

Emma Barnet - Outdated information

From: [REDACTED]
To: <emma.barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au>,
<chris.ritchie@planning.nsw.gov.au>,
<office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>, Melanie Gibbons
<menai@parliament.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 3/14/2013 11:01 PM
Subject: Outdated information
Attachments: Moorebank Recyclers road access.pdf

Good Evening,

I would like a response as to why Moorebank Recyclers have been permitted to exhibit an incomplete EA for their proposed recycling plant (MP 05_0157). One of their attachments to the EA is a document from Liverpool Council granting landowners consent over council land to Moorebank Recyclers. This document has been superseded, as is evidenced by my attachment.

This is only one of many outdated documents contained within the EA. Some of the data, for example, while contained in a report dated 2012, was obtained in 2007, when there were no residents living in the now developed residential precinct of Georges Fair.

I think it is an embarrassment to the Department and hence the Minister that this EA has been exhibited with such glaring flaws. I would like a response as to why this is considered acceptable by the Department and its leader, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Kind Regards,
[REDACTED]

Memo

To: Mayor and Councillors
From: Farooq Portelli, General Manager
Date: 28 September 2010
Subject: Access Road for Moorebank Recyclers
Reference: 172864.2011 2006/0685

For the Information of Councillors

Council received and responded to a media enquiry this week regarding the access road provisions for Moorebank Recyclers.

The media were interested to verify whether Council had in fact historically provided Moorebank Recyclers a permit to access across Council owned land to Brickmakers Drive.

I provide the following response to this enquiry for your information given the media coverage on this matter in the Liverpool Champion today.

“Council research indicates that a letter dated February 2009 was issued providing access to the proposed development.

Formal approval has subsequently been withdrawn by Council to permit access across Council owned land to Brickmakers Drive.


Council resolved at its Meeting of 15 June 2011, that it be made clear that the Council does not support the Moorebank Recycling application, and that approval for access over Part Lot 310 and Lot 309 in DP 11 18048 will not be granted for the proposed project.

Council also wrote to the Director-General of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure confirming that approval is not granted for access.

In addition, Council commented that the proposed development was considered incompatible with the current and planned residential and recreational uses of the area and therefore the project should be refused.

Regardless of the above, it should be noted that Benedict Recycling has a valid approval for construction of a bridge across Council owned land, and Council did provide formal approval for lodgement of this application.”

Should you require any further information, please contact me on 9821 9221.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Portelli', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Farooq Portelli
General Manager

Submission Details for [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: <emma.barnet@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: Friday - 5 April 2013 12:36 AM
Subject: Submission Details for [REDACTED]
Attachments: MR objection.pdf; Mime.822
Department of Planning

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Address:

[REDACTED]
Moorebank, NSW
2170

Content:
See attached PDF below

IP Address: - 101.171.127.239
Submission: Online Submission from [REDACTED]
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=58521

Submission for Job: #100 MP 05_0157, Moorebank Waste Facility
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=100

Site: #91 Moorebank Waste Facility; , Moorebank
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=91

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Powered by [AffinityLive](#): Work. Smarter.

To Whom It May Concern

I am a resident of Moorebank, NSW, and I am writing to detail my objection to the proposed materials recycling facility (Application number MP 05_0157, Moorebank Waste Facility) currently being exhibited by the Department.

I object on the grounds that the submitted Environmental Assessment (EA) does not meet the Director General's Requirements, as issued on 7th July, 2008. The submitted documentation has been superseded, is inconclusive, inaccurate and outdated, and the EA is therefore false and misleading.

General Requirements	<p>The Environmental Assessment (EA) must include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an executive summary;• a detailed description of the project including the:<ul style="list-style-type: none">– need for the project;– alternatives considered; and– various components and stages of the project;• consideration of any relevant statutory provisions;• a general overview of the environmental impacts of the proposal, identifying the key issues for further assessment, and taking into consideration any issues raised during consultation (see below);• a detailed assessment of the key issues specified below, and any other significant issues identified in the general overview of the environmental impacts of the proposal (see above), which includes:<ul style="list-style-type: none">– a description of the existing environment;– an assessment of the potential impacts of the project;– a description of the measures that would be implemented to avoid, minimise, mitigate, offset, manage, and/or monitor the impacts of the project;• a draft Statement of Commitments, outlining environmental management, mitigation and monitoring measures;• a conclusion justifying the project, taking into consideration the environmental impacts of the proposal, the suitability of the site, and the costs and benefits of the proposal; and• a signed statement from the author of the Environmental Assessment certifying that the information contained in the report is neither false nor misleading.
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

I dispute the need for the project –

With regard to *Increasing recovery and use of secondary resources*, the 2007 Strategy adopts the same target as the 2003 Strategy, being that the following targets be achieved by 2014:

Increase recovery and utilisation of materials from municipal sector from the current 26% to 66%

Increase recovery and utilisation of materials from the commercial & industrial sector from the current 28% to 63%

Increase the recovery and utilisation of materials from the construction & demolition sector from the current 65% to 76%.

The proposed development would assist in achieving the above targets of the State government through the removal of building and construction waste from the waste stream which might otherwise have been diverted to landfill.

Allowing for the fact that this project is still at the first public exhibition stage, it is extremely unlikely that the facility will be operational by 2014, and thus will have no impact on the targets set by the NSW Government. Detailed below is the Proponent's own construction estimate.

As construction is likely to continue for approximately six months.

I dispute that alternative sites are not available for a Materials Recycling Facility.

14.3.1 Location

Concrete Recyclers has incurred considerable expense in the investigation of suitable sites in the Sydney metropolitan area for the proposed Materials Recycling Facility such that the environmental impact of such a facility would be minimal.

There is a shortage of land in the Sydney metropolitan area which is large enough to accommodate a Materials Recycling Facility such as that which is proposed while at the same time being sufficient distance from potentially affected land uses to ensure that such a facility operates in harmony with other land uses.

Notwithstanding a continued review of the available industrial land, Concrete Recyclers has concluded that the most cost effective and environmentally acceptable location is the subject site.

Moorebank Recyclers purchased the proposed site in Moorebank (Lot 6, DP 1065574), 20.4Ha of land, for \$10 000.

Form: 97-01T
Licence: 10V/0096/95
Printed: 0897LTO

TRANSFER

New South Wales
Real Property Act 1900

533/605G



Instructions for filling out
this form are available
from the Land Titles Office

Office of State Revenue use only

00'26 20/282622200 40 2015 860110
N.S.W. STAMP DUTY

- (A) **LAND TRANSFERRED**
If appropriate, specify the
share or part transferred.

VOL 4916 FOL 244
FOLIO IDENTIFIER 1/336613

- (B) **LODGED BY**

LTO Box

Name, Address or DX and Telephone

3684

Hardings

Reference (15 character maximum): RB-940355

- (C) **TRANSFEROR** MAYNE NICKLESS LIMITED ACN 004 073 410

- (D) acknowledges receipt of the consideration of \$10,000.00

and as regards the land specified above transfers to the transferee an estate in fee simple.

- (E) Encumbrances (if applicable): 1. 2. 3.

- (F) **TRANSFEE**

T
TS
(s/13 LGA)
TW
(Sheriff)

MOOREBANK RECYCLERS PTY LIMITED
ACN067 281 083

- (G)

TENANCY:

- (H) We certify this dealing correct for the purposes of the Real Property Act 1900. DATE

Signed in my presence by the transferor who is personally known to me.

The Common Seal of Mayne Nickless Limited was
affixed in accordance with its Articles of Association
Signature of Witness

Name of Witness (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address of Witness

Signature of
KM SLEEP

Signature of Transferor Director
JC TRETHOWAN

Signed in my presence by the transferee who is personally known to me.

Signature of Witness

Name of Witness (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address of Witness

Solicitor for
Roslyn Bean

If signed on the transferee's behalf by a solicitor or licensed
conveyancer, show the signatory's full name in block letters.



No reasonable person would consider a \$10 000 outlay for such a large plot of land to be a “considerable expense”. The fact that the initial outlay for Moorebank Recyclers was \$10 000, it follows that they would, naturally, consider this site the most cost effective!

As for there being a shortage of available land in the Sydney Metropolitan area, I am aware, as would the Department be, of another site being proposed as a material recovery facility by Moorebank Recyclers at St Peters, NSW. This land is within the boundaries of an industrial precinct, and is therefore a suitable alternative to the Moorebank site.

I dispute the suitability of the site.

The Site is bound by:

- the Georges River to the east,
- Benedict Sand and Gravel to the north of the main body of the Site and to the east of the access handle to the Site,
- a large area of environmentally sensitive vegetation to the west of the Site,
- a small section of the Georges Fair residential estate which is located on the former Boral quarry to the west of the Site, and

Nexus Environmental Planning Pty Ltd

- New Brighton Golf Club to the south of the Site.

With the rezoning of the Boral site to a residential development (Georges Fair) which will consist of approximately 1000 homes, the rezoning of the Benedict Sand and Gravel site to a residential and recreational space, and the proposed redevelopment of New Brighton Golf Course to a partly residential area, how can the Moorebank Recyclers site be considered suitable for a material recovery facility?

The zoning of the Lot 6, DP 1065574 (the Moorebank Recyclers site) is E2

The Site is zoned E2 Environmental Conservation pursuant to the Liverpool Local Environmental Plan 2008 (**LEP 2008**).

The Land Use Table for the E2 zone indicates that a *resource recovery facility* is a prohibited use in the E2 zone.

The objectives of the E2 Environmental Conservation zone are:

- *To protect, manage and restore areas of high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values.*
- *To prevent development that could destroy, damage or otherwise have an adverse effect on those values.*
- *To enable the recreational enjoyment, cultural interpretation or scientific study of the natural environment.*

These statements, taken from the EA submitted by Moorebank Recyclers, need no further explanation as to why the site is not suitable for a materials recovery facility.

The following is an extract from the proponent's EA outlining Liverpool Council's DCP

Liverpool Development Control Plan 2008 (**DCP 2008**) applies to the Site.

The objectives of DCP 2008 are:

- a) *To provide more detailed provisions for regulating the carrying out of development.*
- b) *To protect and improve the natural environment in the City of Liverpool.*
- c) *To protect and improve the amenity of the City of Liverpool.*
- d) *To protect personal safety and to minimise the risk of damage to areas subject to environmental hazards, particularly flooding.*
- e) *To promote a high standard of urban and environmental design.*
- f) *To conserve, protect and enhance the environmental heritage of the City of Liverpool.*
- g) *To encourage a diversity of housing to meet the needs of the residents of the City of Liverpool.*

h) To facilitate development that is environmentally sustainable.

I dispute that the proposed development will

- Improve the natural environment of the City of Liverpool
- Protect and improve the natural environment in the City of Liverpool
- Protect and improve the amenity of the City of Liverpool
- Minimise the risk of damage to areas subject to environmental hazards, particularly flooding
- Promote a high standard of urban design
- Conserve, protect and enhance the environmental heritage of the City of Liverpool

The proposed site was previously used as a dumping ground and thus is classified landfill. Can the Department be certain that construction of the proposed facility and operation of the facility will not disturb sensitive, hazardous material previously used to fill the site?

Key Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site access – demonstrate that suitable arrangements have been made to secure access to the site, including written evidence of the relevant landowner's consent for the proposed site access works;• Traffic and transport - including details of the traffic volumes that are likely to be generated during construction and operation, and an assessment of the impact of this traffic on the safety and efficiency of the surrounding road network;• Waste management– including waste receipt, classification and stockpiling;• Air quality – including dust, odour and greenhouse gas emissions;• Noise – including construction, operation and traffic noise;• Soil and water - including surface and ground water impacts, particularly on the Georges River; stormwater management, including detailed consideration of any potential offsite drainage impacts; flooding; wastewater disposal; erosion and sediment controls; soil contamination; and salinity.• Visual – particularly on the existing and proposed residential areas, nearby conservation and parkland areas, and the Georges River;
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Flora and Fauna – particularly on any threatened species, populations, or ecological communities and their habitats;• Hazards and risks – including handling of potentially hazardous materials and fire management; and• Heritage – both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal.

Site access is a key issue as defined by the Director General. This issue HAS NOT been addressed, and thus the fact that the EA has been placed on exhibition is inexplicable to me.



Our Ref: 2007/0314
Your Ref:
Contact: Michael Williams
Tel 9821 9212
Fax 9821 9532
m.williams@liverpool.nsw.gov.au
Date: 22/2009

The Director
Moorebank Recyclers P/L
PO Box 238
RYDALMERE NSW 1701

Dear Sir

RE: Landowners consent – Lots 308 & 309 DP 1118048 - Moorebank

We refer to your letter dated 22/12/2008 and confirm that Council grants consent for the lodgement of the Part 3A Project Application with the Minister for Planning in relation to the abovementioned Land for access purposes to the proposed materials recycling yard.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Williams
Property Manager

This document has been included in the Proponent's EA as evidence of landowners consent from Liverpool Council to utilise Lots 308 and 309, DP 1118048. This document has been superseded as evidenced below, and thus renders the information contained within the EA false and misleading, and the Director General's Requirements not met.



Liverpool city council
creating our future together

Our Ref: 100519.2011
Contact: Tanya O'Brien 9821 9287

14 July 2011

Mr Sam Haddad
Director-General
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Haddad

**Re: Proposed Resource & Waste Project
Project Number: P 05_0157
Lot 6 DP 1055574 – Lot 6 Newbridge Road Moorebank**

I write in regard to a proposal for a Resource and Waste Project on the abovementioned property. It is noted that the developer has been issued with modified Director-General's requirements for the project on 7 July 2008.

The scope and extent of matters to be considered by the applicant in fulfilling the Director-Generals requirements is noted. A key issue relating to the project that you noted in your letter to the applicant regarding the DGRs is relating to access.

The proponent is aware that they are unable to gain access from Newbridge Road for the purpose of the proposed development and there is currently no alternate road access, without utilising property not in the applicant's ownership.

The applicant has made representations to Council with regard to gaining access via land in its holding however this has not been granted. Council considered this matter at its meeting of 15 June 2011, and resolved that it should be made clear that the Council does not support the application, and that approval for access over Part Lot 310 and Lot 309 in DP 1118048 will not be granted for the proposed project. As such it is unclear how the applicant intends to gain access to the project.

Further Council has received numerous representations regarding the proposal raising a number of issues not limited to the following:

- Heavy vehicle movements associated with this proposal should not be encouraged to come into residential areas,
- The use will cause dust, noise, light spill and other nuisance disturbances to nearby residents,
- The use will increase pollution including heavy metals, particulates, fumes or other environmental impacts,
- The site is flood liable and use of the site as proposed could create water quality and flooding issues,
- The site has environmental values and is located between a large area of high quality vegetation and the Georges River and is an important biodiversity and conservation link.

Administration Centre 1 Hoxton Park Road, Liverpool NSW 2170, DX 5030 Liverpool
Customer Service Centre Liverpool City Library, 170 George Street, Liverpool NSW 2170

All correspondence to The General Manager, Locked Bag 7064 Liverpool BC NSW 1871 Call Centre 1300 36 2170
Fax 9821 9333 Email lcc@liverpool.nsw.gov.au Web www.liverpool.nsw.gov.au TTY 9821 8800 ABN 84 181 182 471

The Council have in their resolutions expressed that the proposed use of this site is considered incompatible with the current and planned residential and recreational uses of the area. It is therefore recommended that in light of the above issues that this project be refused.

Should you require any further information on this matter, please do not hesitate to call me on 9821 9221.

Yours sincerely



Farooq Portelli
General Manager

The above document also lends considerable weight to the argument that a recycling facility on this site is not compatible with the surrounding precinct.

In addition to the above issues, the issue of access to the Site over Liverpool City Council land is a matter for consideration in the Director-General's Requirements. In the preparation of this Environmental Assessment, numerous attempts have been made to obtain the necessary approval of Liverpool City Council to use Lots 308 and 309, DP 1118048 to gain access to the Site. Notwithstanding Liverpool City Council granting its approval to the lodgement of the Part 3A application (refer **Appendix 3**), the Council has not provided its approval to use that land for access to the Site.

The above paragraph, extracted from the Proponent's EA, contradicts their previous attempt to satisfy the issue of site access – again rendering the EA misleading, and the Director General's Requirements not met.

Current access to the site is via Newbridge Rd, however, as evidenced below, the NSW RMS will not allow this to be an access route for the proposed development.

With regard to the proposed access to the Materials Recycling Facility, the RMS has indicated that it would not give permission to access the proposed Materials Recycling Facility where the access handle of the Site meets Newbridge Road.

Council, as part of its strategy for the development of the Moorebank Precinct and the development of the Georges Fair residential estate, has taken ownership of Lots 308 & 309, DP 1118048 which comprises Brickmakers Drive and an 18m wide strip of land joining Brickmakers Drive to the access handle of the Site. It is proposed to gain access to the Site by way of Brickmakers Drive and the 18m wide strip of land joining Brickmakers Drive to the Site. It is recognised, however, that an alternative access arrangement could be accommodated if required, that being by way of an access ramp to the access handle of the Site from Brickmakers Drive and an exit ramp from the access handle of the Site to Brickmakers Drive.

With regard to the impact on traffic of the proposed development, the following is extracted from the Proponent's EA

Traffic data over a 2 month period in 2003 for a previous recycling facility on the Benedict Sand and Gravel site operated by Concrete Recyclers has been used to estimate the hourly distribution of truck movements for the proposed facility on Lot 6. There will be daily variations in the number of *truck movements per day and per hour*.

This data is more than 10 years old, and cannot be relied upon as accurate for that reason.

The proposed facility will accept building and industrial waste.

The proposed facility would receive concrete, brick, asphalt, sandstone and sand from the building and construction industry in the Sydney metropolitan area. No domestic loads would be received at the facility.

Materials received would be stockpiled and then processed by crushing the material into different sizes depending on the market demand for the end product.

Can the community be guaranteed that hazardous material, such as asbestos, will NOT EVER be included in the materials accepted by the facility?

The community, and employees of the recycling facility, CAN NOT be guaranteed that they will not be exposed to silica dust as a by-product of the concrete crushing activities on the site. Please refer

to the article below which relates to activities documented on the Concrete Recyclers facility at Camellia.

In a dust-up over pollution with KLF Holdings and Concrete Recyclers

- [Health](#)

21 Sep 11 @ 06:52am by DI BARTOK



INDUSTRIAL dust and noise are making life difficult for Rydalmere riverside residents.

The impact of industries across the Parramatta River in Camellia has led to many families moving out over the past few years.

But Patrick Staunton and his family, wife Patricia and two children are staying put - continuing their fight to have offending businesses modify their practices.

Mr Staunton claims one of his children has developed asthma and his house is often covered in white dust, which he believes is silica.

Mr Staunton has reported two of the companies, KLF Holdings and Concrete Recyclers, to the Environmental Protection Agency but is not happy with the inspections the authority conducted.

“You can see silica dust drifting across the river and onto our homes and there is noise from one of the sites, from 7am to 4.30pm, and often at night when building skips are delivered,” Mr Staunton said.

“When I complained to the EPA, they sent out inspectors who spent about 10 minutes and 23 minutes in our street and said there was not a problem.

“When I call now, I am told to ring a hotline to report the problem.”

Mr Staunton lives in Milton St, which leads down to the riverside park. He calculates he is about 400m from the industrial area.

A neighbour, Robert Cazalet, has lived in the street for 35 years and said the impact of industry across the river has never been worse.

“I often have the side of my house coated in white dust,” he said. “I am constantly cleaning it.”

There is no cure for silica dust exposure. How can the Department allow a project such as this in such close proximity to residences, parklands, schools and childcare centres, knowing that silica exposure will occur, and the effects are irreversible?

Within the EA, air quality studies have been performed. These studies are flawed and outdated.

The Bureau of Meteorology (**BoM**) operates an automatic weather station at Bankstown Airport which is approximately 2 kilometres to the northeast of the Site. Measured parameters include temperature, wind speed, wind direction and sigma-theta (a measure of the fluctuation of wind direction) at hourly intervals and data for 2005 and 2006 have been acquired. Given the close proximity and absence of significant intervening terrain,

The data referred to above is 7 years old, and thus outdated and misleading. Additionally, Bankstown Airport is more than four times the distance from the site than the nearest residence, and therefore readings taken from this site are not truly indicative of the impact to residents within a 2Km radius of the proposed site.

The NSW Office of Environment and Heritage operates an air quality monitoring station at Rose Street, Liverpool which is approximately 5km to the west of the Site. A Tapered

Readings taken from this air quality monitoring station are not indicative of the air quality in the immediate area surrounding the proposed site as the station is more than 10 times the distance away from the site as the neighbouring residences. Thus, the air quality information contained within the EA is misleading.

Monitoring from the Liverpool site shows that, in 2005, the annual average PM_{10} concentration was $21 \mu g/m^3$ which is below the annual average PM_{10} criteria of $30 \mu g/m^3$. Maximum 24-hour average PM_{10} concentrations have been above the $50 \mu g/m^3$ criteria on two occasions; $51 \mu g/m^3$ on the 3 May 2005 and $56 \mu g/m^3$ on the 9 June 2005.

Readings and assumptions are based on data collected in 2005. This data is eight years old, and therefore unreliable in making assumptions about conditions today.

Dust deposition data are not available for the Site, however, there is an approximate relationship between annual average TSP concentrations and annual average dust deposition. The relationship suggests that areas experiencing $90 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ annual average

Dust production and disturbance is one of the main health concerns I have regarding the proposed facility. From the extract of the EA above, the Proponent openly admits that dust data is not available for analysis. Again I ask, how can the Department recommend a development to proceed in such close proximity to residences and the like, where the production of hazardous, potentially fatal dust, is a given, and the impact CANNOT be assessed!

Assessment of the acoustic disturbance by Wilkinson Murray Pty Ltd is flawed.

Existing ambient noise levels were monitored at three residences between Tuesday 20 February and Monday 5 March 2007. Although some time has lapsed, these data are still considered relevant. The monitoring locations (refer **Figure 5-1**) are as follows:

- Residence 1 37 Malinya Crescent, Moorebank;
- Residence 2 26 Elouera Crescent, Moorebank; and
- Residence 3 41 Martin Crescent, Milperra.

The data referred to in this excerpt is more than six years old, and is taken from residences not currently bordering the site. Results based on these measurements are therefore inaccurate and unrepresentative.

At the proposed new residential receivers in the Boral and Benedict sites, future background noise levels will be affected by future traffic noise on Brickmakers Drive. Predicted traffic volumes on this road were provided by Lyle Marshall & Associates. The minimum hourly daytime traffic volume is predicted to be 950 vehicles per hour, with 15% heavy vehicles and a speed of 60 km/h.

The above paragraph indicates that assumptions and predictions are made assuming that background noise on Brickmakers Drive will involve 15% heavy vehicles. Pending gazetting, there will

be a 5 tonne weight limit applied to Brickmakers Drive, and thus the volume of heavy vehicles will be negligible. Also, assumptions regarding the background noise are based on a speed limit of 60 km/h when in fact the speed limit along Brickmakers Drive is 50 km/h.

Therefore the assumptions made in the acoustic report relating to background traffic noise along Brickmakers Drive are false and misleading. The impact of crushing and vehicle movements into and out of the proposed facility therefore needs to be reassessed.

I object to the proposed development because of the real risk of flooding, and the real potential for damage to occur to the surrounding waterways and conservationally significant natural environments.

The Site is classified as flood prone as depicted on the LEP 2008 Maps.

Access to the Site and surrounding local areas are relatively low lying and prone to flooding from the Georges River. The direct access road to the Site is subject to minor inundation during a 3 year ARI flood. The Warning System and Site Emergency

If unusually intense flooding occurs (as has occurred numerous times recently in Queensland), how can the Department be satisfied that there will be no damage to or degradation of the environmentally sensitive land surrounding the proposed site, and to the Georges River itself?

The extracts of the Proponent's EA below illustrate the sensitive nature of the geography surrounding the proposed site.

Conservation Significance of the Vegetation

The Woollybutt - Blue Box Open Forest and Ironbark Open Forest are examples of Castlereagh Ironbark Forest. Castlereagh Ironbark Forest is an endangered ecological community listed on the TSC Act as Cooks River-Castlereagh Ironbark Forest.

The Cabbage Gum Open Forest is an example of Alluvial Woodland. Alluvial Woodland is a component of the TSC Act-listed endangered ecological community Riverflat eucalypt Forest on Coastal Floodplains.

Swamp Oak Woodland is also part of the Alluvial Woodland, however, due to the dominance of Swamp Oak, it is part of the TSC Act-listed endangered ecological community Swamp Oak floodplain forest.

Threatened Fauna Species

A review of point records of the Atlas of NSW Wildlife (DECCW 2010a) indicated that the following threatened fauna species have been detected within a five-kilometre radius of the site.

Table 2 Locally Occurring Threatened Fauna

Scientific Name	Status		Habitat
	EPBC Act	TSC Act	
Green and Golden Bell Frog <i>Litoria aurea</i> *	V	E	Permanent or ephemeral freshwater ponds with dense fringing vegetation
Red-crowned Toadlet <i>Pseudophryne australis</i>		V	Clean first order streams in heaths, woodlands and forests on sandstone derived soils
Bush Stone-curlew <i>Burhinus grallarius</i>		V	Mangroves, saltmarshes and woodlands; Single record of an injured bird at Condell Park.
Black-necked Stork <i>Ephippiorhynchus asiaticus</i>		V	Wetlands and their margins
Square-tailed Kite <i>Lophoictinia isura</i>		V	Large areas of woodland
Swift Parrot <i>Lathamus discolor</i> *	E	E	Winter migrant feeding on flowering eucalypts and lerp.
Barking Owl <i>Ninox connivens</i>		V	Nests in large tree hollows. Forages in open forest and woodland
Powerful Owl <i>Ninox strenua</i>		V	Nests in large tree hollows. Forages in open forest and woodland
Regent Honeyeater <i>Xanthomyza phrygia</i> *	E	E	Winter migrant feeding on flowering eucalypts and lerp.
Black-chinned Honeyeater <i>Melithreptus gularis</i>		V	Grassy woodlands
Koala <i>Phascolarctos cinereus</i>		V	Forest and woodlands containing suitable eucalypts
Eastern Pygmy-possum <i>Cercartetus nanus</i>		V	Heaths and woodlands
Grey-headed Flying-fox <i>Pteropus poliocephalus</i>	V	V	Flowering and fruiting trees
Yellow-bellied Sheath-tail-bat <i>Saccolaimus flaviventris</i>		V	Roosts in tree hollows; forages in forests and woodlands and their margins
Greater Broad-nosed Bat <i>Scoteanax rueppellii</i>		V	Roosts in tree hollows; forages in forests and woodlands and their margins
Eastern Little Mastiff-bat <i>Mormopterus norfolkensis</i>		V	Roosts in tree hollows; forages in forests and woodlands and their margins
Eastern False Pipistrelle <i>Falsistrellus tasmaniensis</i>		V	Roosts in tree hollows; forages over forests
Eastern Bent-wing Bat <i>Miniopterus schreibersii oceanensis</i>		V	Roost in caves, mines, tunnels etc; forages over woodlands and forests
Cumberland Land Snail <i>Meridolum corneovirens</i>		E	Intact forests and woodlands on the Cumberland Plain

Key

V – Vulnerable

E – Endangered

The Green and Golden Bell Frog may be located in the area of the Site.

I object to the proposed development on the basis that there will be significant areas of the site visible from the surrounding residences.

A multi storey development is near completion on Nuwarra Rd, Moorebank, which will very likely provide views directly into the proposed materials recycling facility. This development has not been considered by Moorebank Recyclers, and thus the visual impact of the site warrants further investigation.

Similarly, by the Proponent's own admission, vehicles entering and leaving the recycling facility, as well as aspects of the facility, will be visible by residents in the Benedict residential development.

There would not be any significant visibility of parts of the proposed development including any structures or stock piles from the access road to the Benedict site because of the blocking effect of future development on this site and existing and likely future vegetation.

Further buffer planting appropriate to enhancing the existing screening effect along the northern boundary of the Site would assist in reducing any unreasonable visibility from this future residential area.

The final matter of residual impact, which has a visual impact component, is traffic, specifically, the visibility of and character of vehicles entering and leaving the Site. Vehicles travelling within the access road, would travel parallel to a section of Brickmakers Drive for a short distance and be visible from that road.

Vehicles on the access road travelling to or from the Site would be indistinguishable from other traffic on Brickmakers Drive, other than during the act of entering or leaving the access road. While the latter is evidence of the activity for which the application is being made, the nature and character of the use would not be unique and the visibility of vehicles is not considered to be determinative.

I dispute the notion that the vehicles entering and leaving the site will be indistinguishable from traffic on Brickmakers Drive. Brickmakers Drive will, in the foreseeable future (pending gazetting), have a 5 tonne vehicle limit, thus highlighting the heavy vehicles entering and leaving the site.

The visual impacts of the proposed site will be, according to the Proponents, eliminated by trees and other vegetation separating the site from the Georges Fair residential precinct (see extracts below).

The land surface on which the proposed development would exist is not visible from any existing residential location outside the Site because of the topographic relationships which exist between them and the Site, the screening effects of vegetation both on the margins of the Site and in reserve land between the sites and the effect of the link road embankment at the eastern edge of the developing Georges Fair residential development.

The Site is below the visual horizon of trees which are part of the extensive buffer area of reserve land on and between the Boral (George Fair) site and the Site. The proposed development on the Site would not be visible from these areas.

The height of vegetation between the former Boral site (developing Georges Fair) and the Site which can screen visibility of the development proposed was surveyed in November 2003 and showed that, relative to the adjacent vegetation, the recycling crusher sheds and stockpiles with a maximum height of 10 metres would be considerably below the screening vegetation canopy height.

The modest amount of bushland between the site and Georges Fair is considered by Liverpool City Council as a bushfire hazard. Residents who constructed houses along that border were required to make provisions in preparation for a bushfire, should it happen.

If bushfire is considered enough of a risk to demand residents invest thousands of dollars in safety measures, how can the same bushland be considered a significant barrier to noise and visual impacts of the proposed recycling facility?

The proposed facility would receive concrete, brick, asphalt, sandstone and sand from the building and construction industry in the Sydney metropolitan area. No domestic loads would be received at the facility.

Materials received would be stockpiled and then processed by crushing the material into different sizes depending on the market demand for the end product.

Regarding the handling of hazardous and potentially hazardous material - from the above statement, the facility will accept building material. Can the community be guaranteed that there will be no asbestos contained within the recycling material?

How will the community, and employees within the facility, be protected from the silica dust particles produced by the concrete crushing within the facility? Once inhaled there is no cure for the damage caused by the silica dust.

For the reasons detailed above, I vehemently object to the proposed materials recycling facility. Through good judgement, legal framework and common sense I am confident that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, as representatives of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, will conclude that this proposed development is completely incompatible with the suggested site and its surrounds, and will deny the Proponent any hope of moving the project forward.