Submission
No 118

INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITIES

Name: Mr Brad Davies

Date Received: 12 October 2025

Submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry into Energy-from-Waste (EfW) – Brad Davies

Name: Brad Davies
Location: Parkes, NSW

Introduction

I have lived in Parkes all my life. My property is located approximately 4 km from the proposed EfW facility. I operate a small poultry business, raising chickens from day-old chicks to the point of lay, then selling them locally. My business relies entirely on producing safe, high-quality eggs and point-of-lay birds for local consumers.

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed EfW facility due to the very real risks it poses to my livelihood, local agriculture, and the broader community.

1. Impact on poultry and food safety (ToR b, c, d, e)

The proposed EfW facility would release emissions, particulate matter, and potentially toxic compounds into the air and surrounding soil.
Chickens raised near contaminated soil or water could ingest heavy metals, dioxins, furans, and other persistent pollutants, which can accumulate in their bodies and eggs, creating significant food safety risks.
International evidence supports this concern:

- A study in France found elevated dioxin levels in eggs from backyard chickens near a major incinerator.

https://www.euronews.com/green/2023/11/21/millions-in-france-warned-not-to-eat-eggs-from-backyard-chickens-due-to-forever-chemical-p?utm_source

- The IPEN Global Egg Study reported eggs collected near hospital waste incinerators in the Philippines had dioxin levels exceeding safe limits.

https://ipen.org/news/new-study-reveals-alarming-levels-toxic-chemicals-free-range-eggs-5-continents

- Zero Waste Europe found persistent organic pollutants in food, including eggs from backyard chickens near incinerators in Slovakia and the Netherlands.

https://www.foodingredientsfirst.com/news/zwe-biomonitoring-study-uncovers-alarmingly-polluted-food-near-waste-coincinerators.html?utm_source

Contamination would lead to loss of consumer confidence, with people unwilling to buy eggs or chickens produced near the facility, a potentially devastating outcome for a small-scale producer like me.
To protect my business and for future reference, I intend to conduct my own baseline monitoring of soil, water, and eggs prior to any construction, so any contamination from the facility can be documented if it occurs.

2. Environmental and agricultural impact (ToR d, e)

Beyond my poultry business, the facility could contaminate soil and water used for other agricultural production.
Even trace levels of toxic pollutants can accumulate in the food chain, affecting both livestock and crops. This is particularly concerning in Parkes, where many local farms rely on clean soil, air, and water to maintain quality produce and access domestic and international markets.

3. Property value and community wellbeing (ToR d, e, j)

The presence of a large industrial facility so close to my property is likely to reduce land values, affecting not only my own property but potentially the entire surrounding area.
The social and economic consequences for the community include reduced investment in agriculture, potential loss of jobs, and concern over long-term health impacts.

4. Baseline monitoring (ToR b, h, j)

To protect my business and provide evidence of any future contamination, I intend to conduct my own baseline monitoring of soil, water, and eggs for dioxins, furans and heavy metals.
This monitoring will help establish a clear record of conditions before the facility is built, ensuring that any potential contamination can be documented and addressed.

Alignment with the Inquiry Terms of Reference (2025)

ToR (a) & (b): The facility poses clear environmental and health risks. Contamination of soil, water, and air is well documented internationally, and these risks are particularly serious for small-scale agricultural producers.

ToR (c) & (d): The potential impacts on agriculture and local communities are significant. My poultry business is an example how rural enterprises are vulnerable to EfW emissions.

ToR (h): The social and economic consequences are substantial, including loss of business, consumer confidence, and property value.

Conclusion

Given the proximity of the proposed EfW facility to my property, the real risk of contamination to my chickens and eggs, the potential loss of consumer confidence, and broader impacts on land value and community wellbeing, I strongly oppose the construction of this facility in Parkes.
I urge the Inquiry to fully consider the risks to small-scale farmers, food safety, and local communities when evaluating the suitability of EfW projects in rural areas.

Sincerely
Brad Davies
Parkes NSW