

**Submission  
No 88**

## **INQUIRY INTO 'ENERGY FROM WASTE' TECHNOLOGY**

**Name:** Mr Gerald Barr

**Date received:** 22 May 2017

---

I object to the Next Generation Energy from Waste Facility, Eastern Creek proposal based on the following points.

1) The EIS submission fails to list in detail possible contaminants including a range of measurements (of those contaminants) that could be released into the atmosphere in normal operation, or what a failure (either minimal or catastrophic) would look like in terms of emissions. This is not an acceptable level of information for a proposal of this nature, let alone one that is adjacent to urban and residential areas. This lack of information does not allow for reasoned review or analysis.

2) The facility claims to be a clean energy proposal however the proposal, on closer scrutiny, is in fact powered by diesel or gas and only combusts waste material as a part of the process. Apart from waste incineration, this proposal provides negligible benefit over a conventional diesel generator or gas powered power station.

3) Power stations are generally not built in urban environments; I believe this proposal is outside of the intent of the NSW Department of Environment and Planning's development guidelines for the Eastern Creek Industrial zone.

4) The Stockholm Convention (UN GUIDELINES ON BEST AVAILABLE TECHNIQUES AND PROVISIONAL GUIDANCE ON BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES relevant to Article 5 and Annex C of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, 2007) in its summary on Waste Incinerators, concludes that priority should be given to alternatives to Waste Incinerators including improved recycling and the prevention of the formation and release of persistent organic pollutants. This proposal does not meet or attempt to comply with either of these goals. European evidence has shown that the alternatives, increased re-use and recycling of waste are adversely affected by waste incineration. The Energy from Waste Facility proposal does not offer or provide 'best environmental practices'.

5) The submission (by Next Generation) is to design and construct (not to operate) the Energy from Waste facility, it is clear from the lack of detail, e.g. regarding the waste content (only 45% coming from Genesis Waste Centre) that this separation between building and operating the facility, provides the public with little or no re-assurance that actual environmental risks of the plant in operation will be either adequately assessed or mitigated.

6) The EIS was not on display for a reasonable amount of time based on the size of the document (approximately three thousand pages). My submission, due to these constraints can only be based on an overview and not a detailed assessment.

7) The visual impact of building a 100m high pollution stack 1kilometre from residential houses is significant. This is not in keeping with the profile of the adjoining residential or industrial area and should not be accepted in its current form or location.