

Emma Barnet - Objection to proposed Materials Recycling Facility - Moorebank (05_0157)

From: "Kaye & John Mobberley" <kayejohn@optusnet.com.au>
To: <emma.barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 5/03/2013 11:03 AM
Subject: Objection to proposed Materials Recycling Facility - Moorebank (05_0157)

Kaye & John Mobberley
 8 Turton Road
 Moorebank 2170
 Ph: 0412060947

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed Materials Recycling Facility - Moorebank (Project No. 05_0157) at Lot 6 DP 1065574, Newbridge Road, Moorebank.

I seek your support.

My wife and I are dismayed and bewildered why anyone would entertain a proposal for a recycling plant at Moorebank in close proximity to Georges River and adjacent to the new housing estate Georges Fair.

We know that all nearby residents are up in arms. Representations have been and will continue to be made. I won't repeat in detail the many reasons voiced so far supporting the case for objecting to the proposal and seeking its rejection. The significant factors in support of the objection include:

- (a) The proposed development is far too close (250 metres) to existing and proposed residential homes and their occupants - young and older.
- (b) The facility will cause dust pollution and emit a foul smell. Air quality will be diminished.
- (c) Extra truck movements (324 per day) to the facility is a very big increase in local traffic and there is no doubt that they will travel via Georges Fair roads not designed for this purpose but for local residents. We have already found that, contrary to what authorities and the developer said, Brickmakers Drive is regularly used by heavy transport.
- (d) There will also, of course, be increased traffic on the main roads including Nuwarra Road, Newbridge Road and Governor Macquarie Drive, which are already busy with heavy and other traffic. This will add to the traffic growth as a result of the 'Intermodal'.
- (e) Residents should not be subjected to additional traffic noise, pollution and congestion.
- (f) Materials delivered, processed and stored at the facility will represent an unacceptable health risk for residents and the community.
- (g) I understand that the location is not zoned for such a facility. It is not compatible with the current and planned residential, community and recreational uses of the area (including parklands, the Georges River itself, cycleways, a proposed waterside marina). The land is clearly more suitable for recreational facilities and/or a wildlife reserve.
- (h) I also understand that the owners of the adjacent Benedict Recycling plant have accepted that the area is no longer suitable for a building waste processing plant and converting their land for more acceptable use.

- (i) The proposed development is in an area that floods. We well remember the massive flooding of the Georges River in the 1980's. Unsafe building materials and material stockpiles may cause an environmental disaster throughout the entire Georges River basin.
- (j) The local community is opposed to this development. Councillors of the Liverpool City Council have voted unanimously against this development.
- (k) There are existing recycling facilities to cater for the demand and, more relevant, there are other potential locations away from community and natural resources much more suited for industry.
- (l) We are also concerned about the impact on our land values. We have spent our life savings on our house and am very concerned that its value will be reduced if the facility were to be approved. I doubt that we would be compensated - in any event, one cannot be compensated for the risks and disadvantages summarised above.

We would appreciate your support in ensuring that the proposed development is not approved and so that residents and the community can continue to enjoy their space and the Georges River environment.

Best wishes.

John Mobberley
on behalf of Kaye & John Mobberley