

OBJECTION to SSD-10395

Since finding out about a WtE Incineration proposal 1 km from where I live, 5 years ago, my life has not been the same. It is spent worrying, researching, and writing to Govt Depts, Politicians and trying to find some way of convincing the powers that be, that people matter more than money and big corporations.

These proponents have robbed me of 5 years of my life, before even laying the first footings for their toxic proposals. Then, if they are approved, they will rob me of my physical and mental health, my home and my peace of mind.

There are so many issues and points to touch on but I would like to begin by asking, if the last WtE Proposal was rejected on these grounds;

The Commission finds that: •the applicant's predicted modelling, as outlined in paragraph 118, was based on data that is not representative of the actual waste streams proposed to be treated at the EfW Facility; •there is insufficient evidence that the pollution control technologies are capable of appropriately managing emissions from the project and would be agnostic to the composition of the project's waste stream, as outlined in paragraph 136; •there is uncertainty in relation to the air quality, and the relationship between air quality impacts and water quality impacts in the locality, as outlined paragraphs 137 and 166; •as a result, there is uncertainty in relation to the human health risks and site suitability, as outlined in paragraphs 158 and 197; •it is not satisfied that the project is consistent with those objects of the EP&A Act, as outlined in paragraph 219; and •the project is not in the public interest as outlined in paragraphs 218 and 220.

41236. For the reasons outlined above, the Commission has decided to refuse consent to the development application.²³⁷ The reasons for the Decision are given in this Statement of Reasons for Decision dated 19 July 2018.

Then how can any WtE Incinerator proposal be approved now? These same reasons still apply, in fact, more recent research has been released with even more damning evidence in regards to the negative impact on human health and the environment. Air Quality has declined even further since the last proposal was looked at and traffic, industry and resident and workers numbers have increased. So if this proposal was to go ahead, it would do even more damage now and affect more people. WtE incineration was not the answer then and it still isn't now.

I object to this proposal, first and foremost because of the known human health risks associated with this technology and the environmental impacts which will be with us for many generations to come and can't be undone. By approving this technology, you are sentencing an untold number of people to illnesses and shortened lifespans, directly related to this technology.

I object to this proposal because of the poor air quality we already experience in the Sydney Basin. Here in the Western Suburbs of Sydney the AQ regularly exceeds the national standards and the averages for 2015 -19 well exceeded the national standard. I also object to the use of 2015 statistics being used for the EIS baseline figures as 2015 does not give an accurate picture of the air quality that we will be subjected to due to the huge increase in both residential and industrial growth in this area.

I note in the EIS for this proposal, that Cleanaway are aware of this, and say that their bit of extra air pollution (1.9%) will not really make a difference (as it is already so bad). To knowingly add to an already deadly problem like air pollution, with total disregard to the millions of people it will affect, is unconscionable.

We are at a time in history where we can't "risk it" and make big mistakes anymore. We have no reason to make these mistakes with all of the information available to us. All of our technology, health and climate decisions are of the utmost importance at this time and will set up us for success or failure in the future.

These proponents often use similar companies in other parts of the world to try to sell us on the

idea of poisoning ourselves, but the reality is, that the rest of the world has seen the error of their ways. They are backing away from WtE, decommissioning plants and moving towards a better and sustainable model for all of our futures, zero waste. The EU has even removed the subsidies and grants that were available to WtE, because they don't meet the criteria. They are neither green, clean or renewable. There is absolutely NO excuse for us to go down a path that has been proven to be the wrong one. The mistakes have been made by other countries, we don't need to follow them down this dangerous path and allow Australians to suffer the long-term effects too.

I object to this proposal in the way that the Community Engagement has been handled. Our community group have been contacted by many, many people who have said;

They have not been contacted at all about this.

They have objected, yet Cleanaway have told Blacktown City Council and its Councillors that they have had no objections. (One or more Councillors requested and have a list of people who have objected, contrary to what they were told.)

They have been part of the consultations and were unable to provide the answers they wanted to give because they were only given options that led them to seemingly want WtE Incineration. They have also been "muzzled" when trying to speak out.

We also don't understand how the people running these sessions can have absolutely no knowledge on the subject. We know this after speaking to them at one of their pop-ups.

What they did was not community engagement, it was community manipulation and has done nothing but alienate the community and help them to understand what a con, community engagement is. They pick and choose who they want, pay them money to attend and then make them answer questions that can only lead them to one result. The result the company is paid to get. Does this seem like it is in the best interests of the community or that it will result in getting an accurate picture of what the community wants? I was actually chosen for the CE Sessions, but I questioned why I must use their WiFi instead of the one I have available on my phone? They said they would check on that for me and rang me back a short time later to say that I wasn't actually needed, they had made a mistake, they already had someone from my suburb. This is unbelievable to me as I had already been accepted and even if they did have someone from my suburb, was that the extent of their community engagement, one person from one of the two closest suburbs? It also begs the question, why do you have to sign into their WiFi?

I object to this proposal with regards to the expectation that ordinary people are expected to be able to read, understand and object to a thousand page EIS in a matter of days that was created by an expert in their field over a matter of many months. Who is looking after the people? Who is paying for our experts to keep us safe from any inaccuracies in these reports? It is a ridiculous and unfair ask, putting the proponents in a very favourable position.

I object to this proposal and the way it has been handled by Blacktown City Council.

1) Blacktown City Council and the Mayor did not notify the ratepayers/residents of BCC, until a community group started asking them why.

2) They did not respond to the community group's request to be able to give Council a presentation, like the 2-day opportunity that BCC gave to Cleanaway. They were not unbiased in receiving information from both sides of this discussion.

3) Most of the Councillors we spoke to were terribly misinformed and or underinformed.

4) The Mayor refused to confirm Blacktown City Councils position on this proposal, or whether they

would be lodging a submission. It was only very recently, approx. 12-11-20, did he say that a submission would be lodged by BCC. Instead he spent his time repeating the same few statements which included, doing the right thing by the people and it won't be their decision in the end and they have employed an independent expert, all things that said nothing at all really on where BCC stands on this issue in their LGA.

5) When asked if BCC has been offered any form of inducement to support the Cleanaway proposal, they replied by not answering the question they were asked and instead said, "We have not received any form of inducement from any of the companies proposing waste to energy incineration facilities in our City". They were not asked if they had received it, just had they been offered it as shown in pages 975-978 of the EIS. Why are they not being upfront with the community they represent?

6) BCC has hired a Community Engagement company to steer people towards saying they want incineration. Many residents have contacted us saying things like, they felt like they were being tricked and it was all pushing incineration.

7) VPA's should be illegal. Blacktown City Council stands to make a lot of money from Cleanaway in the form of "Royalty Fees". Elected officials should never be put in the position of choosing between big money and the people who voted them in. VPA's should also be illegal for the reason that if a proposal can't stand on its own merit, paying its way through is always going to cast a shadow over that proposal and the people involved in the decision making.

I object to this proposal because the Waste Industry has a step by step program for its members to follow to be able to get WtE Incineration into communities and targets, in particular, lower socioeconomic areas where it is less likely that people will have the time, money or knowledge to fight them. What is big business to them, is life to us.

I object to this proposal because on Friday, 22nd March, 2019, our Premier, Gladys Berejiklian, publicly stated that Eastern Creek was not the right place for incinerators and we should not worry about it because it is not going to happen. Surely that decision from the top is where the buck stops?

(I am happy to direct you to the recording if required.)

I object to this proposal on the grounds that the submission period was inadequate. Not only due to the impossible amount of technical jargon that untrained people cannot possibly understand or learn about in the time allowed whilst still living their lives, but quite often the submissions section of the Planning website was not working and left people with no avenue to lodge their submissions/objections. Even after advising the Dept of Planning on numerous occasions, it was not fixed and it was especially difficult to log in, during the last few days. As a community group, we were given a very lengthy list of instructions by Planning, to tell people to read and follow if they would like to email their submission instead. Unfortunately, a lot of people had given up long before this and didn't realise there were other avenues available to them as they are not advertised on the proposal page.

I object to this proposal because incineration has been banned in ACT. If it is too dangerous to put in the ACT, then it is too dangerous to put anywhere in Australia, let alone NSW/Sydney with the unique topography of the Sydney Basin and the pollution problems associated with it.

I object to the "fake news", "spin" and inaccuracies that Cleanaway have delivered to the public under the guise of real information and how they have been allowed to get away with it.

I object to this proposal because it is only appealing to those who will make huge amounts of money from it. Not because it is a better way to deal with our waste, not because it is better for our environment, not because it will be better for our future generations, not because it is clean or

green. ONLY because it is a gold mine for a few and a health and environmental disaster for many. Our health should never be for sale.

I object to this proposal because in September 2019 The Australian Public Health Association (APHA) published a world first, full systemic review, of health impacts related to waste incineration technologies.

The report finds that both workers and the public are adversely affected by waste incinerator technologies. *"This systematic review highlights significant risks associated with waste incineration as a form of waste management"*

If the Australian Public Health Association finds that there are significant risks associated with Incinerator technologies, why are you even entertaining these proposals?

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1753-6405.12939>

Australian citizens should not have to live in fear that their government or its agencies are going to approve dangerous and toxic technology which will harm their families and future generations. It is a known fact that this technology is dangerous to human health and the environment and its' time to stop entertaining these proposals and wasting everyone's time.

Do the only right thing, put an end to it by sending a strong message, No Incineration for NSW, we will not sell our citizens health.