

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION WASTE RECYCLING FACILITY,
MOOREBANK (MP 05_0157)

From: [REDACTED]
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: Saturday - 30 March 2013 12:33 PM
Subject: SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION WASTE
RECYCLING FACILITY, MOOREBANK (MP 05_0157)
Attachments: Mime.822

To Whom It May Concern c/o NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure.

I do NOT want my name to be available to the Proponent, various authorities, or on the Department's website due to privacy concerns.

My name, [REDACTED]

Joint owner of [REDACTED]

OBJECTION to the proposal.

REASONS for objection to proposal as follows:

1. Moorebank Recyclers Pty Ltd first mooted it's development application in 2006 when limited details were made available on the NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure's website. Seven years later it is now 2013, & a tremendous amount of change has occurred in the immediate locality providing for high quality residential, recreational & environmental areas. Urban renewal in the form of Georges Fair housing development has transformed Moorebank from an unsightly industrial land use precinct to a family friendly, vibrant growing residential community near the Georges River.
2. The proposal has appeared dormant for several years with public consultation of the proposal only starting in 2011. Since then Liverpool City Council is strongly opposed to the proposal. In fact, at an extraordinary meeting councillors voted unanimously to halt the proposal & it refused Moorebank Recyclers road access to its site across Council land. It is disconcerting why the NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure has allowed the public exhibition of this proposal when a fundamental threshold issue such as access to the site has not yet been resolved.
3. The nearby Benedict Sands site has also been rezoned for residential & recreational land use development in the near future with a proposed marina. This is more in keeping with the changed character of the immediate locality, not a proposed recycling plant.
4. The proposal will increase the traffic on adjacent Brickmakers Drive as trucks entering & leaving the proposal will have to use Brickmakers Drive. Brickmakers Drive is a narrow, chicane lined & refuge island designed one lane each way residential public road. Investa Land as the developer of Georges Fair, who designed constructed & paid for Brickmakers Drive have stated that it was never intended to carry heavily laden B-double trucks every two minutes (324 trucks per day according to the proposal's own submissions), but purely as a direct link to both Nuwarra Road & Newbridge Road to be accessed by Georges Fair residents. It should be noted that Georges Fair residents have paid for the cost of constructing Brickmakers Drive as the developer, Investa, would naturally have passed on the costs

involved as a higher price on each block offered for sale. Upon the road's completion, transferring ownership of the road to Liverpool City Council. Why should Moorebank Recyclers proposal now try & link up with Brickmakers Drive when they have not contributed one cent to its construction costs?

5. Land zoned E2 "Environmental Conservation" should not be used for industry that State Environmental Policy No. 33 states is "potentially offensive" industry. This is a potential environmental threat in the making as the objectives of Zone E2 (refer page 3.14) states:

- to protect, manage & restore areas of high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values.
- to prevent development that could destroy, damage or otherwise have an adverse affect on those values.

This proposal is totally contradictory to the objectives of this zone where the ecological & aesthetic values of the nearby residents have been disregarded.

6. This proposal has been located in an environmentally sensitive area immediately adjacent a river. It's an absurd proposition to think this type of industry would be allowed to operate here in this day & age. The Environmental Assessment has stated that the proponent can't control all sediment that will eventually end up in the Georges River.

7. The trucks that will be using the proposal are of a large, heavy type especially when fully laden. Even a speed limit of 25km/h will have a negligible affect on noise emission especially when they have to drive up an embankment 1.8m high to access Brickmakers Drive.

8. The adjacent & existing residential area is populated with young families. The health of the residents & their young children will be compromised by such close proximity to a noxious dust producing proposal. Dust exposure to humans is medically proven to increase morbidity. Dust is very hard to control even with water sprinklers operating especially on very dry, windy days.

9. The proposal's applicants Moorebank Recyclers have given a list of operational commitments, but who will hold them accountable when things do go wrong according to Murphy's Law. What happens if they sell the businesss in the future, or want to expand its operations?

10. If the proposal is granted development permission & nearby resident's property values inevitably decline (after all, logic says who would pay a premium to live next to a noisy, toxic, dust producing, heavy vehicle movement generating operation), who is responsible for this & will compensation be offered? Will Moorebank Recyclers offer monetary compensation to those so affected? I think not, but the proponent does mention saving money for the construction industry in their application. The proponent is in the recycling business to make money, but when it comes to responding about residents concerns about **possible property value loss**, they deliberately choose to sidestep this issue by saying it was not required for the Environmental Assessment (refer page 4-5). This is a **very critical** issue for the residents affected & Moorebank Recyclers should be compelled to address this matter & not brush it aside.

11. It is very dismissive & arrogant in the extreme for the proponent to state "there is no significant environmental benefit would be gained by non development". The proposal will produce extra noise. The proposal will generate extra dust. The proposal will generate significant extra heavy vehicle traffic movements. The proposal will reduce habitat for the endangered Green & Golden Bell Frog & other native fauna. The proposal will house 10,000 litres of toxic, flammable diesel fuel on site. The proposal is adjacent a high bush fire risk area.

IN CONCLUSION: THE PROPOSAL IS THE WRONG USE FOR AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA WHICH WILL DETRIMENTALLY AFFECT EXISTING & FUTURE RESIDENTS' AMENITY.