

**Submission  
No 599**

## **INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITIES**

**Name:** Mr John Taylor  
**Date Received:** 27 October 2025

---

I am opposed to Veolia's waste incineration proposal on a number of issues based on safety and equity.

### Safety

Incineration pumps out known harmful emissions such as acid gases, toxic heavy metal particulates and persistent organic particulates. Plume modelling shows air pollution will effect a large area around the facility.

The NSW Chief Scientist suggests "contamination of food and ingestion of pollutants is a significant risk pathway". "New incinerators should be located away from areas of food production" and "food grown near an incinerator should be avoided"

The region likely to be effected spreads from Goulburn to Canberra and not only has a significant population it is an area of high agricultural activity. The northern parts are also in the Sydney drinking water catchment.

Veolia admits the incinerator will exceed the NSW Government safety standards for air emissions and has banned them in Sydney. The ACT Government also bans incinerators for health and environmental reasons.

AS others have stated we should support the "precautionary Principle". "It simply says if you do not know enough , if there is uncertainty, and there is going to be a likelihood of harm, don't do it".

The proponent, Veolia, says it is safe but has a poor history of regularity compliance.

There are many examples where the application of the "precautionary principle" would have saved lives and environmental damage. A recent few inclus asbestos, man-made stone and PFAS.

Incineration contributes to climate change. It is not renewable energy although often called "energy recovery" in an effort to mislead.

### Equity

On the same principle behind "user pays", as this waste is generated in Sydney it should be dealt with in Sydney.

Pushing the problem onto a regional area is not morally responsible and is indeed insulting to the region.

If incineration is not harmful in any way it needs to take place at source. Simple economics supports this against transporting waste hundreds of kilometres to a regional area. Greatly reduced transport also has environmental benefits.

NSW environment minister, Penny Sharpe, has said energy from waste was the lesser of two evils, "energy-from-waste is the slightly less bad way of dealing with those issues." On what basis is shifting this evil to a regional community valid?

At a personal level, given my experience over more than 20 years, I have little confidence in NSW planning and regulation and conclude that I could have no confidence in this proposal