movements causing noise and air pollution, following the proposed increases of waste volumes which are 8 times more than the currently permitted volumes.
4. Part 3.8 of the EIS states that there are 5 other similar recycling facilities near the Revesby Recovery Facility, all within 3.6 to 8.6 kilometre radiuses. This submission therefore rejects the further excessive expansion of the current facility.

5. Section 79B(3)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* (1979) seeks consideration of a development that is likely to significantly affect a threatened species, population, or ecological community, or its habitat. The EIS report states that there are twenty seven listed threatened species including: six bird species, three frog species, six mammal species, eleven plant species and one species of reptile. The report states that during the construction phase these threatened species may be injured. The report does not state the processes in which these injuries are to be avoided and only refers to one remedy and that is reporting injuries of species to relevant authorities. This submission therefore rejects any further expansion to the facility, also noting that the increase in truck activity is likely to greatly endanger the already threatened species.
6. Part 5.11.2.2 of the EIS states that the facility will continue to employ 25 people notwithstanding the proposed 733% increase in recycling volumes. By continuing to employ only 25 people following such a large increase in volume of recyclable waste, it is likely that the waste will linger around the facility for longer periods than they should, as the number of employees does not correlate with the proposed increase volume of waste. This will in turn create offensive smells, and as a result this proposal is again rejected.
7. The EIS also states that a number of other adverse impacts may arise from the operation of the facility including runoff of contaminants and particulates having potential to pollute stormwater and downstream waterways, dust emissions from stockpiled waste, the generation of litter from users of the site, excessive accumulation of materials, and stockpile instability.

On these grounds, this proposal is firmly rejected.